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ABSTRACT

This study utilizes sociologies two main ecological traditions to explain variation in individual levels of perception of community power. One refers to the individuals total environment or "ecosystem" and is deemed relevant insofar as it views differences in perception as being due to the socialising influence of the ecosystem. The second tradition concentrates on variation among spatial units, and is utilised because different levels of perception were judged to be related to spatial factors which operate to vary the flow of private information in rural areas.

Two hundred and eighty-seven heads of families in a single rural ward (electorial subdivision) in a West Louisiana Parish (County) were interviewed and information secured on background, interactional and attitudinal and spatial data.

An analysis of variance of the final model included two of each type of variables. Of the eight variables five were significantly associated with perception level, i.e., distance of residence from community centre, satisfaction with access to decision-making process, number of kin among power structure members, level of perception of
community problems, and the power level of the respondent's neighborhood. Age, occupation and number of friends visited were not significantly related to the level of perception.

An analysis of the distribution of sociometric choices by respondents of power structure members based on the neighborhood of chooser and chosen indicated that each neighborhood tended to base its choices on the basis of contiguity and relative power level.

The conclusions reached from both forms of analysis indicated that:

Perception levels were related to direct social ties with power structure members rather than to indirect forms of socialisation arising from background and interactional characteristics associated with primary socialisation.

The level of perception in different neighborhoods was related to contiguity to, and level of power of power actors.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on the perception which rural people have of community power. The major focus of interest is the rank-and-file members' view of individuals in the power structure. The population studied resides fifteen miles from the county seat, a town of some 11,000 population, and contains five neighborhoods with no centre of population greater than thirty families. The research site is in a parish in western Louisiana. The emphasis is twofold, (a) on rank-and-file and (b) on rural remoteness, and the broad purpose of the study is to examine rural rank-and-file perception of the local power structure in a remote rural area.

The emphasis on rank-and-file perception is promoted by certain lacunae in past community power research. Most studies of community power have focused on the more active sectors of the polity, i.e. the upper reaches of the power structure. Few insights have been obtained into aspects relating to the perception of community power at lower levels. Studies by Lynd and Lynd (1929 and 1937), Warner (1949), Goldschmidt (1947), Hunter (1953), Vidich and Bensman (1958), Dahl (1961), Martin (1961), and Lowry
(1962) have either ignored the rank and file members' perception or have paid it scant attention on the grounds that leaders in the power structure were representative of their followers, and that consequently followers need not be studied.

The absence of interest in this regard is all the more remarkable in view of the interest of both elitists and pluralists in examining the extent to which existing systems of community decision making approximate democratic values of pluralism, of widely shared power, and participation in major community issues. The imperatives of the modern organizational context of the polity necessitate study of the upper reaches of the power structure, but do not provide a rationale for the assumption (stated or unstated) of many studies that power leaders and organizational leaders do represent interested constituents. Furthermore, the uninterested or inactive sectors or sub-communities of the polity are generally ignored—a sector whose existence may have considerable long term consequences for any structure. The community has been regarded as the ideal situation for study of the power phenomenon as can be seen from the following quotation which could be generally accepted as the
rationale used by most researchers in community power for using the community as a research site.

...field studies of the political process at the community level are needed to test pluralist assumptions for it is here that widespread participation has the best chance to occur. One would expect to find the closest approximation between pluralist ideals and the realities of social and political organization. Barriers of size, distance, and organization are minimal. Access to the politician, the press and economic leaders is relatively open. The issues are neither so complex nor so far-removed that one feels ineffectual. Politics, and, hopefully, power is less a mystery. (Presthus, 1964:32)

However, it is the contention of this dissertation that the full potential of the community as a research site for testing pluralist assumptions has not been utilized because of the assumption (however pragmatically justified) that the extent of pluralism can be determined by delineating the extent of bargaining among a corp of elites to whom easy access exists. The question of the relationship of all members of the rank-and-file to the elites is in need of consideration if the extent of pluralism is to be properly determined.

Presthus (1963) and Jenkins (1966) are exceptions in that both have examined the relationship of a sample of rank-and-file members to the elites. The importance of this approach lies in the recognition that while some
degree of elitism is a necessary concomitant of modern organizational contexts, the crucial question which remains to be answered by such studies is the ability of the rank-and-file to change and control the elites. Consequently one emphasis of this study is on the perception which rank-and-file members in the community have of the elites.

The second emphasis of this study is on rural remoteness. The population lives in an area remote from any large town. The ideology of the past two hundred years has equated rurality with democratic pluralism (Rohrer and Douglas, 1969). In fact Lowry (1962:xxiv) has abstracted the following logically interrelated hypotheses concerning the relationship between small-community public life and leadership from a variety of studies in rural-urban sociology and small community research.

1. The isolated and self-sustaining nature of the small community affords protection against rapid and critical social change and disorganization.

2. An intimate and personal primary relationship among the citizens of the small community makes interaction more deeply meaningful and permits and encourages each member of the community to participate more directly and completely in the larger social and political processes of daily life;
3. The cooperative, rather than fiercely competitive, basis of small-community life is grounded upon homogeneity of the population, little social and geographical mobility, and minimal social differentiation (economic, political, ethnic, etc.), and this cooperation forms the footing of a strong primary community;

4. A stronger consciousness of kind gives rise to a meaningful sense of community and kindred and accounts for a potentially constructive communal awareness of problems and issues;

5. A proximity on the part of the citizen of the small community to the channels of communication and power through which leadership and influence are exercised encourages community-wide participation;

6. An intimate access of leadership to the citizenry and vice versa gives rise to a mutual sense of responsibility and influence;

7. A potential exists, therefore, for better mobilizing community action in response to problems and issues, thus avoiding anti-democratic processes such as alienation and apathy which so characterize larger urban society. (Lowry, 1968:xxiv-xxv)

It is assumed that changes in the organizational context of these areas are less than are to be found
elsewhere in society, and that consequently the actual situation in such areas will approach the ideal more closely in remote areas than elsewhere.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The characteristics of the perceiver, the milieu, and the perceived form the parameters for conceptualisation in this study. An individual's perception is seen as a function of his own characteristics, of the characteristics of his milieu and of the characteristics of those whom he perceives and of his interaction direct and indirect with these people.

The characteristics of the perceiver used in this study are his personal characteristics such as occupation, income, education and age. These characteristics are seen to set the potential level of perception.

The characteristics of the milieu and of the perceived are seen to set the limits within which an individual's potential perception will be realized. The assumption is that an individual who has high occupational status, high education, high income and who is old will perceive most when these high level variables are matched by equally high levels of variables relating to his milieu and to the individuals he perceives as powerful.
These three concepts, i.e., the perceiver, the milieu, and the perceived make up the individual's total ecosystem. Modern ecosystem theory views the basic ecosystem processes to be dependency and exchange relations between organisms and their environment (Cartwright, 1969: 166; Duncan, 1964:38.) In this study the individual's environment consists of his interactional characteristics and this includes his interaction with both power actors whom he perceives as such and with rank-and-file community members. This conceptualisation embraces both the concepts of milieu and of the perceived.

In sum, the characteristics of the perceiver, the milieu, and the perceived form the individual's ecosystem in this study. The ecosystem consists of the relations of the individual to his environment. The individual's (perceiver's) characteristics are seen to determine potential perception, and the environment, which includes characteristics of the milieu and of the perceived, is seen to set the limits to which the individual's potential perception will be realized. The concept environment relates to two different sources by which perception of power can be influenced, (1) the general milieu which is not specifically power oriented and (2) the power oriented milieu. The former relates to the milieu above and the latter to the perceived. The milieu has been emphasised
in studies dealing with socialisation (Young and Larson, 1970) political socialisation (Hyman, 1959, Dawson and Prewitt, 1970) personal influence (Merton, 1957, Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1964) voting (Lazarsfeld, Lipset, Barton, and Linz, 1954) and formation of partisan attitudes (Cox, 1969). These studies use various concepts such as "interpersonal influence", "opinion leadership", and "pressure toward conformity" in connection with their estimation of the effect of interaction on the attitudes and behavior of individuals. It may be noted that these concepts cover two properties of interaction (a) whether it is direct or indirect and (b) whether the respondent is aware of the influence or not. A third property of interaction (c) whether it is power oriented or not gives a property space with eight categories which guides collection of data. Unlike Kornhauser (1955) who conceives of intermediate structures mainly in the form of voluntary organisation the above conceptualisation leads to a broader operational definition of mediating association based on the assumption that many forms of social relationship other than voluntary association serve a mediating function between individual and society. These socialise the individual into the structure and give rise to his perception of the power structure. All forms of social
relationships from the most direct and purposeful interaction to the most diffuse stimuli of the general social, institutional, organisational and physical content are included in this conceptual framework.

The causal scheme underlying the analysis views interaction as an intervening variable between the background variables and perception of community power. As in Lauman (1966) status attributes of the individual are seen to affect cognition directly, and indirectly through the attributes of the structure of interaction.

Figure I. Model of relationships between status location, interaction and perception of community power.

Finally it may be noted that the type of data suggested by this model corresponds closely to that suggested by adult political socialisation theory. The latter views primary group, peer group and daily political experience
(paying taxes, obeying laws, receiving benefits and services) as the main contributory factors in political socialisation (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969).

The rural setting of the problem also prompts a spatial conceptualisation of some variables connected with the model. Haegerstrand (1967) used spatial information to get at the influence of the "neighborhood factor" and the role of private rather than public information. Variations in individuals' knowledge of the power structure is seen to be associated with the neighborhood factor. This emphasis is in line with the previously stated conten­tion that association other than voluntary organisation is important for socialisation. At the lower levels of society association is mainly of an informal nature and rural areas place a greater premium on informality. Neighborhood here however is defined in terms of the affectual perception of residents in view of the fact that the dependent variable is subjectively defined, and that both may be involved in the process of development of self (Young and Larson, 1970, Haga and Folse, 1971).

**Summary of Conceptual Framework**

The individual's perception of community power is seen to be derived from his background characteristics and the characteristics of his environment. The latter is related to both the total ecosystem of the individual
including the spatial characteristics of his "world" delineated at the social system or subsystems with which he identifies. The ecosystem is the environment within which the process of socialisation creates a cognitive map of the power structure for the individual. Power is both a consequence and a cause of social organisation and—by taking contextual effects into consideration a better understanding can be obtained of factors which explain perception of community power than could be obtained from individual characteristics alone. Finally the characteristics of the perceived of which the observers are likely to be aware either as spectators or through sociometric ties will be closely related to perception.

III. ASSUMPTIONS WHICH UNDERLIE THE STUDY

1. That an individual's perception is formed in his environment and is a function of his group affiliations rather than being derived from personal information.

2. That the requirements of a democratic system does not include politicisation of all of the rank and file resulting in high levels of perception for all.

3. That alienation is not a necessary concomitant of lack of perception. Neither is it associated with the rank and file's inability to mold its leaders to its every whim.

4. That the simultaneous imperatives of order, continuity and triviality (Berger, 1971) ensure that perception will vary even among members of the rank and file whose socialisation experiences and personality are similar.
5. That perception is neither wholly rational nor totally irrational, but depends upon the issues with which people are faced and their calculation of the consequences for them of various possible alternatives.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To discover whom the rank-and-file members of the community perceive as power actors.

2. To discover the power actors.

3. To relate the power actors to the neighborhoods which choose them. Power actors will be classified as neighborhood, multi-neighborhood and ward-wide in scope.

4. To guage the relationship of the personal characteristics of rank-and-file members to the extent of their knowledge of the power structure.

5. To compare the power actors' perception of the power structure with that of the rank-and-file.

6. To ascertain the effect of ecological variables e.g. density of population and distance of the neighborhood from the center, on individual perception of community power.

The precise meaning of the terms power actor, knowledgeable, rank-and-file community member will be explained in chapter four.

V. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The study deals with individual, contextual and spatial factors associated with perception of community power. Rural communities are constantly pressured to adapt to changes in society. Generally, society attempts
to change conditions in rural areas by introducing local branches of government agencies or of corporation. Rural communities have little chance to solve their problems without external assistance but crucial prerequisite steps are almost entirely local.

Perception of community power is one indicator of the community's ability to respond insofar as it indicates the ties between rank-and-file and their leaders and the homogeneity of attitude among rank-and-file. Such indicators are of use to economic planners, local government officials, social workers and extension agents in predicting local variations in the response to their efforts.

This study is part of an overall program being conducted by the Southern Forest Experiment Station and Louisiana Forestry Commission in an effort to reduce forest fires. A previous study indicated a low level of contact between Forestry Commission personnel and the members of the public. The range and effectiveness of this contact would be improved through use of information concerning the community power structure and its relation to the rank-and-file community members.
CHAPTER II
THEORIES OF POWER

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will contain a review of literature relating to theories of power. Discussion of theories of power predicates discussion of related concepts and of the relationships between them, e.g. authority, legitimacy, validation, societal integration, group and individual goal formation, the processes of institutionalisation and legalisation, the role of socialisation and exploitation, the relative influence of normative and non-normative processes and the role of the sociology of knowledge as it affects perception of power.

This chapter consists of five further sections. Section two outlines the problems associated with the definition of power and its relation to authority and legitimation. The differing views of the political scientist and the sociologist are discussed. Among sociologists some tend toward the political scientist's views, e.g. Bierstedt, while others view power more as a function of sociological factors, e.g. McIver.

The third section deals with Buckley's (1967) discussion of a possible solution to the above problem. Buckley's (1967:177) first major assertion in short,
is that discussion of power must take into consideration the concepts of authority and legitimacy. Legitimacy or dissensus however is part of a nexus involving power-authority, type of goals promoted (individual or group) and compliance or coercion. Buckley (1967) discusses a number of contributors to the literature on power and concludes that the conceptualisation of some of them adheres more closely than that of others to the theoretical framework predicated by the relationships within the nexus of concepts.

The crucial point for distinguishing between the two ideal types, i.e., power and authority, is the social psychological relationships within the group or society. This is the topic of the fourth section. This section covers Buckley's discussion of the contributions which small group theory and studies of bureaucracy can shed on the problem of legitimacy. Here too is the basis for choosing perception of power as a subject for study. Buckley (1967) classifies the consequences which lack of conceptual clarity and conceptual overlapping in dealing with institutionalisation, legalisation and legitimacy can have for attempts to distinguish between power and authority.

Buckley's (1967) distinctions however emphasise ideal types, power and authority, and consequently they
shed little useful light on the portion of the power-authority continuum which can be observed in social systems.

The remainder of the fourth section which outlines the theoretical framework which Schemerhorn (1970) uses to explain societal integration (in its imperfect form) is more pertinent to discussion of real life forms of power and authority. Schemerhorn (1970) shows the myriad contingencies which must be accounted for if the path which society must follow in its quest for integration is to be mapped. This clearly shows how complicated are the relationships of power and authority.

The fifth section deals with the sociology of knowledge aspects of legitimation and means of validation. Gellner's contribution is valuable for sensitising the student of perception of power to the consequences of basic assumptions which otherwise might go unexamined.

In the final section the topic of the study, perception of community power, is related to the contributions of the previous section. From examination of previous sections it is concluded that the processes of socialisation and exploitation provide the best theoretical framework for explaining individual perception. This framework is used in Chapter IV in the development of hypotheses.
II. SOCIAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT CONCERNING POWER: SOME PROBLEMS OF CONCEPTUALISATION

The fascination of social power per se as a subject matter for study is superceded only by the fascination of the sociology of the study of that particular phenomenon. In fact sociology has few concepts the derivation of which are so closely bound to the history and ideology of the ages through which they passed. The topic of domination has been so closely attached to the values of each particular age that the best minds of those ages have been unable to attain a degree of objectivity which differed greatly from that of the average men of their time. Plato (1942) and Machiavelli (1942) were both closely associated with the ruling class, and in common with all writers in this area prior to the 17th century they viewed society as an object for domination. Interests and polity were so closely related that it was not until a distinction was made between polity and society that a more sociological view of power in society arose. Montesquieu and Hegel were the intellectual heirs of Machiavelli in a tradition "characterised by the common belief in the capacity for autonomous action by government." (Bendix, 1962:487) Another characteristic associated with this tradition beginning with Aristotle was the
"great man" concept which suggested that some men were natural leaders intended by fate to dominate others. This view of power emphasised merely the personality aspects or the aspects relating to power as a function of a small elite section of society.

A contrasting view of power arose during the 16th century persecution of the Hugenots in France. This emphasised the dignity of the individual and depicted politics and government as a product of society. The publication of Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos (Presthus 1963: 14), the writings of Locke and Rousseau, the enlightenment, and conservative reaction according to Bendix (1962:487-88) were responsible for the growth of this point of view. This perspective is more sociologically oriented and relates power to such factors as its social and economic bases and contribution of mobility, equality and distributions of values to the power configuration which obtain in a society and its culture. This perspective emphasises group, society and culture as they relate to power and from it the concept of pluralism developed. Government was suspect and the social contract between all of the people and the state gave the individual a degree of protection heitherto unknown. Theoretically no interest group is allowed to dominate the power structure and the powerful groups are constantly challenged.
The above two trends are continued in modern theories of power and contribute to the differences between the theories. The distinction between the theories can best be understood by discussing social power in its relation to authority and legitimacy. Perception of power will be shown to be an important ingredient in the relationships. The remainder of this section discusses some problems raised by conflicting conceptualisations.

Modern sociological interpretation of the power phenomenon in society dates from Max Weber's studies of domination. The strength of Weber's contribution lies in his combination of the two perspectives mentioned above, the "view from the top" in which he developed the institutional aspects of power important to administrators and the "view of the top" which legislators know as "accountability." However while Weber's combination of the institutional and interactional approach to the examination of power was so fruitful conceptually, his historical idealism did not permit him to view power in a systemic framework. The latter has been one of the few conceptual advances in the sociology of power since Weber's time. For the purposes of this study Weber's use of the concept of "meaningful social action" as a foundation for his method is in need of examination in detail. People behave on the basis of the meaning which a situation has for them. By
orienting themselves toward others they attach meaning to their own behavior (Bendix, 1962:287). This statement holds even when the situation is purely conventional and provokes no reflection since respect for conventionality itself is a meaning. Weber in the traditions of Dilthey and Burkhardt "was not content to accept the idea that past struggles established beliefs and conventions that are eventually imposed upon men as their immemorial heritage" (Bendix, 1962:266). Perpetuation of beliefs or customs or conventions or institutions were in his mind best understood in the light of the meaning people attach to their behavior. He defined sociology as the study of "all human behavior when and insofar as the acting individual attached meaning to it" (Weber, 1947:88). The emphasis in this study on perception arises from interest in the meaning which community power has for community members and from an interest in the consequences of perception for societal regulation and motivation. The choice of independent variables is designed to discover factors which account for differences in meaning, and these are assumed to be the ultimate source of change or modification of existing institutional structures of power. This perspective defines the social largely in terms of subjective behavior relations and views the phenomena which explain the social as being both generated by the
social and imposed on the social, (Wallace, 1969:16). In this connection Weber's definition of power and his classification of types of power is of interest. He defined power as "the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behavior of other persons" (Weber, 1954:323; Bendix, 1962:290). Power from two particular sources is relevant from the sociologist's point of view—"power derived from a constellation of interests that develops on a formally free market," and (2) "power derived from established authority that allocates the right to command and the duty to obey." In these two definitions can be seen not alone the legacy of Weber's training as both an economist and a lawyer but also the legacy of the dual traditions previously mentioned the one viewing society as an independent variable and the other viewing government as the independent variable. This viewpoint has seldom been critically examined nor have alternative viewpoints been posited, with the exception of MacIver (1967) and Gouldner (1954) Blau (1964) and Buckley (1967). Weber's definition of authority is expanded by Bendix (1962:292) as follows:

For domination to be present there must be: (1) an individual who rules, or a group of rulers; (2) an individual who is ruled, or a group that is ruled; (3) the will of the rulers to influence the conduct of the ruled and an expression of that will (or a command); (4) evidence of the influence of
the rulers in terms of the objective degree of compliance with the command; (5) direct or indirect evidence of that influence in terms of the subjective acceptance with which the ruled obey the command.

The question of legitimation looms large in this definition, and its relation to power and authority is the theme of many differing viewpoints expressed by sociologists and political scientists today. Weber's legal training gave him a legalistic view of the relationship between consent and authority and Gouldner gets at the heart of this problem.

"For Weber authority was given consent because it was legitimate rather than being legitimate because it evoked consent" (1954:221-23). The same point is made by MacIver in relation to authority. He contrasted power and authority as follows:

By social power we mean that capacity to control the behavior of others either directly by fact or indirectly by the manipulation of available means". "By authority we mean the established right within any social order to determine the policies, to pronounce judgements on relevant issues and to settle controversies, or, more broadly to act as leader or guide to other men.... The accent is primarily on right, not power . (MacIver, 1947:87). He then concludes that there is authority beyond the authority of government- "a greater consensus without which the fundamental order of the community would fall apart." It is this point of view
which forms the basis of this study of perception of community power. This point of view appears to be more applicable to change programs based on motivation and self direction rather than on manipulation. Buckley (1967:180) asserts

For, Maclver argued force alone never holds a group together; in any constituted government authority of some kind lies back of force which is responsive to the underlying social structure, and the force of government is but the instrument of authority which depends for its endurance primarily upon the prevailing myths, the ideologies, values or knowledge systems of those over whom it is exercised.

The above section outlines the broad problems associated with modern conceptualisations of power.

III. POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

Buckley's (1967:176-207) discussion of power, authority and legitimacy and of its treatment by various authors provide a useful platform for clarification of the relationships between these three concepts and of their content. Buckley (1967:186) defines power as "a control or influence over the actions of others to promote ones goals without their consent, against their will or without their knowledge or understanding (for example, by control of the physical psychological or sociocultural environment within which others must act."

This view of power is narrow in its interpretation of the phenomenon of power, but it serves a heuristic purpose. This definition and the definition of authority below deal merely with the idealised ends of the power-authority continuum. Buckley views society in systemic terms and the shortcomings of this view are highlighted by a comparison with Schemerhorn's (1970) conceptualisation which views society as an imperfect system.

Authority is defined by him as "the direction or control of the behavior of others for the promotion of collective goals based on some ascertainable form of their knowledgeable consent." (Buckley 1967:186) This definition emphasises the voluntaristic aspects of human behavior and is more in the MacIver tradition. In its emphasis on consent it is in the Weberian tradition but is an improvement on it. Buckley (1967:177) seeks a model which will indicate the extent to which the existing social and cultural structures are the result of goal seeking actions of men and to what extent are they the result of an invisible hand of blind sociocultural forces. In answer to this he points out that goal seeking actions enter at every point but that (1) they combine to produce unanticipated effects (2) "the goal seeking actions of some individuals and subgroups ramify but little into the social fabric, while those of others whether playing official or non-official
roles account for important seams and patterns in that fabric." The focus of this study is on the latter fact and the concepts of power, authority and legitimacy and the relationship between them are crucial to any consideration of the problem. Buckley examines the conceptualisations of MacIver, Bierstedt, Laswell and Kaplan, Robin Williams, Talcott Persons, and Robert Lynd; particularly in relation to the question of consent versus coercion in the definition of power and its relation to authority and legitimacy. Buckley's (1967:176-79) main contentions are:

(1) That a continuum exists of patterns of social behavior which includes at its opposite poles, on one hand, control of the behavior of individuals against their will and without their informed commitment or understanding, and on the other hand, control of the behavior of others with their consent and awareness.

(2) That the difference between these two patterns has been the imputed legitimacy of the latter. The conceptual distinction between the two has been obfuscated by defining the latter, called "authority", in terms of the former power.

(3) That compliance of the majority with normatively defined role expectations "is not to prejudice the separate question as to whether such norms and role-structure have a certain base of legitimacy". A key point of Buckley's
conceptual action is that considerable knowledge of social psychological dynamics is necessary to make any decisions as to the legitimacy of a system. This point hinges around the perception which rank-and-file have of the leadership.

(4) That traditional consensus theory has blurred the principle that power and authority have frequently been found to be significantly related to the primacy in a group of competitive goal orientation or of cooperative goal orientation.

Legitimacy is defined as "a function not simply of a structure of "official" (authority) positions, but of this structure in conjunction with individual and collective goal promotion and the related group consensus seen in terms of shared perspectives and emotive commitment."

At the other end of the continuum group cleavage and dissensus are a function of a structure of power positions in conjunction with differential goal promotion and related group compliance. The group cleavages, dissensus, coercive institutional control systems and ideologies generated in the letter system may maintain a social order of overt compliance over long periods. Buckley sees shared perspective and emotive commitment as the basis of authority. For this reason he favors MacIver's concept of authority based on the prevailing "myths" and knowledge systems and deplores the fact that most conceptualisation in this area
has departed significantly from MacIver's valuable beginning. He feels that the identification of authority with power is inept, and disagrees with Bierstedt's statement that in voluntary associations authority is institutionalized leadership and in involuntary associations it is institutionalized power. This conceptualization ignores the fact that power situations can be institutionalized without consent of the whole system. This approach is neo-Hobbesian in its outlook and is similar to Durkheim's and Sumner's belief in the rather rigid and compelling force of norms. What is lacking is a view of society as a complex adaptive system. Institutionalisation may or may not have "a firm social and psychological foundation in an informed cognitively and affectively undistorted consensus on important means, ends and values" (Buckley 1967: 205). Legitimation on the other hand by definition is based on the above type of consensus. Bierstedt (1950:730-738) distinguished between power and prestige and defined power as latent force, force as manifest power and authority as institutionalised power. These definitions place Bierstedt in the field of the political scientist rather than of the sociologist-social psychologist. Laswell and Kaplan (1950:98-99) define power to include the possibility of "coercion by consent". From this, in their opinion,
comes authority. This definition sees power as an antecedent to authority. Likewise, Robin Williams holds that political authority based upon value consensus never lasts without the backing of power and that political power without authority can not be maintained for long. This conceptualization leads to the unacceptable paradox that majority consensus requires coercion for its maintenance when the first part of the statement is considered and the latter part provides the alternative conclusion. This view however shares both the perspective of the political scientist and the sociologist, but its emphasis on the maintenance of consensus places it in the same field as Talcott Parsons' theories of power. Parsons views (1951:121-127) the relation between power and authority as hinging on the question of integration of the power of individuals and groups into collective responsibility. Later the element power is raised by him to the level of a functional pre-requisite and defined as "the generalized capacity of a system to get things done in the interests of collective goals." (1960:181) Authority relates likewise to the consensual collective aspect of control processes. Parsons defines authority as "the complex of institutionalised rights to control the actions of members of the society with reference to their bearing on the attainment of collective goals."
This view delegates the divisive coercive and private aspect of control to a level of importance far below "system" type power. In this emphasis Parsons, despite his sociological profession, approaches the political scientist's view of power. Political scientists in their emphasis of the view from the top and their assumption that all goals that matter are collective and that the state's monopoly of the instruments of force is the foundation of civil society are but one step removed from Parsons who by his emphasis on consensus rules out the possible challenge of the ruling faction by deviants and leaves the way open for sociological sanction of a "consensus" system in which powerful elements can limit possible goals for a society. (Buckley 1968:413)

In striking contrast to the above view is the view of MacIver which envisages a social organisation which emphasises protection of the individual from arbitrary abuse by organised factions, minorities or majorities. Such a society harnesses "deviant" behavior of individuals and utilises it within its organisational context. The philosophy behind this view was expressed by Terence in his statement "Homo sum nihil humanum alienum a me puto", i.e. "I am a man and nothing human is foreign to me." This statement is based on the awareness that excessive emphasis on conformity can stifle the creative contribution which
deviants can make to a society which is changing. Its relevance for a discussion of the relation between power and authority lies in its emphasis of freedom of opinion as the basis of consensual authority. While consensual authority is phenomenally similar to a power situation in its short term consequences as far as domination is concerned, it seems best to keep the concepts independent of each other. The reason for this lies in the fact that an entirely different set of group conditions lies in back of both concepts and that the dynamics (processes) of the different situations are not similar.

The conclusion of the above section are that although the two concepts, power and authority may appear similar at first glance, when they are examined from a broader perspective i.e. in conjunction with the goals and values of the parties involved the differences between them are significant. These differences arise from the distinctly different sociopsychological conditions under which they are found. This is the topic of section IV.

IV. COOPERATION AND COMPETITION: THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF AUTHORITY AND POWER

"The structure of goal-orientations, the extent to which they are self-oriented or
promotively interdependent, and the relative roles of coercion (no matter how subtle or latent) and consent (Buckley, 1967:194) are key factors in deciding the balance of power and authority in social relations."

These factors are the social psychological underpinnings of the distinction between power and authority. They are also of considerable importance for a discussion of the role of perception as it relates to community power.

This section first outlines Buckley's (1967) discussion of studies of bureaucracy in an attempt to clarify the role of will and consent in relation to power and authority. He holds that these are the social psychological variables which intervene between institutionalisation, legitimacy and socialisation, and power and authority. Buckley's point of departure however is from definitions of power and authority which are so ideally typed that they shed little light on less ideal situations. Consequently Schemerhorn's theoretical framework is discussed, and is found to be more suitable for real life situations. Schemerhorn's framework fills a theoretical lacuna pointed out by Buckley (1967:187), who calls for a "more concerted effort to relate these concepts to the lower level propositions stemming from observations of the concrete interactions of individuals and groups." The concepts Buckley refers to are institutionalisation, legitimacy and socialization.
Studies of cooperation and competition have indicated the profound psychological difference between power and authority. Here the key to the difference lies in the extent to which a group's members perceive themselves to pursue promotively interdependent goals. The form of direction in any group depends on the goals and relevant values of the group, the processes of arriving at the goals, the degree of participation of various subgroups or categories within the group in the implementation of those goals, and the degree to which benefits accrue to various categories and subgroups. (Buckley, 1967:191) The full scope of possible relationships between goal orientations and forms of direction needs to be considered to provide insight into differences between power and authority. Studies of cooperation and competition have avoided the trap which consensus theory presents in this case. Emphasis on shared values tends to perpetuate selective perception which has so long been associated with the study of power and to prolong the confusion of the relationship between power and authority. In their study of small groups Cartwright and Zander conclude that a group goal exists when action by one member reduces the motivational tensions of all group members. A group goal affects all members the same way in contrast to individual goals. In the process of coalescence of individual goals
into a group goal, the goal becomes more than the sum of the members' goals. This emergent character is part of the collective character of group goals, and perception plays a large part in its formation. Morton Deutsch suggest that a sociological group is defined by its promotively interdependent goals while a psychological group "exists to the extent that its members perceive themselves as pursuing promotively interdependent goals" (Buckley,' 1967:188). A social group therefore is equated with a cooperative situation. Deutsche's studies have shown that a competitive situation in contrast leads to independent subgroups with mutually exclusive goals. The nature of authority was indicated by Blau in his study of competition and cooperation within sections of an organisation. A competitive situation led to high degree of status anxiety, low group cohesiveness and inefficient production. Cooperation reduced status anxiety (Blau, 1959:532).

Blau (1956:71) defines authority as follows:

... authority involves exercise of social control which rests on the willing compliance of subordinates with certain directives of the superior. He need not coerce or persuade subordinates in order to influence them, because they have accepted as legitimate the principle that some of their actions should be governed by his decisions.

This definition of authority points to "non-normative elements of action underlying consensus" and hence legitimacy of that authority. This conceptualisation goes beyond
conformity and acquiescence. Gouldner's reference to "punishment centered bureaucracy and representative bureaucracy" covers the same point. In his study of the implementation of a safety program in a factory situation he found that in conditions of punishment-centered bureaucracy foremen assumed that their formal positions of authority gave them the right to impose and enforce rules. In conditions of representative bureaucracy the foremen were expected to communicate their knowledge concerning factors contributing to accidents so that they could evoke obedience to safety regulations. In this way integration of goals of the management and workers was achieved. With a minimum of tension both were satisfied to support the roles. (Gouldner, 1954:220-21, 223-23).

On a societal level overall goals are not as easily defined but Margaret Mead offers some evidence from study of preliterate societies whose goal is the security of its members and concludes that "the will to power over persons does not occur in cooperative societies and that ends are shared by individuals giving rise to a high degree of security. Robin Williams Jr. (1947) referred to the fact that behavior in modern societies is oriented to two types of values (a) shared values which are available to all and (b) values that are "scarce, divisible and divisive".
The latter include power, wealth and prestige. In pursuit of the former the individual struggles against the physical environment only, of the latter against the competition and its social background. Modern society therefore exhibits varying degrees of both power and authority as conceptualised above. The degree to which both are exercised is an empirical question. Buckley (1967:191-205) however, makes two proposals which he feels are useful in examining a concrete situation, (a) that the concepts "formally institutionalised power" and "formally institutionalised authority" be recognised and (b) that the concepts "institutionalisation" and "legitimation" be re-examined, and that a distinction be made between the concepts legitimacy and legality. According to Buckley (1967:195) recognition of the two concepts, formally institutionalised power and formally institutionalised authority, acknowledges that "power does not become sanctioned, legitimised, consensual authority simply by being clothed in institutional forms".

Power is "control of others through a normative, at least partly legalised, sociocultural structure based in some ascertainable way, on some form of latent or manifested coercion acting on groups directly or through their environment and which holds together a structure
of private goal orientations". (Buckley, 1967:195) This view recognises historical control of society at different times by minorities and is proposed in opposition to acceptance of the Sumnerian view of norms and institutions guided by the invisible hand or natural law. This view also rules out the possibility that power is dissolved into authority when behavior proceeds wholly in conformity to the norms of formal organisation. The social base of the norms must be considered and this calls for re-examination of the concepts legitimation and institutionalisation. The assumption that any concrete social structure which persists over a considerable period is therefore institutionalised and legitimised ignores the fact that there is a wide gap between universal and completely informed acceptance of an overt opposition to behavior call for by the constituent norms. Studies of transitional societies open a Pandora's box in this regard, while observation of developed societies lulls the observer into a lack of awareness of the relation between the existing structure and the course charted for development of institutions. (Gellner, 1967:47-71), Sherif and Sherif (1953:289) note that some individuals contribute more weight to the process of institutionalisation than others. Likewise, Merton (1948:168) stresses the importance of power groups in rendering the forces of
institutionalisation asymmetrical. Gellner (1967:47-70) in his examination of different elements of democratic theory in relation to transitional society highlights the "entrenched clauses" which are so much a part of the intellectual atmosphere in a developed country that they "are absolutely taken for granted . . ." A democratic society governed by the will of the people can only be acceptable when it respects certain limits, certain entrenched principles. These principles are not and cannot be subject (normally) to consent since they limit consent. When in the discussions of the distinction between power and authority the statement is made that authority presupposes consensus the above distinctions have not been made. Emphasis needs to be placed on the fact that a society wills things at two levels (1) the basic and tacit consensus concerning entrenched rules (this consensus is neither total, rigid nor stable), and (2) within these there is a more superficial level at which greater disagreement is tolerable. (Gellner, 1967: 58) The former is the source of authority to which MacIver refers. It is likewise the major source of norms which are taken to be institutionalised. Buckley (1967:196) states:
We cannot rule out the very real possibility that for a large percentage of actors in any social system the norms are accepted and merely obeyed as given conditions of action, with little understanding of their origin or ideological justification and with even less comprehension that they might be otherwise; and that another sizeable percentage feels oppressed by the norms and follows them unwillingly because no other course of action is realistically open.

In the same vein the assumption in contractual societies that legitimacy is related to Gesellschaft type norms reduces the concept of legitimacy to the lowest common denominator of legality. Following this line of thought Buckley suggests the formula that the concept legality be applied to what he calls institutionalised power while the concept of legitimacy be confined to association with his term institutionalised authority. This distinction, he feels, would throw into relief a weakness of Weber's concept rational legal, i.e. the fact that Weber did regard rationality as an absolute (despite his recognition of the non-contractual element of contract). Rationality rather than being absolute is relative to the particular ends, goals and values toward which expertise is aimed. An example from Gouldner's work on bureaucracy indicates that a proto-democratic process of legitimation is needed for legitimation in
addition to the possession of expertise. The expert's authority was validated in the safety program only when worker's ends (their own safety) coincided with the management's. In this case, authority is legitimate because it evokes consent; while for Weber authority was given consent because it was legitimate. (Gouldner, 1954: 221-23) The above study indicates the importance of asking the question, whose goals are being promoted and by what process are they being promoted in preference to other goals? Gouldner's study situation did not however include stratification, a factor of importance at societal level.

Blau's (1964) conceptualisation fulfills this need however. Power, according to him, emerges from the coincidence on one hand, interaction based on anticipation of benefits and, on the other hand, imbalanced transactions. Legitimation emerges from the coincidence of universalistic standards of preference and goal focused interaction. From power and legitimation emerge authority. (Blau 1964: 9, Wallace, 1969:49-50) His discussion of institutional structure and dynamics indicates that he follows Buckley's conceptualisation described above. He starts with a description of the characteristics needed for balance in transactions. These are (1) to be able to return adequate
recompense, (2) to have alternative sources of supply, (3) to be able to force continuation of the service and (4) to be able to do without the service if necessary. Fundamental differences between the dynamics of power in an individual situation and in a collective situation are that in the latter the subordinates' approval or disapproval of the superiors (collectively) has effective influence on the social structure while the former is relatively helpless. (Blau, 1964:22-25) Buckley (1967:118-25) relates the above four conditions of independence to the four basic problems of social structure.

(1) "exchange processes and resource distribution"

(2) "emerging exchange structure and its competitive features along with the normative standards tending to develop".

(3) "coalition formation and the organisation of power"

(4) "shifts in values formation of new ideologies and conflict between ideologies"

This model of social structure and dynamics differs from a consensus model in that it incorporates the consequences of stratification. Blau (1964:23) next discusses the consequence for structure of the subordinates' collective approval and disapproval.

Collective approval of power legitimates that power. People who consider that the advantages they gain from a superior's exercise of power outweigh the hardships that compliance with his demands imposes on them tend to communicate to each other their approval of the ruler and their
feelings of obligation to him. The consensus that develops as the result of these communications finds expression in group pressures that promote compliance with the ruler's directives, thereby strengthening his power of control and legitimating his authority.

At this point further clarification of the social psychological dynamics of the situation is needed to agree or disagree with this rendition. If differential goal promotion continues through the use of institutionalised and socialised processes then the situation is better described as one of institutionalised power. If on the other hand the goals have now become collective with all the necessary social psychological concomitants then we can agree with Blau. The psychological reasons for individual group consent are many and varied and can range from a response to the symbols of legality to grounds of informed rationality (of various types).

The consequences for structure of collective disapproval are stated by Blau (1964:23-24, 271) as follows:

Collective disapproval of power engenders opposition. People who share the experience of being exploited... are likely to communicate their feeling... to each other. The social support the oppressed give each other... justifies and reinforces their aggressive opposition against those in power. It is out of such shared discontent that opposition ideologies and movements develop... Countervailing forces... deny legitimacy to existing powers and promote opposition and cleavage. Opposition ideals are
finally media of social change and reorganisation, . . . . They legitimate the leaders of opposition movements and thus produce a countervailing force against entrenched powers and existing institutions.

Buckley (1967:205) refers to the above process as de-legitimation of consensual authority and its transformation into coercive power. He emphasises that institutionalisation is not to be confused with legitimation in the sociological and social psychological sense of these terms. He concludes,

It is an empirical question whether the institutional structure of a given society or aspects of it has a firm social and psychological foundation in an informed, cognitively and affectively undistorted, consensus on important norms, means, ends and values.

The interest in perception in this study is to attempt within limits to see whether the power structure is perceived to benefit from institutional arrangements, to contribute most to their creation and maintenance by monopolising resources, controlling exchange processes, dominating the means of coercion and perpetuating the supporting values and ideologies (Buckley, 1967:204).

A second goal of the study is to examine the background, interactional and ecological factors which are related to the perception as it exists.
Dominants and Subordinates

Perception and integration—Schemerhorn.

The main thesis of the above section is that perception is a key factor in societal integration and in deciding whether a society is based on power or authority. Buckley's discussion however ranges around opposite poles of the continuum. While it points to some of the characteristics of intervening section it remains very much a discussion of ideal types. Schemerhorn (1970, passim) deals more with concrete cases and hence relates to the intervening section of the continuum. Therefore, while he does not achieve the conceptual clarity that Buckley does in his discussion of abstractions, his treatment of the types of integration (Schemerhorn, 1970) does much to elaborate what Buckley treated mainly in abstract terms. Buckley's discussion nonetheless is valuable in that it sensitises the researcher to the finer points of Schemerhorn's work. Although Schemerhorn's (1970) work relates to comparative ethnic relations many aspects of his conceptual framework are of interest in this study. It consists of an application of elements of both systems (order, functionalism, integration) and power conflict (dialectic coercion) theory. His final preference is for a modified form of systems theory which implies neither
"institutional omnipotence and omniscience" nor the operation of self regulation through the medium of an "invisible hand" and which incorporates facets of the dialectic present in functionalism but not usually emphasised by functionalists. Following Horowitz (1962: 178) he holds that society is best understood as a selective and collective response to the needs of social interaction in a non-equilibrated world (Schemerhorn, 1970:65). Schemerhorn's topic, ethnic relations, is one of the few major topics which in recent years has been removed from the "entrenched clauses" of Gellner's classification. While Schemerhorn's study (1970:85) deals with the inter-group arena, this study deals with potential or partial cleavages among rank-and-file members of a rather homogeneous area.

Schemerhorn's (1970:15) main hypothesis is as follows:

When the territory of a contemporary nation-state is occupied by peoples of diverse cultures and origins, the integration of such plural groups into each environing society will be a composite function of three independent and three intervening variables. The independent variables posited here are: (1) repeatable sequences of interaction between subordinate ethnics and dominant groups, such as annexation, migration, colonization; (2) the degree of enclosure (institutional separation or segmentation) of the subordinate group or groups from the society-wide network of institutions and associations; and (3) the degree of control
exercised by dominant groups over access to scarce resources by subordinate groups in a given society.

The intervening or contextual variables that modify the effects of independent variables are:
(1) agreement or disagreement between dominant and subordinate groups on collective goals for the latter, such as assimilation, pluralism;
(2) membership of a society under scrutiny in a class or category of societies sharing overall common cultural and structural features, such as Near East societies, Sub-Saharan African societies;
(3) membership of a society under scrutiny in a more limited category of societies distinguished by forms of institutional dominance, i.e., polity dominating economy or vice versa.

Finally, the dependent variables to be explained are the interweaving patterns of integration and conflict either in the relations between subordinates and superordinates on the one hand, or between subordinates and the total society on the other. Of the three dependent variables advanced here, the first two deal with the former relationship (between subordinates and dominant groups) and are correlative with each other; the third variable operationalizes the latter relationship (between subordinates and the society as a whole). The three dependent variables therefore are:
(1) differential participation rates of subordinates in institutional and associational life (including rates of vertical mobility) as compared with rates for the dominant group; (2) the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of both subordinate and dominant group members with the differential patterns of participation as they see them, together with accompanying ideologies and cultural values; and (3) overt or covert behavior patterns of subordinates and dominants indicative of conflict and/or harmonious relations; assessment in terms of continued integration.

Examination of the three independent variables shows they relate to the "concrete interactions of individuals and groups" as called for by Buckley. Furthermore, the three variables relate to "sequences of interaction",
"degree of institutional separation of the subordinate group" and "degree of control exercised by dominant groups" respectively. These variables are of paramount importance in the conceptualisation of power and authority.

Of the intervening variables only one is relevant in the present study i.e. "agreement or disagreement between dominant and subordinate groups on collective goals for the latter such as assimilation, pluralism". This variable corresponds to the social psychological variables which Buckley emphasises, and is the main topic of this dissertation.

Schemerhorn's dependent variables (above) are of relevance to this dissertation in that they are regarded as contributing to the dependent variable. This departure from Schemerhorn's framework can be defended on the basis that there is, over time, a reciprocal interaction between perception and the components of integration as viewed by Schemerhorn. Consequently these components can also be viewed at any one time as independent variables affecting perception. The remainder of Schemerhorn's framework is outlined below. The definition of integration, and of the characteristics of the intergroup arena which affect it, suggest a number of independent variables which affect perception of community power.
Integration is defined as "a process whereby units or elements of a society are brought into an active and coordinated compliance with the ongoing activities and objectives of the dominant group". (Schemerhorn, 1970:66) Authority is recognised as the "core relation of integration" and conditions run the gamut from the idealised situations of pure coercion to that of perfectly legitimised authority. Integration is regarded by Schemerhorn (1970:67)
as a process rather than a state, relative rather than absolute, situational rather than all embracing, corrective rather than self subsistent, a matter of degree rather than an all or none phenomenon, and correlative with conflict rather than a replacement of conflict.

There are three features of the intergroup arena which shed light on conditions associated with integration. These are:

(1) Integration as a problem of legitimation
(2) Integration as a problem of cultural congruence
(3) Integration as a problem of common or discrepant goal definitions for subordinate groups

(Schemerhorn, 1970:67)

Legitimation

Perceptions of legitimacy can range from legitimate through partly legitimate to illegitimate. The extent of integration or conflict is decided by the congruence between the dominants' view of the legitimacy of
its power and the subordinate's view of the legitimacy of the power of the dominant group. This gives a paradigm with nine property spaces. Generally, complete integration exists when both groups are in consensus as to legitimacy and complete conflict exists when both groups differ but all logical possibilities do not exist, e.g. the dominant group seldom if ever regards its power as illegitimate.

It should be noted that the objective situation here is domination, but the congruence of subjective views i.e. of perceptions of the situation held by both subordinate and superordinate groups is the deciding factor in legitimation. What is in question here is the perception of legitimacy of the power of the superordinate group, not the legitimacy of the total societal relationships. Consensus is therefore, not general consensus, but consensus as to the legitimacy of the power of the superordinate group in relation to the first two operational definition of the dependent variable. Placing the cells in sequence this gives an assessment of the relation of the subordinates to the superordinates in terms of continued integration.

**Cultural congruence**

Integration as coordination of objectives involves discussion of two factors (a) cultural congruence between
dominants and subordinates and (b) the power differential between them. Added to the question of legitimation this increases the property spaces fourfold. Schemerhorn (1970:87) concludes that integration processes seem to be more successful when a larger power differentical is combined with cultural congruity than when low power differentials are associated with cultural congruity. This is in keeping with his conclusions as to the nature of social systems as far as order is concerned and with his view that integration is a "condition to be constantly rewon". Once again perception is a key factor since the symbolic indicators of cultural difference can be subjectively defined as relative or absolute and in the latter case integration is more difficult, e.g. racial integration of society in Latin America (relative) versus racial integration in the United States where indicators are absolute.

Reciprocal goal definition

Reciprocal beliefs about the final goals of the relationship between dominant and subordinate are crucial to integration. Schemerhorn pragmatically recognises the fact that "agreement to differ" is just as much a basis of integration as assimilation. He uses the terms "centripetal" and "centrifugal" to denote the combined
cultural and structural facets of the above two concepts. The inclusion of structural factors is of key importance in that it forces consideration of the mediating influence of groups and institutions between the individual and society.

The ingredients necessary for deciding whether social relations are based on power or authority have been discussed above. The social psychological components which need to be examined in order to make such a decision have been outlined. The differences between theories of the authors discussed has been noted. The following section will attempt to suggest the source of these differences, and it will be argued that the source is similar to that which brings about differences in perception of power within a polity.

V. THE SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE, OF THEORIES, OF POWER AND OF SOURCES OF LEGITIMATION

Reference has been made to the fact that different ages have produced different theories of social power. In this section it will be argued that the differences were merely a concomitant of the different theories of knowledge, of morals, of democracy, of legitimation, and of society itself which existed in those times. The basis of this argument is taken from Gellner (1967:47-70), who posits two
theories of legitimation or validation of societies, the former based on trancendent justifications, the latter based on immanent justification. By their own rules the former are absolutely reliable, of transcendent merit, and provide adequate motives for actions, but suffer from the crucial weakness that it is difficult to believe in them. Modern skepticism renders them conventionally unacceptable at least on an supraliminal overt basis.

On the other hand immanent justifications evoke high credibility because of their mundane origins and claims, but their crucial weakness arises because they cannot bear the load they are asked to carry. Feeling, sensation, will, consent are themselves subject to corruptions. Like empiricist theories of knowledge they rely for validation on immanent characteristics, the former using sensation where the latter uses consent. These validity checks (perception and categorisation of sensations) however are themselves a function of the holders concepts and theories. They are not absolute, but relative, and they change under the impact of the very theories they were intended to check. The solution proposed for the above problem is that these theories be assumed to be based on a source of validation which is relatively "external" and independent of themselves. However it is difficult to define "independence".
Similarly in the theories of democracy a change has come about. The classical theory of democracy was based on a lofty ideal emphasising consensus, participation and equality. Its appeal was due to the fact that it appeared to rest solely on immanent bases of validation, i.e. the will of man. The modern theory of democracy is arrived at by a process which recognises that will is not independent of the social structures over which it is meant to be sovereign. Pluralism has been accepted as a source of validation independent largely of the social structure. Modern democratic theory therefore emphasises pluralism, checks on power, and the importance of debate rather than consensus, participation and equality. Pure democratic theory is assumed to be based on will and consent only and not on any extraneously introduced norms. On this its appeal is based. Democracy presupposes consensus either of the type where most people have similar values or where they have agreed to differ. Politics should be only one of the sources of wealth and a strong middle class sufficiently well off to have a vested interest in order is necessary. However, democratic theory does not govern the content of that which is willed. MacIver (1965:151) points to the constitution as the creation of community, a base broader than politics, and it is partly on this base that legitimacy ultimately
exists. Not all laws can be written, and even when written they allow considerable leeway. de Tocqueville pointed to the firm religious (transcendental) base of the United States' system of government. This is the tacit level at which will operates. It never becomes obvious in periods of stability because adjustments in the system are merely marginal. The social structure and its central normative ideas are so much in the air that they are not even recognised. Authority appears based on will and consent only. However in the past, society provided itself with ultimate standards which in times of stability set the limits to will and consent; but these limits were seldom approached. The standards were provided by society "from the fund of its own tacit assumptions and presented to itself externalised in the form of transcendent norms as a set of independently given absolutes". (Gellner, 1967:70) But the appeal of democracy consists in the denial of this type of norm and of emphasis on popular will. In many rapidly changing societies however politics must now attend to much more than marginal adjustments. The tacit assumptions are now being challenged. The limits are being approached and the disadvantages of will and consent unchecked by external norms is evident. Furthermore, we cannot present
our will as a latent norm since its external sources of validation are no longer popular.

A remarkable parallel exists between theories of society and theories of democracy, and this has been evident in Buckley's discussion of various writers and in Schemerhorn's criticisms of systems and power conflict theory. The classical theory of democracy emphasised consensus, equality and participation. It evoked a high level of obligation. The modern theory emphasises checks on power, pluralism, and public debate. Gellner (1967: 49) states:

At the simplest level the classical theory is related to the modern one as the specification of those elements present in the real institutions which validate it morally; on the other way round, the modern theory is related to the classical one as a specification of the nearest one can get to the classical picture in this difficult and complicated world. The former emphasises similarities, the latter differences.

Schemerhorn's (1970:32-64) scrutiny of the shortcomings of systems theory and of power-conflict theory shows the same type of complementarity exists between these two theories. Systems theory, like the attractive classical theory of democracy, has a strong ideological pull since "it couches its appeals in terms of the whole". (Schemerhorn, 1970:24) Its "holistic optimism" concerning the hidden rationality of societal processes however is subject to doubt. On the other hand power
conflict theories base their appeal on clear and distinct ideas "since it appeals to the facts of familiar every day observation tracing out their relation by gradual and easy stages". (Schemerhorn, 1967:42) But like the theories of democracy which ignore transcendent validation they are applicable only within limits. They lack references to the whole system.

VI. PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POWER

The purpose of this chapter is twofold (1) to establish a rationale for the study of perception of community power and (2) to derive from the literature some variables which are relevant for describing the content of perception of community power. This section examines (1) the contribution of the preceding sections of the chapter to the above objectives and (2) attempts to arrive at a clear conceptualisation of the content of perception of community power.

The necessity for establishment of a rationale for study of perception arises because the study of social power has not been free of the consequences of the controversy in sociology and political science regarding the distinction between the influence of facts and the influence of images of facts. Marx, Watson, and Allport carry the banners of the former group, while the latter group
is represented by Weber, Mannheim, Thomas and Mead. (Rose 1967:302) MacIver, because of his emphasis on the importance of myths, can be added to this list. An analysis of the universe of published studies in the social sciences by Walton (1966:v) dealing specifically with community power structure indicated that, while an association was found between several demographic, economic and political factors and different types of community power structure, the researcher and his method was the variable most closely related to the type of community power structure identified. A developmental sequence was found in which disciplinary background influenced choice of method, which in turn influenced the type of power structure identified even under controlled conditions.

Political scientists usually used the decision-making method and interpreted their findings as indicative of pluralism. Sociologists usually used the reputational method and interpreted their findings to indicate an elitist power structure. Within sociology the structural functionalists tended to emphasise consensus, and the more rigid among them tended to view society as a sovereign determinant. The conflict theorists emphasise the "view from the bottom". Both concentrate on the influence of facts rather than on images of facts, but the former puts forward the view of potential rulers, the latter of potential
partisans. The image which rulers and partisans hold of the facts will form a bridge between the two and determine whether there will be conflict or integration.

A number of attempts have been made to derive a synthesis of both the system and power conflict type theories (van den Berghe, 1963; Schemerhorn, 1967; and to a lesser extent, Coser, 1956). A systemic theory which treats means and ends, structure and culture, socialisation and exploitation in a balanced manner would provide an adequate paradigm for synchronic analysis. Both Buckley (1967:178) and Schemerhorn (1970:88) have stressed that the ultimate decision between power and authority, between conflict and integration depends largely on the definition of the situation of both parties. Even in situations which, by any standard of reasonable objectivity, could be considered exploitative, "the conservatism of the lower status groups contributes more to the stability of social systems than all the combined planning or tension management of the elites." (Schermerhorn 1970:25) Barrington Moore (1967:468) makes the same point to explain differences in degree of reaction to exploitation which occur under similar circumstances. These considerations caused both Buckley and Schemerhorn to modify former theoretical framework. Buckley rejected a systemic framework of a narrow type, and introduced elements of social interaction
into his modified systems theory this led him to emphasise the social psychological elements of interaction. Likewise, Schemerhorn (1970) develops his modified systems theory by introducing elements of the dialectic and of social interaction. Their modified theory provides a basis from which to clarify details of the nexus of concepts associated with the concept power. The key element in this modification is their emphasis on perception of power. The choice of perception of power as a topic for this dissertation arises from the above considerations. This choice is also prompted by the discovery in a previous study of the same population (O'Carroll, 1969) that subjective measures of income, occupation, education and level of living were more significantly related to dependent variables than the objective measures of these variables were.

The dynamics of power in the community is therefore assumed to be related more to subjective factors than to objective factors i.e. to images of facts rather than to facts per se.

The second objective of this chapter is to derive from the literature some variables which are relevant for describing the content matter of perception of community power. The literature just reviewed included references to will and consent as an important ingredient of
of power and authority (Buckley, 1967:185). Likewise, studies of bureaucracy indicated the importance of goal orientation (Buckley 1967:186). Other orientations directed toward the power structure are more relevant and form the sum total of perception. Dawson and Prewitt (1969:18) depict perception of the political arena as follows:

As a preliminary notion, we suggest that political orientations have dimensions like these: They involve a little or a lot of information about the political world. They entail positive, negative, or neutral views. Involvement or identification with political symbols range from extremely strong to very weak. Individuals may expect anywhere from a great deal to practically nothing from the government in services, protection, or assurances. More concisely, an individual's political self is likely to include these feelings of nationalism, patriotism, or tribal loyalty, identification with particular partisan factions or groups, attitudes and evaluations of specific political issues and personalities, knowledge regarding political structures and procedures and self-image of rights, responsibilities and position in the political world.

This outline relates to an individual's perception of his total political world. Because it is total it refers to segments of the system other than the top reaches of the power structure, and because it relates to the political world only it does not cover the full scope of perception of community power.

Perception of community power is viewed in this study to include:
(1) identification with particular partisan factions or groups,

(2) evaluations of specific personalities,

(3) knowledge regarding political structures.

This outline of the content of perception of community power deals mainly with the individual's perception of who is powerful. It does not deal directly with what power is nor where power lies. The answer to these questions will be inferred from the perceived characteristics of individuals mentioned.

A distinction is made between private perception and public perception. Private perception is the individual's view of who is powerful, but public perception is the perception of who is powerful in terms of the group and subgroup beliefs. This conceptualisation is based on MacIvers views regarding the role of group myths. Each individual is evaluated in terms of the degree to which his views coincide with the public myth. This view of perception of community power is seen to be more relevant to the theoretical framework outlined above than either a view based on raw perception of the individual, or a view of perception evaluated by comparison with the power structure as determined by more objective methods such as the decisional method. Further discussion of the dependent variable introduces a number of methodological problems which will be dealt with in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The above survey of literature dealing with power and related concepts indicated that two main trends have existed in the development of hypotheses concerning power. Both views have been brought to bear on social systems in the work of Parsons and Marx. The former emphasized culture and social goals, the latter structure and means, likewise the former emphasized socialisation while the latter emphasized exploitation as a dynamic force in the system (Lockwood 1956, 134-46). Each emphasized a different type of interest (normative and non-normative respectively), and consequently they each arrived at a different concept of structure, the former describing stratification in terms of values, the latter in terms of types of ownership and means of control (Schemerhorn, 1970:35-6). An attempt will be made to use both these frameworks in developing hypothesis concerning both the factors associated with differences perception of community power of rank-and-file members in the locality, and the differences between leader's perceptions and those of the rank and file.

The emphasis of the above theoretical framework on the processes of socialisation and exploitation leads
emphasize of these processes in development of the hypothesis. Both these processes affect perception of one's social environment.

**General Hypothesis I**

Community members' level of perception of the power structure will vary with their background characteristics. "Level of perception" is defined as the degree to which the individual rank-and-file member's perception corresponds to a public level of perception.

The theoretical and empirical evidence supporting the above hypothesis is copious. James West (1939) recorded variations in perceptions of the stratification system of the different status groups. (See Figure 2) This variation occurred despite a community ideology which maintained that every body was equal.

Past studies have recorded differences among the social and personal characteristics of members of the power structure, and between those of the power structure and the rank and file members. Hunter (1953), Antonio, (1965) and Bohlen (1964) have found that power structure members differ significantly from rank and file members in occupation, income, education, political orientation, age, and home ownership. It is logical to conclude that
FIG. 2. THE CLASS STRUCTURE AS SEEN BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE PLAINVILLE COMMUNITY. (57, P130)
these differences will likewise be found among rank-and-file members of the community. Young and Larson (1970: 337-53) have examined the effect of occupation and length of residence on participation and community identification and have found that both were significant factors. Political socialization theory shows that both of these variables are closely related to perception of community power specifically, and to induction into social structure generally. Form and Rytina (1969:19-30) have illustrated the elitist perceptions of the lower classes and the pluralist perceptions of the upper classes. This further lays the grounds for assuming within-community differences of perceptions among rank-and-file members. While many past studies of rural areas have assumed rural homogeneity, modern theory has recognized the consequences of development in its emphasis on (1) inequalities of economic resource and social position (2) dissimilarity in activities and experiences, and (3) fluidity of status which renders perception difficult. The theory most relevant for perception of community power is that which relates to political socialisation. Hyman (1959) and Dawson and Prewitt (1969) have attempted to outline the basics of a theory of political socialisation. It must be emphasised at this point that the concept of socialisation as used in this study recognises that in socialisation the
individual is both active and passive since he both socialises himself, and is socialised by society. Dawson and Prewitt's theory is outlined below.

At an early age the child becomes aware of societal categories, and develops an emotional attachment to the category to which he belongs. This initial identification is indiscriminately positive, and is centered mainly around the class of the child. The family as an agent of socialisation and a perpetuator of social class operates largely in an indirect fashion during childhood. It develops basic personality traits and other social attitudes and values. The intense emotional ties developed in the family render its effect very long lasting. In fact the lessons learned may be remembered long after the special interests which formed their rationale have changed. The family and its social class affects perception of community power in three ways. (1) By developing the child's attitudes and values which are unrelated to the power structure. These conditions direct learning of the power structure by acting as a filtering process. (2) By placing its members in a network of social and economic relationship relevant to its class the family guides the individual to a perception of his location in the world. This position which the individual perceives helps him to arrive at a
view of the power structure which is relevant to his class. (3) By direct teaching of abstract and factual information the family influences children deeply in their early years.

The degree and explicitness varies from family to family but the lessons are highly effective. The actual content of the lessons varies with the social class and thus family socialisation perpetuates diverse social and political viewpoints.

Social class likewise affects peer group socialisation which is second in importance to the family as a source of socialisation. Peer group members are usually drawn from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. Where conflict arises between the content of the socialisation messages of different agencies, the individual will follow the agency to which they have the closest ties or the one most politically relevant. (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969:160).

Many studies have recorded the effect of education on political socialisation. V.O. Key (1961:323-331) has summarised some research findings on political socialisation, and concludes that education affects a citizen's role in four ways: (a) by imparting a strong sense of duty to participate; (b) by imparting a stronger feeling of political efficacy; (c) by imparting greater interest
in political matters and; (d) by bringing about a high probability that the citizen will be politically active. (Dawson and Prewitt 1969:175-6) Likewise, Almond and Verba (1963:380-381) found that advanced education was highly related to such factors as awareness of impact of government on the individual, amount of political information, breadth of focus of attention to politics, likelihood of political discussion, feelings of freedom to discuss politics with a broad range of people, confidence in ability to influence government active membership in some organization and general confidence in the social environment. Dawson and Prewitt (1969:177) see the following as the main advantages of a high level of education: (1) greater involvement in societies communication network resulting in greater availability of politically pertinent information; (2) greater familiarity with collective decision making resulting in acquisition of habits and skills applicable to political affairs; (3) a greater amount of attitudes transferable to political affairs such as political competence which results in the belief that rational manipulation of social institutions can produce desired goals; (4) a presumption that political events directly affect their state in society because of their greater social and economic status.
The significance of wealth as an influence on perception of the power structure is derived largely from the social categories to which it assigns individuals. Party preference, policy choice and level of political participation has been found to be related to this factor. Furthermore when this factor interacts with age it is found that children from low income families hold a positive view of authority and accept it more unquestioningly than do children of wealthier parents. However, the position among adults is reversed since low income adults hold a more skeptical view of the power structure than do adults from middle or upper income levels. This is a reflection of the lower class families' tendency to have an authoritarian power structure, and of its failure to encourage its children to participate in public life at a later age with expectations of being effective. (Dawson & Prewitt, 1969:183)

Age is a most important factor in socialisation and since political socialisation is to a large extent cumulative, older people will tend to have a more active perception of the community power structure. Dawson & Prewitt (1969:60) note

Political socialisation begins early in life, before formal education is under way and before the child has the capacity actually to understand and order for himself abstract political symbols
and relationships"..."The most critical basic orientation is apparently an emotionally charged sense of belonging to a particular political community."

These form the basis of future orientations and of interpretation of future experience.

"From childhood on the individual adds information and understanding to these basic orientations; he picks up more concrete information. . . . . .

He develops critical faculties and learns to evaluate the meaning of what he learns politically".

Socialisation of adults continues through secondary groups, mass media and direct experiences with the political world. This stage is important for explaining differences in the perception of community power since at this stage the individual responds to government personalities and immediate issues rather than the political community as a whole or political institution. However basic interpretative orientations acquired early in life set the limits within which change may occur. Age therefore brings a cumulative experience with the power structure which is subject to some limited change in direction in adulthood.

The above discussion leads to four subhypotheses relating occupation, income, education and age to the dependent variable, level of perception of community
power. No previous studies have allowed for the fact that these variables are correlated. The method of testing in this study will do so.

Sub Hypothesis 1

Community members' level of perception of community power will vary directly as their level of occupation varies.

Sub Hypothesis 2

Community members' level of perception will vary directly as their level of income varies.

Sub Hypothesis 3

Community members' level of perception of community power will vary directly as their level of education varies.

Sub Hypothesis 4

Community members' perception of community power will vary directly as their age varies.

The relationship between the independent variables and the dependent are not bivariate but multivariate.
Figure 3. A model showing the relationship between background characteristics and perception.

General Hypothesis II

Community members' level of perception of community power will vary directly as the levels of selected characteristics of his ecosystem vary.

The previous hypothesis dealt with the background characteristics of the perceiver and their effects on the individual's level of perception of community power.

The present hypothesis deals with the relationship of the perceiver to his milieu, including in the latter the perceived. It is assumed that the milieu will set the
limits to perception, the potential of which is set by the background characteristics. The causal scheme underlying the analysis views interactional, attitudinal, and contextual variables as intervening between background variables and level of perception of community power. As in Laumann (1966) status attributes of the individual are seen to affect behavior directly, and indirectly through the attributes of the structure of interaction.

Figure 4. A model of structural and interactional variables. All relationships are positive.

In rural areas the characteristics of the ecosystem which are of importance in socialization into social structure including the level of knowledge of the power structure are those which affect the spatial flow of private information. The role of neighborhoods and of local descent groups is of particular importance in the process of induction into social structure. These elements will be emphasised in the general theoretical framework.
The classical support in favor of the second hypothesis is derived from Stouffer et al. (1949), and Merton's (1957) study of the American Soldier. They found that feelings of "relative deprivation" arose as a result of the soldier's reflection of himself in the light of his experience with others. Men bring to each interaction the experience of previous interactions and this modifies their behavior and their perception. Findings of studies relating to development of cognition of social structure, (Young and Larson, 1970) political socialization, Hyman (1959), Dawson and Prewitt (1969), and personal influence (Merton, 1957, Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1964) have utilized such concepts as interpersonal influence, opinion leadership and pressure toward conformity in reference to the milieu. Young and Larson (1970:337-353) indicated that, while position in the social structure determined both opportunities for interaction and perception of community structure, within these limits interaction increased both the identification with, and participation within the community. They found that low status persons in areas of high interaction form a broader perception of the community than could be predicted from their social position alone. Likewise high status persons, whenever found in areas of low interaction, were found to be below
the predicted level in perception of community. It is therefore logical to assume that the same factors would operate in the case of perception of community power.

Campbell and Alexander (1965:284-289) have documented the effect of interaction on aspirations of high school youth. They discovered that value systems in different schools were responsible for differences in aspirations. However, when they controlled for interaction patterns among friends in school they found that the differences in socio-economic status of school no longer explained differences in aspirations of the individual students. This indicated that the socio-economic status of the school determined its value system which determined the type of friends average students had, and in this way influenced the aspirations and values of the individual.

The above example points to the theoretical and conceptual problems of identifying and describing the ecosystem or milieu in which an individual builds his perception of his community and its power structure. The conceptual framework developed here includes elements of interaction and socialization theory, and particular attention will be paid to the spatial aspects of "contagion" or learning effect in order to provide a basis for testing the assumption of widespread communication in rural areas. The literature of political socialization provides much
evidence in support of general hypotheses II. Politics deals with the organization and operation of power in society, but this is not all of politics, nor is politics the only aspect of life that involves the organization of power. Nevertheless perusal of studies relating to political socialization is relevant, since so much of political socialization is indirect and comes from transference of attitudes, skills, knowledge and opinions acquired in institutional areas related to topics other than political which are subsequently applied to political life.

A study of socialization as it relates to public life in general provides many clues to factors affecting the degree of socialization and its focus. Political socialization in its broadest sense involves three types of orientation.

(1) Attachments and loyalties.
(2) Specific knowledge and feelings.
(3) Transient feelings regarding institutions, policies, programs, persons and events.

(Dawson and Prewitt, 1967)

The genesis of these orientations is associated to a great extent with different stages of the socialization process, consequently with the agencies of socialization which predominate at the individual's stage in the life cycle.
Their effect is generally cumulative and continuous, but later stages of socialization may lack continuity. This is due to two factors (1) the changing attitude toward authority which occurs at this age and (2) the fact that some individuals more than others react to socialization messages in an unintended manner and socialize themselves to unintended behavior.

The following section is a discussion of factors in the individual's ecosystem which affect his perception of the community power structure whether directly or indirectly and whether he is aware of them or not.

The first orientation involves attachment and loyalties which are associated with the child's growing awareness of basic identifications with his social categories. This orientation is highly emotional and almost indiscriminately positive, and since basic orientations to so many other institutional areas are also learned at the same stage, children do not distinguish clearly between institutional areas. Political awareness such as it is in this stage is not distinguished from emotional attachment to the individual's societal categories. Differences in family category give rise to differences in basic orientations and this leads to different associations with the political parties. The orientations
developed in this state are very strong and have long lasting effects in that they provide a filter for perception of future information. The significance of these orientations lies in their broad effects on the perceptions of community power. However, they deal with the tacit consensus upon which political life is based more than with the topics which come up for discussion from day to day. They do however play a large part in deciding what topics will come up for discussion, and which questions will not be raised. In political life they mainly decide the party to which one will belong and subsequent variation is usually limited by party choice. This orientation corresponds to the tacit consensus of society, while the remaining orientations relate to the situation in which society expresses its will and consent. The family is the main agent of socialization at this stage, but church and school operate also to strengthen the orientation. The independent variables, occupation, income, education and age associated with this orientation are those indicated in the first general hypothesis. The significance of the family for the second general hypothesis lies in the continuing influence of family through the individuals life. If adults continue to live in areas where many of their kinfolk live this factor will greatly influence later socialization by reinforcing basic orientations.
acquired in youth, by the indirect effect of that basic orientation on the other two orientations, and by the direct effect of family on daily socialization experiences. Furthermore the effect of family on perception of community power at later stages is relatively greater when agencies of adult socialization are absent, e.g., secondary associations. For this reason the number and closeness of an individual's kinship system is an important part of his milieu. Family and kinship have further importance for the second hypothesis because the family introduces within-class variability, since there is no standardization of the family as is possible in the case of church and especially of school. In rural areas where many people are related this factor can lead to isolated pockets of people holding views which differ from others due to localisation of descent groups. This factor will be discussed in the section dealing with the spatial aspects of the milieu (Dawson & Prewitt 1969:89, LeVine, 1960:295).

The initial basic orientation is imparted mainly by primary agents such as church, family and school. These agents are unorganized, decentralized, varied and not deliberate in their efforts on political socialisation. As the children grow older (7-13 years) their perception improves, and their understanding and discrimination increases so that they advance beyond the stage of abstract
symbols. Likewise they now know more about their position in the geographic and social world. Thus they enter the stage in which they obtain most of the content of the second political orientation, i.e., that which is concerned with specific knowledge and feelings. Adelson and O'Neal (1960:304-5) note five changes in political development which characterizes the orientation.

1. Decline of authoritarianism
2. An increasing grasp of the nature and needs of the community.
3. The absorption of knowledge and consensus.
4. The growth of cognitive capacities.
5. The birth of ideology.

These changes occur between the ages of eleven and eighteen, but most occur between the age of eleven and thirteen. During this stage the previous orientation is sharpened and its general trends continued, although there is no direct political experience. Political socialization is not the principle aim of agencies which individuals of this age will have experienced, e.g., family, school and church. Peer groups are very important at this age. Their importance is derived from the fact that an individual's judgement of what is "fact" often relies on his perception of the opinion of his peers on the matter. These primary groups serve as an intervening factor between formal
definitions of the power structure and public perception of that structure. Studies by Berelson, Lazarsfeld and McPhee (1956:96) indicate that the influence of peer groups increases with age, and that this is accompanied by a lessening of parental influence. The influence of peers is directly related to the degree of agreement in the group, to the importance of questions of community power to that group, and to the strength of the individual's ties to the group. (Dawson and Prewitt 1969:137)

The main peer groups of interest for political socialization are friends, co-workers, and spouses. In this study, close friendships are recorded and frequency of visiting is assumed to indicate the degree of potential influence of friends in formation of perception.

The third type of political orientation is that which deals with transient feeling concerning political institutions, policies, programs, persons and events. The main changes in this stage occur within the limits imposed by the previous orientations. In political matters attitudes to party policy, programs etc. may change, but party itself is seldom changed. At this stage the individual is eligible to attempt to manipulate structures. His attitude to authority changes since he now has a say in directing his own destiny. A greater
degree of political responsibility is felt, and feelings arise as to his own political efficacy. Attitude formation occurs due to the response of the structure to his attempts at manipulation. This stage is an important factor because the hierarchal authority system of the family and the imperfect knowledge of peers has resulted in an idealistic form of perception which has not yet been tempered by personal experience. During this stage the individual's experiences, political and non-political, affect his perception of the power structure and force him to a more realistic appraisal of the situation. Once again the end result of this experience is limited by the effects of background factors such as social class and age.

This orientation is derived mainly from secondary association. These associations vary in effectiveness depending on the extent to which they deliberately set out to affect political views. In the case of community power their influence on perception is related to the extent to which they direct their attention to matters of local interest. Formal organizations in rural areas can be grouped into two types (1) those which are under central control from outside and those which are locally autonomous. The former is more likely to affect perception of the local power structure than the latter. These groups
all affect perception to some degree by some of the following processes:

1. Direct education

2. Participation in their general affairs which provides an apprenticeship for public life.

3. Providing a framework in which primary relations can develop with the resulting peer group influences.

4. Providing reference groups and filters.
   (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969:187)

Secondary groups are important because they relate the distribution of orientations to the social and demographic structure of society. They reflect the cleavages and cohesions of society which arise from difference or coalescence of interests. Groups which engage in direct political education such as party, youth education clubs and occupational groups who have political aims are important out of proportion to their membership size, since the few people who participate in them are generally politically active to a high degree.

A less direct form of adult socialization is derived from performing the ordinary duties of citizenship, e.g. voting, paying income tax and property tax, receiving services from local government and from other levels of government, involvement in government programs, and experiences in problem solving involving response of
of the formal or informal elements of the power structure. As a result of all types of experience directly and indirectly related to the power structure, the individual builds up a series of attitudes relating to self, community and power structure. These are seen on the basis of a general attitude which will affect perception of community power. They include the individual's feelings regarding his own efficacy in dealing with the power structure, the extent to which he feels part of the community, his view of his rights within the community, his feeling as to its effectiveness in solving the problem which he feels the community needs to solve.

As a result of the above discussion, the following subhypothesis can be stated as part of the second general hypothesis. The relationship of the independent variables to the dependent variable is multivariate. The model used to test the hypotheses holds all other measured variables constant while the effect of each variable is being examined. The subhypotheses are stated as follows:

Community member's level of perception of the community power structure will vary:

Subhypotheses 5 directly as the number of friends whom they visit frequently varies;
Subhypotheses 6  directly as their total participation varies;
Subhypothesis 7  directly as their problem solving activity varies;
Subhypothesis 8  directly as their receipt of government income varies;
Subhypothesis 9  directly as their kinship ties with members of the power structure vary;
Subhypothesis 10 directly as their feelings regarding the amount their own influence in the community vary;
Subhypothesis 11 directly as their feelings of attachment to the community vary;
Subhypothesis 12 directly as their feelings regarding the amount of "say" they have in community affairs vary;
Subhypothesis 13 directly as their feelings regarding the degree to which the power structure are effective in carrying out their work vary;
Subhypothesis 14 directly as they perceive that problems exist in the community.

The above hypothesis relates to the interactional aspects of the individual's milieu. Measurement, however is at the individual level, and hence the effect of milieu is merely implied. In the following section some aspects of the milieu that relate to ecological and to other global characteristics will be discussed.
General Hypothesis III

The individual's perception of community power will be positively related to ecological characteristics of the environment.

In this hypothesis the meaning of ecological embraces the two main ecological traditions that have arisen in sociology (Cartwright, 1969) the former relating merely to the spatial distribution, and the latter relating to the individual's total "ecosystem".

The importance of spatial aspects in determining perception of community power can be seen in the finding of Young and Larson, 1970 (337-354). They found that comparatively small differences in distance from the centre of population and in the social density of a person's location of residence made large differences in his perception of and participation in the community structure. Individuals who lived at points remote from the village centre were less likely to identify the village as their community but chose a nearby neighborhood or failed to identify with any centre. Where the pockets of high population density occurred, the individual was likely to identify with the village centre. In this case distance and density were related to the "world" which the individual identified as his own.
The influence of both factors on participation further reinforced the processes of induction into social structure. The advantage which this type of factor brings to the study is its recognition of the more diffused aspects of the milieu (Linz, 1969:107) which cannot be accounted for by ordinary survey data nor by sociometric data.

Haegerstrand (1966) used spatial information in an attempt to account for the "neighborhood" factor and the role of private rather than public information. This factor is assumed to be operative in affecting the respondent's views of what persons in the locality are powerful. The power structure is a locality group phenomenon, even where it is not related to localization of descent groups and high degree of kinship, and its impact is more a global characteristic of the locality than a compositional effect, i.e., it is not reducible to any counterparts at the individual level. Consequently it is assumed that any individual's level of perception in any neighborhood will be related to the leadership level of the neighborhood. This conceptualisation recognizes the influence of the object of perception on the formation of perception, and the influence of spatial factors on the strength of that stimulus. This conceptualization however does not allow for the real
possibility that the subject is affected by stimuli coming from outside the neighborhood. (Cox, 1969:159)

The above discussion relates the factors distance from community centre, neighborhood density and neighborhood power level to the dependent variable, the individuals perception of community power. The following subhypotheses arising from the above discussion can be stated: Community members' level of perception of the community power structure will vary:

Subhypothesis 15 inversely as the distance of his neighborhood from the community centre varies;

Subhypothesis 16 directly as the population density of his neighborhood varies;

Subhypothesis 17 directly as the power level of the neighborhood varies.

In the case of the above 3 subhypotheses it is assumed that all other personal and social attributes are held constant while the individual relationship is being tested.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the theoretical discussion of general hypothesis II and III was to arrive at the interactional factors and the ecological factors in the individual's milieu which affect his perception of community power. Concepts such as opinion leadership,
reference groups and pressure toward conformity imply direct interaction of a sociometric nature with the individual. In addition the question arises whether the individual is aware of the influence which certain elements of the environment have on him. Another factor of importance is whether the interaction is power-oriented or not and the degree to which the action is power-oriented. The range of directness, awareness and power orientation gives a three dimensional property space in which the milieu can be considered. Thus the concept of milieu as it relates to the formation of perception of community power is a broad one.

The question of awareness introduces the necessity of obtaining sociometric type data. This was deemed to be beyond the scope of this study except insofar as relations between rank-and-file and leaders were concerned. In this study four types of interaction are considered. First, direct interaction of a power oriented nature includes problem solving activity, kinship in the power structure, and Chapin participation scores in power oriented organizations which have a high degree of local autonomy. The second category is direct interaction of a general nature (low-power orientation) and it includes visiting of friends and church oriented activities.
## INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aware</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aware</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Power Orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Power Orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving activity involving the power structure or power oriented local voluntary organizations</td>
<td>Church related activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting members of the power structure</td>
<td>Power oriented voluntary organizations which are directed from outside the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of local voluntary organizations which are largely autonomous</td>
<td>Visiting friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area leadership level</td>
<td>Receipt of Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary group and peer group membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global characteristics of neighborhood e.g., density, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 1. Ecosystem of Community Members.
The third category is indirect interaction of a power-oriented nature. This is measured by membership in voluntary organizations which are centrally guided (e.g., Home Demonstration clubs, etc.) and by the level of leadership in the area. The final category is indirect interaction of a general (low-power orientation) nature, and includes such characteristics as receipt of government income and (many people have homestead exemptions) and finally (in an attempt to define the more global characteristics of the locality) measures of distance of the neighborhood center from the community center, density and population potential of the different neighborhoods are included. The above four categories include information relating to the milieu from the most direct and purposeful interaction to the most diffuse stimuli of the general social, institutional, organizational and physical context. In addition, they include information which relates to sociometric ties with the perceived, the third major category of data upon which perception depends. Furthermore, they incorporate data relating to normal survey research, sociometric survey, and ecological research based on neighborhood systems (rather than administrative areas) and derived from survey analysis. Each of these characteristics, though measured at
different levels, is treated as a personal characteristic. Two models are tested. The first involves the background characteristics alone. The second involves the interactional and other contextual characteristics of a spatial nature in addition to the background characteristics. It is hypothesised that introduction of variables relating to the ecosystem of the individual (i.e. his interactional and spatial characteristics) will increase the amount of explained variance.
CHAPTER IV.
METHODOLOGY
I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will outline the methodology used to test the hypotheses developed in Chapter III. The following sections include these topics:

1. A description of the study site;
2. Field procedures and instruments;
3. A statement of the epistemic correlations of the variables;
4. A discussion of the method of analysis and specific technique used.

Some of the data used in this study was collected in a previous study of the population by Dale Welch, Department of Sociology and Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University in cooperation with the Southern Forest Experiment Station and Louisiana Forestry Commission (project No. F.S. S.O. 2102-6.2a.).

II. THE STUDY SITE

The study site is a rural ward (political subdivision) in a parish (county) in West Louisiana. The area of the ward is 100 square miles, and it lies 6-15 miles from the parish centre, a town of some 11,000 population. The area is one of poor sandy soils and pine woods which
were originally cut over between 1880 and 1920. The main centre of population in the ward dates from pre-civil war times, but many people moved into the locality with the lumber companies, and others came between 1930-40 when the lumber companies offered the cutover land for sale for a nominal price.

Many persons bought very little land, but they used the cutover land belonging to the lumber companies for grazing varying numbers of cattle and sheep for a token charge or without charge. Subsistence farming was carried out, and few cash crops were sold with the exception of watermelons. The southern part of the area was very isolated until after the second world war when it was connected with the parish centre by a blacktop road. Approximately two hundred and ninety families live in the area, and they are served by five churches, one school, a post office, skating rink, Masonic hall and five general stores.

Today, five-sixths of the land has been reforested and large lumber companies still own half of the land area. The other half is owned by private individuals. The owners of two-thirds of the remaining land are absentee owners and the residents own the remainder i.e. one-sixth of the whole ward. This is used mainly for grazing, but soyabeans and watermelons are also grown. There is no industry in the
area and almost all family heads derive their living off the farms. Eighty percent of those employed work outside the ward. The area is represented at the parish level by one police juror and one school board member. A part-time deputy sheriff represents the sheriff's office. The parish consists of eight wards. The three police jury members from the urban ward are allocated sixty-two votes, while the remaining seven rural wards are allocated thirty-eight votes. The ward in which this study was conducted is allowed only one vote.

An interesting characteristic of this area is the high degree of kinship which exists among the population. One family name occurred 22 times among the 287 family heads, and the top five power actors included a police jury member, his uncle, who was formerly a school board member, and his cousin, the present school board member. Likewise, the top 15 power actors included a further set of three cousins.

III. THE FIELD PROCEDURE AND INSTRUMENTS

The objectives of this dissertation include measurement of differences in individual perception of community power, and the explanation of these differences.
The population consists of two types of actors: (1) community power actors and, (2) community actors or rank-and-file community members. In order to achieve these objectives the power structure, as measured by some publicly accepted criterion, must first be ascertained, and next each individual's perception calibrated on this basis. Finally the characteristics of each individual are needed to provide explanatory variables.

The field procedure consists of three stages.

(1) Interviewing of external community knowledgeables and study of documents including newspaper files and parish history.

(2) Interviewing of all of the population i.e. the head of every household in the ward. The information obtained in this way related to both rank-and-file community members and to community power actors.

(3) Collection of data relevant to the ward as a whole, and to the individual neighborhoods.

A study of the ward carried out three years prior to the time of the present study had provided a list of persons deemed powerful by the population of the ward. This list, which ranked persons by the frequency with which their names were mentioned in response to the question, "who is most powerful in the ward?", was examined by external community knowledgeables. These were persons living outside the community who were deemed knowledgeable concerning a broad range of affairs within the ward over a considerable period of time. Included were the editor of a local
newspaper, the county agent and a former resident of the ward now residing at the county seat. They indicated the persons on the list whom they considered knowledgeable in regard to the power structure in the ward, and added any names they thought missing. The first phase therefore yielded (1) a list of persons considered powerful in the ward and ranked according to the frequency with which they had been named as being powerful by the population of household heads in the ward; (2) a selection of persons from the above list who are considered by external community knowledgeables to be knowledgeable concerning affairs within the ward. The external knowledgeables were asked to add names of any community knowledgeables they felt were missing from the list. The external community knowledgeables added no names to the list of persons previously mentioned as powerful. This list therefore, with the exception of two members who had died in the interval, is regarded as the list of internal community knowledgeables. i.e. knowledgeables residing within the community.

The second phase consisted of the preparation of an interview schedule designed to obtain relevant characteristics of the individuals in the population, and to
determine the power structure as perceived by rank-and-file community members and by community knowledgeable.

The data were collected during the summer of 1970. The interview schedule was pretested, and a number of interviewers from the parish seat were trained and subsequently they interviewed the head of each family in the area. Thus both power actors and rank-and-file community members were interviewed using the same instrument. Background and interactional characteristics of each person were obtained, and these are reported in Chapter V. Also, attitudes towards the power structure were obtained, and next each person was asked to name the individuals in the ward who were powerful (See question No. 86 in Appendix A). This question was open-ended in order to allow the respondent to mention as many names as he wished. Since this question was asked of each member of the population, i.e. household heads, the aggregate responses contained the perception of the following:

1. Rank-and-file community members;
2. Community knowledgeable

The list of persons nominated by the community knowledgeable as being powerful was analysed. Once again the internal community knowledgeable almost exclusively named each other as power actors. The responses of the rank-and-
file community members are summarised in Table I while the responses of the community knowledgeables is given in Table II.

Table I indicates that sixteen persons were mentioned five times or more by rank-and-file community members. Included were a police jury member, a school board member, a school principal, a retired vocational agricultural education teacher, four local pastors, one mailman, one full-time farmer, a retired businessman, who was a former police jury member, a retired farmer who is a part-time sheriff deputy, a former school board member, a part-time farmer, two electricity company workers and an operator in a chemical company.

Each of the above persons was asked to name the most powerful persons in the ward, and the result of their responses is given in Table II. Persons mentioned twice or more often are arbitrarily regarded as members of the reputational power structure.

Identification of the power structure i.e. who the members are, is merely a prerequisite to evaluation of the differences in individual perception which is the main focus of this study.
### TABLE I
RANK-AND-FILE COMMUNITY MEMBERS' PERCEPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Gallagher*</td>
<td>Police Jury Member</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saunders°</td>
<td>Vocational Agriculture teacher</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Findley</td>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly*</td>
<td>Former Schoolboard member</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gallagher*</td>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O'Brien</td>
<td>Worker in Electric Co-op</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McKenna</td>
<td>Worker in Electric Co-op</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mooney</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Saunders°</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McGreevy</td>
<td>Retired Farmer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard J. Early</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Egan</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Early°</td>
<td>Mailman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thady Dunleavy</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sheerin</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Coggins</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names appearing in this table are fictitious.

* Close Relatives

° Close Relatives
TABLE II
COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGEABLES VIEW OF WHO IS POWERFUL COMPARED WITH THE RANK AND FILE MEMBERS PERCEPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
<th>(a) by knowledgeable</th>
<th>(b) rank-and-file</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Gallagher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saunders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Findlay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gallagher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O'Brien</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McKenna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mooney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Saunders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McGreevy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard J. Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Egan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thady Dunleavy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sheerin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Coggins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of persons in Table II who were mentioned twice or more is regarded as an indicator of public opinion of who are power actors. The frequency with which they were mentioned as persons of power was not regarded as a sufficiently accurate appraisal of their relative power. Therefore each of the ten community power actors was asked to rank, on a scale of one to eleven, the ten persons who had been mentioned most frequently in the previous study as persons of power. They were also asked to add and rank any persons whom they felt to be missing from the list.

No names were added to the list by the power actors. The sum of the power rankings ascribed to each power actor by other power actors was divided by the number of times he was nominated, and the average score thus obtained was accepted as an indicator of the relative weight of his influence. These scores are regarded as a measure of the relative degree of power each possessed, which is acknowledged by an informed group representative of public perception. With the completion of this task, a standard was made available by which the perception of the rank-and-file could be judged. The method of evaluation of each rank-and-file community member's perception of community power will be explained in the following section dealing with epistemic correlations.
IV. EPISTEMIC CORRELATIONS

The testing of hypotheses calls for operational or epistemic definitions of the theoretical concepts used in the hypotheses. The problem of such definitions in the behavioral science can best be seen by comparison with a well-developed science.

A well-developed science includes in its structure well integrated theory on one hand, and data on the other. Theory consists of constructs and their logical relations to one another, while data consists of observables. Validation of theory is carried out by observations of data, and this calls for rules by which theoretical constructs are related to relevant data. These rules are called operational or epistemic definitions (Torgerson 1965:8). The difference between the well-developed sciences and the social sciences arises from the difficulty of obtaining proper epistemic correlations. Useful theoretical constructs must have constitutive meaning if they are to contribute to the formation of laws and theories. In the well-developed sciences the constructs either have direct correlations with observable data, or they have precise logical relationships with other constructs which have direct operational definitions. Thus they have indirect relationships to observable data. The behavioral sciences
however have many constructs which have no direct correlations with observable data, are further handicapped by the fact that they do not have precise logical relationships to other constructs which have observable empirical correlates. (Torgerson 1965:6) The epistemic correlations are defined by Northrop (1959:119) as:

"... a relation joining an unobserved component of anything designed by a concept by postulation to its directly inspected equivalent denoted by a concept by intuition ... an epistemic correlation joins the aesthetic component of a thing to its theoretic component."

Since a given construct may have several constitutive (Theoretical) and several epistemic definitions, the following epistemic correlations are only one of many possible solutions to the problem of measurement of constructs. The theme of the dissertation has been stated in two general hypotheses. Both of these seek to explain the dependent variable individual perception of community power in terms of characteristics of the individual and of his social content. The dependent variable is conceptualised as the degree to which an individual's perception of which community members are powerful, coincides with the perception of the power structure held by the informed section of the public.

It is assumed that those who are in the power structure are the most informed members regarding the extent of the
objective and subjective power attributes of other power structure members. The pretest carried out in the locality indicated that rank and file persons tended not to distinguish between the issue areas in which power could be exercised, consequently the conceptualization relates to overall power in the general affairs of the community. Each power actor ranked the others in terms of the amount of power they felt they had, and the average rank ascribed to each power actor was regarded as a measure of his relative power in the community. Subsequently each time a community member mentioned a power actor, he was allocated a power knowledge score equal to the mean score of that power actor. The sum of the scores allocated to the individual community member is regarded as his total power knowledge score. This is the epistemic correlate of the concept individual perception of community power, and is the dependent variable in all of the empirical hypotheses. This method has been used by Jenkins (1966: 132) to measure perception levels.

General Hypothesis I states: Community members' level of perception of the power structure will vary with their background characteristics. Background characteristics considered are occupation, income, education and age. Their relationship to the dependent variable is
multivariate. The epistemic correlation of the concepts representing the independent variables are given below.

**Occupation**

A modified version of the census categories was used to rank occupations (Bureau of the Census, 1960). The categories "clerical and kindred workers" and "sales workers" were combined into a single category. A further category called "retired" for persons who were retired since a number of persons in the locality had no source of income other than social security. The categories were ranked in the following order.

1. Professional
2. Manager, Owner, Official
3. Clerical and Sales
4. Skilled Worker
5. Operative
6. Unskilled Worker
7. Retired

Occupational ranking is regarded as an indicator of social status.

**Income**

The importance of income level for perception of community power arises from the consequences of the social category to which it delegates persons. In this study subjective level of income is used as the epistemic
correlation of income. Previous study of the same pop­ulation indicated a higher correlation between sub­jective level of income and some selected variables. Sub­jective level of income was determined from the responses to the question: "How do you feel your income compares to others in the community?" (Q 11. Appendix A)

Responses were classified in six categories.

1. Greatly above average
2. Fairly well above average
3. Just slightly above average
4. Just slightly below average
5. Fairly well below average
6. Greatly below average

Education

The consequences of level of education for perception of community power have been outlined in Chapter III. The main result is the individual's greater confidence in his own efficiency. The epistemic correlate of level of education is regarded as the respondent's subjective feeling of his level of education determined in a similar manner as the subjective level of income and the responses were likewise categorized.

Age

Age affects activity in community affairs consider­ably. The level of activity annually increases upon
marriage and decreases when the adult reaches the sixties. The epistemic correlate is the age reported by the respondent.

**Visiting of friends**

Informal interaction is an important variable in the formation of perception. Each respondent was asked, "Whom do you visit most?" The number of persons mentioned was accepted as the epistemic correlate of the level of the respondents degree of informal interaction with friends.

**Formal Participation**

A Chapin participation score was determined (See Q 16 Appendix A) which included participation in farm, school, church, fraternal, civic and political organizations.

**Problem Solving Activity**

Individuals who take part in problem-solving activity are seen to be more likely to have higher perception levels than those who have no experience of problem solving. Each respondent was asked to mention a number of local problems (Q. 91 Appendix A) about which people were concerned. In addition each was presented with a list of problems (Q. 93 Appendix A) and then asked if he had tried to do anything about any of the problems he mentioned. The responses were "yes" or "no".
Receipt of Income from the Government

Regular dealing with government officials and power structure members influence perception level of community power. Each individual was asked whether he was in receipt of any form of "government income" (Q. 9.c3 Appendix A). The responses were "yes" or "no".

Kinship in the Power Structure

Having been presented with a list of power structure members, each respondent was asked if he was related by kinship to any of them. (Q. 103 Appendix A) The actual number of kin is the score used.

Respondents' feelings regarding the extent of his own influence in the community.

Respondent was asked the following question.

(Q. 105 Appendix A.).

Which of the statements on Card (7) best describes your feeling regarding the amount of influence you have on decisions in this community?

(Card 7)

I THINK I HAVE MORE INFLUENCE THAN THE AVERAGE PERSON ON DECISIONS MADE IN THIS COMMUNITY . . . -5
I THINK I HAVE JUST AS MUCH INFLUENCE AS ANYONE ELSE IN THIS COMMUNITY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -4
I HAVE A VOTE JUST LIKE EVERYONE ELSE, BUT I REALLY HAVE VERY LITTLE INFLUENCE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -3
THIS WARD IS RUN BY A SMALL GROUP OF PEOPLE AND I HAVE NO INFLUENCE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -2
I HAVE NEVER REALLY THOUGHT ABOUT HOW MUCH INFLUENCE I HAVE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -1
Attachment to the Community

The epistemic correlates of this concept were measured by responses to the following question. (Q. 107 Appendix A).

Which of the categories on Card (8) best describes how well you like living in this community?

(Card 9)

I WOULD LIVE IN NO OTHER COMMUNITY .................. -5
I WOULD LIVE IN ANOTHER COMMUNITY IF I HAD TO, BUT I FEEL THIS COMMUNITY IS AMONG THE BEST IN WHICH TO LIVE ........................................ -4
IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE TO ME WHAT COMMUNITY I LIVE IN ........................................................ -3
I AM SOMEWHAT SATISFIED WITH THIS COMMUNITY, BUT I FEEL I WOULD BE MORE SATISFIED IN ANOTHER COMMUNITY ................................................. -2
WOULD LEAVE THIS COMMUNITY IF I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY ....................................................... -1

Satisfaction with access to the decision-making process.

This variable was measured by the responses to the question (Q. 98 B. Appendix A).

"Do you feel you should have more say in local affairs than you do?"  ________Yes, ________No.

Feelings regarding the effectiveness of the power structure

Each respondent was asked the following question.

(Q. 108 Appendix A)

(Card 10)

THE LEADERS ARE VERY EFFECTIVE IN RECOGNIZING AND SOLVING COMMUNITY PROBLEMS .................................. -5
OUR LEADERS ARE SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE IN RECOGNIZING AND SOLVING COMMUNITY PROBLEMS ................ -4
THERE SEEMS TO BE A LACK OF LEADERSHIP IN THIS COMMUNITY ......................................................... -3
Level of perception of community problems

Each respondent was asked to mention the top problem in the ward (Q. 91 Appendix A) about which people were concerned. They were then presented with a list of problems which had been mentioned by local knowledgeable persons and other community members who were interviewed in the pretest. The problems mentioned by each respondent corresponded in the aggregate to problems mentioned by knowledgeable and those involved in the pretest. A Guttman scale (Guttman 1949:78-80) was derived from the responses to the above question and the score allocated to each individual was regarded as an indicator of his level of problem-awareness. (See Appendix B)

Distance of neighborhood from the center

The historic center of the ward is the seat of the post office, Masonic hall, two churches, and a number of stores. Previous studies (Young and Larson, 1970) have found a close relationship between distance from the center and degree of induction into social structure. Likewise distance from the center is generally associated with low population density and isolation from areas of greater activity. Consequently the site of each
home was plotted on a map, and the distance of each household from the center of the ward was calculated. Each individual was allocated a score equal to the distance of his home from the ward center. Respondents living at the ward center were allocated a score of a half mile. In this case the neighborhood is divided into concentive bands half a mile wide within which all respondents are allocated a similar score.

**Neighborhood density**

The variable is included because of the importance of isolation for socialization. It is assumed that residential isolation is indicative of a degree of possible social isolation and of its effect on socialization processes. The map of the locality was divided into one mile sectors, and the density of households in each sector was allocated to each respondent within the sector.

**Neighborhood power level**

Each respondent was asked to identify the neighborhood to which he belonged. The different identifications were plotted on the map and gave quite clear identification of six neighborhoods. The location of each power actor was then identified. The neighborhood power level
is the sum of the total power score of each power actor in the locality. The neighborhood power level score thus obtained varied from zero to 30.4. Each respondent was allocated the neighborhood power level score of his neighborhood.

V. RESEARCH TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGY

The purpose of this study is to explain an individual's level of perception of community power in terms of characteristics of the perceiver, of his milieu, and of the object of perception. It is hypothesized that the individuals background characteristics will explain his potential level of perception while his interactional and contextual characteristics will set the limits to which the potential will be realized. The first model to be tested is a multivariate model including the background characteristics i.e. occupation, income, education and age. This model is represented diagrammatically in Figure (3). It is assumed that the amount of variance explained by this model will be less than a model including the remaining variables in addition to the background variables. The first model includes variables relating to the perceiver as individual. They are collected by survey method, and their relationship to the
dependent variable is examined. The latter is measured by survey method at individual level. However, individual perception can be explained also as a function of the characteristics of the individual's milieu including the object which he perceives. It is assumed that when the original model is expanded to include the variables mentioned in General Hypothesis II and General Hypothesis III much more of the variance will be explained. The total model is given on the following page. (Figure 5).

Although inclusion of interactional attitudinal and "ecological" variables is an attempt to span the total ecosystem in which the individual's perception is formed, not all of these variables are measured at subsystem (neighborhood) level. However, the variables measured at individual level are taken to be indicative of elements of the respondent's ecosystem which affect his rating on the dependent variable perception of community power. Total visiting score is more a personal characteristic and probably has less importance as an ecosystem element explaining the dependent variable than for example has the level of kinship in the power structure. The latter is a sociometric tie direct to the power structure.
### BACKGROUND VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTERACTIONAL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total visiting score</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving activity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the power structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of government income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin participation score</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of own influence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of effectiveness of power structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of perception of community problems</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### "ECOLOGICAL" VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the center</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector density</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood power level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 5. A MODEL OF BACKGROUND, INTERACTIONAL AND CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES RELATED TO LEVEL OF PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POWER
Likewise among the attitudinal variables an individual's perception of his own influence in the community is less power oriented than his view of the effectiveness of the power structure. However, due to the tendency of individuals with like attitudes to associate more frequently with each other such measurements at individual level may be regarded as an indication of the respondent's milieu. The three "ecological" variables; distance from the center, sector density and neighborhood leadership level represent measurement of the ecosystem at a level above that of the individual. The first is indicative of the effect of living close to the "center of affairs", the second is indicative of the potential for interaction among neighbors who live less than a mile away, and is an attempt to allow for pockets of high density which may occur at some distance from the "center of affairs".

Finally neighborhood leadership level is a variable based on a subsystem identified by a collectivity of respondents, and not reducible to representation at individual level. Sector density and neighborhood leadership level represent the only two indicators of the milieu which are measured at the level of the collectivity rather than at individual level. This technique of aggregating survey type data on the basis of identified neighborhoods is superior to the normal method of aggregating survey
type data without reference to locality. Its suitability for the topic in hand i.e. the level individual perception of community power arises from the fact that perception is an individual phenomenon while the object of perception i.e. power is a function of locality group organization.

A number of different techniques were used to test the hypotheses and to elaborate the relationships of the independent variable to the dependent variable. The techniques included:

(1) A general description of the social characteristics and institutional affiliations of these chosen power actors.

(2) A chi-square test of association between key independent variables and the dependent variable.

(3) A classification of the sociometric linkage between rank-and-file community members and power actors based on the spatial relationships between them.

(4) An analysis of variance of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

The latter is the prime method of analysis. Harvey's (1960) technique of analysis of variance for unequal subclasses was used. This technique is applicable to analysis of the relationship between "one dependent variable regarded as quantitative and two or more independent variables each regarded as qualitative or classificatory." (Blau and Duncan, 1967:128-140) This type of technique generally makes no prior assumption as
to the form of the relationship of the dependent variable to any of the classificatory variables or of the classificatory variables to one another. (Harvey, 1960) Neither is any assumption made as to the order of the categories. It does, however, have the advantage of giving the net effect of the variables, i.e., the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable holding all other independent variables constant. It has the further advantage over nonparametric techniques of specifying the relationship between variables. This technique assumes that the correlation between the independent variables is not excessive. It provides analysis of variance and of covariance, and orthogonal comparisons between categories within a single variable. In addition, interaction between factors can be explained by inference.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of the analysis of the data. Three techniques are used. The first is a test of association between selected independent variables and the dependent variable. (Table III) The second section is an analysis of variance. In this section the effect of a model including background variables (Table V) is compared to that of a model containing variables relating to both the individual's background and milieu. (Table XIII) This is the largest section of the chapter. Finally, the third section analyzes sociometric data which clarifies the nature of some of the above relationships.

II. INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXT

A main theme of this study is that both personal and contextual factors affect individual perception of community power. The statistic Chi-square tests the degree of departure from independence of any two variables and the C coefficient is a measure of the extent of the departure of the variables from independence. The coefficient is standardized to allow for the size of the population and the number of categories used. Table III is a general profile of the data classified on the basis of an individual characteristic (years of residence),
Table III. Distribution of Power Knowledge Score by Neighborhood and Length of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Power Knowledge Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center Neighborhhood</td>
<td>19 &gt;</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Neighborhhood</td>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Neighborhhood</td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighborhhoods</td>
<td>19 &gt;</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighborhhoods</td>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighborhhoods</td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ c (\text{Neighborhood} \times \text{Power Knowledge Score}) = 0.281 \ (P > 0.001) \]

\[ c (\text{Length of Residence} \times \text{Power Knowledge Score}) = 0.202 \ (0.01 < P < 0.02) \]

\[ c (\text{Length of Residence} \times \text{Neighborhood}) = 0.154 \ (\text{NS}) \]

* The power knowledge score is dichotomized at the category containing the mean, i.e., 9> and 10<.

* Length of residence is dichotomized at 19 years or less and 20 years or more.

and of a spatial characteristic (neighborhood). The proportion of respondents in each power knowledge score category indicates the effect of place and length of residence. Neighborhood was significantly associated with power knowledge score as was length of residence although the latter association was weaker. The association between both of the independent variables was very weak.
The variable power knowledge score is dichotomized at the categories closest to the mean, i.e. nine or less and ten or more. Length of residence was dichotomized likewise at nineteen or less and twenty or more.

This table indicates that the locality group context affects perception of community power. What element of the locality group environment is responsible for the effect remains to be specified. The analysis of variance of the power knowledge scores and subsequent analysis will attempt to elaborate on the contribution of selected factors to differences in levels of perception of community power and the relationship of this variable to "neighborhood effects."

III. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

The first general hypothesis relates background variables to the dependent variable. This relationship is examined in Table IV in which the degree of relationship between the background variables and the power knowledge score of the rank-and-file members is given. The significance of the main effects is normally tested by means of the F test, but the assumptions of such tests are not fully met by the data. Consequently, the result of the F-test must be treated with some caution. For these reasons the magnitude of the mean square will be taken as
an indicator of substantive relationship rather than the
F value. In Table IV income and age provide the largest
adjusted deviation and, therefore, they were included in
the final background model (See Table V). This model
explains 12.29 per cent of the variance. The model upon
which the technique is based assumes that a high degree of
multicollinearity does not exist. The first three back­
ground variables are related to some extent, and the ex­
clusion of education and income from the final background
model in Table V caused the variance explained by occu­
pation to increase. The difference between the variance
explained by this model and that explained by a model con­
taining variables relative to both the background and
milieu represents the additional increment arising from
the milieu. In the final background model age is signifi­
cantly related to the dependent variable. The main impli­
cation is that age affects stage of socialization and de­
gree of knowledge of the power structure.

The second general hypothesis posits an association
between an individual's level of perception of power and
factors within the individual's milieu or context, includ­
ing those which bring the individual into contact with
the power structure. Fourteen variables are held to
represent the elements of the milieu which are associated
with level of perception of community power. These
Table IV. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Background Characteristics of Rank-and-File Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Subjective)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subjective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>5.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11593</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 15.88 percent

Table V. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Background Characteristics of Rank-and-File Members. Final Background Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11995</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance 11.5 percent
variables are composed of three categories, interactional, ecological-contextual and attitudinal. Models consisting of each of these groups are tested in Tables VI, VIII, and X. The variables which contribute most to the explained variance are then tested in Tables VII, IX, and XI. Finally, Tables XII and XIII tests a model which includes both background variables and variables related to the milieu which have contributed most in the latter three models to the explanation of the dependent variable. When the variance explained by this model is compared with that explained by the model presented in Table V, i.e., the background model above, then the difference between them is the contribution of the milieu. Each table presents the following information:

(1) The total sum of squares, i.e., the total variance in the data.

(2) The total reduction, i.e., the amount of variance explained by the model. This is the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and the square root of it gives the multiple correlation ($R$) of the model with the data.

(3) The main effects of each variable are given. This is the effect of each variable holding all other variables in the model constant.

(4) The remaining unexplained variance or error. The model can be written to include first order interactions.

(5) The arrays of subclass means can be examined to infer trends, and where there are only two subclasses the source of orthogonal variance can be inferred. (See Table XIV and XV)
The Interactional Model

This model is presented in Tables VI and VII which is the final interactional model. The total reduction in the first model, Table VI is 14.58%.

The main contributors to the variance among interactional variables are those relating to informed interaction such as visiting. This supports the contention that perception of community power is largely the result of socialization based on informal contacts. By far the lowest contribution to the explanation of the variance is derived from problem-solving activity. This finding throws suspicion on the contribution of the variable which made second highest contribution i.e., the Chapin participation score. Since the variable problem solving activity which explains so little relates to the extent to which individuals admitted attempts with other people and organizations or alone, to solve local problems it seems contradictory that the Chapin participation score which measures activity in voluntary organizations explains so much of the variance. One solution to the contradiction is to assume that the voluntary organizations were mainly vehicles of informal intention. Examination of memberships indicated this was the case.

The final interactional model (Table VII) contains total visiting, kin in the power structure, receipt of
Table VI. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Interactional Characteristics of Rank-and-File Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the Power Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting of Non-Kin Structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6174</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 14.58 percent

Table VII. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Interactional Characteristics of Rank-and-File Members. Final Interactional Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the Power Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6643</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 9.13 percent
government income and length of residence. The inclusion
in Table VI of visiting of non-kin in addition to total
visiting quite obviously leads to confounding due to the
overlapping effect of the variables. Both were included
since it was assumed that the effect of visiting of non-kin
would vary depending on the total number of persons visit-
ed. Total visiting includes visiting of both kin and non-
kin and this is used in the final model.

The Ecological Model

The previous model indicated a low contribution to
explained variance by variables relating to formal inter-
action. Due to the difficulty of measuring informal inter-
action the variable sector density is included as a
measure of potential interaction in the model presented
in Table VIII. All of the variables included in this model
are an attempt to measure the day-to-day effect of locality
group membership in contrast to membership based on social
ities which are independent of spatial contiguity. The
effect of isolation on induction into community structure
has been recorded by Young and Larson (1970) and the
inclusion of the variable sector density is an attempt to
measure this effect. However, distance of residence from
the community center has also been shown in the above study
to affect socialization into the community structure. This
effect is largely due to its correlation with the variable
Table VIII. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Ecological Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Density</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7047</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 10 percent

Table IX. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Ecological Data. Final Ecological Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7168</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 12.5 percent
occupational prestige level. There is also the assumption that the community center is the center of power activity and possibly the site of the residence of the power actors. Consequently the variable neighborhood power level is included to allow for the effect of differences in power level from one neighborhood to the other. This aspect is further examined by perusal of sociometric data at the end of this chapter.

In the initial ecological model in Table VIII it can be seen that sector density explains very little variance. Distance from the center and neighborhood power level are included in the final ecological model (Table IX). The increase in the amount of variance explained is due to the degree to which sector density was confounded with both these variables. The final ecological model explains 12.5 per cent of the variance.

**The Attitudinal Model**

This model (Table X) tests the relationship between an individual's attitudes toward himself (his own influence), toward his community (his attachment to it, and the problems which it has), and toward the power structure (its effectiveness and the access it allows him to decision making). The major contribution to the variance was made
Table X. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Attitudes of Rank-and-File Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>7987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Influence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Community Problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6666</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 16.54 percent

Table XI. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Attitudes of Rank-and-File Members. Final Attitudinal Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7306</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 9.8 percent
by the respondent's degree of satisfaction with access to community affairs, his views concerning the extent of problems in the community and by his views regarding the effectiveness of the power structure. The second variable mentioned relates to the respondents' view of the community, the other two to their view of the power structure. Degree of satisfaction of access and problem perception are included in the final attitudinal model (Table IX). In that model these variables explain 9.8 per cent of the variance.

The Final Models

The above eight models, Tables III to XI indicate the contribution of four different type of variables to explaining variances in power knowledge scores. The final models now bring the variables of different types together. Two final models are presented in Tables XII and XIII. The former contains background, interactional and ecological variables and the latter contains attitudinal variables in addition to the types of variables included in Table XII. The total reduction of the model in Table XII is statistically significant at the .05 level and amounts to 35.48 per cent of the variance. This corresponds to a multiple correlation of .5956. The addition of interactional and ecological variables to the model
Table XII. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Background, Interactional, and Ecological Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the Power Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4890</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 35.48 percent

Table XIII. Analysis of Variance of Power Knowledge Score and Selected Background, Interactional, Ecological and Attitudinal Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the Power Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Perception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4533</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance. 41.60 percent
results in a net gain of 24 per cent explained variance over that which was explained by the final background model in Table V. If the F value is accepted as a criterion of significance the variable distance from the center is statistically significant at the .05 level. Area leadership level is significant at the .1 level. Distance from the center, leadership level, occupation and kinship in the power structure contribute most to the variance. Three of these variables relate to the individual's milieu and one (occupation) is a background variable.

The attitudinal variables were excluded from the above model but are included in the model examined in Table XIII. The total reduction of this model is 41.60 per cent, i.e., the multiple correlation is .6449. It is statistically significant beyond the .001 level and explains six per cent more variance than the previous model, and thirty per cent more than the background model. Of the eight variables three are statistically significant at the .05 level, i.e., kin in the power structure, distance from the center, and level of perception of community problems. Satisfaction with access to community decision making is statistically significant at the .1 level, as is neighborhood leadership level.
The arrays of means of the subclass categories of
these variables are presented in Tables XIV and XV. Even
though the subclass means differ significantly from each
other the source of the difference cannot be indicated by
examination of the tables unless in cases where there is
only one degree of freedom.

**Kin in the Power Structure**

Ties of kinship with the power structure form a
permanent ascribed link with power structure members. The
subclass mean for those who have no kinship ties among the
power structure is considerably lower than the mean
power knowledge score of members who have kinship ties with
the power structure.

The conclusion suggested by these findings is that
kinship plays an important role in introducing members of
the community to the power structure. Contact with and
knowledge of the local power structure is based on this
primary relationship and since it is an ascribed relation­
ship it imparts an advantage to those who possess it.
Since those who do not have kinship ties with any power
structure member cannot easily remedy the disadvantage the
consequences of kinship militate against fluidity and
change in the power sphere.
Table XIV. Effects of Selected Background, Interactional and Ecological Factors on Power Knowledge Score of Community Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Least-Square Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Members</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Owner, Official</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Worker</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Visited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin in the Power Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 or more miles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 - 6 miles</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 - 4.5 miles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 - 4 miles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2.5 miles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Leadership Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distance from the Center

Perusal of the subclass means of the various categories of this variable in Table XIV indicates that the relationship is not linear. The highest means occur among those living at two and half to four miles and four and a half to six miles. The inclusion of this variable was based on the assumption that respondents who lived in areas removed from the center of affairs would be less acquainted with the power structure. These data show that this is not the case even though the variable is significant and explains much more variance than other variables. The nature of the relationship will be examined at the end of this chapter.

Level of Perception of Community Problems

Political socialisation theory posits a relationship between awareness of community problems in general and degree of political awareness. It is hypothesized that individuals who have a broad view of community problems will have a more accurate view of the community power structure. Examination of subclass mean of the variable perception of community problems indicates a gradual if irregular increase of power knowledge score as the level of perception of community problems increases. The
Table XV. Effects of Attitudes on the Power Knowledge Score of Rank-and-File Community Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Least Square Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Members</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with access to decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Perception Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications of this are that the level of perception of community power is associated with a similar level of perception of the existence of community problems. The problems which were mentioned most frequently in the locality were the usual problems of rural people - road maintenance, quality of schooling, difficulty of obtaining off-farm employment. The finding that both high problem perception and satisfaction with access to the decision-making process were both related to a high perception scope seems to indicate that those who expressed satis-
MAP NO. 1

THE NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE COMMUNITY

Neighborhood I
Power Level 0

Neighborhood II
Power Level 6.3

Neighborhood III
Power Level 15.4

Neighborhood IV
Power Level 12.1

Neighborhood V
Power Level 30.4

Ward Centre

Neighborhood Centre
faction with access to decision-making process recognized that many of the problems in the locality could not be solved by the local power structure.

**Satisfaction with Access to the Decision Making Process**

If community members feel excluded from access to the decision-making process it is likely they will know less about the power structure. The least square mean of the power knowledge score of the subclass which feels satisfied with access to the decision making process is significantly higher than that of the group which feels dissatisfied (i.e., 9.62 vs. 6.38). The number of persons expressing satisfaction with the extent of access they had to the power structure was more than twice that of those who felt dissatisfied with access to decision making.

**Neighborhood Leadership (Power) Level**

Table XIV shows neighborhood power level to be positively related to the dependent variable. This implies that the presence of power actors in the neighborhood imparts to the local people an awareness of the power structure. This characteristic is ascribed and forms another barrier to access to the power structure. When
individuals live in neighborhoods of low leadership level they can do little by way of changing residence to improve their degree of contact with power structure members.

IV. SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OF THE POWER STRUCTURE MEMBERS

Three of the five variables which are statistically significant in Table XIII deal with actual or potential sociometric ties which rank-and-file community members may have with the power structure members. These are kinship, neighborhood power level, and satisfaction with access to the decision making process. The findings in the case of the variable distance from the center can be interpreted in the light of the factor which the above three variables have in common, i.e., the actual or potential sociometric linkages with power structure members. The variable distance from the center is included in the model on the assumption that those who live near the center of affairs are more in contact with the power structure members and their activities. A further assumption is that power structure members, particularly the more influential members, reside at the center. Perusal of Table XIV indicates that the largest means occur at two and a half to four miles and four and a half to six miles from the center. The former locality contains the
residences of the school board member and the latter the residence of three of the power actors who have a total power score of 16.4. This implies that the attempt to control for neighborhood leadership level was unsuccessful. The concentric zones formed by the categories of distance from the center did not completely overlap the neighborhoods (See Map I and II). Consequently the relationship of the variable distance from center to the dependent variable is confounded by the neighborhood power levels. Distance from the center does explain the levels of perception and the residuals over that predicted are due to the different power peaks which occur at points outside the center. This can be seen from data in Table XVI.

In zone V, the central zone, the score is 6.1. Zone IV has a power score of 7.0 which prevents the perception level from falling and actually increases it to 9.8. Zone III which is further away than zone four has a lower perception level despite the similar level of power in the zone. Zone II has a score of 15.9 which is considerably above that predictable on the basis of distance. A local power level of 16.4 may explain the discrepancy. Finally the lowest score occurs at the point farthest from the center. It is not considerably lower than the score for the center. The zone does however include the residence of the police juror who had the
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### Table XVI
Distance from center, power level, and perception of power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Miles from Center</th>
<th>Zone power level</th>
<th>Perceived Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.1 or more</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4.6 to 6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4.1 to 4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.6 to 4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Center to 2.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XVII.
The proportion of possible choices which were made, based on the neighborhood of those choosing and of those chosen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents neighborhood</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Power Actors Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>*2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figure in each cell represents the proportion of possible choices of neighborhoods power-actors which were made in different neighborhoods.
highest number of choices by rank-and-file members
(See Table I) and was adjudicated by the other power actors
to have the highest power score.

One shortcoming of this form of analysis is the assumption that the perception of power within zones departs from that predictable on the basis of distance from center only to the extent that it is affected by power actors residing within the zone. Some of the more powerful actors may influence perception in many zones. Likewise a less powerful actor may influence a contiguous zone if he lives near it. The same problem arises in the case of the neighborhood power level. In addition to being influenced by neighborhood power actors the perception of individuals is likely to be influenced by powerful actors living in contiguous neighborhoods and by less powerful actors living near the neighborhood boundaries. Perception is therefore influenced from all points of the compass where power actors reside rather than from the center. An examination of sociometric choices across neighborhood boundaries will cast light on the extent of this problem.

Table XVII presents in each cell the sociometric choices made as the proportion of choices of power actors from different neighborhoods which could be made by rank-and-file community members from each neighborhood. The table is standardised on the basis of the proportion of the
community members from each neighborhood. The table is standardized on the basis of the proportion of the total rank-and-file members who reside in each neighborhood, and on the basis of the proportion of power actors who reside in each neighborhood. The total number of possible choices is 2770, i.e., the number of rank-and-file times the number of power actors. Neighborhoods one through five have zero, one, two, two and five power actors respectively, and 19, 37, 61, 47 and 113 rank-and-file members respectively. Each cell, therefore, has a potential number of choices equal to the product of the number of power actors in the neighborhood its column represents and the number of rank-and-file members residing in the neighborhood which the row represents.

The number in each cell represents the proportion of potential choices which were made. The maximum proportion possible in any cell is 100 per cent. If the maximum is achieved in a full row of cells this would represent recognition of all of the power structure by all of the rank-and-file residents in a single neighborhood.

If the maximum is achieved in a complete column it would represent complete community wide recognition of all of the power actors in the relevant neighborhood. Two hundred and fifty-six choices were made, i.e., 9.24 per cent of the potential choices.
The figures in the underlined cells represent the proportion of possible choices which were given by respondents to power actors in their own neighborhood. The figures in cells marked with an asterisk represent the proportion of possible choices which respondents gave to power actors in neighborhoods contiguous to their own. Finally, the cells which include neither underlining nor asterisk represent choices given by respondents to power actors in non-contiguous neighborhoods. When each row is examined it will be recognized that the options available to respondents were not similar. In all neighborhoods except neighborhood one the respondents could choose power actors in their own neighborhood. Since there were no power actors in neighborhood one, it did not represent a potential choice whether it was contiguous or not. The following neighborhoods had contiguous and noncontiguous neighborhoods to choose from, i.e., in which there were power actors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number of Contiguous Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Number of Noncontiguous Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Hypothesis IV

It is hypothesized that choices will be made jointly on the basis of contiguity and of the power relative level of neighborhoods. Specifically, it is hypothesized that:

A. Neighborhood power actors will make a higher proportion of possible choices of power actors in their own neighborhoods than they will of power actors in contiguous or noncontiguous neighborhoods provided the contiguous and noncontiguous neighborhoods do not have a higher neighborhood power level.

B. The neighborhood power actors will make a higher proportion of possible choices of power actors in contiguous neighborhoods than they will in noncontiguous neighborhoods provided the noncontiguous neighborhood does not have a higher neighborhood power level.

C. When choosing among contiguous neighborhoods, respondents will choose on the basis of relative neighborhood power levels.

D. When choosing among noncontiguous neighborhoods, neighborhood respondents will choose on the basis of relative neighborhood power levels.
Findings

Sub-hypothesis A

1. The five neighborhoods had the option of choosing contiguous neighborhoods rather than their own twelve times. Two of these twelve occurred in neighborhood one, which had no leaders. The option, therefore, really did not hold in this case since power actors were forced either to choose outside their neighborhood or to choose no power actors.

Of the remaining ten cases, nine were in the direction predictable on the basis of contiguity. In the one exception the rank-and-file members in the community chose neighborhood three power actors proportionately more often than their own power actors (10.81 v 8.10 per cent). The power level in neighborhood two was lower than that in neighborhood three. (6.3 v 15.4).

2. On the two occasions where a neighborhood had the option of choosing power actors of noncontiguous neighborhoods in preference to their own they chose their own. All of the cases relevant to the above hypothesis supported it.
Sub-hypothesis B

Six cases were relevant to his hypothesis. In four of them the higher proportion of choices was given to power actors from noncontiguous areas. In three of these four cases the preferred neighborhood (three) had a higher power level than the rejected ones (two and four).

One case was not in the direction predicted. Neighborhood three (power level = 15.4) was preferred to neighborhood five (power level 30.4) by respondents in neighborhoods one, two, and four. The margin of preference was small (9.57 v7.23). Five of the six cases relevant to Sub-hypothesis B all were in the direction predicted.

Sub-hypothesis C

This sub-hypothesis predicts that the order of choice among contiguous neighborhoods will be related to the order of neighborhood power levels. This means that if a neighborhood's respondents have the option of choosing among power actors from contiguous neighborhoods they will pick those from the neighborhoods with the highest power score. Nine cases occurred which were relevant to this sub-hypothesis. Six cases
supported this hypothesis. In three of these neighborhoods, three was the preferred neighborhood. In two of the exceptions, neighborhood two power actors were chosen proportionately more than neighborhood four power actors, despite the higher power level of the latter (12.1 v 6.4). In both cases the number of choices was very small. Neighborhood one gave one choice to neighborhood two power actors and no choice to neighborhood four. In the second case neighborhood five gave two choices to both neighborhood four and five. Little importance can be attached to these two exceptions. The final exception has more substantive import. In this case neighborhood two respondents gave 10.81 per cent of possible choices to neighborhood three power actors and 1.62 per cent to neighborhood four power actors. This implies that the respondents in that locality perceived the power actors of neighborhood five to have more power than those in neighborhood three. This is the first case of the 27 cases discussed which fails to conform to the general hypothesis. These findings indicate that when rank-and-file community members choose among power actors from localities of equal standing as far as contiguity is concerned, their choice preferences are decided by the power differentials.
Subhypothesis D

This subhypothesis predicts that the order of choice which rank-and-file respondents will make among non-contiguous neighborhoods will depend on the relative power level in those neighborhoods.

One case occurred in which the respondents of neighborhood one preferred the power actors of neighborhood three to those in neighborhood five giving them 13.18 per cent of the potential choices in contrast to the 4.21 per cent of the choices they gave to neighborhood five power actors. This case like the previous case is felt to have substantive import.

Since the major emphasis of this study is on the ecological contributions to perception of power, the thirteen cases where choices were in the direction predicted by contiguity were examined to see how often the effect of contiguity superceded that of the power differential. In seven of the cases both the power differential and the effect of contiguity operated together while in six of the thirteen cases contiguity operated to place a majority of choices in a neighborhood which was inferior on the basis of its power.
The findings can be summarised as follows:

I. Only 9.4 per cent of the total possible sociometric choices were made.

II. Neighborhood preference (i.e., relative proportion of choices given to power actors) was explained jointly - on the basis of contiguity to power actors and of neighborhood power levels in seventeen cases out of eighteen. (Subhypotheses A,B,and C).

III. Contiguity alone explained thirteen cases and the remaining four were explained by the power differential.

IV. In one case the direction of choice was opposite to that predicted by the general hypotheses IV.

V. Neighborhood preference in the case of neighborhoods of the same standing (in regard to contiguity) were found to be explained by differential neighborhood power levels in six out of ten cases. Two of the four exceptions were shown to be substantially insignificant and the other two both chose neighborhood three power actors in preference to neighborhood five power actors.

VI. All three significant departures from the predicted choice direction involved the choice of neighborhood three power actors in preference to those in neighborhood five.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes: (1) an outline of the major findings of this study; (2) a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of those findings; (3) a discussion of the limitations of the study; and (4) the conclusions derived from the study and some suggestions as to future avenues of research.

II. THE FINDINGS

The objectives of the study are stated at the end of chapter one. The six objectives stated there can be reduced to three, - two major objectives and a third - which is merely a prerequisite to the execution of the other two. These objectives are:

(1) To discover the extent to which rank-and-file members' perception of who the power actors in the community are coincides with the power structure as identified by community knowledgeables.

(2) To discover the independent variables which are associated with differences in rank-and-file perception of community power. (i.e., in the extent
to which rank-and-file perception coincides with the community knowledgeable's perception).

(3) To discover the power structure, the institutional areas represented in it, and their balance.

The last objective is a prerequisite to the achievement of the first two objectives.

The theoretical significance of the first major objective is that it seeks to measure the extent of perceptual concomitance between the rank-and-file and the community power structure.

The theoretical significance of the second major objective is that it attempts to identify the antecedents of consensus in the community. The limitations of this assumption will be elaborated in the discussion of the implication of the findings.

The theoretical significance of the third objective lies in the inferences which can be made from the institutional areas represented in the power structure as seen by community knowledgeable.

**The Power Structure**

The power structure of the community identified by two or more choices of sixteen community knowledgeable is presented in Table II (Chapter IV). Ten persons were mentioned twice or more and they included the Police Jury
member of the ward, the Vocational Agricultural teacher, the school principal, two former school board members, the present school board member, a skilled electricity company employee who was also a church deacon and trustee of the local cemetery society, two Baptist pastors, and a part time sheriff deputy.

The ten members of the power structure represented all of the institutional sectors relevant in the ward - political, religious, and educational and economic -(two of the members were active in farming.) The power structure was therefore judged to be representative of community interests. The balance however was tilted in the direction of the political interests due to the presence of two elected officials, two formerly elected officials, and two individuals who had unsuccessfully run for public office. Five of the ten members held appointive positions i.e., Deputy Sheriff, Vocational Agriculture teacher, school principal and the two pastors. The one member who held neither an elected nor appointed public position occupied two semipublic positions in his church organization. Obviously the local conceptualisation of community power is a rather public one.

The second finding regarding the power structure is the relative importance given to the six persons who have been politically active. Five of the six persons who were
politically active were mentioned most frequently. The sixth person had dropped out of politics some six years previously. On this basis the power structure is balanced in favor of political activity and thus is less representative of all community institutions. Political activists were mentioned by the sixteen knowledgeables thirty times out of a total of thirty-nine. The remaining four persons were mentioned only nine times.

The third finding is the proportion of possible choices which were made by knowledgeables. Thirty-nine out of a possible one hundred and sixty choices were made, i.e., almost twenty-five per cent. If this is accepted as an indication of the perception level among knowledgeables it provides a standard against which the aggregate perception level of the rank-and-file members can be judged. The above findings relate to an informed publicly accepted view of the power structure. It provides a standard for evaluating the aggregate view which rank-and-file members hold of the power structure. This comparison is the first major objective of the study.

The findings in regard to the first major objective will be reported under the following headings: (1) A comparison of the level of perception of rank-and-file and knowledgeables as to who is powerful in the community; (2) The relative ordering of power actors on
the basis of the number of choices given to each; and the proportion of total possible choices given to power actors.

Table II indicates the individuals identified five times or more as being powerful by the two hundred and seventy-seven members of the rank-and-file. The left hand column provides the number of choices given to the same persons by the sixteen knowledgeable. Of the ten persons identified twice or more by the knowledgeable, nine were among those most frequently identified by the rank-and-file. This is evidence of a high degree of concurrence between rank-and-file and knowledgeable as to who the power leaders are. One power structure member, James Coggins was mentioned only five times by rank-and-file members. He is a former school board member, and has retired from political and community activities and devotes his time to part-time farming and is employed as a skilled worker outside the community. The one individual, Patrick McKenna, who was identified thirteen times by rank-and-file members as a power leader while receiving no mention from knowledgeable, was interviewed as to his part in decision-making during the past ten years. He is active in a number of community organisations and generally is satisfied to assist in legitimising decisions already made. On one occasion however, he was instrumental in
initiating activity which resulted in the selection of a counter candidate in a local election.

The second basis of comparison of rank-and-file and knowledgeable perception involves order of frequency of identification of individuals as power structure members. The six power actors identified most frequently by the knowledgeable were also among the six most frequently identified by the rank-and-file. Five of these six were active in political affairs and either held or sought political office at one time or another. The Police Jury member was placed fourth by frequency of identification by knowledgeable and first by a wide margin by rank-and-file members. Three of the four power actors who were placed lowest on the list by the knowledgeable were also placed in a similar order by the rank-and-file members. The tenth power actor was ranked at the bottom of a list of sixteen persons. The third basis of comparison between rank-and-file members' perception and that of the community knowledgeable lies in the proportion of possible choices made. The former made nine per cent of choices and the latter twenty-five per cent. These figures are assumed to be an indication of the degree of knowledge which both parties have of the power structure. Further classification of sociometric
choices indicates that thirty per cent of rank-and-file members mentioned no one as being powerful, a further forty-four per cent mentioned power actors only, and the remaining twenty-six per cent mentioned power actors and non-power actors. This implies that there is considerable variation in perception among individual respondents within an area which is so small that "barriers of size, distance and organization" are assumed to minimal (Pres- thus 1963).

In sum, the completion of the first major objective has indicated that the aggregate perception of rank-and-file members as to who the power actors are in the community varied in extent but not in content from the perception of the community knowledgeables. The delineation of the sources of this variation was the second major objective of the study and the findings are now reported.

The second major objective of the study is to discover the independent variables which are associated with differences in individual rank-and-file members' perception of power. Individual levels of perception were assumed to be the result of different socialisation experiences. The model contains the usual variables deemed relevant for socialisation and incorporates a number of modifications which allow for the peculiar character of
socialisation in rural areas. Since socialisation in rural areas is so much affected by spatial flow of private information variables relating to this aspect of the model are included in the three phases of the analysis, i.e. Chi-square, analysis of variance, and classification of sociometric choices.

A Chi-square test (Table III) indicated a significant difference in power knowledge score between members of the central neighborhood (no. 5 on Map I) and all of the other neighborhoods.

An association was found likewise between years of residence and power knowledge score. These findings support the assumption of an association between both place of residence and state of socialisation and power knowledge score. The test also indicates that stage of socialisation and place of residence are not confounded.

The second state of analysis is an attempt to measure the contribution of a number of variables suggested by socialisation theory in general and political socialisation in particular, to the variance in perception levels of community power. These variables can be classified into four types; (1) background variables such as occupation, income, education and age (Table IV); (2) interactional variables including visiting of friends and relatives, problem solving activity, kinship with power
structure members, receipt of income from any government source, length of residence and a Chapin participation score (Table VI); (3) ecological variables including distance from centre, sector density and neighborhood power level (Table XIII); and (4) attitudes relating to a respondent's view of his own influence, his view of the community and of the power structure (Table X).

Each group of variables was tested to evaluate the ability of each type of variable to explain the variance in the power knowledge scores (Tables IV, VI, VIII, and IX). None of the four groups of variables made a statistically significant contribution to explaining the variance of the perception levels. No model containing one type of variable was adequate so two final models (Table XII and XIII) containing different types of variables were tested. The former consisted of selected background, interactional and ecological variables, and the latter of the four types of variables. Both models were statistically significant and the ecological type variables contributed most to explaining the variance in the first model (Table XII). In the second model five variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in perception. In declining order of importance they are:

(1) Distance of the respondent from the community centre; (2) Satisfaction with access to the decision
making process; (3) Kinship among power structure members; (4) Level of perception of community problems; (5) The power level in the different neighborhoods.

The effects of the variables were as follows:

(1) The farther the respondents lived from the community centre the lower was their perception except in areas where the more important members of the power structure lived.

(2) Respondents who expressed satisfaction with the degree of access they had to community affairs perceived the power structure more accurately i.e., more in line with the perception of knowledgeable persons and of members of the power structure.

(3) Those who had kin among the power structure members had a higher perception score than those who had no kin.

(4) Those who perceived fewer problems in the community had a lower power knowledge score than those who perceived more problems in the community.

The third technique used in the analysis was a classification of the proportion of sociometric choices which respondents from each neighborhood made of power actors in the five neighborhoods. This technique indicated the community wide distribution of choices from
each neighborhood. Choice preferences in seventeen out of eighteen cases were explained on the basis of greater contiguity or of a power differential or of both. Of the seven cases where a neighborhood rejected the option of choosing neighborhood power actors who were more powerful, six were explained on the basis of contiguity, i.e., they preferred to choose less powerful neighborhood power actors who were closer to their homes than more powerful actors far away. Five cases occurred in which neighborhoods did not make their choice on the basis of contiguity. Four of these cases could be explained by superiority of the power actors in the chosen neighborhood. The above findings indicate that perception of power varies on a neighborhood basis and that the variation is due to the contiguity factor in some cases, and to the power differential in other cases. This implies the utility of a gravity model in explaining perception of the power structure.

III. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The main goal in the development of the theoretical paradigm in chapter three was to explain individual differences in perception in terms of the individual's ecosystem. The concept ecology has two main significances in the social sciences. The former deals with the
individual's total environment, while the latter tradition concentrates on the variation among spatial units. Both these meanings were deemed relevant for the theoretical framework, the former insofar as the differences in perception were seen to be the consequence of differences in the individual ecosystems operating as a socialising force, the latter insofar as the different levels of perception were judged to be related to spatial factors which operated to vary the flow of private information, an important factor in socialisation and induction into local structure. The theoretical framework suggested that background characteristics would be important insofar as they were indicative of agencies of primary socialisation, but that, within the limits imposed by the primary socialisation, perception levels would vary mainly due to adult day to day direct experiences of a power oriented nature. The theoretical implications of the findings suggest that more emphasis should be made in the model to the more immediate day to day experiences which have a high degree of power orientation. This argument is based on the order of importance of different types of variables in the final model (Table XIII). The first three variables in order of importance are distance from the centre (five power actors lived at the community centre), satisfaction
with access to community affairs and kinship in the power structure. The findings in regard to the effect of the latter two variables imply that the attitudes and socio-metric ties which are directly power oriented are of more substantive significance than those which are not. The first variable was shown upon examination to be best interpreted as arising from proximity to power structure members. The effects of first and third variables imply that the respondent may or may not be aware of the consequences of his contacts as they affect degree of access to decision-making. The second variable implies that to the extent that people feel they have a say in community affairs their power knowledge score is high. In this case a feedback process appears to operate. The fourth and fifth variables in order of importance are problem perception and area leadership level. Those who perceived few problems in the locality had a low power knowledge score while awareness of many local problems, e.g., school standards, road maintenance, and employment were associated with high levels of perception. Problem perception therefore appears to be associated with an increased awareness of who the powerful people are. This is the only variable which is dictated by non-normative considerations. Its use in conjunction with the variables relating to satisfaction with access is relevant in the
light of the theoretical framework discussed in chapter two. The social psychological underpinnings of the power structure in the community can be more readily projected if the degree of consensus on goals and the degree of satisfaction with the power structure is incorporated into the model.

The more exogenous variables in the model such as age and occupation contribute least. Occupation is a variable which is very difficult to measure exactly in an area which is in transition where so many persons have a number of jobs, and where income is supplemented to varying extents by subsistence farming. Future theories may with benefit classify occupations in similar studies on the basis of the degree to which the occupant is exposed to peer groups, or of the occupational authority structure, or the degree of social and spatial contacts they provide. Occupation may in some cases contribute more to knowledge of the outside world than of the affairs within the community. The low contribution of the variable total visiting to the explanation of the variance highlights the necessity of including variables in a model which relate directly to political socialisation. The failure of variables which normally contribute indirectly to the process of induction into community
structure (visiting, occupation) may be due to the narrow conceptualisation of the variable – only one of many possible elements of perception were measured. However, the dominantly political nature of the power structure may have narrowed its significance for rank-and-file members to the extent that variations in its perception arise mainly from variables which are directly power related.

The practical implications of the study arise mainly from the light they shed on conditions at the microlevel. The success of microlevel programs in the public and private sectors ultimately rests on the tailoring of such programs to local conditions. The ability of the community and the neighborhoods to respond to assistance from higher units of organisation depends on the degree of integration of various localities into the community. Some awareness on the part of administrators of the ecological distribution of the power system and of the spatial variations of perception is a prerequisite to prediction of the success of such programs. This knowledge becomes vital when complete coverage is needed. In such cases either vicinal or social isolation of individuals or groups will be reflected in the perception of the power structure which those groups hold. The presence of local descent groups and of neighborhoods which form packets of resistance to political ideas, to technological and social
change are associated with variations in the perception of community power. Neighborhood and multineighborhood units form coalitions which alter the configuration of power and its alignment around various issues. The antecedents of such variations in perception which were found in this study provide clues for strategic implementation of programs which are complementary to those based on the conceptual framework of diffusion of innovation and the trickle-down process. By allowing for some factors such as the effect of contiguity on perception such strategies may succeed where others fail.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of the study arise from a number of sources.

(1) The conceptualisation of perception of community power is narrow in that it covers only one of its many facets mentioned in chapter II.

(2) The topic of research - socialisation into the local power structure - lends itself more to diachromic analysis and the dynamics of the process would probably have been revealed more clearly rather than being hinted at if the research design were longitudinal. Dialectical processes even if they only refer to the interaction of
local factions as they related to conflicting interests and styles (that of the old incumbents versus that of the young aspirants) must influence those who are getting to know the structure. Synchronic analysis within a single community confines the researcher to techniques of analysis from which causality cannot be inferred with any degree of confidence, e.g., in the relations between problem perception, satisfaction with access and their influence on perception. This limit also has consequences for the theoretical inferences which can be made from the study.

(3) However, the main difficulty in the study arises from problems of measurement. This problem arises first of all from the difficulty in survey analysis of measuring a respondents' perceptions concerning such traditions as the "democratic creed". Some respondents' "don't knows" regarding who was powerful were suspected to be invalid in the light of their responses to other questions and of their reluctance to refuse directly to answer some questions. Another source of difficulty in measurement arises from the nature of informal interaction. Its occurrence is so pervasive that a simple measure cannot tap all of its dimensions.

Occupation also proved difficult to measure because of the transitional nature of the area. As an indicator
of social class it leaves much to be desired in areas of part-time farming and where so many heads of families had retired.

(4) The final limitation arose from the difficulty of evaluating the results in the absence of standards. Studies by Jenkins (1966), Presthus (1963), and Rose (1967) have examined perception of community power but have not focused on the ecological distribution of sociometric choices.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The main conclusion of this research is that a model which would best explain variations in levels of perception of community power should concentrate on the more direct sources of socialisation, e.g., day-to-day experiences with the power structure rather than an indirect socialisation. In rural areas such as the site of the study kinship and other sociometric ties with power structure members best explains perception levels. In addition, perception of local problems provides opportunities for local residents to approach such members of the power structure as have access to outside sources of solution to local problems.

Since direct ties to power actors are so important in induction into the local power structure it appears
that future studies should emphasise the social organisation of the community sociometrically.

The spatial aspects of the model proved fruitful and considerable light on a factor which has not been emphasised and seldom recognised in rural power studies. The findings in regard to the consequence of the spatial factor suggest that the reputational method of ascertaining the power structure has a built-in source of variation when applied to rural areas. This source of variation can lead to the identification of different types of power structure in localities where the social organisation of the community, rather than its power structure varies.

The main conclusion of relevance for Forestry agencies arises from the finding that many people in the study area did not mention any of the power structure members. This finding indicated a low degree of cohesion between the rank-and-file and power structure members. Previous studies in the same locality indicated a positive relationship between social class and contact with Forestry agency personnel. Both studies taken together indicate that the localities which are remote from the power leaders have least awareness of the power structure, least contact with Forestry agency personnel and a greater amount of forest fires. Further research is needed to examine methods which would improve agency efficiency in such localities.
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APPENDIX A

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
1. What is the name of this community? ________________

2. How many years have you lived in this community? _____ years

3. We would like for you to give us the following information about the members of this household:

   a. Person in household  Sex  b. Age  c. Highest grade completed

   Head of household
   Second, e.g., wife
   Father or mother

   Total in household

4.a) Will you please look at this card and tell me the number that corresponds to your family's total yearly income before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues, or other items. If income is from farming or other business enterprise, what is the income after business expenses were paid? Card No. 1. Hand card to respondent.

Card 1. Income

   0. $ 0  -499
   1. 500  -999
   2. 1000 -1499
   3. 1500 -1999
   4. 2000 -2999
   5. 3000 -3999
   6. 4000 -4999
   7. 5000 -5999
   8. 6000 -6999
   9. 7000 -7999
  10. 8000 -8999
  11. 9000 -9999
  12. $10,000 and over

b) Approximately what per cent of your family income comes from farm income?

   1. ______ 100 per cent
   2. ______ 75 per cent
   3. ______ 50 per cent
   4. ______ 25 per cent
   5. ______ No farm income
c) If other than 100 per cent

1. What is the source of your non-farm income?
   - Current employment
   - Source other than current employment

2. If current employment, for whom do you work?
   (name of company, organization, or other employer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Tenure (Yr.)</th>
<th>In or out of Ward 7</th>
<th>In or out of Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If source other than current employment, what is the source of this income?
   - a. government income
   - b. income from property
   - c. insurance payments

d) How far must you travel to your place of work? __ miles

e) What is your occupation?
   - Professional
   - Manager, Owner, Official
   - Clerical & sales
   - Skilled worker
   - Operative
   - Unskilled worker

5. Will you please look at this card and tell me the number that corresponds to your family's total net worth. (hand card to respondent) Card 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card No. 2</th>
<th>Total Net Worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. $</td>
<td>0-$ 4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 5,000-</td>
<td>9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10,000-</td>
<td>14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 15,000-</td>
<td>19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 20,000-</td>
<td>24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 25,000-</td>
<td>29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 30,000-</td>
<td>39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 40,000-</td>
<td>49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 50,000-</td>
<td>59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 60,000-</td>
<td>or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the categories on the card, how would you compare yourself regarding each of the following:
(Hand card 2. to respondent)
Circle correct number

Card 2. Individual's Comparison

1. Greatly above average
2. Fairly well above average
3. Just slightly above average
4. Just slightly below average
5. Fairly well below average
6. Greatly below average

6. How do you feel your income compares to others in this community?

7. How do you feel your education compares to others in this community?

8. How do you feel your total net worth (assets) compares to others in this community?

9. How do you feel your standard of living compares to others in this community?
10. Are you a member and/or do you attend any of the following groups or organizations? (FIRST READ THE LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS THE RESPONDENT SAYS HE IS A MEMBER; ASK THE QUESTIONS IN COLUMNS III TO VII).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Percent Meetings attended</th>
<th>Financial Contributions</th>
<th>Member of Com. in last 3 years</th>
<th>Comm. Chairman, or off. in last 3 yrs</th>
<th>Why are you a member?</th>
<th>For Ward 7</th>
<th>Meeting place</th>
<th>Outside Ward 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeders Ass'n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermelon Ass'n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattlemens' Ass'n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La. Forestry Ass'n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Coop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.T.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't. Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Give approximate per cent (to nearest 10%)
2. Check if "yes"; if "no" leave blank
3. Do not provide categories for the respondent. If his response falls into one of the following categories, record the #; otherwise record the response:

1) Income Benefit; 2) Fellowship; 3) Sense of Duty; 4) Education and information; 5) Expectation of others; 6) Means of being involved in community decision.
11. Do you hold any other elected or appointed position not mentioned?  
   No  _______  Yes  _______  What?  ____________________________  

Now we would like to ask your opinions about the influence that various organizations may have in the general community affairs of the community.

12. In your opinion, which three organizations have the most influence in this community? (Insert names in question 20 under "organization names".

13. Would you please rank these according to the amount of influence you feel they have? (Insert rank in question 20 under "rank".

14. What are the factors which you took into consideration in naming . . . (name of organization) . . . as an influential organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Names</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factors Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How many hours a week, on the average, do you spend in community activities? ____________ hours.
16. Whom do you visit with most? (Probe for 5 names)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>How often do you visit</th>
<th>Where does he live</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the following codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Frequency (how often)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Father or mother (including in-laws)</td>
<td>1. at least 7 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Son or daughter (including in-laws)</td>
<td>2. 3 to 6 times weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sister or brother (including in-laws)</td>
<td>3. Once or twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grandparents, aunt &amp; uncle</td>
<td>4. Every two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grandchildren, nephew, niece</td>
<td>5. Less often than any of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cousin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Friend (non-relative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What class would you say your parents belong to:
   Upper __________
   Upper middle __________
   Lower middle __________
   Upper lower __________
   Lower lower __________

18. Compared to your friends, are you more likely or less likely to be asked for advice about community affairs?
   More ______ Less ______

19. Thinking back to your last discussion of community affairs, were you asked for your opinion or did you ask someone else's opinion?
   Asked for your opinion ______; Asked someone else's opinion ______; Both ______.
20. Which happens to you more often? Do you tell your neighbor about some new ideas? ______ Do they (neighbors) tell you about a new idea? ______

21. Do you have the feeling that you are generally regarded by your friends as a good source of advice? ______ Yes ______ No

22. Do you have the feeling that you are generally regarded by your neighbors as a good source of advice?

23. To whom in this community do most people turn for advice on general community affairs? (try to get at least 3)

1. ___________________ 4. ___________________
2. ___________________ 5. ___________________
3. ___________________

24. Which persons in this community are the most powerful in terms of bringing about action they desire in the community or in terms of preventing action they do not support? (Try to get at least four names. You might ask "are there any others" or "are there any others like the individuals named"). Record answer in col. 88A.

25. What are the factors you took into consideration in naming . . . (person named) . . . as a person of influence? (Ask for each person named and record in col. 88B.

26. From the categories on Card 3 how well would you say you know . . . . Read respondent each name he has given and have him classify each as either: (Record in col. 88C) Card 3

1. Heard of, but do not know personally
2. Know slightly
3. Know well
4. Know very well
27. Suppose you decided to run for public office here in this community. Who are the people you would be most likely to contact in order to get their backing and support so that you can have a good chance of winning, e.g., sheriff, police jury, or school board member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Names</th>
<th>Factors Considered</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(First or Initial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Last)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I want to ask you a few questions to find out what citizens like you think are important problems in this Ward.

28. Can you tell me what problems people in your area are concerned about? (ALLOW RESPONDENT REASONABLE TIME TO THINK) Enter response in Col. 91A.

29. Which government--parish, state or federal--do you think will be more likely to help in the solution of your problems? (Enter response in Col. 91B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Government from which solution will come</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a.                          

b.                          

c.                          

d.                          

30. Have you any reason to believe that other people in this Ward are now concerned about Problem(a) above? 

   Yes  No

   if yes, have you:
   (1) heard people talking about it?
   (2) talked with people about it?
   (3) read about it in newspapers & magazines?
   (4) heard or seen it on radio or TV?

Have you any reason to believe that other people in this Ward are now concerned about Problem(b) above? 

   Yes  No

   if yes, have you:
   (1) heard people talking about it?
   (2) talked with people about it?
   (3) read about it in newspapers & magazines?
   (4) heard or seen it on radio or TV?
Have you any reason to believe that other people in this Ward are now concerned about Problem (c) above?  
____Yes  ______No

If yes, have you:
____(1) heard people talking about it?
____(2) talked with people about it?
____(3) read about it in newspapers & magazines?
____(4) heard or seen it on radio or TV?

Have you any reason to believe that other people in this Ward are now concerned about Problem (d) above?
____Yes  ______No

If yes, have you:
____(1) heard people talking about it?
____(2) talked with people about it?
____(3) read about it in newspapers & magazines?
____(4) heard or seen it on radio or TV?

31. Here is a list of problems which other people say exist in Ward 7. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 4)

(a) Which ones in your opinion are of concern to people around here?

(b) How important do you think the selected problems are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>ARE PEOPLE HERE CONCERNED</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TAX ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FINANCING EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HEALTH SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NATIONAL UNREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ROAD MAINTENANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TOO MUCH WELFARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. FIRE ANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WATERMELON MARKETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Have you, as an individual, or with a group or organization, tried to do something about any of the problems you mentioned or the problems listed on this card? (Refer to Card 4 again)

____ (1) Yes, as an individual (Fill out A, B, and C)

____ (2) Yes, with a group or organization (Fill out A, B, C, D)

____ (3) No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the problems?</td>
<td>What action was taken</td>
<td>What resulted from your efforts?</td>
<td>What groups or organizations participated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter 1 prob. ea. p. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)

| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| | | | | |

(3)

| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| | | | | |

(4)

| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| | | | | |

(If respondent tried to do something with others:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many other persons were involved? (write in the no. under the appropriate group)</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who were the main leaders in the total group (Write in the #)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What public official did you approach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we would like to ask your opinions about the influence that various organizations may have in improving the economic situation in the area, e.g., increasing employment.

33. What organizations in this community do you think would have the most influence in obtaining more employment in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Names</th>
<th>Comments (DO NOT PROBE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we would like to move to another area of influence and decision-making—that of political decision.

34. In your opinion who are the people in this community who are the most influential in the Democratic party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Names</th>
<th>First or initial last</th>
<th>Comments (DO NOT PROBE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Now, in your opinion, who are the people in this community who are in the most influential in the Republican party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Names</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first or initial</td>
<td></td>
<td>last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (DO NOT PROBE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. A. Do you think that citizens in this community like yourself have a great deal to say or very little to say about the way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A GREAT DEAL</th>
<th>VERY LITTLE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The school is run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The amount of taxes you pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Secondary roads in the parish are maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The allocation of welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Do you feel you should have more of a say in local affairs than you do? _______ Yes _______ No

C. Why do you feel this way? ____________________________________________
37. Could you give me the name of the:
   School Board member for Ward 7 ____________________________
   Police Jury member for Ward 7 ____________________________
   Sheriff of the Parish ______________________________________

38. As we visited briefly in this community three years ago we accumulated a list of persons who were named by community members as being influential. We do not know how complete this list is, nor do we know how influential these persons may be. We would like your opinion.

   (At this point hand Card 5 to respondent and proceed with explanation)

First, in your opinion, how much influence does each person listed on Card 5 have in the community?

To the right of each person's name is a scale numbered from 1 to 11. The number 1 represents NO INFLUENCE, the number 11 represents VERY INFLUENTIAL. Please tell me which number you believe best describes the amount of influence that person has in the community. If there are other persons you feel should be added to this list, I will add them at the bottom of the page and rank their influence on the 11 point scale. If there are any names on the list of which you have never heard, circle the zero to the left of the person's name. (In case you are interested, the order in which the names appear on the card is completely random.)

NOTES TO INTERVIEWER

* [If respondent says he has never heard of any of the names, circle the zero to the left of the person's name]

* [If respondent REFUSES TO RANK any of those named, circle the "99" to the right of the scale]

* If the respondent says he has heard of the name, but doesn't feel he has enough information to classify the person, have him rank the individual as 1. In many cases respondent may decide he knows the person's influence better than this and may want to give him a higher ranking. This is O.K., let him.

Also, when the respondent has completed the list, go over it to make sure all persons listed have been given some ranking. If one has been overlooked, probe until you can get some sort of acceptable rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never Heard of Him</th>
<th>Name of Influentials</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Respondent Refused to Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Gallagher</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saunders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Findlay</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gallagher</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O'Brien</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McKenna</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mooney</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Saunders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McGreevy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add any extra names on bottom of list.
39. On Card 6 (on the other side of Card 5) are the names of the people who were on the previous list. For each person we would like for you to tell us which one of the columns numbered 0-4 best indicates the degree to which you are acquainted with each person. (Write in those names added to Card 5 at bottom of Card 6).

40. Now, we would like for you to indicate those persons you visit with socially in either your home or their home. (Circle the "1" if he does not visit; circle the "2" if he does visit with them socially. If he does not visit with any of those listed mark an X in the box at the top of column 102).

41. Finally, would you indicate those persons on the list to whom you are related. (Circle the "1" if he did not related. If he is related to any of them, mark an "X" in the box at the top of column 103).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Never heard of him</th>
<th>Heard but don't know</th>
<th>Know slightly</th>
<th>Know well</th>
<th>Know very well</th>
<th>Visit in home socially</th>
<th>He is a relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Gallagher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saunders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Findlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gallagher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O'Brien</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McKenna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mooney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Saunders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McGreevy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add any extra names to the bottom of the list.
42. If a young married person came into this community and started a business, or began farming, or began to work for someone in the community, and this person wanted to take part in community affairs and eventually become influential in the community—what should he do?

(PROBE FOR SPECIFICS: In what activities? what clubs? what church? and so on. Should he take part?)

Are there any things he should avoid doing?

43. Which of the statements on Card 7 best describes your feelings regarding the amount of influence you have on decisions in this community?

Card 7
I think I have more influence than the average person on decisions made in this community.................5
I think I have just as much influence as anyone else in this community..................................4
I have a vote just like everyone else, but I really have very little influence..............................3
This Ward is run by a small group of people and I have no influence.....................................2
I have never really thought about how much influence I have.................................................1

44. To what extent do you feel a part of this community?

Card 8
Very much.....................................4
Quite a bit....................................3
Not very much................................2
Very little or not at all.....................1
45. Which of the categories on Card (8) best describes how well you like living in this community?

Card 9
I would live in no other community .................. 5
I would live in another community if I had to, but I feel this community is among the best in which to live .................. 4
It makes no difference to me what community I live in ................................... 3
I am somewhat satisfied with this community, but feel I would be more satisfied in another community .. 2
I would leave this community if I had the opportunity ... 1

46. Which of the categories on Card (10) do you feel best describes the leadership of this community?

Card 10
The leaders are very effective in recognizing and solving community problems ...................... 5
Our leaders are somewhat effective in recognizing and solving community problems ................ 4
There seems to be a lack of leadership in this community ........................................... 3
Our leaders seem to have difficulty in recognizing and solving community problems ................ 2
Our leaders seem to block the solution of problems facing the community ......................... 1

47. Which of the categories on Card (11) best describes the way organizations operate in this community?

Card 11
There seems to be conflict between organizations .... 1
Most organizations seem to work independently of the other organizations ...................... 2
The organizations often work together and cooperate .................................................. 3
The organizations almost always work together and cooperate ........................................ 4

48. Which of the categories on Card (12) do you feel best describes the leadership of this community?

Card 12
Very progressive ........................................ 1
Somewhat progressive .................................. 2
Only slightly progressive ............................ 3
Not at all progressive ................................ 4
49. Who did you vote for in the 1967 (the most recent) gubernatorial election?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John McKeithin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rarick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Who did you vote for in the 1968 presidential election?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

GUTTMAN SCALE TYPES
DISTRIBUTION OF PROBLEM PERCEPTION

GUTTMAN SCALE TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Type</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes agreement.

NOTE - See Question 93, appendix A for items.
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