Z [redacted] 025

[redacted]

snag028

[redacted]

[redacted]

ABSTRACT

THE REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE IN A CROSS-SOMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE: SELECTED PROBLEMS OF THEORY AND MEASUREMENT

by Eugene Curtis Erickson

For a number of years researchers in the social sciences have been involved in research on a phenomenon called "community power." A variety of methods have been employed to study the phenomenon. One of these methods is commonly called the "reputational technique." It has been suggested that this technique is actually a measure of phenomenon other than "power." However, certain theorists have suggested that correlations between "power" and other social phenomena might be expected. Little has been done by either proponents or critics of the technique to specify a more general basis upon which the results of an index of influence might be evaluated. It is this background which led to the specification of the problem, viz., to determine the relation between high evaluation of influence and other evaluative foci or indices of these foci.

In this thesis the propositions which are derived from social system theory are related to empirical generalizations drawn from previous research. From these results hypotheses are developed to be tested on "samples" of influentials selected from several community settings. Besides relating the evaluation of influence to a theoretical perspective, the reputational technique itself is tested for reliability. It is argued that positions in class, power, and prestige hierarchies

contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence. More precisely, the "contents" of evaluations relevant to a profile of influence potential embody such general phenomena as social class and prestige, a "history" of power, social background, certain personal characteristics, and the personal control of relevant "objects" which give the influencer an advantage, such as a backlog of skill. At least the broad expectation of a profile of influence potential is derived from theory and many of the specific empirical components are specified.

The components of the profile subjected to test are education, occupation, sex, age, marital status, father's occupation, religious affiliation, ethnic background, birthplace of influential and length of residence in community, orientation to community, and length of tenure in firm of employment.

Hypotheses derived relative to each of these variables are tested against two "universes." The first universe is that ditribution of a specified characteristic among the population of the community from which a group of influentials are drawn--the "intra-community" case. The second universe is the total group of influenctials from whom the specific empirical generalizations were derived--the "intra-influential" case.

Six community influence structures were assessed on the basis of the methodological technique called the reputational technique. Four were communities in the Southwestern United States and two were border communities in Mexico. The six communities varied widely in size, ethnic composition, and industrial base. "Knowledgeables" were selected in each community who in turn selected the basic list of influentials. For each influential interviewed the above listed characteristics were determined. The results were submitted to statistical test for evaluation.

In the intra-community case the influentials were found to be sharply distinguished from the general community on the variables of education, occupation, sex, age, and marital status for each of the six communities. For the four communities in the United States, two had groups of influentials who were drawn disproportionally from among the Anglo population of the community.

For the intra-influential case the specifications drawn from other studies of influentials yielded the following results on comparison with the influentials. Except where noted the results hold for all six communities.

Education:	More had some college
Sex:	More were male
Age:	More were over 50 years of age (except for one community)
Marital Status:	More were married
Father's occupation:	More were sons of fathers whose occupations were white collor or above
Place of Birth:	Varied by community (as expected)
Length of Residence in community:	More had lived in community over 25 years
Orientation to community:	More had local orientations (except for one community)
Tenure in "firm":	More had over 20 years tenure in firm (except for two communities)
Occupation:	Business occupations were dominant
Religious affiliation:	In the United States--Protestants were dominant In Mexico--Roman Catholics were dominant (certain reservations are necessary)
Ethnic background:	Anglos dominanted.

The reputational technique is held to be an efficient and reliable indicator of influence.

THE REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE IN A CROSS-COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE: SELECTED PROBLEMS OF THEORY AND MEASUREMENT

By

Eugene Curtis Erickson

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1961

C 23219
11/2/62

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No statement of indebtedness can adequately fulfill the obligations entailed in the writing of a thesis. The training, learning, and knowledge gained from this experience are generalized and difficult to specify. In general, the support given by the United States Public Health Service and the Carnegie Corporation is most sincerely appreciated. Specifically, for the direction of these projects and the format of the thesis itself, my major advisor, Dr. Charles P. Loomis, was inspiring.

For the more detailed experiences which confront the "learner," Dr. Archibald O. Haller spent many hours of probing at approaches and ideas which in the context of professional criticism was appreciated. Also, I should acknowledge Drs. Beegle and Hoffer for their committee work.

For numerous other persons it is difficult to itemize contributions. But contributions there were! Naming George and Carole Wolff for their hours of editing, Verl Franz for his not-to-gentle needling and he and his wife Margaret for proofing, David Lewis and Edward Pryor, Jr. for Being, succeeds in the specification of but a few.

To Robert and Margaret Holloway I extend appreciation for a relationship categorized by Sincereity, for a relationship which had immeasurable effect upon this production.

To Ann Marie and Kenyon, Stephen, and Jeffrey I formally extend the kind of informal Thank You which is appropriate only in the context of close family living.

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

CHAPTER Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS - C ntinued

TABLE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction to the Problem

For a number of years researchers in the social sciences have been very much concerned with a phenomenon called "community power." A variety of methods have been employed to study the phenomenon. One of these methods is commonly called the "reputational technique." It is a technique which has been the subject of specific criticism by a number of professionals.

The reputational technique has generally found a relatively small group of persons within American communities to be "power wielders." This group of persons may not have been elected to office; they are not subject to recall elections and only in indirect ways to the sanctions of a public. Their actions in decision-making processes may further only those public goals which are in congruence with the "private" goals of the group's members. Generalizations such as these strike at the heart of theories of the ideal democratic society.

For whatever reason certain professionals have purported that the methodological technique upon which these generalizations or research results are based is actually a measure of a phenomenon other than "power." Some of the alternative phenomena which the technique is purported to measure are "limited scopes" of influence rather than "general" influence, a prestige dimension of the persons classified as influentials, the formal leadership of the community, or certain "personality traits" highly conspicuous in the community.

Little has been done by either proponents or critics of the technique to specify a theory with which the results can be related. Are the critics of the findings of the reputational technique correct in their implication that persons evaluated as possessors of the characteristic "influence" will not also possess other characteristics such as those mentioned above? Since "influence" is assigned to a given individual as a result of a process of evaluation of some content of action (infra), are there other evaluative foci which might be correlated with a high evaluation of influence?

B. The Problem

The specific problem to which this thesis is directed will be to attempt to derive from social system theory, in however limited a fashion, the relation between the high evaluation of influence and other evaluative foci or indices of these foci. The propositions which contain these relations will then be related to empirical generalizations derived from previous research so that hypotheses may be developed which can be tested on "samples" of influentials selected from several community settings. A corollary problem will be a test, insofar as is possible with available data, the reliability of the methodological approach which is called the reputational technique in the context of the above findings.

C. Importance of the Problem

The specific criticisms of the reputational technique should be placed in a theoretical perspective and in turn subjected to a test for the purposes of substantiation or rejection. The focus upon the "universal" correlates which may be associated with influence is long overdue in the research area of community influence structures. The findings should substantially increase knowledge in this area.

CHAPTER II

SOME EXPECTATIONS FROM A THEORY OF INFLUENCE POTENTIAL

A. Introduction

1. Objectives of Chapter

The objective of the discussion to follow will be to develop the conceptual framework of the study. In addition, it shall be our purpose to use this framework as a device to glean from the theoretical literature certain propositions[1] concerning the substantive subject under discussion, namely, the social correlates of influence, or what will be called the components of influence potential.

2. A Note on the Concepts Power, Influence, and Authority.

In a thesis concerned with the complex phenomena called "power," or "influence," it is appropriate to limit one's scope of interest to a workable sphere. The conceptual difficulties with these terms have been widely explored (e.g., see Cartwright [ed.], 1959: 186 for a collection of definitions). Variously "power" and "influence" are used as the generic term by different theorists. Parsons (1951: 95) and Loomis (1960: 20) use the term "power," while Barber (1957: 232ff) uses "influence" as the generic term. The matter is relative. Whichever is used, however, some degree of control or effect of an ego over the behavior of alter is implied. Various aspects of this control have been described. For example, the legitimacy of the assignment of

---

[1]A proposition will refer to a statement in which something is affirmed or denied of a subject.

control over something to a status-role or the illigitimacy of the assumption of control by an ego may be used as a sub-class of the generic phenomena (e.g., Loomis, op. cit.: 20). Likewise the application or non-application of sanctions as distinguishing the relationship between ego and alter has been used as a sub-classification device.

Most discussions of power or influence have been concerned with the description of all social relations insofar as there are elements of super- and sub-ordination in them. For the purposes of this paper, the use of these terms will be much more restrictive than this. The substantive context of the social relations involved in community power refers only to those social relations which comprise the action situation in which community-wide goals or objectives are being met. A definition of influence sufficiently applicable to the empirical phenomena of interest to us will be "the capacity of a system-unit (ego) to control other system-units' (alters) action" (ibid.: 20). System-units in the context of this paper are the incumbents of status-roles involved or participating in social relationships the substantive context of which is a community-wide activity. Neither term, power or influence, will be distinguished from the other in this text.[1]

When the concept authority is used it will mean that the rights and obligations attached to a status-role are legitimate. A status-role properly classified as "influential" may or may not be authoritative. That is, the capacity to control with which the incumbent of a status-role is said to be endowed may or may not result from formal rights and obligations attached to that status-role.

3. Conceptual Framework.

Social relations have been defined as "reciprocal activity or interaction that is repeated and persists" wherein interaction is an event

---

[1]Form and Miller (1960: 434) also use the concepts in this way.

involving a plurality of actors, communication between actors, a time dimension (and thereby, a history), and an "observable" objective (Loomis, op. cit.: 2-3).

Since social relationships are repetitive they can be recognized as social systems, or "the patterned interaction [reciprocal activity] of members" (ibid.: 4). Social systems have actors including system-units. The member or system-unit has a position or status relative to the other members or system units of the social system, and the system-unit is expected to act in a predictable or repetitive way, and thus has a role (ibid.: 19).

The assignment of a position or status implies some form of evaluation of an ego by an alter(s). The evaluation is the process of ascertaining the relative value or importance of the position. Thus an evaluation implies some standard against which the position is rated. One end product of such a process of evaluation is the assignment of a position of influence to a status-role. That is, the status is "rated" on an influence hierarchy. It is analytically possible to duscuss hierarchies--or systems of things in graded order--of influence. Likewise, it is possible to conceive of hierarchies of esteem--in which the standard of valuation involves a generalized component of estimation, and of prestige--involving a standard which is commonly based on achievement. System-units may also be "members" of larger aggregates of people wherein similar life-styles and the appropriate symbols associated therewith permit the assignment of class membership. Again, gradation or hierarchies are implied. Positions of authority--with their specified rights and obligations--may also be placed in graded order. Thus, an ego may be evaluated by the alters with whom he interacts on the basis of a variety of standards.

It may be said that relative status is assessed on the basis of many possible standards which lead to hierarchies. Individual persons,

however, occupy many statuses--e.g., father, president of "x," teacher, etc.--and many roles are enacted for each status--e.g., father enacts discipline, affection, to spouse, sons, and daughters. Merton uses the terms "status-set" and "role-set" to describe these pluralities in expectations and positions (1957: 368). Loomis, in turn, also groups status-sets and role-sets in order to discuss a given actor's relative standing or rank. In reality each actor has a "rank" within a system. Analytically, that rank can be subdivided into "singular" status-roles which like a generalized rank are the result of a process of evaluation. An evaluation which has been based upon standards or other expectancies of the system is a process whose object is ego or a group of egos.

These are the minimal terms needed to discuss the problem to be developed in the following chapter. That problem is, having been given a process of evaluation the result of which is an assignment of relative influence to a particular status-role, are there any similarly graded statuses or roles which contribute to the individual's influence? That is, are there social elements which may be conceived of as enhancing or creating a potential for influence?

This is not a study in influence per se (i.e., in the dynamics of influence). Likewise it is not a study in the variety of forms of influence. Rather, the correlates of influence are our central focus. It will be necessary to establish an index or measure of influence. To adequately achieve an acceptable measure it will be necessary to discuss some general problems in the contents (i.e., in the contents of the social relationships which involve influence) of the influence relationship. Once this is done, however, this aspect of influence will be dropped.

B. Discussion

Merton asserts that hierarchies resulting from the process of evaluation are not, necessarily, concerned with the same phenomena. Specifically, he suggests that hierarchies of class, prestige, esteem, and influence may each be very different (ibid.: 419). Nevertheless, he goes on to say ". . . positions in the class, power, and prestige hierarchies contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence, but do not determine the extent to which influence actually occurs" (ibid.).

The variability in the bases of evaluations (or standards upon which the evaluation is based) is also stressed by Loomis. "Ranking," he suggests, may be dependent, on the one hand, "upon particularistic characteristics"--that is, standards derived from the status of an object in the relational system--and, on the other hand, "upon universalistic considerations--especially technical competence or skill" (op. cit.: 25). However, he adds that both of these dimensions of evaluation may be operating though one or the other may be dominant. Dominance of one dimension over another, as he points out, may vary from society to society and from one community to another. (Community is defined as "a collectivity encompassing a territorial unit within which members pursue most of their every day activities necessary in satisfying common needs" ibid.: 118-119, fn. 1).[1] These comparisons of the dimensions of ranking are relative and in units such as the community and society may be intertwined.

---

[1]For our purposes community will be operationally defined to include the population within the boundaries of large urban centers as these boundaries are defined by census bureau. This means that census definitions of Standard Metropolitan Areas and of an Urban Place as of 1950 will be used for communities in the United States. For communities in Mexico, the boundaries will include the geo-political unit called the "municipio."

Parsons confronts the problem of the variety of differential evaluations related to the evaluation of influence. To utilize his discussion, the definition of "power" which he uses should be presented. Power is defined as "the realistic capacity of the system-unit to actualize its 'interests' . . . within the context of the system-interaction and in this sense to exert influence on processes in the system" (1953: 95-96). "Interests," as used above, are equated with goals, the prevention of interference, command of respect, control of possessions, etc.[1] Except for the contextual limitation of the social relation, the definition embodies the same problems as the one presented for this text.

Since "power" is a "capacity" it is present when certain factors are present (at least power potential is then maximized). These factors involve evaluation. Power, then, is maximized when various forms of evaluation are integrated. Let us present these briefly.

First, there "is the evaluation of the unit in the system according to value standards . . ." (ibid.: 95). "Value standards" refer to the standards of the common value system within the social system; and, they have as their referent those behavioral characteristics which are highly evaluated. The differential evaluations based upon this axis would be relatively diffuse. Prestige and class are examples of such diffuse evaluations.

Second, there is "the degree to which the manner in which actors in the system permit deviance from these standards in performance" (ibid.). Deviance refers to the extent to which ego is willing to exploit opportunities otherwise forbidden by the norms. Deviance, as Parsons notes, may increase ego's power because he is allowed to "'get away with it.'" Presumably, the relationship of deviance to power depends heavily upon a tradition which a particular ego has established in which

---

[1]See following discussion for some of the implications of this definition.

he has proven his ability to meet his interests. Thus, if an individual has a tradition or history of using unusual techniques to achieve his objectives, this very fact of unpredictability in means with predictability in ends may enhance that individual's power in any given new situation.

Third, there is "the control of possessions" (ibid.) which refers to differentials in advantage. Possessions have a specific relationship to control. Both possessions and what possessions "control" have a system reference. In general possessions are valued objects, and, thus, obtain their "nature" from whatever relationship members of a system assign to them. To rephrase, possessions are objects (situational) over which an actor has control, or they are rights to use or of which to dispose. Possessions are of two orders: goal attainment processes or objects of gratification. As goal attainment processes they are called facilities and are the means by which an actor may achieve certain goals. As objects of gratification, they are rewards. Degrees of technical competence or skill are examples of goal attainment processes. Wealth may be a form of possessions as a reward.

The three factors just discussed each involve elements which are evaluated. In addition, the elements, e.g., skill, wealth, prestige, are components of a status-set (and, in turn, of role-sets). They may be treated as separate or individual evaluative foci. As such, hierarchies may be established wherein many status-roles (occupied by human incumbents) are arranged in graded order. To what extent can one expect these hierarchies to be correlated?

As Parsons puts it, "The assumption is that these three sets of factors are interdependent and, hence, that 'position' with respect to any one of them will be correlated with position with respect to each of the others, but they will also be of some degree independent" (ibid.: 96).

The argument should be taken one further step. That is, the operational (empirically observable) forms of the generalizations should be developed. It was suggested above that a characteristic (i.e., result of an evaluation of ego) which implies a close relationship to broad "societal" value standards and which is highly evaluated is a phenomenon such as social class membership. Indices relevant to such a membership are education level, occupation, income, ethnic status, family social level, etc. Characteristics or elements which suggest high evaluation of skill and competence are those related to sex, occupational level, or indices of a stage of social development. These latter indices may be subdivided into factors such as age and marital status. Age is very likely a characteristic subject to universal differentiation. Certainly industrialized societies have supplemented age-sex criteria with other elements (see, Loomis, op. cit.: 26), yet it seems reasonable to expect that age-sex considerations are still relevant to some degree.

Persons who are the leaders in the community (by whatever index of leadership or influence one takes) can be assessed as to the characteristics they embody, and it follows that one would expect these characteristics to differentiate this group from the general population in that community. An analysis of this form should yield what Merton called "a profile of influence potential" (see Merton, op. cit., and Freeman, et al., 1960).

C. Propositions on the Components of Hierarchies of Evaluative Phenomena Correlated with Influence

From the above discussion certain propositions can be derived. From Merton's general statement a specification of some of the evaluated phenomena may be made. He states, positions in class, power, and prestige hierarchies contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence (supra).

The more specific "content" of evaluations may be in part derived from Loomis' generalization, which is that ranking may be dependent upon particularistic characteristics: for example, characteristics inherent in the relational system such as prestige, which may be combined with or analytically separate from another extreme, that ranking may be dependent upon universalistic characteristics: for example, technical competence and skill. Parsons also states a specification of the conditions under which power is maximized. Power is maximized when there is (1) a high evaluation of the system-unit on the standards of the common value system: evaluations of prestige and class, (2) a utilization by the system-unit of a "history" of activities in which ends have been met: evaluations which imply a backlog of experience, e.g., age, and (3) a differential of advantage on the part of the system-unit with regard to the control of possessions, which may be (a) the control of facilities: for example, extraordinary skill or competence; or (b) the control of rewards: for example, extraordinary wealth.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ON COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURES

It is now necessary to turn to the problems of the phenomena with which influence may be correlated. A variety of techniques have been used for studying these problems, and many specific criticisms have been leveled against the technique employed in the present study. However, certain hypotheses may be deduced from these criticisms and these hypotheses may in turn be interrelated with the propositions discussed in Chapter II.

A. Introduction

Extensive research has been completed on decision-making or "power structures" in the community. In fact Freeman et al. cite a source which listed 599 such studies (Bell, et al., 1960, mimeographed, cited in Freeman, et al., 1960: 2). In addition, nearly all of this research has been reported in the last ten years. Over this short period a variety of methodological techniques has appeared for determining, operationally if not actually, the group of persons in each community who may be defined as "influential." The field is still at a point wherein much more knowledge is necessary regarding the nature of influence in order to fully specify the operational devices which best measure the phenomenon. Some of the techniques which have been devised have been criticized "in substance," but few studies have been presented which correlate information obtained from the use of a variety of methods.

The following section will briefly summarize some examples of the methodological techniques which have been used. The purpose of this presentation is to place within a total research framework one of these techniques which is the focus of this study.

There are a variety of classifications which have been presented attempting to place these methodological techniques in perspective.[1] The classifications are illustrative for the purposes of this paper; the one used by both Rossi and Freeman, et al., will be used. There are three categories into which these techniques have been subsumed: the reputational technique, the social participation technique, and the positional technique. Each of these will be presented in turn.

B. Three Methods in Perspective

1. The Reputational Technique for Determination of Influence

One group of techniques which is clearly separated from the remainder is that which has used the "reputational technique" for determining influential persons.[2] The methodological specifications for this technique are, in brief, that a group of informant or knowledgeables are polled and asked to name influential persons in the community; thus the name, "reputation for influence."

Hunter's study of Regional City in 1953 is a near classic in this approach. From a total list of 175 names drawn from civic, governmental, business, and status leaders (i.e., reputed leaders) a six

---

[1]E. g., Peter Rossi, "A Theory of Community Power," 1960, mimeographed, and Freeman, et al., op. cit.: 2-3).

[2]E.g., specific research reports which have relied on this technique are Hunter, 1953; Schulze and Blumberg. 1957; Miller, 1958a and 1958b; Schulze, 1958, Barth and Abu-Laban, 1959; Agger, 1956; Agger and Ostrom, 1957, Goldrich, 1958, Klapp and Padgett, 1960, Hunter, Schaffer and Sheps, 1956; and Foskett and Hohle, 1957.

"judge" panel selected 40 persons as the power leaders. Of these 40 persons 23 "represented" the occupations of business (commerce, finance, and industry); 5, "society and wealth"; 4, government; 6, the professions; and 2, labor unions, (op. cit.: 11-13 and Appendix). Hunter also said these were the people who make the policy decisions. They were integrated, i.e., acted in concert. They had a pattern of interlocking memberships in community organizations. In short, key decisions were easily made by this handful of persons, according to Hunter (ibid.: 104, 230, 232).

Most of the other studies which have used the "reputational technique" have not been quite as adamant as Hunter on the point that their "leaders" or influentials were an integrated unit. A great deal of emphasis has been placed upon the "institutional structures" or broad occupational compositions of the persons selected as influentials.[1]

2. The Positional Method for the Determination of Influence

A general method which "defines" influentials (operationally) on the basis of the positions which they occupy in the community structure can be called the positional method for determining influence. Beyond this broad definition, the method has taken a number of forms. When "positions" or statuses are defined in economic terms--such as top positions in industry, credit and other business institutions--it takes a Marxian basis.[2] Stouffer, in contrast, used this approach to identify "community elites"--with the inference that these are influentials--but he used the top political and civic statuses in the community as the criterion of influential positions.[3]

---

[1]Especially by Miller, 1958a and 1958b and Form and Miller, 1960.

[2]See Schulze and Blumberg, op. cit.; 291, who argue that this is the underlying argument which both the Lynds, 1930 and Mills, 1956, follow.

[3]Stouffer, 1955 cited in Schulze and Blumberg, op. cit.: 291.

An example of the technique is Stouffer's selection of 14 public statuses: mayor, president of the Chamber of Commerce, county chairmen of the Republican and Democratic parties, commander of the largest American Legion post, regent of the DAR, president of the women's club, chairmen of the library and school boards, parent-teachers' association, the bar association, and the publisher of the largest locally owned newspaper. Schulze duplicated Stouffer's "elites" in his study of a community-Cibola. Schulze also selected 17 persons as "economic dominants" of Cibola. These were designated as "top formal statuses in the major local industrial and credit units."[1] In addition, the more typical group of "knowledgeables" were used to select the individuals by the reputational technique. The knowledgeables used were the formal heads of voluntary associations. These two groups were asked to select, by the reputational technique questions, the "public leaders" or the "power elite, as defined by reputation" for Cibola. In addition, the selected public leaders themselves were asked similar questions.

Schulze reports there was no significant difference between the selections of influentials by the economic dominants, the heads of voluntary associations, and by the "public leaders" or influentials themselves. All agreed that "substantially the same set of persons" were "most influential in the affairs of the community (ibid.: 295)." However, when top positions were compared with this list of persons, in no case did more than four of the "positional leaders" correspond with the list

---

[1]The specific criterion used selected persons who were "the heads of all industries employing 75 or more workers, the heads of all banks with total assets in excess of one million dollars, and . . . persons who were members of the boards of directors of two or more of these industries and/or banks and who thus served in the formal 'interlocking' of the dominant economic units" (op. cit.: 292).

of influentials. This held true for the definition of positional leader given by Stouffer (see above) and for other criteria of a political-civic elite (ibid.: 293).

In summary, Schulze found a distinction between persons who occupy formal political and civic offices and those persons assessed as influential by the reputational technique (ibid.).

Another illustration of this technique is the study of the community power of the city of New Haven (Polsby, 1959b). This study combined the positional method for determining influential persons with the "issue-area" approach. The latter specifies the substantive issues upon which decisions are made and attempts to determine the persons who are active on these issues. Polsby reports that a "leadership pool" was drawn from three issue-areas: public education, political nominations, and urban redevelopment. The specific disadvantage of this technique is the number of persons who are eventually left in the leadership pool and whose actions must be accounted for. For the three issue-areas mentioned there were 131, 497, and 428 persons involved in each respectively (ibid.: 798). The positions which defined the leadership pool by issue-area were

> Public education--"members of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools and his professional staff, school principals, leaders of teachers' and custodians' unions, and PTA presidents."
>
> Political nominations--"all political office holders in the city, both in government and in the party organizations, and delegates to the conventions nominating party candidates for city posts in the 1957 election. . ."
>
> Urban Redevelopment--"the membership of the Mayor's Citizen's Action Committees, a bi-partisan appointive body of 428 citizens..." (ibid.).

The criticism made by Freeman et al. of this technique is appropriate. They state that "no matter how complex and formal the organization of a community, there are always significant informal personal associations

as well as formal ones--these are ignored by the positional approach; . . . this approach allows the investigator to make too many arbitrary judgments in defining which positions are important in shaping the affairs of the community" (op. cit.: 2-3).

3. The "Decision" Method for the Determination of Influence

Different from the above approaches is the concentration on "issues" or "problems." However the persons are identified, only those who are "actually" involved in a decision are considered.[1] Part of the difference between this technique and those mentioned above is its emphasis upon how decisions are carried out (e.g., see Rossi and Dentler, 1960).

We have already cited Dahl's study of urban redevelopment in New Haven (Polsby, op. cit.) as a study which utilized this "method." The term "method" is somewhat misleading since the approach only directs the research to specific substantive problems in the influence relationship; the participants may be determined independently.[2]

A study which takes an issue-oriented approach but which circumvents the positional method's difficulties is that of Freeman, et al., (op. cit.). In this study a list of 39 "community-wide" issues were selected. From public documents the formal authorities responsible for making each decision were determined. Each person was interviewed and asked to list all issues in which he actively participated. In addition he was asked to name other individuals who had participated. When two persons had nominated an individual as a participant for the same issue but who

---

[1]Appropriately, Rossi calls this method "decision sociometry (1960, mimeo.: 6).

[2]E.g., the Polsby report (op. cit.) uses a positional approach in which the positions are authorities for a given issue.

was not in the original group of authorities this person was then interviewed and asked the same questions. He was dubbed a first-level leader. The process was repeated so that nominations were received two steps removed from the formal authorities for the issue. Interviews with 628 leaders were completed.

The 39 issues were then factor analyzed to determine the patterns of participation in these community affairs. In addition, selected "social characteristics" of the leaders were factor analyzed to determine the differences between the social characteristics of the leaders and non-leaders in the general community.

The specific findings of this study will be related in a following section of which it will be the purpose to develop as many empirical generalizations based on research findings and variables relevant to the problem of this thesis as possible.

C. Criticisms of the Reputational Technique

Criticisms of the reputational technique, discussed above, have been centered around three questions. They are (1) Is the reputational influence index a measure of something other than generalized community wide influence? (2) How does the dimension of time affect the evaluations of reputed influence? and (3) Are there "serious discrepancies between actual and reputed leadership?" (Freeman, et al., ibid.: 2).

1. Alternative Phenomena

The alternative phenomena which the reputational technique is said to measure (as selected possibilities) are a series of "limited influence" measures (see below), a form of "status elite," "formal leadership," and certain types of personality traits.

a. Scope. - As was mentioned above, the general thesis which Polsby (as a single representative of a group of researchers) has developed, stresses the presence (hypothesized) of limited areas or sectors to which a given individual's influence is limited. His thesis does not deny the phenomenon of influence, for he states, "On any single issue, there are only a few influentials: one usually finds that for any particular sector of policy only a small number of persons ever initiate alternatives or veto the proposals of others" (Dahl, in D'Antonio and Erhlich eds.: 7). Thus they suggest an overall thesis that American communities are made up of a number of segmented "power structures," and that a person's influence is limited to certain sectors (thus limited in scope) which are defined, presumably, by the "institutional"[1] areas in which the individual has skill or with which he is identified.

As suggested above, Dahl's thesis is most sharply contrary to that of the reputational researchers who have found that influentials tend to remain the same from issue to issue regardless of the "institutional sector" they represent (See, e.g., Polsby, 1959a: 232 and Wolfinger, 1960: 638). One of the most succinct statements on this problem is that of Wolfinger who states:

> The term scope is used to refer to those actions of B which are affected by A's exercise of power; for example, the major scope of a school superintendent's power is public education.... futhermore, the researcher cannot be sure that his respondent is [when answering the question on general influence] tacitly

---

[1]A brief discussion of this concept is appropriate. The most frequent use of the concept "institution" has been by Form and Miller, 1960: 19; Miller, 1958a and b; Form and Sauer, 1960; Sauer, 1960; Form and D'Antonio, 1959. Form and Miller trace the concept of Lynd (1945) and Lynd and Lynd (1929 and 1937). Five "institutions" are considered: economic, political, family, religion, and recreation. The operational use of the term has been in terms of occupations (e.g., D'Antonio, Form, Loomis, and Erickson, 1960). It is in this occupational sense that the concept is used here.

> basing his rankings of community leaders on an implicit scope, with the result that an individual may be given high general power rating because he is perceived to be very influential on a particular issue which is either currently important to the community or salient to the respondent (op. cit.: 638).

In summary, the argument has been that the methodology used by the reputational researchers belies reality. (It has already been pointed out that the same argument has been used to discuss the limitations of the positional approach to influence which Dahl, Wolfinger and Polsby have used.) Our objective must be to present additional data which will substantiate or refute the general thesis presented here.

Following the above argument the hypothesis may be derived: That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index (by the reputational technique) will vary sharply over measures of influence on particular issue situations.

b. "Status" elites and influence.- Among the alternatives to a measure of influence which certain critics hold is the "true" phenomenon measured by the reputational technique is that which Polsby calls "status" elite (1959a: 232, fn. 5). Though the concept is not defined it seems safe to assume that the phenomenon it is intended to involve is high evaluation of social characteristics. Presumably the criterion of this would be elements of prestige and esteem.

No argument is presented on the background for this proposition--either theoretical or empirical. A following section will suggest an argument based on the more generalized interpersonal evaluations from sociological theory which leads us to conclude we should expect little difference in hierarchies of evaluation whose separate criterion is influence or social level.

Again however, following the argument, a hypothesis may be derived: That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will correspond with his position on an index of "status."

c. "Formal leadership" and influence.- Polsby also (ibid.) suggests the alternative that "the community's formal leadership" supplied the criterion for reputed influence indexes. Again an inference must be supplied as to the meaning of the concept. There are two interpretations which shall be presented. First, the formal leadership refers to these status-roles which are governmental or authoritative in function. Both elective and appointive offices may be involved.[1] A second alternative would involve the above positions and those heads of community committees such as United Fund, Library, etc. This latter case departs from the prior alternatives in that individual skill and identification are not limited to "institutional sectors" of interest.

The following hypothesis may be derived from the argument: A given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will yield the community's "formal leadership."

d. Selected "personality traits" as an alternative to influence.- Some very gross characteristics were also noted by Polsby in his criticism (ibid.). For example he lists "old civic war horses," "letterhead names," and "vocal leaders in the community" without specification as to the empirical phenomenon involved in the generalized characteristics. However, the following hypothesis may be derived: That a general influence index yields a group of persons who are "vocal leaders," "old 'civic warhorses,'" or "letterhead names" in the community.

---

[1]This criterion seems to be identical to that used by Dahl, Polsby and Wolfinger in their New Haven study (see Polsby, 1959b). This is an odd criticism then since it argues that the reputational technique yields the same measure of influence which the critics use.

2. The Factor of Time

There are two dimensions to the question of time as a determinative factor in these problems presented by critics of the reputational technique. These are problems of "longevity" and "recency."

a. The longevity question. - This question refers to the assessment of influence holders in a given community over time. Olmsted (1954) found substantial differences between panels of "knowledgeable citizens" named in 1943 and 1949. Wolfinger (op. cit.: 644) seems to imply that a similar lack of persistence would be common under the methodological conditions of the reputational technique. He states:

> While some individuals might maintain some or all of their power after a change in regime [by election], others would not, and some relatively powerless persons would be placed high in the "power structure." The inclusion of all political actors within a supposed power elite would be neither surprising nor discriminating (ibid.).

Wolfinger adds a strange note to this statement. Certainly it is reasonable to suggest that authority positions are seats of power. None of the reputational researchers have argued the negative of this. Thus whether the researcher expected a segmented power structure along the axis of limited scope or, in the extreme, a homogeneous power elite, "positions" of authority must in either case be considered. Election might therefore change the persons who occupy the status-roles but not the status-roles themselves. Even here the discussion is forced back to a definition of "political actors"--which Wolfinger does not supply and to the question of whether this implies "persons" or "status-roles." This is a confusion which will be treated shortly.

At any rate, a hypothesis on the problem of longevity can be derived from this discussion. Viz., That the individual's named on a general influence index are so named because of their action on

recent issues which have confronted the community and that similarities over time would be a chance occurrence.

b. The "recency" question. - There are two interrelated facets to this question. One has reference to the recency (in time before the interviews with the respondents occurred) with which specific issues have been before the community. Implied here is the idea that persons named as reputed influentials, since they are each "affiliated" with a single "issue sector," will vary as issues vary. The second facet focuses on the respondent. The idea states that whatever issues are particularly salient to the respondent, these issues will have a determinant effect upon his choice of "top community influentials."

The hypothesis derived from this argument is that the individuals named on a general influence index are so named because of certain issues which are especially salient to the respondent.

D. Summary of Hypotheses and Interrelation with Propositions

The task before us is that of interrelating the propositions concerning influence and the specific hypotheses presented in the foregoing section.

The proposition has been presented that positions in class, power, and prestige hierarchies (as defined above) contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence. In addition it was pointed out that ranking may be based upon a variety of standards. It is argued, then, that influence may be "attached" to a status-role (in reference to one position), such as the case involving authoritative status-roles. Or it is possible that the researcher is confronting ranking, involving

a complex of statuses and roles (status-sets and role-sets), some (or each) of which are highly evaluated and correlated with the evaluation of influence. Under these conditions the carry-over of influence from one substantive-issue situation to another will be expected. The reader is reminded that the "substantive-issue situation" has been restricted to community-wide issues and thereby is a restriction on the forms of influence under consideration. This penetration of influence may be due to two phenomena: the position which is involved in numerous issue situations due to its broadly authoritative nature (e.g., a mayor), or the "composite" evaluation (ranking) of a combination of historically relevant statuses and roles which are attached to a given individual. It may be concluded that if there is a phenomena of general influence, its empirical form will not be different from that relative influence determined in a particular issue situation. If these arguments are not true and, if influence, by virtue of relative skills on particular issue situations, is limited to specific issue situations, the comparisons of individuals named on a "general" and "limited" issue influence index will show substantial divergences. Following the first alternative it is held that instead of the hypothesis derived from the arguments of the critics of the reputational approach, viz.:

> [C.1.a:0] That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will vary sharply over measures of influence on particular (and limited) issue situations,

the converse may be stated for purposes of testing:

> [C.1.a:1] That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will correlate with influence measured on a particular or limited scope issue situation.

In addition, the exceptions to the hypothesis may be specified to be those positions which are influential by virtue of inherent authority apart from the individuals who occupy them.

It also follows from the propositions stated that instead of offering the criticism

> [C.1.b:0] That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will correspond with an index of "status,"

the hypothesis may be considered an expectation. This hypothesis will also be treated in more detail in Chapter IV.

The argument has relevance for the hypotheses presented in this section on the longevity of persons involved in influential status-roles. Instead of the hypotheses

> [C.2.a:0] That the individuals named on a general influence index are so named because of their action on recent issues which have confronted the community and that similarities over time would be a chance occurrence,

and

> [C.2.b:0] That the individuals named on a general influence index are so named because of certain issues which are especially salient to the respondent,

a more general hypothesis may be derived. It would deny both of these as stated above; it would be

> [C.2:1] That individuals evaluated as influential at one point in time will also be evaluated as influential at a later point in time.

It may also be necessary to revise this hypothesis to account for authoritative status-roles.

The problem of the extent of the "time" for which the statement will hold true is one which of necessity must be ignored. Data available dictates that the time period to consider will be approximately four years. For this period it is felt, intuitively, that the statement holds. Obviously, there is a point at which only an "overlap" might be expected.

Two hypotheses presented in the foregoing section are conflicting. They were

> [C.1.c:0] That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will have yielded a group of persons who correspond to the community's "formal leadership." (Where "formal leadership" is equated with governmental status-roles.)

and,

> [C.1.d:0] That a general influence index yields a group of persons who are "vocal leaders," "old 'civic warhorses,'" or "letterhead names" in the community. (Where these selected characteristics are not synonymous with or indicies of governmental status-roles.).

To some extent the formal leadership of the large economic bureaucracies may indeed be expected to be influential. These are positions which are to some degree indicies of skill and, as has been shown, skill may be a phenomenon correlated with influence. However, care must be taken since studies have shown that economic dominance is by no means a predictor of influence in community-wide activities (e.g., Schulze, op. cit.). The general hypothesis may be posited that experiences derived from formal leadership may be an enhancement to community influence. Thus, defining "formal" leadership as a broad range of executive experience, the hypothesis may be restated

> [C.1.cd:1] That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will yield a group of persons whose occupational experience involves executive or directive responsibilities.

CHAPTER IV

PROFILES OF INFLUENCE POTENTIAL: THE EMPIRICAL GENERALIZATIONS FROM RESEARCH LITERATURE

A. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter will be to present a summary of the research literature on the basis of certain empirical generalizations and to interrelate the hypotheses which result with the hypotheses developed in Chapter II.

B. Elements of the Profile of Influence Potential

1. Introduction: The Classification Model

Of all the research in the area of community power to date, Freeman et al. (ibid.) present the most complete data on the interrelations of the characteristics of influentials. Citation and description of the study was given earlier. In addition it must be noted that 15 "social characteristics" were interrelated by the technique of factor analysis. As a result these 15 variables reduced to six major factors: social level, sex elaboration, life cycle, ethnic status, family's social level, and localism.

In general, the argument of this section, D in Chapter II, would lead us to expect this very occurrence. The problem now becomes one of specifying what level of education, what occupation(s), and which sex, etc., operates as the selecting criteria or potential for influence.

The remainder of this chapter will be addressed to a review of the research literature on community influentials in order to achieve the empirical generalizations of these characteristics. The chapter outline will follow the general scheme presented by Freeman, et al. That outline follows.[1]

Factor Social Characteristic

A Social Level: criterion of social class membership
  1. Educational level of influential
  2. Occupation of influential
B Sex Elaboration: Division of Labor variables
  3. Sex of influential
C Life Cycle: Stages of Social Development
  4. Age level
  5. Marital Status
D Family Social level
  6. Father's Occupation
E Ethnic Status
  7. Religious affiliation
  8. Ethnic Background
F Localism
  *9. Birthplace of Influential and Length of Resident in Community
  *10. Orientation to Community
  *11. Length of tenure in Firm with which employed

*Length of residence in community, orientation to community, and length of tenure in the firm by which employed, were not included in the list of Freeman's, et al. characteristics. The reasons for their inclusion here will be developed under their respective headings.

---

[1]The following social characteristics were also included in Freeman's et al. analysis: Factor A: Income level of influential, political identification, and father's educational level; Factor C: Home ownership; Factor D: father's community participation; Factor F: Father's Birthplace. The following characteristics were found intercorrelated under more than one factor. Listed under factors to which they are added: Factor B: Occupation of influential; D: Father's education; and E: Political identification. These items are omitted due to the post factum classification presented in this thesis.

2. Social Level: Criteria of Social Class Membership

Two characteristics will be reviewed: the educational level of the influential and the influential's occupation.

a. Education. - Freeman, et al. suggest a college degree is highly valued (or predominant) among community influentials (op. cit.: 16). Hunter reported that 92.5% of the 40 influentials in his study cite--Regional City--had a college degree (1953: 39). Sauer reported that 23 of 39 influentials (59%) had graduated from college while 31 (or 84%) had had some college education or more (op. cit.: 64).

The studies by Stewart (1947a and b) and Merton (op. cit.) on interpersonal influence are difficult to interpret (infra). Merton found the following differences. "Localities"[1] had graduated from high school; eight of the 16 (50%); while "cosmopolites" had a relatively higher educational background, with 13 out of 14 graduating from high school (93%). Stewart found that of 55 top influentials, 79% had graduated from college, 88% had had some college or more, and 94% had graduated from high school. As an additional complication, Stewart's sample was primarily "local" (13 persons), or "mixed" (16 persons). Only four were classified as "cosmopolitan" (1947a: 23).[2]

---

[1]The two classes "localite" and "cosmopolitan" are variables which distinguish the influentials' orientation to the community. They will be discussed and defined in a later section on the subject.

[2]Stewart's use of "local" and "cosmopolitan" follows Merton. He adds, however, a middle class which is termed "mixed." A "mixed" orientation is held by "one who has interest extending well beyond the home community but who, as shown by participation in civic activities, is an integral and active member of the community (op. cit.: 23)."

The following empirical generalizations may be derived. [IV.a:1] That among a given group of persons who are classified as influential in a community, the majority of them will have had at least a year or more of college education. And, [IV.a:2] That a group of influentials will have significantly more education than would have been the case if the group were drawn at random from the population of the community.

(That latter hypothesis attests to the selection of these persons as influentials.)

b. Occupation. - Many studies report incomplete or very generalized information on the characteristics of the persons involved in the influential relationship. Though this dictum applies to many specific characteristics which will be discussed, it is especially a problem with the occupational position variable.

Freeman, et al., in Syracuse, found that among the "leaders" in the community those occupational roles which represented "white collar or above" occupations were "more valued" than other occupations (op. cit.: 16). In this very general form, no research study has carried contrary findings.

Enumerations of specific categories of occupations are not common. Fourteen of Merton's 16 "local" influentials and nine of 16 "cosmopolitan" influentials were either businessmen or professional (op. cit.: 502). Likewise, none of 11 top leaders in the Boomtown site reported by Agger and Goldrich were businessmen, while one was the mayor and the last a school board member who was also a brother of the mayor (1958: 386). Schulze and Blumberg report that 11 of Cibola's 16 "public leaders" were businessmen (industrial executives, merchants, professional Chamber of Commerce officials, wholesaler, realtor, salesmen) while four were professionals and one retired (op. cit.: 296, fn. 20).

Stewart used a number of questions each of which were used to tap "an influence" dimension.[1] On the dimension selected for comparison, he reported a total of 17 persons.[2] Of this total two were in government, eight were in business, and seven (of which three were "wives of") were in professions.

---

[1]The questions for which Stewart reports detailed information on occupation are

(1) When people you know have some personal trouble, to whom are they most likely to go for advice? (1947b: 273).

(2) Who do you think would best be able to get people to cooperate in a war bond drive in civilian defense, etc.: (1947a: 26).

(3) Who would you say are the important people in town? (1947b: 273).

The present writer computed a rank order correlation to test whether the persons named to questions 2 and 3 above would be ranked with relatively the same magnitude to each variable. The result was an $r_s = .33$--A Spearman Rank Order Correlation--which indicates little correspondence in the rankings.

However, when gross groupings of Stewart's lists were compared, the relationship between persons named on these two questions were much closer. For example, six of the top ten on both lists are the same persons.

These three questions illustrate the problem of assessing the nature of influence relationships. The phenomenon of extraneous factors slipping into the general evaluation of influence is illustrated by the first question listed above. In this question, Stewart reports that it is the clergy to whom people go for advice on personal difficulties. The meaning of this particular relationship is so ambiguous it is difficult to place it within the framework of influence. Because of this ambiguity question one is omitted from further consideration.

Though the gross comparison between lists of persons named in response to questions 2 and 3 indicated significant overlap, it can be argued that question 3--important people in town--is closer to the index of influence used in the study to be reported in this thesis than question 2. Therefore, results of that question will be detailed in the text.

[2]Of the 17 persons named on the question, 13 were males. In the case of women named, they are classified as to the occupation of their husband (therefore, are "wife of" a man in ...) with one exception--a woman executive in a business.

Miller has compared the occupational background of the influentials in two cities which he studied with results reported by Hunter (1958b). The same data was later compared with eight other communities with the result that in all United States communities similar occupational groups were found to dominate the influential structure (D'Antonio, et al.). Persons who dominate the community power structure generally "represent" the business institution of the community. Likewise, "high" government officials and occasional professionals are represented, though with less frequency than business.

There are at least two reasons why one should be cautious in making generalizations about the dominance by the business and professional persons. First, business dominance has varied among communities. For example, Miller has shown that one English City manifested a high dominance of labor leaders (the only case of such representation reported in the literature) (1958b). A Mexican community was reported to have a high representation from the sphere of government (Form and D'Antonio, op. cit.). We conclude that there must be confounding circumstances which lead to the production of influentials in particular communities.

Second, despite the fact that business institutions may furnish most of the persons who are reputed to be influentials, not all businessmen have an equal chance of becoming influential. Thus, other characteristics must also be assessed.

It is recognized that categories such as "business," "government," and "professions" may involve individuals whose identity to one or the other of these categories is obscure: for example, a "businessman turned mayor for a term," or a "corporation lawyer." Though chances of ambiguous classifications exist, it is tentatively held that experiences of persons who have been educated in a profession, turned from a business to politics, etc. will be different enough to warrant their separate classification in these studies.

In short, the literature leads us to the generalization [IV.b:1] That for communities in the United States, the dominant occupational background of influentials will be "business" occupations, followed by government positions and the professions. For Mexico, on the other hand, we may only tentatively generalize [IV.b:2] That for communities in Mexico the dominant occupational background of influentials will be both business and governmental status-roles.

3. Division of Labor Variable

Two variables are involved in the discussion of this section: sex and occupational prestige. The second of these, occupation, has already been discussed.

a. Sex characteristics.- From all the specific studies which have been completed on influence structures one generalization seems secure. It is that males dominate the structure.

We have already noted that Stewart found on his index of influentials that 13 of 17 named were males. He also suggests that over all dimensions of influence on which he had information he found "male dominance, even when women were expressly asked for (1947b: 273)." Sauer found only males in positions of influence in the community of Wheelsburg (op. cit.: 55-56). Freeman et al., found general male preference in Syracuse (op. cit.: 16), and Hunter lists but one female among 40 males in Regional City (op. cit.: 38ff).

It should be noted that a host of additional studies do not mention the sex characteristic of influentials. However, it seems safe to assume from the context of their reports that the groups may have been composed entirely of males. Occupational characteristics and the explicit neglect of the characteristic of femaleness are the basis of

this generalization. Studies on which it is based are Schulze and Blumberg (op. cit.), Smith (1960), Fanelli (1955, 56), Agger and Goldrich (op. cit.), Agger (op. cit.), and Miller (1958a and b).[1]

The generalization may be developed [IV.c:1] That a significant proportion (a majority) of a given group of influentials will be male.

4. Life Cycle: Stages of Social Development

Two characteristics will be discussed under the above topic: age and marital status.

a. Age. - Most studies have included information on age characteristics of the influentials. However, the data are generally given in the form of gross findings such as range, median age, or mean. Freeman, et al., (op. cit.: 16) found an age range from 35 to 64 years was "most valued" among their group of influentials in Syracuse. Stewart reported a median age of 48.7 years for all of his influentials (op. cit.). Hunter notes an "average" age of 50 years (op. cit.: 38ff). Schulze and Blumberg found a median age of 53 years (op. cit.: 294), while Sauer reports a median age of 57 years for the influentials in Wheelsburg (op. cit.: 64).

Merton found that in dividing his sample of influentials by "local" and "cosmopolitan" criteria, the former was "older," and the latter

---

[1]One study is a "companion" study to that of Sauer (op. cit.). It concentrated on the women who were active both socially--devoting their time to a few select associations with their peers--and civically--participating in civic, social, and religious organizations. Wolff found support for a hypothesis that "women whose husbands are either economic dominants or top influentials or whose family is in the top twenty socially choose social means . . . to express their social position; whereas, women whose husbands have not achieved community prominence [as any of the above specifications] . . . choose civic means . . . of expression (1961: 71)."

were "younger" (op. cit.: 395). However, when the variable "length of residence in the community" was considered, the older-local group had lived in the community longer than the older cosmopolitan group.

Despite Merton's findings, it seems sound to argue that age is itself a selecting criterion. The experiences and "history of effectiveness" which can only be attached to individuals presuppose an element of time. Time, in turn, presupposes aging. From the above studies the following generalization was developed: [IV.d:1] That the mean age of a given group of influentials will be over 50 years of age. In addition, it may be suggested [IV.d:2] That a given group of influentials will differ significantly in their age characteristics from the general population of the community from which they come.

b. Marital Status.- Only one study to this writer's knowledge gives data on the marital characteristics of the group of influentials which were described. The study is the Syracuse study by Freeman, et al., in which it is reported that the characteristic "married" is preferred in the community. Influentials in Syracuse are more likely to be married than unmarried.

Basing an empirical generalization on this one study it may be stated [IV.e:1] That a majority of the influentials will be married rather than single in marital status. Also, [IV.e:2] That a given group of influentials will differ significantly in their marital status (more will be married) from the general population of the community from which they come.

5. Family Social Level

a. Father's Occupation.- Occupational mobility deserves special consideration. Schulze and Smith have both reported, in studies of two

widely separated communities, that "economic dominants"[1] are no longer evaluated as part of a community's influence structure. Indeed, "economic dominants" are largely a group distinct from the group of influentials.

It might be assumed that economic dominants consist primarily of persons who have inherited wealth, since they are defined, at least in part, by their unusual control of property. Contrary to the Schulze and Smith thesis is that of Hunter, who reports that wealth and influence are largely coterminous. Apparently 14 out of 40 influential persons in Southern City had inherited a business or a "leadership position" (op. cit.: 29).

Against this economic foundation of influence is the thesis that influence is founded in a broad class hierarchy. Thus, Freeman, et al. (op. cit.: 16) report that most of their respondents' fathers were members of white-collar occupations. Schulze and Smith both conclude, on the basis of historical evidence, that the economic foundation of influence has been decreasing in recent years. However, this is most directly measured in terms of official governmental positions which economic dominants are reported to have held in the past.

Certainly these data suggest the following generalization.[2] [IV.f:1] That a group of influentials in a community will be drawn from a population whose fathers were engaged in white-collar or higher occupations.

---

[1]See footnote page 14 for description.

[2]Qualification may be necessary on this and other variables when the conditions of community variability are considered. For example, does "community age" have a determining effect on the type of father's occupations which predominate for a given group of influentials? Though recognized, these possibilities are not properly considered here.

6. Ethnic Status

Two characteristics of ethnic status are to be considered: religious affiliation and ethnic background.

a. Religious affiliation.- Two studies have reported the distribution of influentials among the various religious affiliations. Freeman, et al. report that "Protestantism" is highly valued in Syracuse (op. cit.: 16). Smith reports that 14 of 16 top influentials in the community of Northville were of the Mormon religion.[1]

Religion as a social phenomenon may be viewed in quite diverse ways when the implications of its linkage with the influential structure are considered. First, it can be considered as indicative of a sincere value or belief commitment on the part of its adherents. Therefore, if religious affiliation is a community-centered phenomenon--as Smith suggests is the case in Northville--commitment by influentials to a specified belief system is a community-oriented phenomenon. Smith writes, "The integration of these influentials . . . appears to depend much more on the kind of stake they have in the community . . . [with] Mormon religious sentiment . . . relatively strong in the community . . . there exists at present a relatively high degree of residence commitment to the community . . ." (ibid.: 88).

The nature of the pattern differentiation to which this order of the phenomenon refers is "internal." Here the dominance is the local belief system. A pattern such as this might be expected in those communities which have a largely homogeneous religious foundation. The expectation on the level of the influentials comes not so much from the relative frequency with which a given faith is held in the

---

[1]The community of Northville which Smith studied is reported to be highly dominated by Mormons. This affiliation made up approximately 80% of the 18,000 inhabitants in 1959.

community as it does from the adherence by these influentials to the dominant value pattern in the community. Presumably, insofar as religion is concerned, this might also vary as the nature of this religious commitment varies. For example, since the Mormon religious sect might be described as an autocratic, dogmatic religion, the sect probably requires more of a personal commitment than some other religious affiliations.

A second view of the meaning of religious affiliation in the context of community influence is quite distinct from the first. This view suggests that the pattern differentiation for religious affiliation is primarily an "external" affair. That is, that the dominant value patterns in the society are determinants of intracommunity religious affiliation. Much research suggests a dominance of Protestantism, which is only one characteristic in a syndrome (e.g., Warner and Srole, 195). Presumably, as in the case of Syracuse, the dominance of Protestantism reflects this broader, more diffuse characteristic.

Church affiliation can also be considered completely apart from the internal-external value components. The view would bring into focus an interactional point of view. Unfortunately, this writer knows of no study of influentials which reports their membership in a particular church community. (This is more specific than a particular denomination since in large urban centers, at least, many denominations have more than one church community within their boundaries.) It is true, of course, that even from an interactional point of view homogeneity in belief commitment is possible. However, the "content" of an expectation on this level would, in all likelihood, be quite different when built upon the basis of sheer interaction as against a commitment to a religious ideal.

We have no reason to believe any of the four United States' communities under study represent homogeneous religious commitment

such as Smith reports in Northville. Thus, we should hypothesize on the basis of this that there will be differential affiliation in the various denominations. Reasoning from the Syracuse study, it is possible to expect that the predominant type of religious affiliation would be Protestant.

Some Southwestern communities in the United States have at least a majority of their population affiliated with Roman Catholic churches. This fact is due to the heavy concentration of persons of Mexican heritage. If the pattern which we suggest does not hold up, it will surely be on this ground that the explanation of the exceptions must be made.

The situation in Mexico offers a different problem. Here Roman Catholicism is the dominant religious affiliation. However, whether or not it represents a dominant commitment to a religious ideal or to a dominant societal value pattern is another matter. The history of Mexico suggests a segmentation of religious and political commitment (Davis, 1958: 16 and 238). This relationship between church and state and between the church and the individual (on the level of personal commitment to a belief system) is one that deserves a complete study in itself. In general it would seem unwarranted to expect religion to play more than a nominal role in the context of community decision-making. Exactly what form this would take in the context of a question "what is your religious affiliation?" is difficult to predict. In extreme cases, the question would probably result in an answer indicating no commitment whatsoever. Precisely what proportion of persons would represent this situation is almost impossible to tell.

As a contrasting development it must also be mentioned that the Northern states of Mexico are among the major centers of a growing minority party in Mexico. This is the Partido Accion Nacional (PAN),

the Party of National Action. The majority party, Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), has had a traditional anti-clerical constitution. PAN, on the other hand, has developed a firm alignment with the church--Roman Catholic. Thus, the "content" of an individual response to a question on religion might be very different in Mexico. Nevertheless, if respond he does, it would probably be to indicate Roman Catholic affiliation.

Generalizations developed in this section are [IV.g:1] That a group of influentials in a United States community will have religious affiliations characteristic of those highly evaluated in the general society, viz., protestant, regardless of proportions of non-protestant affiliations in the community. And, [IV.g:2] That a group of influentials in a Mexican community will have religious affiliations characteristic of the dominant religion in Mexico, viz., Roman Catholicism.

b. Ethnic background.- Few studies have been aimed at the relationship of ethnic identities to the compositions of influence structures. Freeman et al. report that Syracuse influentials were predominantly North-western European in national background (op. cit.: 16). They do not state the national backgrounds or minorities which are non-North-western European.

Hunter found no Negroes among his top influentials in Southern City (op. cit.). Likewise, if Barth and Abu-Laban's study (op. cit.) is a counterpart to Miller's (1958a and b) study for Pacific City, no members of the Negro subgroup are represented in that influential structure.

It is generally clear that the status-role in influence structures may not be divided proportionately among the various ethnic groups (or nationality groups) in the community. It is quite plausible to expect

representativeness of a ethnic group among top influentials to vary with such characteristics as size (proportion of the population) and relative prestige.

Ethnic identities, much like religious identities, are subject to value standards within the wider society, and, therefore, to patterns external to the particular community. The place that an ethnic (or religious) group whose status is low has in community decision-making would very likely depend upon the explicit effects the group can bring to bear on decisions by way of formal, legal activity. For example, their voting or economic power in a community may be important.

For intra-community comparative purposes it will be necessary to compare the ethnic composition of the top influential hierarchy with the proportions of like-ethnic groups within the total population. Briefly, one can expect that a larger number of "representatives" from various ethnic "minorities" will be found among top influentials as the size of that "minority" increases in proportion to the total population of the community.

Two generalizations can be stated. [IV.h:1] That a significant proportion of influentials will be members of ethnic groups highly evaluated within the general society, viz., anglo. And, [IV.h:2] That representation of an ethnic "minority" (subordinate group) among the general influentials will be less than proportional to that minority's number in the total population of the community.

7. Localism

Four variables are to be summarized in this section. They are place of birth and length of residence in community, orientation toward the community, and number of years with firm of employment.

a. Place of birth and length of residence in community.- Freeman et al. found that birth within the local community was more highly valued than birth in some other place (op. cit.: 16). Schulze and Blumber, on the other hand, found that five of their 18 "public leaders" (28%) were native-born Cibolians (op. cit.: 295).

More important than place of birth as a selective factor for influentials is the length of time that influentials have spent in the community. Schulze and Blumberg found that the median number of years residence of all 18 public leaders was 30 years (ibid.).

Stewart does not give specific information as to the place of birth or the length of residence of each influential in the community (op. cit.). He does, however, report the general information that the length of residence in years increases as the number of mentions on various influence scales or indexes increases. Hunter reports that 16 of 27 persons interviewed in his study were born in the state; and that 12 of these 16 persons were born in Southern City itself (op. cit.: 33). Hunter does not report length of residence. Merton reports sharp differences between the "localites" and "cosmopolites" on these variables. The local-oriented influentials tended to have been born in the vicinity. Also, 14 of the 16 had lived in the community over 25 years. The cosmopolitan-oriented influentials had a more mobile background. "Fewer than half of the [14] cosmopolitan" influentials had lived in the community of Rovere for over 25 years (op. cit.: 395). Finally, Sauer found 34 of 39 influentials (88%) in Wheelsburg were born in the "midwest" as contrasted to those born in the West, South, East, or some country other than the United States.

Two generalizations, one of which is not selective of influentials, may be stated. [IV.i:1] That a group of influentials will have varying characteristics as to place of birth. (Is is important that this be

selected for testing since there has been disagreement on its importance.) And, [IV.i:2] That a majority of influentials will tend to have lived in the community for 25 years or more.

b. Orientation to the community.- The primary distributing characteristic used by Merton to distinguish the influentials in Rovere was that of their orientation toward the community. He developed two types: the "localite" and the "cosmopolite."[1] The localite "largely confined his interest to this community. . . . he is preoccupied with local problems. . . . [and is] parochial" (op. cit.: 393). The cosmopolitan type, on the other hand, "is oriented significantly to the world outside Rovere, and regards himself as an integral part of that world. . . . [he] is ecumenical" (ibid.).[2] Merton found differences between these two groups in their participation in community organizations--the localites participated more--and in the spheres of influence within which each person developed his relations--the localite "is typically concerned with knowing as many people as possible " (ibid.: 396)

---

[1]The name types were adopted by Merton from Carle C. Zimmerman, who, in turn, "used them as translations of Toennies' well-known distinction between Gemeinschaft (localistic) and Gesellschaft (cosmopolitan). . . . here applied to empirical materials on types of influential persons" (Merton, 1957: 393, fn. 7). Zimmerman's work was based on Ferdinand Toennies' Fundamental Concepts of Sociology (New York, 1940), a translation by C. P. Loomis.

[2]Merton is not, in this article, concerned with the "objective determinants" of differences in orientation. As he states, "A vaguely formulated question enables each respondent to project his basic orientations into his replies" (Merton, 1957: 394). He also indicates that more formal criteria of these types might create the necessity of development of intermediate types "which approaches neither the local nor the cosmopolitan poll" (ibid.: 393, fn. 8). Cf. discussion of Stewart (1947a and b).

while the cosmopolite is concerned with "the kinds of people they know. . . " (ibid.: 397).

Stewart also divided his group of influentials on the basis of these orientations. He added, however, a middle type which he called "mixed." In full, these types are defined as

> Local--"one whose interests and activities are confined just about exclusively to his home community,"
> Mixed--"one who has interests extending well beyond the home community but who, as shown by participation in civic activities, is an integral and active member of the community,"
> Cosmopolitan--"one whose interests and activities lie principally outside the local scenes." (op. cit.: 23).

One other study used the variable "orientation." This was Smith (op. cit.) who reports that all 16 persons identified by reputation and called "determinative influentials" were "local-oriented." He contrasted this with a group variously called "economic elites," and "absentee-unit elites" (ibid.: 87) all of whom were "cosmopolitan-oriented." Smith "defines" local orientation as describing those persons who (a) were more interested in local community newspaper, (b) evaluated events as to effect on community, (c) were more ethnocentric about community, and (d) measured social popularity in terms of numbers (quantitatively rather than qualitatively) (ibid.: 86).

Both Smith and Merton agree that localites are "activists" in the community, i.e., that they belong to organizations which allow them broad contact with other community members. It is argued that broader social contact implies broader issue-interest and broader influence base. Smith's findings are entirely consistent.[1]

---

[1] At this point the reader should be reminded of a qualification to generalizations on the nature of influence. Merton maintains that interpersonal relations with which he was concerned comprise a different phenomenon than influence relations on the community level. This is exceedingly difficult to assess since Stewart, who used Merton's approach, is concerned with the phenomenon of influence identical to

Due to seemingly contradictory data the generalizations made on the basis of these studies must be tentative. However, it would be consistent with arguments presented earlier, i.e., that influence in this context has a community-wide objective and that evaluations are important in giving an individual a potential for influence, to expect influentials to be oriented to the local community. Thus, the following generalization is proposed: [IV.j:1] That a majority of a group of influentials will have an orientation to the community.

c. Number of years with firm. - Sauer reports that 27 of 39 influentials (69%) had been with their present firm more than 20 years. None of the influentials had been with their firm for less than five years (op. cit.: 67). Though there may be a minimum number of years experience which "qualify" an individual in his evaluation by others, Sauer's data hardly justify a firm conclusion. It is still quite problematic, in other words, as to what long years of experience with one firm might mean. Since it may be but one variable among a large number and since Sauer's data permit a statement, however tentative, the problem will be explored.

(cont'd) that with which we are concerned, viz., who in a community exerts influence on projects which are of community-wide significance? The differences in the influence phenomena notwithstanding it should be reported that Merton found his locally oriented influentials to be "monomorphic" in their influence--i.e., they exerted influence in a narrowly defined area, e.g., politics or as "experts in limited fields. The cosmopolitan influentials whom he studied, on the other hand, tended to be "polymorphic"--i.e., they exerted influence in a variety of spheres, expecially those with the most influence (1957: 414).

Smith does not give an indication of the specific areas to which his "determinative influentials" limited their influence. From his very general discussion on this point, however, it may be assumed that this influence is "general," i.e., it comprises many different issue-situations.

Thus, the empirical generalization is [IV.k:1] That a majority of influentials will have had over 20 years experience with their firm of employment.

C. Interrelation of Empirical Generalizations with Propositions from Section II.E.

The section just completed has summarized a number of specific studies which have been reported in the area of community influence structures. Only selected data has been abstracted from these studies. The selection of data was based upon a classificatory model drawn from the literature itself. From this selected data empirical generalizations[1] have been stated. Then the generalizations are interrelated with framework derived from theory, they may be considered hypotheses subject to verification or denial. It is this step which will be taken in Chapter VII. Justification for this move is simple; theory suggests, as has been shown, that the elements of a profile of influence potential may be drawn. Research, on the other hand, has verified for a single case the justification for the expectation of such a profile. It will be the object of this research to further verify the validity of these expectations.

It was stated that positions in class, power, and prestige hierarchies contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence. In addition, it was stated that the "contents" of evaluations relevant to the

---

[1]"Empirical generalizations" is defined by Merton as "an isolated proposition summarizing observed uniformities of relationships between two or more variables" (1957: 95). In the form of isolated statements they are nothing more than a miscellany of propositions. With the order imposed upon them by generalization (such as Freeman's et al. model, 1950) the set of statements is still an empirical generalization however more removed from reality.

profile--which in effect give a differential advantage to one partner in a social relationship, ergo, influence--embody such general phenomena as social class and prestige, a "history" of power which would involve components of the life cycle, social background, personal characteristics, and the personal control of relevant "objects" which give the influencer an advantage, such as a backlog of skill (related to the division of labor in the community) and wealth. Thus, at least the broad expectation of a "profile of influence potential" is substantiated from theory and, indeed, many of the specific empirical components also.

The following hypotheses have been presented in this chapter.

[IV.a:1] That among a given group of persons who are classified as influential in a community, the majority of them will have had at least a year or more of college education.

[IV.a:2] That a group of influentials will have significantly more education than would have been the case if the group were drawn at random from the population of the community.

[IV.b:1] That for communities in the United States, the dominant occupational background of influentials will be "business" occupations, followed by government positions and the professions.

[IV.b:2] That for communities in Mexico, the dominant occupational background of influentials will be both "business" and governmental status-roles.

[IV.c:1] That a significant proportion (a majority) of a given group of influentials will be male.

[IV.c:2] That a group of influentials will have significantly more males among them than would have been the case had the group been drawn at random from the general population of the community.

[IV.d:1] That the mean age of a given group of influentials will be over 50 years of age.

[IV.d:2] That a given group ofinfluentials will differ significantly in their age characteristics from the general population of the community from which they come.

[IV.e:1] That a majority of influentials will be married rather than single in marital status.

[IV.e:2] That a given group of influentials will differ significantly in their marital status (more will be married) from the general population of the community from which they come.

[IV.f:1] That a group of influentials in a community will be drawn from a population whose fathers were engaged in white-collar or higher occupations.

[IV.g:1] That a group of influentials in a United States community will have religious affiliations characteristic of those highly evaluated in the general society, viz., Protestant, regardless of proportions of non-Protestant affiliations in the community.

[IV.g.2] That a group of influentials in a Mexican community will have religious affiliations characteristic of the dominant religion of Mexico, viz., Roman Catholicism.

[IV.h:1] That a significant proportion of influentials will be members of ethnic groups highly evaluated within the general society, viz., Anglo, for the United States communities.

[IV.h:2] That representation of an Ethnic "minority" (subordinate group) among the general influentials will be less than proportional to that minority numbers in the total population of the community.

[IV.i:1] That a group of influentials will have varying characteristics as to place of birth.

[IV.i:2] That a majority of influentials will tend to have lived in the community for 25 years or more.

[IV.j:1] That a majority of a group of influentials will have an orientation to the community.

[IV.k:1] That a majority of influentials will have had over 20 years experience with the firm of employment.

The hypotheses listed above will be grouped in two ways by which their reference will be specified. The first type refers to hypotheses about the relation between the influentials in a community and the

specified characteristics of the "non-influentials" in the community. This will be called the "intra-community" problem. It asks whether the influentials are affected by these populations from which they come with regard to specific characteristics. The hypotheses which are of this form are

[IV.a:2]
[IV.b:3]
[IV.c:2]
[IV.d:2]
[IV.e:2]
[IV.h:2]

The second type of problem will be called "intra-influential." It is concerned with generalized characteristics which can be attributed to influentials no matter what the characteristics were of the community within which their influential social relations took place. The questions regarding the components of the problem are specific. The hypotheses relevant to this problem are

[IV.a:1]
[IV.c:1]
[IV.d:1]
[IV.e:1]
[IV.f:1]
[IV.i:1]
[IV.i:2]
[IV.j:1]
[IV.k:1]

Finally, there are a group of hypotheses of the intra-influential type which specify inter-nation uniquenesses. The five hypotheses of this type are

[IV.b:1]
[IV.b:2]
[IV.g:1]
[IV.g:2]
[IV.h:1]

The hypotheses will be retained within the classification of social characteristics as they have been presented in the foregoing section. The grouping which has just been presented will not be used until the summary of the results have been presented.

CHAPTER V

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

Data gathered and reported in this thesis were part of a larger project at Michigan State University for which funds were made available by the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities of the United State Public Health Service for project W-108, "Anglo-Latino Relations in Hospital and Communities," and the Carnegie Corporation for a project dealing with the United States-Mexican Border. This fact in large part dictates the selection of sites and a number of questions in the interview schedule. That schedule is attached in Appendix I. The purpose of this chapter will be to present the descriptive data on the communities selected, the technique used to determine influential persons, relevant aspects of the schedule, the respondents interviewed, and other details of analysis.

B. Research Sites

Six communities were selected representing a wide range in the variables of size, industrial composition, and ethnic composition. Details on these variables for each of the six communities are summarized in Table A, Appendix II. Brief descriptions of the six communities follow.

San Diego is a commercial and financial center in southern California with especially large proportions of its population employed in public administration and personal service. Its industries include fishing, fish packing and aircraft. It is an important transportation center with an ocean port. One major college is located there.

El Paso is a transportation and communication center and a major tourist port of the southwestern United States. Its industries include clothing manufacture, metal and oil refining, and meat packing. It houses two major military installations and a small college.

Tucson is a financial and commercial center of southern Arizona. A high proportion of its population is employed in personal and professional service. Its favorable climate attracts considerable tourist trade and a number of state, federal, and private hospitals. It has a major state university.

Las Cruces serves as a commercial center of a district rich in cotton, corn, fruit, alfalfa, truck and dairy products. A high proportion of its population is employed in public administration. It houses a state university.

Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua is a commercial and distributive center of North Central Mexico. It is also a minor manufacturing center. As a transportation center, it probably reflects the extensive tourist trade which comes to Mexico through El Paso and Juarez. In addition, it is the largest of the Mexican border cities.

Tijuana, Baja California is also a commercial and distributive center for the Northwesternmost corner of Mexico. It is a minor manufacturing center. It is also a transportation center and attracts tourist trade from the western states, particularly from the San Diego environs. (Descriptions from D'Antonio, et al., op. cit.: 442).

C. The Reputational Technique in Process

1. Knowledgeables

A group of knowledgeables were selected[1] in each of the six communities.[2] Each knowledgeable was asked to name as many

---

[1]Since this was contract research, professional sociologists were employed to select the influentials and conduct the necessary interviewing in the community with which they were familiar. These persons were under the direction of a field director who helped in all phases of the research.

[2]In each case there was an attempt to get as wide a representation of the various institutional sectors of the community as possible in the persons of the knowledgeables. However, the same status-roles are not appropriate for each community. Tucson offers an example of the status-roles used as knowledgeables in the cities of Tijuana, San Diego, and Las Cruces. Twenty-one individuals were interviewed. They were the radio station manager, the Chief of the Associated Press bureau, the City Hall reporter for one of the newspapers, the Managing Editor of a newspaper, a "prominent" representative of the Democratic Central Committee, the President of the Tucson Council of Churches, the Secretary to the Bishop (Roman Catholic), Assistant Superintendent of Schools, the County Superintendent of Schools, the Advertising Manager of the Chamber of Commerce, a representative of the Better Business Bureau, a member of the largest Public Relations firm in the city, the Director of the Council of Social Agencies, a Director of a large labor union, the County Health Officer, the Secretary of the Chairman of the Board of a Bank, the Director of the YMCA, the Director of the Red Cross, an Executive Vice-President and Public Relations Director of a major bank, and the Director of the United Fund. (Source: information from the field researcher in Tucson.) For two cities, El Paso and Juarez, a modified technique was used. Both of these cities had been studied in detail in 1954-1955 (the reader is referred to the report of this study for relevant details including methodology, D'Antonio, 1958: 47-51). Consequently, extensive lists of influential persons were already available for these two communities. Therefore, a small group of knowledgeables who had been particularly good informants in the earlier study were asked to review these lists for their current accuracy. These persons were an active member of the Medical Society auxillary, a Vice-President and public relations officer of the largest bank, an active political reporter, and the City Clerk all in El Paso.

influential persons in the community as possible.[1] The criterion which each knowledgable was asked to use was that these persons be the "most influential" in community affairs in general. That is, they were to name persons who could and did initiate, block or significantly help resolve issues which were of community-wide interest. From these lists a combined general list was complied. Only the most frequently named persons were selected for the final list of Top Influentials.[2] These lists varied from about 22 to 45 persons for each of the six communities.

2. General Influence

Interviews were conducted with the group of Top Influentials in each community. As many persons as possible were interviewed with a schedule of questions. Among the questions was the following (see question 36, Interview schedule, Appendix I).

> Listed above are the names of _____people who are considered to be influential in this community. We have talked about some of them already. Now we would like you to consider the whole list and rank the ten you consider to be the most influential. If a name has been omitted which you believe should be here, please feel free to add it. They are listed in alphabetical order.

The respondent was encouraged to add names which should have appeared among the Top Influentials (in his judgment), to vote for that

---

[1]A list of about 50 persons was requested from each knowledgeable. However, not all knowledgeables could name this many persons. The lists of completed names from knowledgeables varied from 20 to 50 names.

[2]Researchers were instructed to include about 40 persons on the final list (see footnote 2, page 12 for references). Smaller lists indicate that the next lower number of mentions by knowledgeables would have included far over this number.

person as one of the ten most influential if he wished, to remove any names which he felt should not have been left among the Top Influentials, and to vote for himself if he chose. The question asked respondents to rank the top 10. This was not required in later interviews. Many respondents, though perfectly willing to name the ten most influential, were very much troubled by the request to rank them.

It is the result of this selection together with the Knowledgeables list which is the final list of Top Influentials (T.I.) used in each community. Since each respondent, who is a T.I., has cast 10 votes for the 10 most influential, there is an additional subdivision possible. As all the votes are tabulated a list of the ten most frequently chosen influential may be selected. These are the Key Influential (K.I.).

Where possible data was obtained on all of these persons named by both knowledgeables and respondent Top Influentials. Obviously, some TI were unavailable for interviews.[1] Certain information was available on nearly all influentials named in each community. For example, for each person named there was an attempt to get his firm of employment and his position within that firm. This information did not require an interview. Since there was a substantial difference between the number of persons named and the number of persons interviewed in some communities, it was deemed advisable to compare these two groups--interviewed and not interviewed influentials--as to the possible bias in selection. When complete information is not available a complete comparison is impossible. However, the groups can be compared as to the various occupational categories from which they

---

[1]There were, however, very few refusals. In El Paso there was but one formal refusal among the 33 for whom an interview had been scheduled. There are other shortcomings in that some respondents refused to answer certain questions. The number varied from question to question. No attempt has been made to classify the various types of "no answers" to specific questions.

come. The data are presented in Table B, Appendix II. There was no significant statistical difference between these two groups for any of the six communities when they were compared as to the occupational categories among which they were distributed.[1]

3. Limited Influence

"Limited" scope of influence was determined by another specific question (question 28, Appendix I), which reads

> Suppose that a major hospital project were before the community, one that required decision by a group of leaders whom nearly everyone would accept. If you were completely free to choose, which people would you choose to make up this group--regardless of whether or not you know them personally?

This question asks the top influentials to choose about eight persons. The question appears early in the interview schedule of questions. It is the first question which requests the mention of specific persons in the community.[2]

4. The Time Dimension

Finally, the dimension of time will be covered for one community. It has been mentioned that an earlier study in El Paso yielded a group of influentials as of 1954-1955. This group is compared to the list determined in the fall of 1958.

---

[1]The Chi-square test was used to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the two groups as to the proportion of persons in various categories (Siegel, 1956: 101). This hypothesis is not rejected in any case.

[2]It is not the last question before the respondent is shown the pre-arranged list. There are two scope questions in which the respondent is asked the details of the resolvement of two issues. Only after the respondent has confronted this variety of scope questions is he asked to make the choice of the ten most influential persons from the pre-arranged list.

D. Research Techniques

Interviews were conducted with from 22 to 42 influentials in each community. The interview schedule took about one and one-half hours to complete.[1] The schedule was divided--temporally--as follows. A section on the personal background information of the respondent (questions 1 through 14), was followed by questions on the respondent's--and his firm's--activity in various community affairs (15 through 27), the question on "limited" influence (28), the role of the medical doctors in community health issues (32 and 33), two questions on issue resolvement (34 and 35), the list of general influentials and respondents interaction with them (36 and 37), questions on perception of issues (38 and 39), and a final section on the respondent's image of persons of Mexican descent in the community (40 through 47).

E. Analytical Tools

The statistical techniques and tests used were Chi-square (Siegel, 1956: 104-111), t-test (Dixson and Massey, 1957: 115-119), a correlation coefficient and a multiple correlation coefficient (Walker and Lev, 1953: 230-242 and 315-322), and a binomial test (Siegel, op. cit.: 36-42). Chi-square is used to test such hypotheses as "there is no difference between two groups in their proportions as they are distributed among specified variables." The t-test tests a hypothesis "that a universe mean is not less than a specified constant."[2] The binomial tests

---

[1]Not all interviews took this long since there were refusals to answer certain phases of the questions. On the other hand, many interviews took as long as three or more hours. In general, the cooperation of the respondents was superb.

[2]The t-test may, of course, test the hypothesis in which the converse to this statement is tested or in which one is interested in the equality of means. None of these forms of the hypothesis are used herein.

the hypothesis "that there is no difference between the probability that influentials are drawn from a population in which a specified variable is distributed according to a given proportion." The correlation coefficient is used for descriptive purposes while the multiple correlation is used to determine the correlation between observed scores on two indexes of influence (as determined in the 1954-1955 study) and the index of general influence from the current study.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS ON SPECIFIC CRITICISMS OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE

A. Introduction

The specific hypotheses which are to be tested in this chapter have been presented in Chapter III. Following a presentation of the results a brief comment on the general significance will be stated.

B. The Hypotheses

1. The "Limited" Scope Question

In hypothesis [C. 1. a: 1] it was stated That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index will correlate with influence measured on a particular or limited scope situation.

Two indexes of influence have been described in Chapter V: a general influence index on which a given individual receives a number of "votes" (question 36, Appendix I), and a limited influence index on which a given individual receives a number of "mentions" (question 28, Appendix I). The general influence index is derived from a question in which the respondent is asked to name persons who have general influence in the community, i.e., are influential on community-wide issues. The limited influence index is derived from a question soliciting those influential when the issue area is perscribed as health.

For comparison purposes the indexes will be dichotomized into "high" and "low" number of votes or mentions. The "high-low"

dividing point will be based upon an arbitrary ten persons (or, under the condition of ties, the nearest number) who received the most votes-mentions for "high" and the remainder for "low."

Comparisons are presented in Table 1. Chi-squares were computed for each community distribution.[1] The Chi-squares for each community were: San Diego, 20.73; El Paso, 17.94; Tucson, 8.45; Las Cruces, 20.76; Ciudad Juarez, 17.68; and Tijuana, 24.47. Each Chi-square is significant at a probability level greater than .005. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the two indexes are unrelated or independent is rejected for each community. Therefore, the hypothesis as stated above is confirmed.

2. The "Experience" Question

In hypothesis [C.1.cd:1] it was stated That a given individual's influence measured on a general influence index yields a group of persons whose occupational experience involves executive or directive responsibilities.

Executive or directive responsibilities will be defined to include major executives in business,[2] executives in government either elected

---

[1]Chi-square is an appropriate statistic since marginals are fixed and the test must be one of the independence between the two indexes. The null hypothesis which is tested is "that there is no difference between the proportions of persons given High and Low general influence in the proportion given high or low limited influence. Alpha will be .05 for which one degree of freedom requires a $x^2 \geq 2.71$ in order to reject the null hypothesis.

[2]Major executives in business include hotel and restaurant owners, retail store owners when specified as executive, manufacturers including officials, owners, managers and superintendents, bankers and bank officials, real estate agents and officials, builders and building contractors, owners of two or more drug stores, radio and TV station executives, and Generals or Admirals in the military.

Table 1. The Number of Persons with High and Low General or Limited Influence Where Marginals for High and Fixed at Ten for Each of Six Communities.

Community and Limited Influence	General Influence Low (n)	High (n)	Totals (n)	Chi-Square (X^2)	P*
San Diego	11 or less-12 or more votes				
High (8 or more Mentions)	1	9	10		
Low (7 or less Mentions)	26	2	28		
Totals	27	11	38	20.73	< .0005
El Paso	10 or less-11 or more votes				
High (4 or more Mentions)	5	6	11		
Low (3 or less Mentions)	79	5	84		
Totals	84	11	95	17.94	< .0005
Tucson	13 or less-14 or more votes				
High (8 or more Mentions)	6	4	10		
Low (7 or less Mentions)	90	6	96		
Totals	96	10	106	8.45	< .005
Las Cruces	12 or less-13 or more votes				
High (6 or more Mentions)	4	6	10		
Low (5 or less Mentions)	72	4	76		
Totals	76	10	86	20.76	< .0005
Ciudad Juarez	8 or less-9 or more votes				
High (5 or more Mentions)	6	7	13		
Low (4 or less Mentions)	72	5	77		
Totals	78	12	90	17.68	< .0005
Tijuana	3 or less-4 or more votes				
High (3 or more Mentions)	5	8	13		
Low (2 or less Mentions)	62	3	65		
Totals	67	11	78	24.47	< .0005

* P is one-tailed.

or appointed,[1] and salaried professionals.[2] All other positions, including farming, are classified as non-executive or directive positions.

Table 2 is a summary of this data. No distributions of the community population are available against which these "sample" results could be compared. However, it is argued here that the proportions listed in Table 4 are significantly in favor of executive or directive experience. The extremes in this category range from 89% for San Diego to 45% in Las Cruces.[3] A qualification of the hypothesis is necessary. Namely, that though executive experience may be helpful in the achievement of influence, there is a variation from community to community. It is doubtful that presence of businessmen as the majority of executives is a distinguishing variable since executives are a very limited number of all businessmen and since buinessmen also appear among the non-executives.

---

[1]Government executives either elected or appointed include mayors, County Judge or other Chairmen of County Boards, and County commissioners.

[2]Professionals who are salaried include college presidents and professors, clergymen, Superintendents of Schools.

[3]There is a statistical test which may be computed on these data also. The test is the binomial which asks, in the form of the null hypothesis, whether there is no difference between the probability of an influential being employed in an executive position or not being so employed. The alternative hypothesis is that the probability of being employed in an executive position is greater than not being so employed. It is necessary to assume that the probability of employment in either position is equal to .5. The decision to reject the null hypothesis is based on p being $\leq .05$. Inspection of the binomial probabilities on Table 4 show H_o is rejected in the case of four of six communities.

Table 2. The Number of All Influentials in Executive or Directive Positions, The Number Not in Such Positions and in Agriculture for Each of Six Communities.

Position	San Diego (n)	San Diego (%)	El Paso (n)	El Paso (%)	Tucson (n)	Tucson (%)	Las Cruces (n)	Las Cruces (%)	Juarez (n)	Juarez (%)	Tijuana (n)	Tijuana (%)	Total (N)
Executive or Directive	32	89	37	61	34	77	24	45	54	63	38	55	219
Major Executive	30		29		27		18		42		30		
Government Executive	1		4		2		2		9		6		
Salaried Professional	1		4		5		4		3		2		
Not Executive or Directive	4	11	24	39	10	23	25	41	30	35	24	35	117
Manual Labor and Clerks	0		0		0		1		2		0		
Minor Executive	2		5		1		4		1		5		
Government: Legislative	0		0		0		0		0		3		
Government: Judicial	0		3		0		1		0		0		
Professional Self-employed	1		9		5		9		22		12		
Semi-Professional	1		2		3		2		1		1		
Housewife	0		2		1		5		0		0		
Retired	0		3		0		3		0		1		
Politician	0		0		0		0		4		2		

Farmer	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	4
Not Ascertainable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	10	9
Totals	36	100	61	100	44	100	53	100	86	100	69	100	349

Binomial test that Executive or Non-Executive and Farm occupations could occur with equal probability.

p <	.000	.062	.000	.71	.020	.048

Data on this table includes information on each person ever named as an influential in each of the six communities. These persons must be compared to those among them who were interviewed. For San Diego there were 25 influentials interviewed who were executives (IE), 7 who were executives who were not interviewed (-IE), 2 who were interviewed who were not executives (I-E), and 2 who were not executives and were not interviewed. Comparisons yields a $X^2 = 1.50$. El Paso, IE: 20, -IE: 17, I-E: 11, and -I-E: 13 for which $X^2 = .394$. Tucson, IE: 33, -IE: 1, I-E: 9, and -I-E: 1 for which $X^2 = .887$. Las Cruces, IE: 12, -IE: 12, I-E: 14, and -I-E: 15 for which $X^2 = .016$. Juarez, IE: 18, -IE: 36, I-E: 7, -I-E: 23 for which $X^2 = .922$. And Tijuana, IE: 15, -IE: 23, I-E: 7, and -I-E: 17 for which $X^2 = 1.46$. None of the Chi-squares would reject the hypothesis of similarity between the two groups.

If it had been assumed that the critics of the reputational technique defined "formal leadership" as "governmental executive positions" the assumption would clearly be questioned by the interpretation of these data.

It is held then, that to some extent the hypothesis that executive or directive experience is conducive to influence status-roles is true.

3. The Longevity Question

The hypothesis on longevity [C. 2:1] was stated so That insofar as individuals are evaluated as influentials at one point in time, the same individuals may be expected to be evaluated as influentials at a later point in time.

In Chapter V it was mentioned that the data on influentials obtained in a 1954-1955 study consisted of two indexes of influence (D'Antonio, op. cit.). The two indexes were determined on the basis of a frequency count of mentions of given individuals on each of the following questions.

1. Would you please give us a list of names of people whom you believe are and have been the most influential in El Paso government and politics in recent years? (D'Antonio, op. cit.: Appendix A, 241).
2. Will you please give me the names of the most influential businessmen in El Paso? (ibid.: 237).

There were 51 persons who qualified as business influentials and 30 who qualified as political influentials as a result of these questions. Eleven persons qualified on both lists thus gave a total of 70 different persons who were reputed to be influential in business and/or politics in El Paso in 1954-1955.

When the tabulation of votes on the 1958 list was completed, there were 48 names. Eight of these names had been added in 1958,

i.e., they did not appear on the 1954-1955 lists.[1]

In order to find some single index of influence for 1954-1955 by which relative 1958 influence may be assessed, the inter-correlation of the three indexes must be completed. For purposes of a correlation, there are certain exclusions which must be made. For example, the presence of too many persons with a "0" score or vote may yield a spurious correlation since, then, the assumptions of correlation are not precisely met.[2] Therefore, the following criterion were devised. (1) Eliminate all persons who have retired from active public life in the years between the two studies. (2) Set up the requirement that an individual must have been named in 1955 on at lease one of the two indexes--business or politics--and that he must have been named in 1958.[3] Forty-five persons are thus eliminated from the total list of 79 persons.[4]

The 34 persons who remain were thus named on either or both of the indexes used in 1954-1955 and on the general index in 1958.

---

[1]Having received a vote is important here since the fact of having a vote will be used as a criterion for inclusion on the lists to be correlated (see below).

[2]At the same time the exclusions must be made on criteria general anough so the results are not purposely biased. One cannot select out those who have a few votes on one index and a large number of votes on another.

[3]Criterion (1) follows in that new names may be added when older influentials are replaced. Criterion (2) follows since some persons no longer take part in influence relationships (for whatever reasons) and therefore pass from the scene. Of interest to the problem presented here is: Do the same persons recur on influence lists and at what relative magnitude?

[4]Of these 45 persons, none had been added in 1958, 16 had withdrawn from public life or were among the 9 who were named as political influentials only or the 20 who had been named as business influentials only. Of this group which received mentions on only one index, only two had received more than seven votes on one list to which they had been named. One was the County Judge who had since "retired," i.e., been defeated in election.

Correlation coefficients may now be computed on these indexes.[1] Simple product moment correlations computed on each pair of indexes follow:

	Index		
	1954-55		1958
Index	Political (z)	Business (y)	General (x)
1955 Political (z)	1.000	-.098	.296
1955 Business (y)	-.098	1.000	.581
1958 General (x)	.296	.581	1.000

A multiple correlation[2] was computed on these indexes. Of interest is the correlation of the general index on the political and business indexes. $R_{x.yz} = .683$. Since $R^2_{x.yz}$ = proportion of variation of the general influence index which can be ascribed to variation in the business and political indexes (Walker and Lev, op. cit.: 322), this variation may be calculated to be 47%. Considering the state of knowledge concerning the components of influence, this supports a statement that a relationship between these indexes exists. The correlation also gives us a justification for combining the two indexes used in 1955.

Table 3 presents the data with the comparisons between the combined 1954-1955 business-political index and the 1958 general influence index. A Chi-square computed on these data lead the investigator to reject the hypothesis that the indexes are independent, the probability level being < .02.

The hypothesis presented above is therefore confirmed.

---

[1]Computation of both correlations follow Walker and Lev (op. cit.). The correlation coefficient of all persons named on either the business or political index in 1954-55 was r = .028. That relationship is not notably different from the one presented in this text based upon an N of 34 rather than 70.

[2]Computation for multiple correlation follows Walker and Lev (ibid.: 315-322).

Table 3. The Number of Persons with High and Low Influence on the Combined Business-Political Index of 1954-1955 and the General Influence Index of 1958 for El Paso.[a]

1954-1955 Business and Political Index[c]	1958 General Influence[b] Low	High	Total
High	5	7	12
Low	18	4	22
Totals	23	11	34
$X^2 = 5.72$			

[a]The marginals have been fixed so that Key Influentials are compared with Top Influentials.

[b]High scores include those who received 11 votes or more and Low refers to those who received 10 votes or less.

[c]High scores include those who received 19 votes or more and Low refers to those who received 18 votes or less.

C. Chapter Summary

Data have been presented by which it has been argued that certain specific criticisms of the "reputational" technique have been invalid. These criticisms concerned the problem of "scope" of influence, i.e., when "scope" is "narrow" an individual will be limited in the contents of the social relationships in which he has influence. It does not follow that a general influence index yields only individuals of limited scope when a limited scope index also yields substantially the same individuals. Since this relationship held up over six widely different communities, it is much more reasonable to suggest that general influence permeates many different contents of social relationships.

Though the data used to confront the problem of the continuity of a group of influentials over time was not discussed in this context, it

is also relevant to the problem of scope of influence. Since the two indexes determined in 1954-1955 were essentially scope indexes--albeit a very different classification of scope, i.e., business and politics--the fact that each of the indexes of this "special" influence contributed to general influence supports the thesis that a general influence does indeed exist.

It is not argued here that there are not individuals within a community who indeed do limit (or are limited in) the social relationships in which they exert influence to certain content areas. However, neither was that presented as an alternative thesis by the critics of this particular technique.

On the problem of whether there exists a group of influentials who are recognizable over time it has also been argued that such is true. Nothing was implied in the "longevity" hypothesis concerning the interrelationships of the influential group. That is, nothing concerning whether the "group" of influentials either acted in concert or acted as individuals.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS ON THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROFILE OF INFLUENCE POTENTIAL

A. Introduction

Hypotheses and data relevant thereto will be presented for each of the items listed in the profile of influence potential. A summary section will follow the presentation of data.

B. Hypotheses on the Elements of the Profile of Influence Potential

1. Social Level

a. Education. - In hypothesis [IV.a:2] it was stated That a group of influentials will have significantly more education than would have been the case if the group were drawn at random from the general population of the community. This hypothesis must be restated in the form of a working hypothesis.[1] The working hypothesis is That a group of influentials will have proportionally more education than all persons twenty-five years old and over in the community when the distribution of persons is divided at median number of school years completed for all persons.

Table 4 presents the data on the level of educational attainment for six communities. The distribution of the number of school years completed for all persons 25 years old and over in each community has

[1]Following Zetterberg (1954: 31) a working hypothesis is the hypothesis that is submitted to empirical test.

Table 4. Level of Educational Attainment of Top Influentials and Years of School Completed by Persons 25 Years Old and Over Dichotomized Near the Median of School Years Completed for Each of Six Communities.[a]

Community and Years of School Completed	All Persons 25 Years of Age and Over[b]		Top Influentials		Total	Chi-Square	p[c]
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(X^2)	
San Diego, SMA (Median = 12.0 years)							
12 years or more	161,975	51	25	96	162,000		
11 years or less	158,309	49	1	4	158,310		
Totals	320,284	100	26	100	320,310	19.39	< .0005
El Paso, SMA (Median = 9.3 years)							
9 years or more	47,885	51	30	97	47,915		
8 years or less	45,799	49	1	3	45,800		
Totals	93,684	100	31	100	93,715	25.32	< .0005
Tuscon Urban Area (Median = 11.8 years)							
12 years or more	13,230	51	40	95	13,270		
11 years or less	12,738	49	2	5	12,740		
Totals	25,968	100	42	100	26,011	34.44	< .0005
Las Cruces Urban Area							
9 years or more	2,674	49	26	100	2,700		
8 years or less	2,740	51	0	0	2,740		
Totals	5,414	100	26	100	5,440	26.12	< .0005
Municipio of Juarez (Median = 3.9 years)							
7 years or more	5,772	11	25	100	5,797		
6 years or less	47,018	89	0	0	47,018		
Totals	52,790	100	25	100	52,815	183,43	< .0005
Municipio of Tijuana (Median = 4.0 years)							
7 years or more	3,678	13	19	90	3,697		
6 years or less	23,776	87	2	10	23,778		
Totals	27,454	100	21	100	27,475	99.64	< .0005

[a] Census data is from Table 34, "1950 United States Census of Population: Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, General Characteristics," and Cuadro 8, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado de Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

[b] Persons for whom school years completed are not reported are omitted.

[c] A one-tailed test is used.

been dichotomized at the median. The influentials are compared with this distribution.

Chi-square is computed for each community. The results were: San Diego, 19.39; El Paso, 25.32; Tucson, 34.44; Las Cruces, 26.12; Juarez, 205.42; and Tijuana, 99.63. Each chi-square is significant at the probability level of .0005. The null hypothesis that the influentials' level of education is distributed as that of the general population is rejected. The hypothesis as stated above is confirmed.

More specifically, the hypothesis [IV.a:1] was also stated That among a group of influentials in a community, the majority of them will have had at least a year or more of college education.

Table 5 presents the number of influentials with some college education as against those with a High School education or less for each of six communities. In addition, the mean number of years of education is presented. The mean number of years education for influentials in each community were for: San Diego, 14.69; El Paso, 14.76; Tucson, 15.07; Las Cruces, 16.23; Juarez, 14.00; and Tijuana, 13.05. It will be necessary to determine, statistically, if these means differ from the specified mean, viz., 13 years, significantly. Inspection indicates all these communities have groups of influentials whose mean number of years of education are equal to or greater than 13 years.[1]

---

[1]This is a case in which the statistical computation is a manipulation because of the particular hypothesis which is to be tested. The null hypothesis would be that the universe mean (taken from the sample mean) is equal to or greater than the constant, 13 years. A t-test for difference between a universe mean and a specified constant has been computed. H_o, is to be rejected, with an alpha of .05, if $t < t_{1\text{-alpha}}$. The computed t score and the necessary rejection region for each size N are shown on Table 5. In no case can H_o be rejected. Therefore, the hypothesis is confirmed.

Table 5. Number of Influentials With One Year of College Education or More and With a High School Education or Less for Each of Six Communities.

Education	San Diego		El Paso		Tuscon		Las Cruces		Juarez		Tijuana		Total
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(N)
Some College or More	18	69	25	76	34	81	21	81	19	76	12	57	128
High School or Less	8	31	8	24	8	19	5	19	6	24	9	43	39
Totals	26	100	33	100	42	100	26	100	25	100	21	100	167
$\bar{X}$ =	14.69		14.76		15.07		16.23		14.00		13.05		
S.D. =	2.82		2.93		3.49		2.70		3.37		3.34		
t =	+3.07		+3.45		+3.83		+6.09		+1.48		+0.07		
Reject of t	-1.708		-1.697		-1.684		-1.708		-1.711		-1.725		

Therefore, the hypothesis as stated above is confirmed.

b. Occupation.- Before confronting the hypotheses that predicted which occupations would predominate among influentials, it is necessary to meet the problem of the general distribution of occupations in the community and among the influentials. By following arguments presented earlier a general expectation may be stated. It if [IV.b:3] That a group of influentials will have significantly different occupations than would have been the case if the group were drawn at random from the general population of the community.

Table 6 presents data on the number of influentials and the total male experienced civilian labor force by certain occupational categories for all communities in the United States in the sample. Data are also presented on the number of influentials and the total work force by certain principal occupational categories for all Mexican communities.[1]

Chi-squares were computed on each of these classifications. The chi-squares were 145.21 for San Diego; El Paso, 191.30; Tucson, 74.04; Las Cruces, 54.09; Juarez, 1042.37; and Tijuana, 567.50. These are all significant beyond the probability level of .0005. The hypothesis that the influentials are drawn proportionally from occupational categories as they are distributed in the community is rejected.

Since it has now been established that influentials are not randomly selected from the population of the community in which they reside as to some broad occupational categories, the specific hypotheses which specify the content of the alternative categories of occupation may be presented. The relevant hypotheses were [IV.b:1] That for communities in the United States, the dominant occupational background of influentials

---

[1]The N for influentials for Table 8 is based on all influentials named. This N is taken to utilize all the information possible on the group. Reference to Table 2 indicates there was no significant difference between the influentials interviewed and the total group of influentials on the variable of occupation. The census classifications between the United States and Mexico are not perfectly comparable. However, it is doubtful that erroneous comparisons would affect the results since the groups are substantially different.

Table 6. Number of Influentials and Total Male Experienced Civilian Labor Force by Certain Occupational Categories for all United States Communities and by Total Work Force by Certain Principal Occupational Categories for all Mexican Municipios.[a]

Community and Occupational Category	Total Experienced Civilian Labor Force (n)	(%)	Top Influentials (n)	(%)	Totals (n)	Chi Square (X^2)	p
San Diego, SMA							
Managers...[b]	15,963	14	30	83	15,993		
All Others	101,534	86	6	17	101,540		
Totals	117,497	100	36	100	117,533	145.21	<.0005
El Paso, SMA							
Managers...[b]	5,453	14	38	61	5,491		
Professional[c]	2,986	7	19	31	3,005		
All Others	31,779	79	8	8	31,784		
Totals	40,218	100	62	100	40,280	191.30	<.0005
Tucson, Urban Area							
Managers...[b]	1,662	17	26	59	1,688		
Professional[c]	1,226	13	14	32	1,240		
All Others	6,686	70	4	9	6,690		
Totals	9,574	100	44	100	9,618	74.04	<.0005
Las Cruces, Urban Area							
Managers...[b]	417	16	22	45	439		
Professionals[c]	308	12	15	31	323		
All Others	1,948	72	12	24	1,960		
Totals	2,673	100	49	100	2,722	54.09	<.0005
Municipio of Juarez[d]							
Directing...[e]	566	1	51	59	617		
Professional[f]	2,166	5	24	28	2,190		
All Others	39,159	94	11	13	39,170		
Totals	41,891	100	86	100	41,977	887.06	<.0005
Municipio of Tijuana[d]							
Directing...[e]	277	1	43	69	320		
Professional[f]	1,359	6	13	21	1,372		
All Others	19,898	93	6	10	19,904		
Totals	21,534	100	62	100	21,596	567.50	<.0005

[a]Data from census' is from Table 35, "1950 United States Census of Population: California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, General Characteristics," and from Cuadro 11, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado de Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

[b]Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.

[c]Professional, technical, and kindred workers.

[d]Total work force data for the Mexican municipios includes both men and women. Also, it includes those persons who are "economically active: employed or unemployed for not more than 12 weeks."

[e]Directing personnel except in agriculture, cattle, forestry and fishing.

[f]Professionals and technicians in every branch of activity.

will be "business" occupation, followed by government positions and the professions, and [IV.b:2] That for communities in Mexico, the dominant occupational background of influentials will be "business" and governmental positions.

Table 7 shows the number of influentials classified in each of four occupational categories: business, professions, government, and miscellaneous.[1] For each of the six communities, business occupations are the most frequent. And, for each of the six communities, professionals are the next most frequent. However, comparing all four United States communities with the two Mexican communities, there are nine governmental status-roles in each of the Mexican communities and two, seven, two and two in the United States communities, respectively. Thus, in sheer numbers, the Mexican communities offer a greater number of governmental status-roles even though the proportions of these roles are smaller because of the larger number of total influentials.

Therefore, support is indicated for the hypothesis which specifies that business occupations will predominate among influentials in United States communities. Though this seems to be true there is a qualification which must be stated. The variation within communities is substantial. Where 78% of the influentials in San Diego are in business occupations, only 41% of those in Las Cruces are so involved. Also, 24% of the Las Cruces influentials are involved in occupations other than business, professions or government.

---

[1]Business occupations included banking and finance, insurance and real estate, retail merchants, wholesale merchants, manufacturing and utilities, construction and transportation. The professional category included religion, welfare, education, medicine, law, and communications. The government category includes local, state and federal government while miscellaneous includes agriculture, labor unions (officials), households, executive secretaries and officers of voluntary associations, personal service occupations, retired persons, and active politicians (a classification used only in Mexico for persons who claimed no other occupation).

Table 7. The Number of All Influentials Who were Employed in the Occupational Categories of Business, Professions, Government, and Miscellaneous, for Each of Six Communities.

Occupational Categories[a]	San Diego (n)	San Diego (%)	El Paso (n)	El Paso (%)	Tucson (n)	Tucson (%)	Las Cruces (n)	Las Cruces (%)	Juarez (n)	Juarez (%)	Tijuana (n)	Tijuana (%)	Total (n)
Business	28	78	31	50	24	55	20	41	42	49	34	55	179
Professionals	5	14	19	31	14	32	15	31	24	28	13	21	90
Government	2	6	7	11	2	5	2	4	9	10	9	15	31
Miscellaneous	1	3	5	8	4	9	12	24	11	13	6	10	39
Totals	36	101	62	100	44	101	49	100	86	100	62	101	339

[a]See footnote 1, page 75, for illustration of occupations included in each category.

2. Division of Labor

a. Sex. - By hypothesis [IV.d:2] it was stated That a group of influentials will have significantly more males among them than would have been the case had the group been drawn at random from the general population of the community.

The sex of all persons who received at least one vote as a key influential by all influentials interviewed and of all persons who are 25 years of age and older in the community is given in Table 8 for each of the six communities. Chi-squares computed for each community were: San Diego, 25.53; El Paso, 40.36; Tucson, 41.89; Las Cruces, 30.40; Juarez, 68.65, and Tijuana, 66.16. Each chi-square is significant at the probability level of .0005. The hypothesis that influentials are drawn proportionally from the males and females in each community is rejected. The hypothesis as stated above is confirmed.

The hypothesis was also stated [IV.c:1] That a significant proportion of a given group of influentials will be male. If a significant proprotion is assumed to be a majority, the hypothesis is also confirmed by data presented in Table 8. The highest percentage of females occurred in Las Cruces in which four of 43 persons who received one vote as a top-ten influential were women.

3. Life Cycle

a. Age. - In hypothesis [IV.d:2] it was stated That a given group of influentials will differ significantly in their age characteristics from the general population of the community from which they are drawn. Stated in the form of a working hypothesis this would read Influentials in a community will be proportionally older than the median age of all persons twenty-five years of age and over in the community.

Table 8. Sex of All Persons Who Received at Least One Vote as a Key Influential by All Influentials Interviewed and of All Persons 25 Years of Age and Older in the Community for Each of Six Communities.*

Community and Sex	All Persons (n)	(%)	Top Influentials (n)	(%)	Totals (n)	Chi-Square (X^2)	p
San Diego, SMA							
Males	162,109	49	31	100	162,140		
Females	166,855	51	0	0	166,855		
Totals	328,964	100	31	100	328,995	25.53	<.0005
El Paso, SMA							
Males	48,054	50	46	96	48,100		
Females	47,938	50	2	4	47,940		
Totals	95,992	100	48	100	96,040	40.36	<.0005
Tucson Urban Area							
Males	12,084	45	41	95	12,125		
Females	14,498	55	2	5	14,500		
Totals	26,582	100	43	100	26,625	41.89	<.0005
Las Cruces Urban Area							
Males	2,701	49	39	91	2,740		
Females	2,816	51	4	9	2,820		
Totals	5,517	100	43	100	5,560	30.40	<.0005
Municipio of Juarez							
Males	25,358	47	60	100	25,418		
Females	28,435	53	0	0	28,435		
Totals	53,793	100	60	100	53,853	68.65	<.0005
Municipio of Tijuana							
Males	14,368	51	66	100	14,434		
Females	14,029	49	0	0	14,029		
Totals	28,397	100	66	100	28,463	66.16	<.0005

*Census data is from Table 34, "1950 United States Census of Population: Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, General Characteristics," and Cuadro 8, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado de Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

Relevant data is presented in Table 9. The chi-squares computed for each community were: San Diego, 14.22; El Paso, 17.28; Tucson, 38.16; Las Cruces, 18.66; Juarez, 11.56; and Tijuana, 22.00. Each chi-square is significant at the probability level of .001. The null hypothesis that influentials are distributed evenly around the median age of the population of the community is rejected. Therefore, the hypothesis [IV.d:2] is confirmed.

Data relavant to the more specific hypothesis, [IV.d:2] That the mean age of a given group of influentials will be 50 years of age or over, is presented in Table 10. The number of influentials appearing in various age groups and the mean age of influentials is given for each of six communities. The mean ages were for: San Diego, 55.38; El Paso, 54.23; Tucson, 58.52; Las Cruces, 49.42; Juarez, 46.40; and Tijuana, 51.64. The decision must be reached as to whether the means are equal to or greater than 50.00. A statistical test is required. The t-test is appropriate.[1]

A t-test is computed against the null hypothesis that the mean of the universe (estimated by the sample) is equal to or greater than 50.00. Based on an alpha of .05, the decision to reject H_o will be made if $t < -1.708$ (for Las Cruces N = 26) or $t < -1.711$ (for Juarez' N = 25). Since $t = -0.35$ for Las Cruces and -1.98 for Juarez, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis for the community of Juarez and not to reject the null hypothesis for Las Cruces.[2]

---

[1]Actually, only the means for Juarez and Las Cruces, 46.40 and 49.42, are of significance to us since a test of the hypothesis stated must confirm the statement that all other means are equal to or greater than 50.00.

[2]The t scores for the other communities are also given on Table 10. They do not, of course, reject the null hypothesis.

Table 9. Age of Influentials and Age of All Persons 25 Years of Age and Over Dichotomized Near the Median Age for Each Community.*

Age Community and Age	All Persons 25 Years of Age and Older (n)	(%)	Top Influentials (n)	(%)	Total (n)	Chi-Square (X^2)	P
San Diego SMA (Median = 42.7)							
Older than 42.7 years	164,356	50	22	88	164,378		
Younger than 42.7 years	164,424	50	3	12	164,427		
Totals	328,780	100	25	100	328,805	14.22	< .0005
El Paso, SMA (Median age = 40.3 years)							
Older than 40.3 years	47,956	50	25	80	47,981		
Younger than 40.3 years	48,016	50	3	11	48,019		
Totals	95,972	100	28	100	96,000	17.28	< .0005
Tucson Urban Area (Median age = 45.7 years)							
Older than 45.7 years	13,296	50	41	98	13,337		
Younger than 45.7 years	13,389	50	1	2	13,390		
Totals	26,685	100	42	100	26,727	38.16	< .0005
Las Cruces Urban Area (Median age = 40.9 years)							
Older than 40.9 years	2,925	50	24	92	2,949		
Younger than 40.9 years	2,942	50	2	8	2,944		
Totals	5,867	100	26	100	5,893	18.66	< .0005
Municipio of Juarez (Median age = 39.8 years)							
Older than 39.8 years	26,776	50	21	84	26,797		
Younger than 39.8 years	26,816	50	4	16	26,820		
Totals	53,592	100	25	100	53,617	11.56	< .0005
Municipio of Tijuana (Median age = 38.8 years)							
Older than 38.8 years	14,175	50	22	100	14,197		
Younger than 38.8 years	14,166	50	0	0	14,166		
Totals	28,341	100	22	100	28,363	22.00	< .0005

*Census data is from Table 33, "1950 United States Census of Population: Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, General Characteristics," and Cuadro 2-B, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado de Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

Table 10. Number of Influentials in Various Age Groups for San Diego, El Paso, Tucson, Las Cruces, Juarez, and Tijuana.

Age Groups	San Diego		El Paso		Tucson		Las Cruces		Cuidad Juarez		Tijuana		Total
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)
54 years or more	14	54	14	45	27	64	6	23	8	32	7	32	74
49 to 53 years	5	19	9	29	10	24	8	31	2	8	5	23	39
44 to 48 years	3	12	3	10	5	10	5	19	3	12	9	41	26
43 years or less	4	15	5	16	1	2	7	27	12	48	1	5	29
Totals	26	100	31	100	42	100	26	100	25	100	22	101	168
Mean Age	55.38		54.23		58.52		49.42		46.40		51.64		
S.D.	10.47		10.68		8.85		8.45		9.10		8.97		
t	+2.62		+2.20		+6.22		-0.35		-1.98		+0.86		
Reject if t < alpha = .05.	-1.708		-1.697		-6.84		-1.708		-1.711		-1.721, where		

Therefore, for all communities except Juarez the hypothesis [IV.d:1] is confirmed. For the community of Juarez the hypothesis is not confirmed.

b. Marital status. - The hypothesis [IV.e:2] was stated such That a group of influentials will differ significantly in their marital status (more will be married) from the marital status of persons in the general population of the community. The corrollary may be stated specifically, [IV.e:1] That a majority of influentials will be married rather than single.

To test the first hypothesis the influentials are distributed as to the categories married and single. This distribution is then compared with the distribution of the community from which they come. The data is presented in Table 11. Chi-squares computed for each community are for: San Diego, 11.56; El Paso, 9.96; Tucson, 15.87; Las Cruces, 5.60; Juarez, 14.79; and Tijuana, 20.02. With an alpha of .05 the rejection region (against the null hypothesis that the proportions of the two distributions are the same) includes all $X^2 \geq 2.71$. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected for each community. The hypothesis [IV.3:2] is confirmed. Inspection indicates the lowest proportion of married influentials was 93% (in El Paso). This fact permits a statement of confirmation of the second, more specific hypothesis [IV.e:1].

4. Family Social Level

a. Father's occupation. - In hypothesis [IV.f:1] it was stated That a group of influentials in a community will be drawn from a population a majority of whose fathers were engaged in white-collar occupations.

To complete a test on this hypothesis it was decided to use census data on each community. The proportions of persons employed in white-collar, non-white-collar, and farm occupations as of 1950 are

Table 11. Number of Influentials Who are Married and Single and Number of Male Persons in Total Community Population Over 14 Years of Age Who are Married and Single for Each of Six Communities.*

Community and Marital Status**	All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over (n)	(%)	Top Influentials (n)	(%)	Totals (n)	Chi-Square (X^2)	p
San Diego, SMA							
Married	145,015	69	26	100	145,041		
Single	65,176	31	0	0	65,176		
Total	210,191	100	26	100	210,217	11.56	<.0005
El Paso, SMA							
Married	43,549	64	26	93	43,575		
Single	24,137	36	2	7	24,139		
Totals	67,686	100	28	100	67,714	9.96	<.005
Tucson Urban Area							
Married	10,293	65	38	95	10,331		
Single	5,446	35	2	2	5,448		
Totals	15,739	100	40	100	15,779	15.87	<.0005
Las Cruces Urban Area							
Married	2,736	73	23	96	2,759		
Single	1,005	27	1	4	1,006		
Totals	3,741	100	24	100	3,765	5.60	<.01
Municipio of Juarez							
Married	24,000	59	23	100	24,023		
Single	16,894	41	0	0	16,894		
Totals	40,894	100	23	100	40,917	14.79	<.0005
Municipio of Tijuana							
Married	11,508	52	20	100	11,528		
Single	10,894	48	0	0	10,552		
Totals	22,060	100	20	100	22,080	20.02	<.0005

*Census data is from Table 34, "1950 United States Census of Population: Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, General Characteristics," and Cuadro 15, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

**The United States Classification of marital status includes "Males, 14 years old and over: Single, Married." The Mexican census has two relevant classifications: "Heads of Family and Persons married or Living in Free Union." The Mexican census does not, however, divide single persons as to sex and the classifications include all age categories. Consequently, all persons under 14 years of age were eliminated from the totals of male population once the "Married" category had been extracted. The remaining number was taken to be the "Single" class. This difficulty accounts in part for the larger proportions in this class in

to be compared with the distribution of influentials' fathers occupations.[1] The data are presented in Table 12.

Chi-square computed for each community is for: San Diego, 26.17; El Paso, 20.02; Tucson, 7.77; Las Cruces, 34.49; Juarez, 57.57; and Tijuana, 39.10. Each chi-square is significant at the probability level of .005. Thus the null hypothesis that the influentials' fathers' occupations are distributed as the occupations of the community are distributed as to white-collar or non-white collar is rejected for each of the six communities. By inference it is possible to state that since fathers' occupations were significantly white-collar in number (from a low of 58% in Las Cruces to as high as 87% in Juarez), influentials will tend to be sons of fathers who have been so employed.

The hypothesis as stated above is therefore confirmed.

5. Ethnic Status

a. Religious affiliation. - In hypothesis [IV.g:1] it was stated That a group of influentials in a community in the United States will have religious affiliations characteristic of those highly valued in the general society, viz., protestant, regardless of the proportions of non-protestant affiliations in the community.

Data on the religious affiliations of influentials from the four communities in the United States is shown in Table 13. A chi-square

---

[1]This is actually a very conservative measure of the relationship. It is known that the proportion of persons engaged in agriculture has changed from 32.4% in 1910 to 12.1% in 1950. Those engaged in White-collar occupations have changed from 11% in 1910 to 17% in 1950 while non-white collar occupations have changed from 57% in 1910 to 70% in 1950. Had comparisons been made with an earlier distribution, the differences in the proportions would have been even more extreme. It may also be argued that no specific census year would be an appropriate measure since there is a variation in age of influentials. (Data is selected from Loomis, 1960: 87).

Table 12. Number of Influentials Whose Fathers' Occupations were White Collar, Non-White Collar, or Farm and Number of Persons in the Male Experienced Civilian Labor Force in White Collar, Non-White Collar or Farm Occupations in 1950 for Each of Six Communities.*

Occupational Category** and Community	Total Male Experienced Labor Force (n)	(%)	Top Influentials' Father's Occupa. (n)	(%)	Totals (n)	Chi-Square (X^2)	p
San Diego, SMA							
White Collar	45,366	39	21	81	45,387		
Non-White Collar	63,611	54	1	4	63,612		
Farm	8,530	7	4	15	8,534		
Total	117,507	100	26	100	117,533	26.17 <	.0005
El Paso, SMA							
White Collar	14,895	37	22	76	14,917		
Non-White Collar	22,523	55	4	14	22,527		
Farm	3,290	8	3	10	3,293		
Total	40,708	100	29	100	40,737	20.02 <	.0005
Tucson Urban Area							
White Collar	4,566	48	29	69	4,595		
Non-White Collar	4,920	51	9	21	4,929		
Farm	90	1	4	10	94		
Total	9,576	100	42	100	9,618	7.77 <	.005
Las Cruces Urban Area							
White Collar	1,053	39	15	58	1,068		
Non-White Collar	1,539	57	5	19	1,544		
Farm	104	4	6	23	110		
Total	2,696	100	26	100	2,722	34.49 <	.0005
Municipio of Juarez							
White Collar	9,099	22	20	87	9,119		
Non-White Collar	25,700	61	2	9	25,702		
Farm	7,155	17	1	4	7,156		
Totals	41,954	100	23	100	41,977	57.57 <	.0005
Municipio of Tijuana							
White Collar	5,426	25	19	86	5,445		
Non-White Collar	11,452	53	1	5	11,453		
Farm	4,696	22	2	9	4,698		
Total	21,574	100	22	100	21,596	39.10 <	.0005

*Census data from Table 35, "1950 United States Census of Population: California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, General Characteristics," and Cuadro 11, "Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Estado de Chihuahua and Baja California Territorio Norte."

Table 12 - Continued

** White Collar, Non-White Collar and Farm include the following occupational categories in the United States and Mexican census'.

UNITED STATES	MEXICAN
White Collar	White Collar
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors, except farm	Directing personnel except in agriculture, cattle, forestry and fishing
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	Professionals and technicians in every branch of activity
Clerical and kindred workers	Sellers in every branch of activity
Sales workers	
Non-White Collar	Non-White Collar
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	Skilled workers in every branch of activity
Operatives and kindred workers	Laborers, artisans (craftsmen) and day laborers in extractive industries
Private household workers	Laborers, artisans and day laborers in processes of the production of property and services: Directors and those driving vehicles and not directors
Service workers, except private household	Occupations (those employed), with compensation, who borrow service personnel in homes or in institutions or management of service personnel, recreation or social.
Laborers, except farm and mine	
Farm	Farm
Farmers and farm managers	Occupations (those employed) in agriculture, cattle, forestry and fishing including directing personnel
Farm laborers, unpaid family workers	
Farm laborers, exc. unpaid, and farm foremen	

Table 13. Number of Influentials by Various Religious Affiliation Classifications and by No Affiliation for Four Communities in the United States

Religious Affiliation Classification	San Diego		El Paso		Tucson		Las Cruces		Total
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)
Protestant	25	93	16	53	22	54	17	65	80
Roman Catholic	1	4	6	20	8	20	4	12	19
Jew	0	0	1	3	3	7	1	4	5
No affiliation	1	4	7	23	8	20	4	15	20
Totals	27	100	30	100	41	100	26	100	124

87

was computed on the proportions of persons affiliated as Protestant or Non-Protestant among the four communities. That chi-square was 13.19. It is significant at the .01 level; a fact which leads the investigator to the conclusion that the communities are indeed different from one another as to the proportions of persons committed or not to Protestantism.

As to the proportions of persons involved in each community a further step is necessary. This involves a test of a hypothesis which is stated as follows: that influentials are drawn from a population (or universe) which is either Protestant or non-Protestant with equal probability. The proper test for this hypothesis is the binomial.[1] Let us assume that non-Protestant includes only those persons who state an affiliation with Roman Catholicism or Judaism. The decision to reject a null hypothesis (of equality in proportions) will be based on an alpha level of .05. That is, the null hypothesis will be rejected if $p \leq .05$. The probabilities associated with the occurrence of the frequencies specified are for: San Diego, <.000; El Paso, <.047; Tucson, <.041; and Las Cruces, <.008. Thus the statement is accepted that among those influentials who stated a religious preference of Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jew the number of Protestants was significantly greater than would have occurred by chance.

But, it may justifiably be asked, what about those persons who declared they had no affiliation? It is proper to submit this question to a test also. Thus the non-Protestant category should be redefined to include Roman Catholic, Jew, and No Affiliation. Under a similar test and the same null hypothesis (same the redefinition of non-Protestant) the probabilities associated with the occurrence of the

---

[1]The null hypothesis is symbolized as H_o: $p_1 = p_2 = .5$ where p_1 = Protestant and p_2 = non-Protestant. The alternative hypothesis is H: $p_1 > p_2$.

frequencies specified are for: San Diego, <.000; El Paso, <.429; Tucson, <.378; and Las Cruces, <.081. Thus the statement that among all alternative types of religious commitment or non-commitment the number of influentials that were Protestant in affiliation is significant for only the community of San Diego.

Before commenting further on the meaning of these findings the data on the problem of religious affiliation in Mexican communities should be confronted. The hypothesis [IV.g:2] has been stated That a group of influentials in a Mexican community will have religious affiliations characteristic of the dominant religion of Mexico, viz., Roman Catholicism.

Table 14 presents the data on the religious affiliations of influentials from the two communities in Mexico. A chi-square was computed on the proportions of persons affiliated as Roman Catholic or Not Roman Catholic between the two communities. That chi-square was 9.82. It is significant at the .005 level, a fact which leads to the conclusion that the communities are indeed different from one another as to the proportions of persons committed or not to Roman Catholicism.

Again the question was asked, are the commitments to Roman Catholicism, as against the commitments to Protestantism and Judaism, proportionately more than one would have expected by chance? The binomial test indicates that the probabilities associated with the occurrence of the frequencies specified are for Juarez, <.000 and for Tijuana, <.008.

However, when Not Roman Catholic is defined to include No Affiliation a strikingly different result occurs. The probabilities associated with the occurrence of the frequencies thus specified are for C. Juarez, <.005 (still within the rejection region indicating dominance of Roman Catholicism as a commitment), and for Tijuana, <.974. The latter level of probability occurs because of the comparison

Table 14. Number of Influentials by Various Religious Affiliation Classifications and by No Affiliation for Two Communities in Mexico.

Religious Affiliation Classification	Juarez (n)	(%)	Tijuana (n)	(%)	Total (n)
Protestant	0	00	0	00	0
Roman Catholic	18	78	7	32	25
Jew	1	4	0	0	1
No Affiliation	4	17	15	68	19
Totals	23	100	22	100	45

involved. Seven influentials in Tijuana claim affiliation with the Roman Catholic church. Fifteen, on the other hand, claim no affiliation at all. The number "seven" is significant; but it is significant because it is so small and not because it is so large.

The fact of the "dominance" of the religious affiliations in the directions hypothesized does not fully explain the variations noted when No Affiliation is considered. Unfortunately, no data were gathered which could attest to the significance of the affiliation which an individual had with his church.[1]

For the present, it will be held that the hypotheses are "supported" albeit with certain reservations.

b. Ethnic background. - It was held that (hypothesis [IV.h:2]) Representation of an ethnic "minority" among the general influentials will be less than proportional to the number of that minority in the total population of the community.

The data of persons with Spanish surnames are taken from a special census report and are shown in Table 15.[2] The Chi-squares

---

[1]One further bit of information is enticing which relates to an earlier discussion of the meaning of religious affiliations (supra). In the community of El Paso it was discovered that 11 of the 48 influentials frequently named were members of one Presbyterian Church. And in addition four other influentials were either "nominal" members or had a relative in the church--a wife, son-in-law, and son. Thus 15 (or 31%) had direct connection with one another by way of this membership.

[2]The differences in percentages of Spanish surname population within communities between Table 1 and Table 15 are due to the restriction of the latter to those persons 25 years of age and over. It was decided to restrict these comparisons to those parts of Tables 8 and 34 in the United States Census reports (identified in Table 15) which were based on a sample of total returns. Under this condition persons 25 years of age and over are listed directly and do not require error-laden abstraction from other distributions such as age. All persons--male and female--were included in Table 15. This was done to permit use of the statistical sample of the population for both categories, Anglo and Spanish surname. Table 8 of the Census does not give a statistical

computed for each community are for: San Diego, 1.370; El Paso, 13.715; Tucson, 2.475, and for Las Cruces, 7.898. With alpha at .05 the null hypothesis is to be rejected for cases in which $X^2 > 2.71$. Therefore, the statistical hypothesis is rejected for two communities: El Paso and Las Cruces. In both of these communities, the hypothesis, as stated above, is held to be confirmed.[1]

The rejection of the hypothesis under consideration is thus improper for the two communities, San Diego and Tucson, until a finer measure of the "intent" in the restriction of ethnic groups is devised.

---

breakdown by sex. Besides, simply using males (or females) would not change the proportions of Anglos and Spanish surnamed persons since sexes are evenly distributed. (A Chi-square was computed on males only, 25 years of age and over, for El Paso with the result that the chi-square is larger (and therefore more stringent) and that no difference results in the decision to reject or not reject the statistical hypothesis.) The "Anglo" classification might more properly be called the "Non Spanish surname" population since it includes the Total population minus the Spanish surname persons. Finally, a note on the reliability of the Census classification, Spanish surname, is appropriate. In an Albuquerque survey, the 1950 census enumeration district results were systematically compared with results from more detailed reporting methods and interviews (Winnie, 1960). The conclusion of this study indicated "that no single criterion can be selected as 'best' for identifying Hispanos in population statistics in general or in censuses in particular....[however,] the surname criterion seems to offer as good a general-purpose classification as any from the technical standpoint." Its disadvantage is that it understates the size of the population (apparently by about ten percent) (ibid.: 365-366).

[1]In the case of Tucson and San Diego, a cautious comment is required. Tucson has among its total population of persons 25 years of age and over 18% who have Spanish surnames. Ten percent of the influential in Tucson are persons of Mexican descent. The fact that these proportions are not statistically different does not obviate the fact that the proportion of influentials of Mexican descent is not equal to or greater than the proportion of their numbers in the total population. Likewise for San Diego. Here only four percent of the specified portion of the population have Spanish surnames. Yet none of the influentials are of Mexican descent.

Table 15. Ethnicity of Influentials and Number of All Persons With Spanish Surnames 25 Years of Age and Over for Each United States Community: San Diego, El Paso, Tucson, and Las Cruces.[a]

Community and Ethnic Category[b]	All Persons 25 Years Old and Older (n)	(%)	Top Influentials (n)	(%)	Totals (n)	Chi-square (X^2)	p
San Diego, SMA							
Anglo	315,947	96	28	100	315,975		
Spanish-surname	13,020	4	0	0	13,020		
Totals	328,967	100	28	100	328,995	1.37	<.15
El Paso, SMA							
Anglo	58,417	61	43	96	58,460		
Spanish-surname	37,578	39	2	4	37,580		
Totals	95,995	100	45	100	96,040	13.72	<.0005
Tucson Urban Place							
Anglo	21,742	82	38	90	21,780		
Spanish-surname	4,841	18	4	10	4,845		
Totals	26,583	100	42	100	26,625	2.48	<.10
Las Cruces Urban Place							
Anglo	3,148	57	22	85	3,170		
Spanish-surname	2,386	43	4	15	2,390		
Totals	5,534	100	26	100	5,560	7.898	<.005

[a]Census data from Table 8, "1950 United States Census of Population: Persons of Spanish Surname," and Table 34, "1950 United States Census of Population: Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, General Characteristics."

[b]"Anglo" category includes all persons over 25 years of age not classified as "Spanish-surname."

6. Localism

a. Birthplace and length of residence in the community. - The hypothesis [IV.i:1] was stated That influentials will have varying characteristics as to place of birth. (See supra for discussion of rationale.)

Data on the place of birth of influentials interviewed in each of the six communities are presented in Table 16. As was hypothesized, the communities divide or vary on the basis of this variable. However, the form of the variance is interesting. San Diego and El Paso had a higher percentage of their influentials who were natives of the community than any of the others. Notably, Tucson and Las Cruces had the highest proportion of influentials who had not been born in the state within which the community was located, 69 and 58 percent respectively. Finally, the two Mexican communities showed a larger proportion of influentials who were not natives of the city and who were not out-of-state migrants but who were natives of the state in which the community is located.[1] The three results were found to include internally similar communities, but each pair was different from any other pair in combinations involving their central tendency. It is possible that more information concerning the history of each community would suggest reasons for the specific differences which are noted here. For our purposes, however, it may be concluded that the hypothesis as stated above was confirmed.

The other hypothesis stated in this section was [IV.i:2] That a majority of influentials will tend to have lived in the community for 25 years or more.

---

[1]Chi-squares were computed on the categories grouped as "City-Not City" and "State-Not State" with the result that the pairs were not different. The Chi-square results for the various combinations or communities and categories were:

Table 16. Place of Birth of Influentials in Each of Six Communities.

Place of Birth	San Diego		El Paso		Tucson		Las Cruces		Ciudad Juarez		Tijuna		Total
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(N)
Native of City	10	38	16	52	9	21	5	19	5	20	1	5	46
Native of State	2	8	5	16	3	7	4	15	18	72	17	77	49
Out-of-State	12	46	10	32	29	69	15	58	0	0	0	0	66
Foreign Born:													
Mex-US	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	9	4
Other	2	8	0	0	1	2	2	8	0	0	2	9	7
Total	26	100	31	100	42	99	26	100	25	100	22	100	172

Data for each of the six communities on the number of years in which the influentials interviewed had resided in the community are given in Table 17. The mean number of years residence is also given. The results were: for San Diego the mean number of years residence was 39.88; for El Paso, 40.32; Tucson, 33.67; Las Cruces, 25.46; Juarez, 26.00; and Tijuana, 28.14. Since none of the means are less than 25 years, the hypothesis as stated above is confirmed.[1]

b. Orientation toward the community. - The hypothesis was stated [IV.j:1] That a majority of influentials will show orientation to the community as against not showing orientation to the community.

The index of orientation toward the community will be taken as the respondent's answer to the question (number 5, Appendix I) "Under what conditions, if any, would you consider leaving this community?" Data on orientation toward the community are presented in Table 18. In only one community--Las Cruces--were as many as one-third of the influentials willing to state a willingness to leave. In general, this is interpreted as confirmation of the hypothesis stated above.

A slightly more stringent test may be completed by submitting these frequencies to a binomial test. In this test the null hypothesis is

	Category	
Community Comparisons	City-Not City	State-Not State
San Diego by (X) El Paso	.99	2.70
Tucson X Las Cruces	.05	.27
Juarez X Tijuana	2.51	1.09
San Diego and El Paso X Tucson and Las Cruces	.89	9.22
San Diego and El Paso X Juarez and Tijuana	13.05	10.80
Tucson and Las Cruces X Juarez and Tijuana	1.18	35.52

(Rejection region for alpha = .05 with one d.f. all $X^2 > 3.84$.)

[1]A t-test was computed on these data. The t's were for San Diego, +3.65; El Paso, +4.91; Tucson, +3.44; Las Cruces, +0.16; Juarez, +0.28; and Tijuana, +1.25. For relevant rejection regions see Table 12. None of the t-scores are smaller than those necessary to reject H_o.

Table 17. Number of Influentials Who Have had Residence in the Community for Various Numbers of Years by San Diego, El Paso, Tucson, Las Cruces, Cd. Juarez, and Tijuana.

Length of Residence in Community	San Diego		El Paso		Tucson		Las Cruces		Ciudad Juarez		Tijuana		Total
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)
25 years or more	19	73	26	84	30	71	13	50	12	48	14	64	114
21 to 24 years	1	4	2	6	2	5	2	8	2	8	0	0	9
11 to 20 years	2	8	1	3	8	19	6	23	5	20	8	36	30
10 years or less	4	15	2	6	2	5	5	19	6	24	0	0	19
Total	26	100	31	99	42	100	25	100	25	100	22	100	172
Mean years	39.88		40.32		33.67		25.46		26.00		28.14		
S.D.	20.79		17.37		16.36		14.51		17.94		11.82		
t	+3.65		+4.91		+3.44		+0.16		+0.28		+1.25		

Table 18. Index of Orientation to Community Based on Influentials Willingness to Leave the Community for Each of Six Communities.

Index of Orientation	San Diego		El Paso		Tucson		Las Cruces		Ciudad Juarez		Tijuana		Totals
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)
Willingness to leave	5	20	9	30	2	5	8	32	3	19	3	15	30
Not willing to leave	20	80	21	70	38	95	17	68	13	81	17	85	126
Totals	25	100	30	100	40	100	25	100	16	100	20	100	156
p	.002		.022		.000		.054		.011		.001		

set up which states that the probability of Willing to Leave and Not Willing to Leave will occur with equal frequency. Results were that the probability of these frequencies would occur for San Diego with a chance < .002; for El Paso, <.022; Tucson, <.000; Las Cruces, <.054; Juarez, <.011; and Tijuana, <.001. With the exception of Las Cruces, this would be accepted as significant at an alpha level of .05.

c. Tenure in firm.- The final hypothesis to be tested was stated in the form [IV.k:1] That a majority of influentials will have had over 20 years experience with the firm with which they are employed.

Data on the number of years the respondent had worked with his present firm is given in Table 19. The mean number of years of employment with the firm were for San Diego, 29.04; El Paso, 23.23; Tucson, 24.02; Las Cruces, 13.73; Juarez, 14.40; and Tijuana, 16.33. A t-test is the appropriate test of the significance of these results.

The t scores for each community were for: San Diego, +2.87; El Paso, +1.25; Tucson, +1.87; Las Cruces, -3.32; Juarez, -2.45; and Tijuana, -1.47. The region of rejection where alpha is .05 will include all t scores less than a specified number. The region of rejection is shown on Table 19. The result is to reject the null hypothesis that the universe mean (of which the sample is an estimate) is 20 years for the communities of Las Cruces and Juarez.

The variability of these findings do not permit confirmation of the hypothesis as stated.

C. Summary of Chapter Findings

A simple tabular summary of the state of the hypotheses will be used. The first column will list the hypotheses which were of interest as elements or parts of the Profile of Influence Potential. Each community will follow in a column form and an "X" will indicate that the

Table 19. Number of Years Working with Present Firm by Influentials for Each of Six Communities.

Number of Years Tenure with Firm	San Diego (n)	(%)	El Paso (n)	(%)	Tucson (n)	(%)	Las Cruces (n)	(%)	Ciudad Juarez (n)	(%)	Tijuana (n)	(%)	Total (n)
21 years or more	17	65	16	54	25	60	8	31	6	24	7	33	75
11 to 20 years	5	19	6	18	12	29	5	19	8	32	4	19	34
6 to 10 years	2	8	6	18	3	7	7	27	4	16	7	33	28
5 years or less	2	8	2	11	2	5	6	23	7	28	3	14	20
Totals	26	100	30	101	42	100	26	100	25	100	21	99	157
Means	29.04		23.23		24.02		13.73		14.40		16.33		
S.D.	16.07		14.12		13.96		9.66		11.43		11.45		
t	+2.87		+1.25		+1.87		-3.32		-2.45		-1.47		
Rejection region if t	-1.708		-1.699		-1.684		-1.708		-1.711		-1.725		

hypothesis was confirmed, an "(X)" will indicate substantial confirmation. A final column will indicate, by the same sign, that the hypothesis was confirmed for all six communities.

Hypotheses[1]	San Diego	El Paso	Tucson	Las Cruces	Ciudad Juarez	Tijuana	All Communities
[IV.a:2]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.b:3]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.c:2]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.d:2]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.e:2]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.h:2]		X		X	-	-	
[IV.a:1]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.c:1]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.d:1]	X	X	X	X		X	
[IV.e:1]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.f:1]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.i:1]	X	X	X	X	X	X	(X)
[IV.i:2]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[IV.j:1]	X	X	X		X	X	
[IV.k:1]	X	X	X			X	
[IV.b:1]	X	X	X	(X)	-	-	(X)
[IV.b:2]	-	-	-	-	(X)	(X)	(X)
[IV.g:1]	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	-	-	(X)
[IV.g:2]	-	-	-	-	(X)	(X)	(X)
[IV.h:1]	(X)	X	(X)	X	-	-	(X)

To this point there has been no attempt to differentiate two very different reference points from which and to which inferences can be made. In summarizing these results this shall be done.

The first reference point is "intra-community." The question is, do these groups of influentials actually differ in selected characteristics from the general community from which they are drawn?

---

[1]The reader is referred to Chapter IV, Section C (pages 46 and 47) for the summary of all the hypotheses discussed in this section. The symbols remain constant with that group. (See page 73 for presentation of [IV.b:3].

Whether the fact is assumed or is known, communities vary widely as to age distributions, religious affiliations, etc. Do these differences affect the characteristics of influentials?

The second reference point is "intra-influential." That is, are there generalized characteristics which one could expect of these persons labeled as "influential" no matter what the characteristics are of the community within which their relevant social relations take place? Does the influential have a specified age characteristic, for example? This "intra-influential" reference point has been derived from the specific empirical generalizations made from other studies of influentials. Also, generalized national differences have been accounted for in some instances. It was felt that a foundation could be laid for expecting differences between communities within different national circumstances on certain problems. Three problems included expectations which were specified for the different national contexts in which the community was laid: occupation, religious affiliation, and ethnic identity.

1. The Intra-community Problems

The following hypotheses were of this type: [IV.a:2], [IV.b:3], [IV.c:2], [IV.d:2], [IV.e:2], and [IV.h:2] dealing with education, occupational structure, sex, age, marital status, and ethnic groups respectively. The results were that for all problems except ethnic group representation, the hypotheses were confirmed. That is, for each community, the influential groups were significantly different from the community population. The exception was the ethnic group representation problem wherein the trend was established that Spanish surnamed persons were underrepresented among the influentials in most communities.

2. The Intra-influential Problem

The following hypotheses were built upon a generalized reference to influentials in western, capitalistic societies. They were [IV.a:1], [IV.c:1], [IV.d:1], [IV.e:1], [IV.f:1], [IV.i:1], [IV.i:2], [IV.j:1], and [IV.k:1]. These were concerned with educational level, maleness, age level, marital status, father's occupation, the place of birth, length of residence in the community, orientation to the community, and the tenure of the influential in the firm of employment. With the exception of age, orientation to the community and tenure in the firm, the hypotheses were confirmed for all communities. (Place of birth of the influential was expected to vary. It was held that this was so, but some unexplained patterns developed suggesting certain similarities between pairs of cities.) The age level specified for influentials did not hold for the smallest city in the study, Las Cruces. Orientation to the community, likewise, did not hold for the smallest city. For all other communities, these elements held as specified. The specified length of tenure in the firm did not hold for both Las Cruces and Juarez, and, in addition, showed wide variation for the remainder of the communities.

Finally, there were five hypotheses which had specified outcomes to be different across societal boundaries. These were [IV.b:1] and [IV.b:2]--expecting different institutional areas to be predominant in the occupational categories within which influentials were employed, [IV.g:1] and [IV.g:2]--expecting different configurations of religious affiliation, and [IV.h:1]--expecting a generalized ethnic dominance of Anglos over persons of Mexican descent in the United States communities. Only the last was held to be confirmed with little qualification. The "business" institutions were generally dominant in all communities regardless of societal foundation. The professions were also represented in relatively large numbers. The qualification necessary on

these findings are a result of (1) the variation in these representations in the different communities, and (2) the lesser place that governmental status-roles held in the Mexican communities, proportionally. The question of religious affiliation was upheld so long as the reference point included only specified commitments to religious orientations. However, when the qualification was made of allowing for the alternative of No Affiliation with a religious group, the thesis was upheld only for San Diego and Juarez.

In short, the Profile of Influence potential was maintained for the characteristics of education, sex, marital status, father's occupation, and residence in the community. Other characteristics which were variable by the community situation were age, ethnic background, religion, and occupation.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem to which the discussion and research in this thesis has been directed was (1) to derive from selected social system theory certain propositions concerning the interrelation of various foci of evaluations one of which was influence, (2) to interrelate these propositions with (a) statements derived from the specific criticisms of the findings of a methodology called the reputational technique, and with (b) empirical generalizations concerning certain indices of differential evaluation. These empirical generalizations are taken from the research literature. A corollary problem is to test the reliability of the reputational technique as a method for the determination of influence.

A. The Propositions Derived from Theory

From the selected theory it was possible to deduce propositions with regard to the expected interdependence of certain foci of evaluation. For example,

> Positions in class, power, and prestige hierarchies contribute to the potential for interpersonal influence.

The statement implies that three general standards of evaluation of actors are interrelated. Thus, positions on a class hierarchy are related to positions on a prestige hierarchy both of which are related to positions on a power hierarchy. Hierarchy refers to a graded order of things where, in this case, the grade is high or low evaluation.

It was also stated

> That ranking may be dependent upon evaluations which range from particularistic characteristics to universalistic characteristics such as competence or skill.

Extreme differences in the standards of evaluation may be attributed to a relational situation by the observer. The standard upon which he is drawing may vary from the limited relational system to a very broad, generalized base. It is possible that both of these extremes are operating for the individual evaluating others within the relational system. Thus the range in phenomena which are the foundation of differential evaluation are great.

Finally, it was suggested that power is maximized (in the status-role of a given individual) under certain conditions. These conditions were:

(1) when there is a high evaluation on the foci of generalized phenomena such as class and prestige,
(2) when there is high evaluation of a history of achievement, and
(3) when there is high evaluation of certain possessions such as skill or competence or wealth.

In short, some degree of intercorrelation of evaluative hierarchies one of which is influence is to be expected.

B. The Criticism of the Methodology

Moving now to the assertions of the critics of the reputational technique, it is possible to state their objections in the framework of these expectations just presented. It will be remembered that the critics have suggested that the reputational technique does not measure influence. Instead, it is said to measure some other phenomena. What are the alternative phenomena which it measures? These are the elements "status," "formal leadership," and "personality traits" indicating long activity in the community.

In addition, the critics suggest that the "scope" of influence is narrow and not general. That is, they assume that influence is determined by the relative skill or interest (presumably learned or proved over time) which the individual exhibits in particular, substantive areas. The criteria which specify these substantive areas is not given. By inferences from the areas chosen in the research of the critics, one might assume that examples of these areas are "public education," "urban renewal," or "politics." It is rather difficult to imagine the skill boundaries for issues such as these without substantial exploratory research. The bases of relative skill have not been spelled out by the critics.

Let us reason from two assumptions drawn from this work. The first is that influence varies by the skill or interest of the influential. And, therefore, individuals will be prominent in those issues which confront the community at a particular time that happen to conform with whatever of their skills or interest. The second is that the respondent who is evaluating relative influence in others is basing his evaluations not on influence but on a multitude of other factors. The conclusion follows that the same group of individuals would not be named as influentials over time.

When the propositions derived above are combined with these arguments it may be said (1) that contrary to the critics the high evaluation of influence should correlate with high evaluation of prestige (which is what is assumed to be equal to their "status"), of skill, and of "experience." In addition, two arguments must be developed further. (2) The question of "general" vs. "limited" scopes of influence must be tested independently, and (3) the longevity of influentials should be confronted directly. Let us now look at the possible outcomes of their theses on these latter points.

If the "general" vs. "limited" influence argument is accepted as it was stated above--i.e., that influence is a matter of skill or interest and that each occupant of an influential status-role is limited to specific substantive areas--the statement is not different from that derived from theory, viz., that influence is related to skill. The result would, however, limit the usefulness of the reputational technique since the technique would be masking more accurate indicators of influence or at least more specific indicators. If, however, the argument is in fact rejected--i.e., that general influence is not to be distinguished from limited influence--substantial reliability may be placed on the reputational technique as an efficient indicator of influence. In addition, the factor of skill as related to influence is not denied nor is it held to be an exclusive indicator of influence.

On the question of alternative phenomena as events independent from influence evaluation, more will be commented below.

Finally, the longevity question is concerned with the problem of whether the same incumbents of status-roles which are assessed as influential appear over time. If different incumbents appear over time, serious reservations would need to be placed on the technique. This result would indicate that the evaluators of influence were judging the status of influence independently and that the status of influence is likely to be separate (independent) from other statuses which the influential individual occupies. On the other hand, if substantially the same incumbents are reported as influentials over time, the reliability of the reputational technique is well established. It would be inferred that influence is but one focus of a series of evaluations.

The findings of this research on these matters were that "general" influence cannot be distinguished from "limited" influence. General influence was operationalized by a question which did not specify issue-areas to which the influence was restricted. Limited influence was

determined by naming only persons influential on a specific hospital project in the community.

It has also been shown that the reputational technique, when determined at two time periods separated by four years, reports substantially the same incumbents in the influential status-roles assessed. No more difference between incumbents in the two time periods was found than one would have expected from retirements and deaths in the interim. There is one exception to this statement. The exception involves those status-roles which are primarily authoritative in form. In the context of community-wide activity, these authoritative status-roles are primarily elective political offices. For these status-roles the relative influence seemed to be independent of the incumbents of the positions. The loss or gain of political office largely meant the loss or gain of influence. The fact that even in these situations the loss may not be "total," attests to a multiple foundation for influence. In general, then, respondents who are asked to evaluate others as to influence tend to report the same incumbents of influential status-roles over time.

The interpretation given here is that these findings largely refute the arguments presented by the critics of the reputational technique as outlined here. There is, however, one further problem. What if the component being evaluated is not influence but some other phenomena? Would the same consistency over time and over subject area permit the above conclusion?

C. The Elements of a Potential for Influence Complex

To confront the question just stated the set of variables dealing with alternative evaluative hierarchies must be presented. It will be remembered that the selected theorists supported the generalization

that certain parallels would be expected between various evaluative hierarchies. The critics of the findings in the area of community power have suggested that the measure used here finds nothing but some alternative evaluative bases, i.e., bases other than influence.

Partly to meet these objections and test the propositions and partly to extend research generalizations concerning the influential person in the community, an extensive review of the literature was used to develop a series of empirical generalizations. These generalizations were ordered on a model which itself was generalized in such a way that it fit within the concept areas in which we have been interested. The specific components or elements which were summarized were justified in part from findings of past research and in part because of dictates from the propositions derived from theory. The proliferation of research hypotheses develop from this base.

There are, however, two questions which must be directed to as many of these elements or indices of alternative foci of evaluation as possible. These two questions are: is the "sample" of influentials in a given community different from that which could have been drawn at random from the community as to particular elements? and, is the characteristic of the influential such that a "universe" of influentials--regardless of community variation--might be a reality?

Once the first question has been answered--viz., that the influentials are different from the general community--it may be assumed that for that element some independent selection is entering into the choice of these individuals. Then the second question is permitted wherein it is asked if differences overlap community boundaries.

The reference for evaluation must be reiterated at this point. The influence question asked the evaluators to assess the status of influence by naming incumbents of status-roles which were influential. There must be an assumption that these persons are knowledgeable as

to the nature of influence. The personal characteristics of the influentials are not evaluated by the observers. The individual characteristics are therefore indices of more general factors which have been shown in other studies to be highly evaluated.

The detailed findings have just been summarized in Chapter VII. The general finding was that a given group of influentials was indeed different from the population of the community in which their action took place. Thus the group is selected from the population of that community according to specified criteria. There is sufficient similarity within communities to argue that this selection is generally substantiated. In addition, when these samples are compared to expected results which are based on a wide range of other communities, very little difference was found. Therefore, statements such as these resulted: influentials tend to be different from the population of the community in which they reside as to their age distribution and, more specifically, they tend to have a mean age of at least 50 years. The result over a series of elements is a remarkable consistency over the boundaries of the various communities.

This is all the more important since the communities themselves differed widely. Their populations ranged from 25,000 to one-half million. The size of the "minority" group dominant in the Southwestern United States--persons of Mexican descent--varied from less than five percent of the total population to over half of the population. The communities were culturally separated by political allegiance to two different countries--the United States and Mexico. (This latter point may be of lesser importance since the two Mexican communities are contiguous to the United States boundary.)

The conclusion is that elements such as age, sex, occupation, father's occupation, ethnic background, religion, education and marital status are in total or in parts indices of evaluative hierarchies other

than influence and that there is substantial interdependence among these hierarchies. The specific objection that "status" is the element measured by the reputational technique is substantiated (not rejected) in the sense that individuals named tended to be high on indices of social level. It seems unlikely however, that "status" or prestige is the only phenomena being assessed by the general influence measure since nearly all of the elements were related in the expected direction. A view much more reasonable is that the interrelation of these indices of evaluative hierarchies with the evaluation of influence is true.[1]

It has been noted that indications of a potential for influence are life experiences such as those implied by an advanced state of education, age, and skill. Likewise, generalized life styles indicated by social level, ethnic status, religion would seem to be among the items which create a condition permitting or giving potential to influence.

D. Evaluation

Problems arise in research which cannot be adequately handled within the limits of time and budgets available. Ideally, for example,

---

[1]Appendix III reports the results of an extention of this argument wherein not only influence but relative influence within the influential group is compared to the possession of the specified characteristics. The results are inconclusive in that only two communities show a very high positive correlation between the two indexes while the other four communities showed no correlation at all. An analysis of the items involved in the multiple social characteristics index reveals that the four communities which showed no difference were substantially homogeneous on these items and that the items did not, therefore, adequately discriminate between relative influence and relative score on the multiple social characteristics index. As has been shown, the individual items did discriminate between influentials and non-influentials. The data in Appendix III do not affect the conclusions of this thesis.

a class, prestige, and possibly authority structure should have been determined for each community so that each influential could have been accurately placed therein. So doing would not only permit more accurate placement of influentials within other evaluative hierarchies but would have placed the entire analysis within the same referent system. That is, a given Ego would always have been the focus of the evaluation. A less involved alternative would have been achieved had samples of the community been drawn with which the evaluations of influentials could have been compared.

Another phase which in future research will yield more precise information on relative influence among influentials involves increasing the size of the sample. In the past, the time and effort involved in interviewing has hampered this goal. (A related problem arises from the nature of the persons who are influential. Generally they are very busy, active persons. Often they are called out-of-town on business matters or for conferences and the like. Thus, the longer the time period given over which to conduct the interviews the more likely will the researcher conclude more interviews. Though there were very few refusals for interviews in El Paso, for example, many persons were simply unavailable in the short, 16-day period set aside for interviews. Much better response was achieved in Tucson where the interviewer remained in the community.) A larger sample would have enabled an increase in the extent of involvement of various classes of influentials.

The model used by Freeman, et al. (op. cit.) is an ideal one from the double standpoint of wide involvement in the influential group and efficient use of research time. The model could likely be improved with an evaluation of relative influence such as that described in this study.

REFERENCES

Agger, Robert E. (1956) Power Attributions in the Local Community: Theoretical and Research Considerations, Social Forces, 34: 322-331.

_____ and Daniel Goldrich (1958) Community Power Structures and Partisanship, American Sociological Review, 23:383-392.

_____ and Vincent Ostrom (1956) The Political Structure of a Small Community, Public Opinion Quarterly, 20:81-89.

Barber, Bernard (1957) Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Barth, Ernest A. T. and Baha Abu-Laban (1959) Power Structure and the Negro Sub-Community, American Sociological Review, 24:69-76.

Bell, Wendell, Richard J. Hill, and Charles R. Wright (1960) Public Leadership in the United States, White Plains, New York, The Fund for Adult Education (mimeographed) cited in Freeman, et al., loc. cit.

Cartwright, Dorwin (ed.) 1959 Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.

Dahl, Robert A. (1960) The Analysis of Influence in Local Communities, Social Science and Community Action (Charles R. Adrian, Editor), East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University, pp. 25-42.

_____ (forthcoming) Equality and Power in American Society, Power and Democracy in America (William V. D'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Editors), Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press.

D'Antonio, William V. (1958) National Images of Business and Political Elites in Two Border Cities, Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University.

D'Antonio, William V., William H. Form, Charles P. Loomis, and Eugene C. Erickson (1961) Institutional and Occupational Representations in Eleven Community Influence Systems, American Sociological Review, 26:440-446.

Davis, Harold E. (1958) Government and Politics in Latin America, New York, The Ronald Press Co.

Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. (1957) Introduction to Statistical Analysis, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Fanelli, A. Alexander (1956) A Typology of Community Leadership Based on Influence and Interaction Within the Leader Subsystem, Social Forces, 34:332-338.

Form, William H. and William V. D'Antonio (1959) Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials in Two Border Cities, American Sociological Review, 24:804-814.

_____ and Delbert C. Miller (1960) Industry, Labor, and Community, New York, Harper's and Brothers.

_____ and Warren L. Sauer (1960a) Community Influentials in a Middle-sized City, General Bulletin No. 5 of the Institute for Community Development, Michigan State University.

_____ (1960b) Organized Labor's Image of Community Power Structure, Social Forces, 38:332-341.

Foskett, John M. and Raymond Hohle (1957) The Measurement of Influence in Community Affairs, Research Studies of the State College of Washington, XXV:148-154.

Freeman, Linton C. and Warner Bloomberg, Jr., Stephen P. Koff, Morris H. Sunshine, and Thomas J. Fararo, (1960) Local Community Leadership, Paper No. 15 of the University College, Syracuse University.

Hunter, Floyd (1953) Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press.

_____ (1959) Top Leadership, U.S.A., Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press.

Hunter, Floyd, Ruth Conner Schaffer, and Cecil G. Sheps (1956) Community Organization: Action and Inaction, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press.

Klapp, Orrin E. and L. Vincent Padgett (1960) Power Structure and Decision-Making in a Mexican Border City, The American Journal of Sociology, LXV:400-406.

Lynd, Robert S. (1945) Knowledge for What? Princeton, Princeton University Press, cited in William H. Form and Delbert C. Miller, loc. cit.

_____ and Helen Lynd (1929) Middletown, New York, Harcourt Brace and Co., cited in William H. Form and Delbert C. Miller, loc. cit.

_____ (1937) Middletown in Transition, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Loomis, Charles P. (1960) Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change, New York, Van Nostrand Co.

Merton, Robert K. (1957) Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, The Free Press, Chapter X.

Miller, Delbert C. (1958a) Decision-Making Cliques in Community Power Structures: A Comparative Study of an American and an English City, American Journal of Sociology, 64:299-310.

_____ (1958b) Industry and Community Power Structure: A Comparative Study of an American and an English City, American Sociological Review, 23:9-15.

_____ (1957) The Prediction of Issue Outcome in Community Decision-Making, Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 25:137-147.

Mills, C. Wright (1956) The Power Elite, New York, Oxford University Press.

Nelson, Howard J. (1955) A Service Classification of American Cities, Economic Geography, 31:189-210.

Olmsted, Donald (1954) Organizational Leadership and Social Structure in a Small City, American Sociological Review, 19:273-281.

Parsons, Talcott (1951) The Social System, Glencoe, The Free Press.

_____ (1953) A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification, Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification (Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset, Editors), Glencoe, The Free Press.

Pellegrin, Roland J. and Charles H. Coates (1956) Absentee-Owned Corporations and Community Power Structure, American Journal of Sociology, 61:413-419.

Polsby, Nelson W. (1958a) The Sociology of Community Power: A Reassessment, Social Forces, 37:232-242.

_____ (1958b) Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power, American Sociological Review, 24:796-803.

Rossi, Peter H. (1957) Community Decision Making, Administrative Science Quarterly, 1:415-443.

_____ (1960a) Theory and Method in the Study of Power in the Local Community, Paper presented at the 1960 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, (mimeographed).

_____ (1960b) Theory, Research, and Practice in Community Organization, Social Science and Community Action (Charles R. Adrian, Editor), East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University.

_____ and Robert A. Dentler (1960) The Politics of Urban Renewal, Glencoe, The Free Press.

Survey of Buying Power (1959), Sales Management, 82-201-780.

Sauer, Warren L. (1960) Labor-Business Images of Community Power: Convergences and Divergences, Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University.

Schulze, Robert O. (1958) Economic Dominants in Community Power Structure, American Sociological Review, 23-3-9.

_____ and Leonard U. Blumberg (1957) The Determination of Power Elites, American Journal of Sociology, 63:290-296.

Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950, Baja California Territorio Norte.

_____, Estado de Chihuahua.

Siegel, Sidney (1956) Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Smith, Ted C. (1960) The Structuring of Power in a Suburban Community, The Pacific Sociological Review, 3:83-88.

Smuckler, Ralph H. and Georgé M. Belknap (1956) Leadership and Participation in Urban Political Affairs, Government Research Bureau, Michigan State University.

Stewart, Frank A. (1947a) A Sociometric Study of Influence in Southtown, Sociometry, 10:11-31.

_____ (1947b) A Study of Influence in Southtown, II, Sociometry, 10:273-286.

Stouffer, Samuel A. (1955) Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, Garden City, Doubleday cited in Robert O. Schulze and Leonard U. Blumberg, loc. cit.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 3, Arizona, Chapter B. United States Government Printing Office, Washington. D. C., 1952.

_____ Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 5, California, Chapter B. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

_____ Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 31, New Mexico, Chapter B. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

_____ Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 43, Texas, Chapter B. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

_____ Vol. IV, Special Reports, Part 3, Chapter C, Persons of Spanish Surname. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev (1953) Statistical Inference, New York, Henry Holt and Company.

Winnie, William W., Jr. (1960) The Spanish Surname Criterion for Identifying Hispanos in the Southerwestern United States: A Preliminary Evaluation, Social Forces, 38: 363-366.

Wolff, Carole A. (1961) The Role of Women in the Structure of "Society" in a Midwestern Industrial Community, M.A. Thesis, Michigan State University.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. (1960) Reputation and Reality in the Study of "Community Power," American Sociological Review, 25:636-644.

Zetterberg, Hans L. (1954) On Theory and Verification in Sociology, New York, The Tressler Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Respondent number_____ Date of interview_____

Interviewer_____

In order to get the most complete and clearest picture possible of community leaders and their activities, we would first like to know something about your background.

1. Do you mind telling us when you were born? Year _____

2. Where did you grow up?

City	State	Town?	Farm?	Nation
City	State	Town?	Farm?	Nation

3. What is (or was) your father's regular occupation? (Be specific)

Occupation_____ Industry_____

Example:

Occ. mechanic Ind. airplane factory
farm laborer cotton farm

4. How long have you lived in this area? _____years.

5. Under what conditions, if any, would you consider leaving this community?

_____

_____

6. How much schooling have you had?

Number of years _____

How many, if any, were in Mexico? _____

(If college or university) Degrees: _____

Major subject in college _____

7. Do you speak any other language besides English?

   If so indicate what languages? _____

   Well _____
   Fair _____
   Little _____

8. Do you have any church affiliation?

   _____

9. What is the name of your firm or organization? _____

10. How long have you worked for this organization? _____ years.

11. What kind of work do you do? (Official title) _____

    (Job description) _____

12. How long have you been in this position? _____ years.

13. Could you please give us a brief outline of the high points in your occupational experience: What are the major steps you have taken to get to this present position. (Some of this data may be obtainable beforehand.)

Position	Description	Firm or Ogranization	City	State	Dates (years)

14. As a businessman and/or community leader, (use relevant phrase) What are the most important voluntary associations of which you are or have been a member?

Name of Organization	Office held	Committee	Attend Regularly Y/N
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

Why do you think of them as important? (Probe for differences between them)

_____

_____

15. In any of the associations you have mentioned, do you sometimes think of yourself as representing a group such as business, professions, or government?

No _____ (Go to Question 16 directly)

Other _____

Yes _____

(IF YES)

15a. What organizations?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Why is the representation of your _____ (group respondent has mentioned above) important?

_____

_____

_____

15b. Do you feel that your participation contributed to the associations' general policies or not?

No____ Why not?_____

_____

Yes ____ Which associations?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Other ____ (Explain) _____

_____

16. What kinds of groups do you think ought to be represented in local government?

_____

_____

_____

17. Is your group (mention name of relevant occupational group) now represented in the local government?
(In this question group may refer to a specific business type such as insurance, or a church, or a profession).

_____

18. (If not answered in 17, ask), Is this representation now at the administrative or legislative level? (Probe to find out just who represents him)

_____

_____

19. How do you usually proceed with respect to important issues: do you contact these men in government, or do they contact you?

_____

_____

20. How would you rank the importance of the following kinds of political participation for persons of your occupational group?

_____running for office
_____being an active political party member
_____contributing money to campaigns
_____giving advice if called on
_____prefer not to be involved in political activity

21. Is your wife active in community affairs, through such organizations as League of Women Voters, AAUW, etc.?
(This information may be obtained elsewhere.)

_____

_____

22. What sort of a role has your (name organization or firm) had in health matters in the community in recent years, that is, in such things as the Polio Drive, Hospital Fund Drive, etc.?

_____

_____

_____

23. What particular types of community activities would you <u>personally</u> be most likely to become interested in?

_____

_____

_____

24. Is this interest due to your occupational position or to some other factor? (Probe)

25. What have been the major community activities in which you have participated in the last five years or so?

26. Have you personally ever taken an active role in general community health problems? (If no, skip next question)

27. Do you feel that you represent your occupational organization's interests in these activities, or is this something you do strictly on your own?

28. Suppose that a major hospital project were before the community, one that required decision by a group of leaders whom nearly everyone would accept. If you were completely free to choose, which people would you choose to make up this group--regardless of whether or not you know them personally?

1. _____ 5. _____

2. _____ 6. _____

3. _____ 7. _____

4. _____ 8. _____

29. Why have you chosen these people?
(Write in number to left of name in appropriate blanks here.)

Their personal qualities _____
Technical knowledge _____
Organizational affiliation _____
Personal friends _____
Other _____

30. Whom would you choose if the project were a school bond issue?

1. _____ 5. _____

2. _____ 6. _____

3. _____ 7. _____

4. _____ 8. _____

Why the differences? _____

_____

_____

31. If a decision were to be made in the state capital that would affect a hospital or other health project in your community, who would be the best contact man to get in touch with state officials (besides local members of the legislature?) _____

Why did you choose him? _____

_____

31a. Who would be the best contact man for the school problem?

_____

Why? _____

_____

_____

32. In your response to the hypothetical problem about the hospital project and getting an acceptable group together to put it across, you (didn't mention or mentioned only x number of physicians as the case may be). What would be the general role of the physicians in this community in such a project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Which doctors would be important here?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Why these? _____

_____

33. Have the medical men here ever resolved any major health issues on their own?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Why? _____

_____

_____

34. Now we would like to discuss how an issue actually gets resolved in _____. We are not primarily interested in how you stand for or against a community issue or project. Let us consider the New Hospital Expansion Drive (or other such hospital projects as relevant): (Use same issue with every respondent)

How did the issue arise in the first place? Who initiated it?

_____

_____

_____

Were you contacted on this issue? Yes_____ No _____

(If yes) How were you contacted?

Personal call_____ Informal chance meeting_____
Private luncheon_____ Other (specify)_____
Committee meeting___ _____

Who contacted you?_____

Did you contact others? Yes_____ Whom_____
No_____ _____

What did you decide to do?_____

_____

_____

Did you do it? (explain)_____

Who else did you talk to about it?_____

Why? (Follow action, involvement, etc.)_____

_____

_____

What persons and organizations worked for this issue? Against the issue? (F - for; A - against)

ORGANIZATIONS	PERSONS

(If the issue is not yet resolved, ask) How, in your opinion, will the issue be resolved? _____

(Probe as to why he feels this way?) _____

_____

Was it necessary to organize in some way to achieve community approval? How long after the issue first arose did this take place?

_____

_____

(If not already clear from the previous discussion, ask) In the final analysis, whose influence counted most?

Names of persons	Organizations

How did they put it across, or get it their way? _____

_____

35. Now let us compare this issue with another issue (inject title of issue as relevant but not a health issue. Use same issue for all respondents).

How did this issue arise? Who initiated it? _____

_____

Were you contacted on this issue? Yes____ No _____
(If yes) How were you contacted?

Personal call_____ Informal chance meeting_____
Private luncheon_____ Other (specify)_____
Committee meeting_____ _____

Who contacted you?_____

Did you contact others? Yes____ Whom_____

No_____ _____

What did you decide to do?_____

_____

Did you do it? (explain)_____

Who else did you talk to about it?_____

Why? (Follow action, involvement, etc.)_____

_____

What persons and organizations worked for this issue? Against the issue? (F - for; A - against)

ORGANIZATIONS	PERSONS

(If the issue is not yet resolved, ask) How, in your opinion, will the issue be resolved?_____

(Probe as to why he feels this way?)_____

_____

Was it necessary to organize in some way to achieve community approval?_____
How long after the issue first arose did this take place?_____

_____

(If not already clear from the previous discussion, ask) In the final analysis, whose influence counted most?

NAMES OF PERSONS	ORGANIZATIONS

How did they put it across, or get it their way?_____

_____

36. NAMES OF TOP INFLUENTIALS

1. _____	26. _____
2. _____	27. _____
3. _____	28. _____
4. _____	29. _____
5. _____	30. _____
6. _____	31. _____
7. _____	32. _____
8. _____	33. _____
9. _____	34. _____
10. _____	35. _____
11. _____	36. _____
12. _____	37. _____
13. _____	38. _____
14. _____	39. _____
15. _____	40. _____
16. _____	41. _____
17. _____	42. _____
18. _____	43. _____
19. _____	44. _____
20. _____	45. _____
21. _____	46. _____
22. _____	47. _____
23. _____	48. _____
24. _____	49. _____
25. _____	50. _____

Listed above are the names of _____ people who are considered to be influential in this community. We have talked about some of them already. Now we would like you to consider the whole list and rank the ten you consider to be the most influential. If a name has been omitted which you believe should be here, please feel free to add it. They are listed in alphabetical order.

37. On this page, we have listed several other issues which have been major community problems in the past five years; we would appreciate it if you would simply check the names of the persons with whom you have worked on these problems.

	NAMES						
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							
16.							
17.							
18.							
19.							
20.							
21.							
22.							
23.							
24.							
25.							
26.							
27.							
28.							
29.							
30.							

38. What are some of the most important issues still facing _____ today?

Issues	What position will _____ (occup. group) take?	Will _____ (occup. group) affect the outcome?
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

39. Would representatives of the Spanish-speaking part of the community generally agree or disagree that these are the most important issues?

Agree_____

Disagree_____

Other_____

(IF NO OR OTHER) Specify

What are the most important issues for them?

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

Since (Although) this community has a large (small) percentage of people of Spanish-speaking background living here, we are also interested in knowing something about their participation in community affairs and the problems they present for community leadership, particularly in health matters.

40. Does the community have a group of Spanish-speaking leaders apart from the top community leaders whom we have already talked about? WHO ARE THEY?

1. _____ 6. _____

2. _____ 7. _____

3. _____ 8. _____

4. _____ 9. _____

5. _____ 10. _____

41. Are any of these Spanish-speaking leaders particularly interested in health matters in the community? _____
(IF YES) Do they take an active part in community health projects?

_____

AT WHAT LEVEL do they participate? Decision making? _____
Initiation of action _____
Carrying out of policy _____

42. How would you evaluate the extent of participation of the Spanish-speaking leaders in community affairs?

_____ As much as other people
_____ More
_____ Less
_____ Other _____

43. On what kinds of problems is it necessary to take Spanish-speaking leaders into account in important community projects? _____

_____

_____

43a. In important issues, at what stage do you solicit support from the Spanish-speaking group?_____

_____

What kind of support do you need?_____

_____

44. It has been noted that persons of Spanish-speaking background here in the Southwest are not very strongly represented in the medical profession, at least not in proportion to their total numbers. How would you account for this?_____

_____

45. It has frequently been found in the Southwest that people of Spanish-speaking background have to work a lot harder, perhaps twice as hard, as Anglo-americans to get ahead. Would you say that this is true in this community?

_____

_____

a. Would it be true for a Spanish-speaking person trying to get ahead in business?_____

_____

b. Would it be true for a Spanish-speaking person trying to get ahead in government?_____

_____

c. Would it be true for a Spanish-speaking person trying to go into medicine, particularly if he wanted to become a physician?

_____

(IF DIFFERENCES) Why these differences?_____

_____

46. In your opinion, do Anglo-americans here in the Southwest generally like ot dislike the Spanish-speaking Americans here?

    Like_____
    Dislike_____
    Other _____

47. Are there any particular jobs or occupations in the area of health including hospital work which persons of Spanish-speaking background seem to be better suited for than others.
    WHICH?

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

In closing this interview we would like to know what experiences or lessons you have gained from your many years of community leadership with respect to working with other people? Has it been a worthwhile experience? How so? What have been the major problems in trying to work with other people?

APPENDIX II

Table A. Service classification, estimated population, and percentage of persons with Spanish surname of six cities.

City	Service Classification[a]	Estimated Population of Central City at Time of Study[b]	Percentage of Spanish Surname Population in 1950
San Diego, California	Pb2PsF	522,600	4.6%
El Paso, Texas	T	263,000	49.0
Tucson, Arizona	Ps2PfF	110,000	21.1
Las Cruces, New Mexico	Pb2R	22,500	48.7
Ciudad Juarez	CS[c]	250,000[d]	96.0[e]
Tijuana	CS[c]	160,000[f]	97.0[e]

Source: Selected from Table 1, D'Antonio et al., (1961:441).

[a]Taken from Howard J. Nelson, "A Service Classification of American Cities," Economic Geography, 31 (1955), pp. 189-210. Key: Mf, Manufacturing; R, Retail Trade; Pf, Professional Service; T, Transportation and Communication; Ps, Personal Service; Pb, Public Administration; W, Wholesale Trade; F, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate. A "2" after the symbol signifies the city fell two standard deviations from the mean.

The Nelson classification considers the proportion of the labor force engaged in performing a service for the 897 urban concentrations of 10,000 or more persons in the United States. The mean proportion of persons engaged in a particular service in all 897 cities is calculated for each service group and standard deviation in excess of the mean is calculated. The classification of a city in one group arbitrarily reflects an excess of at least one standard deviation of the labor force employed in that service group. The service data is taken from the 1950 Census of Population Classification of Industry Groups (Vol. 2, Table 35, "Economic Characteristics of the Population...." See Nelson, op. cit.

[b]Except where noted differently, these estimates are taken from Sales Management, "Survey of Buying Power," 82 (May 10, 1959), and are the estimates as of January 1, 1959, pp. 201-780.

[c]The classification of Mexican cities are based on a service classification of Municipios of over 10,000 population which include a city of over 10,000. There were 37 municipios which fell within our criteria from the six border states. The Mexican and United States Census have non-comparable categories for "trade" and "service." For this reason two different categories were made for the Mexican cities. The Commercial (C) includes Nelson's Retail and Wholesale Trade, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate. The Service (S) includes Nelson's Professional and Personal Service, and Public Administration.

[d]Estimate based on census taken by municipio government, January 1959.

[e]The percentage of Mexican persons in the population in 1950; from Septimo Censo General de Poblacion, 6 de Junio de 1950.

[f]Estimate obtained by researchers in the area.

Table B. Comparisons of All Influentials Named and Not Interviewed with Influentials Named and Interviewed for Certain Occupational Categories for San Diego, El Paso, Tucson, Las Cruces, Cd. Juarez, and Tijuana.

Community and Occupational Categories	All Influentials Named Not Interviewed (n)	Interviewed (n)	Total (n)	Chi-Square (x^2)	p
San Diego					
Merchants	1	7	8		
Banking, Finance	2	9	11		
Manufacturing and Construction	3	6	9		
Professionals	2	3	5		
Government Service	1	1	2		
All other	0	1	1		
Totals	9	27	36	.858	<.50
El Paso					
Merchants	6	6	12		
Banking, Finance	2	5	7		
Mfg. and Constr.	6	6	12		
Professionals	9	10	19		
Government Service	2	5	7		
All Other	4	1	5		
Totals	29	33	62	1.111	<.90
Tucson					
Merchants, Banking and Finance	1	19	20		
Mfg. and Constr.	0	4	4		
Professionals, Gov't Service, Others	1	19	20		
Totals	2	42	44	.000	>.99
Las Cruces					
Merchants	6	4	10		
Banking, Finance	1	5	6		
Mfg. and Constr.	2	2	4		
Professionals and Government Service	7	10	17		
All Other	7	5	12		
Totals	23	26	49	.924	<.70
Juarez					
Merchants	15	6	21		
Banking, Finance	2	2	4		
Mfg. and Constr.	11	6	17		
Professionals	18	7	25		
Government Service	7	2	9		
Others	9	2	11		
Totals	62	25	87	1.771	<.80
Not Ascertained	2	0	2		

Table B Continued

Community and Occupational Categories	All Influentials Named Not Interviewed (n)	Interviewed (n)	Total (n)	Chi-Square (x^2)	p
Tijuana					
Merchants	14	9	23		
Banking, Finance	8	1	9		
Mfg. and Constr.	0	2	2		
Professionals	8	5	13		
Government Service	6	3	9		
Others	4	2	6		
Totals	40	22	62		
Not Ascertained	8	0	8	.521	<.95

Chi-Squares were computed with certain categories combined. When categories were combined the most nearly like occupations were grouped.

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

This thesis has been concerned with the association of certain social characteristics with status-roles evaluated as influential. With few exceptions it has not been our interest to consider the relative influence which specified influential status-roles are assumed to possess. The general argument which has been presented is that there are social characteristics which are conditions or indices of conditions the presence of which enhance a potential for influence. It may also be argued that degrees of influence may be associated with the degree to which the influential status-roles possess the total set of social characteristics.

Two indexes are defined:

Relative Influence Index.--The number of votes an individual received nominating him as one of the top ten influentials in the community.

Relative Social Characteristics Index.--The number of highly evaluated social characteristics a given influential possesses.

To determine the degree of a social characteristic which is to be classified as "highly evaluated" each of the social characteristics (13) was to be dichotomized and scored "1" for high evaluation and "0" for Not high evaluation. Each item (social characteristic) in the index was scored consistent with the findings presented in Chapters VI and VII. For each of the six communities the following items were rates as follows:

Item	Score	
	"1"	"0"
Ethnicity	Anglo	Mexican descent
Father's occupation	White Collar	Not White Collar
Occupation	Business	Not Business
Position	Executive or Directive	Not Executive or Directive
Marital Status	Married	Not Married
Orientation to Community	Locally oriented	Not Locally Oriented
Sex	Male	Female

For each of the communities in the United States the item religious affiliation was scored, "1" for Protestant and "0" for Non-Protestant. For each of the communities in Mexico the item religious affiliation was scored, "1" for Roman Catholic and "0" for Non-Roman Catholic.

For each of the remaining characteristics a score for each individual was available. It was reasoned that if x years in the community is minimal to a potential for influence then x + 1 will be "better." The point at which the dichotomy of "+" and "-" years would be determined is to be the mean number of years given for the item for each community. Thus, for each of the following communities the score "1" was given at the level indicated. (A "0" score would be any number less than the one listed.)

"1" scores given at anything equal to or greater than the level indicated for each social characteristic (item) listed for each of six communities.

Item	Communities					
	San Diego	El Paso	Tucson	Las Cruces	Ciudad Juarez	Tijuana
	years					
Age	55	54	59	49	46	52
Residence in Community	40	40	34	25	18	28
Tenure in Firm	29	23	24	14	11	16
Tenure in Position	16	13	18	12	9	15
Years in Education	15	15	15	16	14	13

Each individual received a score on each item of "1" or "0." With 13 items in all the score for an individual might range from "0" to "13." This cumulative score is the Relative Social Characteristic Index. A product moment correlation was then computed on the two indexes for each set of influentials by community.

The results were:

Community	r	t	p	N
San Diego	-.0618	-0.3133	.60 < p <.70	26
El Paso	.5585	3.6256	p < .005	31
Tucson	.3442	2.3185	.01 < p < .025	42
Las Cruces	.1819	1.0276	.10 < p < .20	26
Ciudad Juarez	.1428	.6919	.20 < p < .30	25
Tijuana	.0958	.4513	.30 < p < .40	22

The hypothesis that the two indexes are positively associated is accepted for two of the six communities: El Paso and Tucson. No decision is permissible on the findings for the other four communities. (Note: the negative correlation in San Diego may also be spurious since the rho is not significantly different from zero.)

Inspection of the items on the index of social characteristics reveals that the scoring method used did not discriminate between influentials for the four communities for which there was no correlation. For San Diego, for example, the mean relative social characteristic index score was 9.85 with a standard deviation of 1.74. With the scoring method used, the range in index scores was simply not great enough.

These findings cast no reflection on the items as to the selection of influential as against non-influentials. Rather, for more precise selection of degree of influence, more precise scoring of items is necessary. Judgments should be made on the basis of items highly evaluated by the public that surround the influential. The fact that two of the communities show a significant correlation between the two indexes calls for an elaboration of the items and their scales.[1]

---

[1]It is interesting that one of the conclusions Belknap and Smuckler drew from their study of a Mid-West City was that "There is general agreement between those active in community public affairs and those who are inactive in the community in identifying generally influential persons. However, there is considerable disagreement in identifying those who are most influential." (George Belknap and Ralph Smuckler, "Political Power Relations in a Mid-West City," Public Opinion Quarterly, 20 (Spring, 1956), p. 74.) Despite the similarity in the findings of Belknap and Smuckler with those reported above, it is held that improvement of the indexes will supplant the difficulties.

NOV 2 8 '62 ROOM USE ONLY

FEL [illegible]

DEC 9 1967

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293103379644