

November 1982

## Who Rules in Local Communities: Reputation, Decision-Making, Leadership, and Community Power Revisited

Mitchell F. Rice

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rice, Mitchell F. (1982) "Who Rules in Local Communities: Reputation, Decision-Making, Leadership, and Community Power Revisited," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 10 : No. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol10/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@coastal.edu](mailto:commons@coastal.edu).

---

## Who Rules in Local Communities: Reputation, Decision-Making, Leadership, and Community Power Revisited

### Erratum

Several pages of this article were printed out of page order. Page 26 should be page 24; page 24 should be page 25; and page 25 should be page 26. The Journal apologizes for these errors.

# Who Rules in Local Communities: Reputation, Decision-Making, Leadership, and Community Power Revisited

MITCHELL F. RICE

*Southwest Texas State University*

A theory allows something significant to be said about a particular institution or subject to permit it to be understood better or to increase its usefulness as a tool of study. In urban political research two theoretical schools of thought have sought to explain how decisions are made in local communities: the elitist and pluralist theories of community power. Elitists argue that a single elite group based on reputation or social class background determine decisions which reflect their own interests. Pluralists contend that political decisions are the outcome of a plurality of many competing interest groups, elected officials, and other influences. These views have set-off an interdisciplinary debate which has yet to reach its end. During the 1950s and 1960s a dialogue ensued between social scientists, particularly sociologists and political scientists, concerning how decisions are made and by whom in local communities. Today as a result, a large number of studies differ significantly on how to measure and study power in a community.

For those who have a large role in the operation of the urban polity, community power studies may offer an approach for identifying citizen leaders one can mobilize or activate to support or oppose particular issues in a community. Furthermore, the configurations of power in a community may substantively effect the distribution of benefits and services to various segments of the population. For example, William Morris notes that pluralism views "the administrator as an objective arbiter of conflicting group demands" and elitism encourages him "to become a spokesman for and clients of the privileged few."<sup>1</sup> With this observation in mind, it is not difficult to argue that the kind of power structure in a community will affect both the process of decision-making as well as its distributional results.

The purpose of this paper is threefold: first, to briefly review community power studies through a recapitulation of methodological issues and approaches in the study of local decision-making and leadership; second, to point out that there is no consensus on the one best way to measure power; and third, to show that the search for community power still continues.

## REPUTATION, LEADERSHIP, AND COMMUNITY POWER

The study of community power gained recognition with the publication of Floyd Hunter's study *Community Power Structure* (1953).<sup>2</sup> Hunter's work served two purposes: 1) to update community studies of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s by researchers such as Lynd and Lynd, Warner and Lunt, Goldschmidt, Warner et al, and Hollingstead;<sup>3</sup> and 2) to lay the groundwork for a scholarly debate that has not yet run its course. Hunter is

generally given credit for first attempting to utilize the reputational approach in his study of Atlanta.<sup>4</sup> This approach is also known as the sociometric approach, the sociological approach, and the elitist approach.

The methodology utilized in this approach can be classified into two categories: one-step and two-step procedures. In the one-step procedure a set of informants is asked to provide a list of community leaders. This technique was utilized by Schulze and Blumberg, Form and D'Antonio and Olmstead.<sup>5</sup> The two-step procedure calls for a panel of judges, experts, or another group to choose community leaders from a compiled list of individuals selected in the one-step procedure. This technique was employed by Hunter who compiled lists of names and based his final selection on choices made by a panel of judges.

Hunter, in *Regional City (Atlanta)*, obtained four lists of leaders from managers of civic organizations—the community council, the chamber of commerce, the League of Women Voters, and newspaper editors and other civic leaders. Hunter used these organizations because the reputational approach operates on the assumption that there are certain people who know who runs a city. As William Schultze observes, “The reputational approach starts from the common sense assumption that if you want to know who is in charge of a city, you ask the people who ought to know.”<sup>6</sup> Hunter’s next step was to select a panel of judges who were to select in their opinion the top leaders from each list. The final list represented Hunter’s power elite. A few years later Hunter in another work, like Ferdinand Lundberg before him and C. Wright Mills and G. William Domhoff after him, made a similar claim at the national level.<sup>7</sup> At the local level, the reputational approach was later used to study the cities of Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Ypsilanti, Michigan; Seattle, Washington; and Dallas, Texas.<sup>8</sup>

*Criticisms.* Nelson Polsby, a strong opponent of the reputational approach, finds much fault in Hunter’s methodology. Polsby posits four critical questions; “*First*, how many ‘top leaders’ are there? *Second*, what differentiates ‘top’ from ‘nontop’ leaders? *Third*, how do we know the judges are applying standards of ‘topness’ consistent with one another and with Hunter? *Fourth*, how do we know the judges are correct and that . . . they [the leaders] have been correctly identified?”<sup>9</sup> In questions one and two Polsby assumes that there is no set number of rulers and he finds it difficult to select top leaders from lesser leaders. In questions three and four Polsby argues that the criteria for determining top leaders will most certainly vary from judge to judge since their definitions of top leaders and leadership are not the same.

Charles Bonjean offers general criticisms of the reputational approach and devises methodology utilizing what he claims to be a workable reputational strategy. His criticisms are:

- (1) The approach enables the investigator to find a monolithic power structure. When, in fact, such a structure may not exist in the com-



munity. (2) Assuming there is a monolithic structure, this approach may lead to premature closure (not including all leaders) or may lead to the inclusion of non-leaders. The problem is the cut off point in the final list of nominees. (3) If the reputational approach is used, we must take into consideration inaccuracies in respondent perceptions. Private citizens, . . . may be unreliable sources of information. (4) Interviewer and respondent may not agree on what is meant by 'power.'<sup>10</sup>

Bonjean employs a two-step procedure which differs from Hunter. After the final list had been compiled, Bonjean asked each member on the list to choose and rank those who are the most influential. Bonjean claims that this additional step employs no arbitrary cut off point and reduces the likelihood of inaccuracies.

Robert Dahl, Nelson Polsby, and Raymond Wolfinger criticize the reputational approach because they claim it is inefficient for the study of local political systems.<sup>11</sup> Dahl questions if the reputational approach can actually determine if a small number of people are influential over an important number of issue-areas. Polsby notes that the respondent's answers may result from salient issues perceived to be important rather than from other issues which did not appear as salient to the respondent, but affected the community as a whole. In short, the respondent's answers depend on his perception of important issues in contrast to unimportant ones. Polsby labels these answers as "opinions of second hand sources." The opinions of the respondents may not reflect the true leaders in the community. Furthermore, where Hunter found elitism, Kent Jennings in a later study of power in Atlanta, found pluralism.<sup>12</sup>

Wolfinger articulates four criticisms of the reputational approach; ambiguity, misperception, the unutility of influence rankings, and cohesiveness. First, the reputational approach fails to elaborate on scopes of power and assumes that the leader's power is equal in all issues. Second, a prevalence of misperception exists because the respondent's definition of power is inappropriate, leading to an inaccurate perception of power. Wolfinger, like Polsby, concludes that citizens are unreliable sources. Third, rankings have little usefulness unless other questions are asked in the analysis, which Wolfinger claims proponents of the reputational approach fail to do. The analysis must include criteria for selecting the final amount of leaders. Too few leaders exclude many significant actors. Too many leaders may result in non-leaders gaining leadership. Fourth, Wolfinger argues that the reputational approach does not identify leaders as its purports to do because it does not establish if leaders are enemies or allies. This is to say that this power must be defined as a group. In another essay, Wolfinger posits the following comments: "What should be made of the reputational method? It requires a factual assumption that is obviously false; its findings are often invalidated and never confirmed; and its product conveys little useful information about a local political system."<sup>13</sup>

Victor Jones and Herbert Kaufman disagree with Hunter over the use of the term power.<sup>14</sup> For these two political scientists, Hunter's question "Who are the power elite of this community, what are they like and how do they operate?" indicates that an elite existed prior to Hunter's study. They further note that Hunter failed to analyze critically the use of power. Actors, feedback, and the role of the community were given little attention in this definition of power. They take the position that Hunter fails to prove that Atlanta would have operated differently in the elites' absence.

Michael Aiken and Paul Mott summarize the various criticisms of the reputational approach:

- a. The reputational technique measures opinions about power, not power itself;
- b. it receives erroneous assessments by informants as a result of erroneous perceptions of the power structure . . . ;
- c. the method is diffuse and fails to acknowledge 'issue specialization' (i.e., power is assumed to be stable over time);
- d. it assumes there is a power structure, but does not demonstrate it;
- e. it is insensitive to the role of both formal political parties in the study of decision-making;
- f. it confuses status with power . . . ;
- g. it is insensitive to the feedback mechanisms in the community influence system, with the result that power is portrayed as a one way process.<sup>15</sup>

*Defense of the Reputational Approach.* William D'Antonio and Eugene Erickson suggest that Dahl and others who criticize the reputational approach have not empirically proven their argument. In support of the reputational approach they posit the following comments:

- (1) The reputational technique does seem to measure general community influence. . . .
- (2) The technique seems to be highly reliable. . . .
- (3) . . . it is not surprising that consistencies occur between evaluation of status and influence. . . .
- (4) . . . the reputational technique, . . . [does] provide us with a picture of the dynamics of power. . . .<sup>16</sup>

William Gamson in a study of 54 New England communities concludes that the term reputation and the reputational approach has great utility in the study of community power.<sup>17</sup> His analysis focuses on reputation as a resource and the contributing factors which produce reputation. In support of the reputational approach Gamson presents a theoretical justification for identifying reputational leaders: "one asks about reputation simply to identify those who have reputation; such reputation is significant because it is a stable and generalized persuasion resource."<sup>18</sup> While he admits that arguments may arise from the use of this approach, its greatest utility lies in "how well it measures reputation, not its connection with influence



behavior.”<sup>19</sup> For Gamson, the social organization of reputational leaders is significant for the understanding of stable power relations in the community. In the final analysis, Gamson argues in contradistinction to Wolfinger’s plea for a decent burial and suggests that a “decent convalescence seems more in order.”<sup>20</sup>

### THE PLURALIST ALTERNATIVE

The major assumption in this approach is that participation in decisions leads to leadership. The methodology requires an analysis of representative community decisions to determine the key participants and to discover the true possessor of resources. This approach was employed by Bloomberg and Sunshine, Dahl, Freeman, Jennings, Martin, Polsby, Presthus, Scoble, Wildavsky, and Wolfinger.<sup>21</sup>

Dahl’s *Who Governs*, the most influential work which supports the pluralist approach, utilizes three main procedures in his study of New Haven. Schultze identifies these as “selecting key issues,” “designating the stages in the resolution of each issue,” and “observing actual decision-making behavior at each stage.”<sup>22</sup> Dahl concludes after careful study and examination that New Haven is a “Pluralistic democracy.”

Polsby observes that the pluralist approach makes an attempt “to study specific outcomes in order to determine who actually prevails in community decision-making.”<sup>23</sup> He develops a set of criteria for determining key issues:

1. How are people affected by outcomes;
2. How many different kinds of community resources are distributed by outcomes;
3. How much in amount of resources are distributed by outcomes;
4. How drastically present community resources distribution are altered by outcomes.<sup>24</sup>

In other words, the pluralists unlike the reputationalists, insist that an accurate description of community power can only be achieved by examining political actions, not opinions. According to their view, power exists only when it has been exercised. An examination of power when it involves key political issues will reveal the distribution of community power in local politics.

*Criticisms.* Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz point out that the decision-making approach does not consider the implicit aspects of power and that pluralists have overlooked an important area called “‘non-decision-making,’ i.e. the practice limiting the scope of actual decision-making to ‘safe’ issues by manipulating the dominant community values, myths and political institutions and procedures.”<sup>25</sup> Specifically, they suggest that the exercise of implicit power prevents issues from reaching the decision-making stage in the political process. The non-decision-making approach assumes that a mobilization of bias exists which benefits certain

groups at the expense of others. Certain demands are not processed through normal political channels but are instead suppressed by force, power, and bias application of norms, rules or procedures creating a non-decision. Bachrach and Baratz maintain that these important factors are not considered by the proponents of the decision-making approach. They conclude that the mobilization of bias and the dynamics of non-decision-making must be analyzed as well as the decisions themselves.

Wolfinger takes issue with Bachrach and Baratz and argues that their approach cannot determine who rules in a local community because "events" as opposed to "non-events" must be studied.<sup>26</sup> Bachrach and Baratz empirically test their approach in the City of Baltimore and claim that it can be used to analyze the forces that lead to decisions in any community.<sup>27</sup>

Aiken and Mott criticize the issue selection process in the decision-making approach: "One of the greatest problems with the decision-making approach is in the selection of issues. What issues are most essential to the community? From what time span should the issues be selected? What sampling procedure . . . should be utilized? What criteria can be utilized in determining when issues become decisions?"<sup>28</sup> Similar criticisms of the decision-making approach are advanced by Thomas Anton, William D'Antonio, Howard Ehrlich, Frederick Frey, and Andrew McFarland.<sup>29</sup>

Finally, G. William Domhoff, in a recent study, challenges the works of the major proponents of pluralism. Devoting most of his attention to Dahl's *Who Governs*, Domhoff criticizes his interpretation of the urban renewal process asserting that the study of decision-making in this area "did not develop a complete picture of the power network in New Haven."<sup>30</sup> Domhoff further notes that "the book is factually wrong in many instances . . . , because of its theoretical and methodological shortcomings."<sup>31</sup> Moreover, Domhoff argues that Dahl "had only a partial picture of membership in the social and economic notables, an incomplete decisional network that he did not follow to its institutional basis . . . , and only a situational indicator of power. . . ."<sup>32</sup>

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

L. Vaughn Blankenship offers a summary and comparative analysis of the major methodological techniques for identifying the power structure in a community. While Hunter found power in the community to be highly structured, unevenly distributed, with an overrepresentation of key economic roles, Blankenship notes that the pluralists would argue that the elitists "started off defining social power as being structured, asked questions which severely limited the number of individuals who could be nominated as influentials and talk mostly to businessmen or only looked at those community activities . . . which have traditionally been of great concern to the social and economic elite of the community."<sup>33</sup> The pluralists



are implicitly suggesting that the elitists started with a biased approach. They suggest the decision-making approach because they found that "while power is unevenly distributed, it is also fragmented, unstable, constantly shifting, and quite specific to each particular decision."<sup>34</sup> This argument holds that leadership and power exist in a multiplicity of groups, each within a particular issue area. The elitists counter argument notes Blankenship is that "if you focus on process instead of on structures, you are quite naturally going to find that a structure does not exist."<sup>35</sup> However, an assessment of the elitist-pluralist dialogue discerns a relationship between approaches and results revealing a distinct possibility of predetermined bias on the part of the investigator. As John Walton puts it, "the disciplinary background of the investigator tends to determine the method of investigation he will adopt, which, in turn tends to determine the image of the power structure that results from the investigator."<sup>36</sup> On this same point, Murray Stedman observes that "there is a very high relationship between methodology and findings in the area of community power structures."<sup>37</sup>

Blakenship suggests that efforts be made to compare the two approaches (reputational and decisional) when used simultaneously to study leadership patterns. In a study of two small communities in New York State, Blakenship observes that "there is considerable overlap in the results produced by our two measures of power . . . and in that sense leadership may be said to be homogenous: reputation and action joined."<sup>38</sup> Therefore, it is not difficult to argue that when two or more methodological approaches are employed similar results prevail. Thus elitists and pluralists though adamantly opposed may be making substantially the same observation. As Kenneth Prewitt and Alan Stone note, the findings of both approaches mean that a small group of people govern and make policy in America's cities.<sup>39</sup>

Robert Presthus in an attempt to reconcile the dispute between the two approaches makes the following observations: "to some extent, where the sociologists found monopoly and called it elitism, political scientists found oligopoly but defined it in more honorific terms as pluralism."<sup>40</sup> With these observations in mind, it is argued that a large debate persisted over what appears to be an insignificant concern because it is difficult to prescribe the one best method. Each approach should be considered in light of the findings it produces. It is also apparent that no one approach is sufficient to produce an analysis of community power.

*The Future of Community Power.* While the foregoing discussion has devoted close attention to case studies and different research perspectives of community power investigators, there is still much that is not known. Several researchers suggest some new directions in the study of power in a community. William Schultze calls for some sort of comparative phase to standardize terms and processes for selecting issues, identifying research strategies to describe relationship between leaders at various government

levels, and test the non-decision-making hypothesis.<sup>41</sup> A. M. Rose suggests ranking communities after a comparison of different approaches along an "elitist-pluralist continuum."<sup>42</sup>

David Ricci argues that the scholarship in community power studies has reached an impasse and he attributes this condition to democratic theory and the development of Liberalism in America. Both the elitists and pluralists in his words lay claim "to occupy the Center and serve its Liberalism."<sup>43</sup> As a solution, Ricci proposes that a new theory of community power be developed that maintains no ties with the current dominant research methods: "the process theory of democracy and an emphasis on issue areas of enormous importance."<sup>44</sup> The process theory operates on the assumption that democracy is defined in terms of competitive processes and Ricci contends that this assumption is accepted by both the pluralists and elitists. Their dispute focuses on the degree of fair competition in the political system at both the local and national level. Community power researchers, according to Ricci, should turn their attention to specific issue areas which pose social, economic, and political problems and sufferings and their basic research question should be: "What shall we study in relation to democracy?" This approach would allow for competitive or uncompetitive forces, i.e., democratic or undemocratic to automatically enter the picture leading to an identification of powerholders in a community.

John Walton observes that various variables such as absentee ownership, adequate economic resources, satellite status (dependent or independent), and political party competition are all indicators of a community's dependence on its surrounding environment which in turn will affect the local configuration of power.<sup>45</sup> The degree of local dependence is a determining factor in the amount of linkage community units have to outside community systems. A strong linkage may result in outside control of resources and sanctions which will affect the configuration of power in a community. For example, an analysis of the relationship between community organizations (public and private) with the national system will determine decentralized patterns of decision-making at the local level. The affect of the "vertical axis" may determine local power arrangements. Walton suggests that future research should address the vertical ties relationship to determine its impact on power competitiveness or uncompetitiveness in a community.

Robert Alford considers additional variables which may affect community decisions.<sup>46</sup> He categorizes these as long-run (structural, cultural, environmental) and short-run (situational) factors. Structural factors are the basic elements of the community such as the economic base, race, class and age of the population. Cultural factors reflect the values of the community in group solidarity, political participation, and etcetera which are expressed through laws and policies. Environmental factors constitute extracommunity activities which affect the local community system. Situa-



tional factors represent a particular sequence of events including political and social forces which bear upon and determine a particular outcome. The interplay of these factors particularly structural and cultural versus situational factors may affect the distribution of power and influence in the urban political process. Alford calls for future research to emphasize the relationship between these variables and local decision-making.

Terry Clark suggests that researchers have asked wrong and unchallenging questions.<sup>47</sup> It is his contention that investigators should not only focus on who governs but where, when and with what effects. This is to say that an analysis of community power structure must include the nature of the power structure, in what kinds of communities, and under what conditions with what consequences.

Finally, more than two decades ago, Peter Rossi recognized that the political life of a community will be the prime indicator of the pattern of community power structure.<sup>48</sup> The characteristics of local governmental institutions such as the degree of professionalization (part-time versus full-time officials), electoral rules (non-partisan versus partisan) and the number of officials the electorate may elect are important determinants in the forms of decision-making. For example, Rossi observes that the decisions of part-time officials are affected by extra-official considerations. Furthermore, and most importantly, Rossi notes that the political hegemony and 'political crystallization' of the electorate will also impact decision-making. The latter dimension considers the extent to which the lines of political cleavage coincide with class and status differences. Rossi hypothesizes that the above characteristics will determine whether community power structures tend to be polythic or monolithic and he suggests future research need to test empirically this proposition.

In conclusion, as one can see, the search for community power is far from over and because of the differing views on methods, conceptualizations, and conclusions a consensus may never be reached on the best way to measure power. Yet the study of community power can provide us with a fuller understanding of the democratic polity. The continuing search for community power has tremendous possibilities of providing new insights which can help us solve the constantly arising problems in our urban society. These possibilities, above all others, justify the continuing inquiry in this area of study.



<sup>1</sup>William L. Morrow, *Public Administration: Politics and the Political System* (New York: Random House, 1975).

<sup>2</sup>Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision-Makers* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

<sup>3</sup>See Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown and Middletown in Transition* (New York: Harcourt and Brace 1929 and 1937, respectively); W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community* and *The Status of Modern City, I and II*, "Yankee City Series" (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942 and 1945, respectively); Walter R. Goldschmidt, *As You Sow* (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1947); W. Lloyd Warner et al., *Democracy in Jonesville* (New York: Harper and Row, 1949); And August B. Hollingstead, *Elmstown's Youth* (New York: Wiley, 1949).

<sup>4</sup>However, some aspects of the reputational approach were utilized by Robert C. Angell in "The Moral Integration of American Cities," *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (July 1951): part 2.

<sup>5</sup>See R. O. Schultze and L. U. Blumberg, "The Determinants of Local Power Elites," *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (November 1957): 290-296; William H. Form and William V. D'Antonio, "Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials in Two Border Cities," *American Sociological Review* 24 (December 1959): 808-814; and D. W. Olmstead, "Organizational Leadership and Social Structure in a Small City," *American Sociological Review* 19 (June 1954): 273-281.

<sup>6</sup>William A. Schultze, *Urban and Community Politics* (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1974), p. 256.

<sup>7</sup>See Floyd Hunter, *Top Leadership, U.S.A.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959); Ferdinand Lundberg, *America's 60 Families* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1937); C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); and G. William Domhoff, *Who Rules America?* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967).

<sup>8</sup>See Ronald J. Pellegrin and Charles H. Coats, "Absentee-owned Corporations and Community Power Structures," *American Journal of Sociology* 61 (March 1956): 413-419; Robert O. Schulze, "The Bifurcation of Power in a Satellite Community," in *Community Political Systems*, Morris Janowitz ed. (New York: Free Press, 1961); D.C. Miller, "Industry and Community Power Structure," *American Sociological Review* 23 (February 1958): 9-15; and Carol Thometz, *The Decision-Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963).

<sup>9</sup>Nelson W. Polsky, *Community Power and Political Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), pp. 48-49.

<sup>10</sup>Charles M. Bonjean, "Community Leadership: A Case Study and Conceptual Refinement," *American Journal of Sociology* 68 (May 1963): 672-673.

<sup>11</sup>See Robert Dahl, "Critique of the Ruling Elite Model," *American Political Science Review* 52 (June 1958): 463-469 and Dahl, "Equality and Power in American Society," in *Power and Democracy in America* W. V. D'Antonio and H. J. Ehrlich eds. (South Bend, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1961); Nelson W. Polsky, "Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power," *American Sociological Review* 24 (December 1959): 796-803; Polsky, "How to Study Community Power; The Pluralist Alternative," *Journal of Politics* 22 (August 1960): 474-484; and Polsky, "The Sociology of Community Power," *American Sociological Review* 25 (October 1960): 636-644; and Raymond Wolfinger, "A Plea for a Decent Burial," *American Sociological Review* 27 (December 1962): 841-847.

<sup>12</sup>See Kent Jennings, *Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta* (New York: Free Press, 1964).

<sup>13</sup>Wolfinger, "A Plea for a Decent Burial," p. 485.

<sup>14</sup>Victor Jones and Herbert Kaufman, "The Mystery of Power," *Public Administration Review* 19 (Summer 1954): 205-212.

<sup>15</sup>Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott (eds.) *The Structure of Community Power* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 195-196. Similar observations are made by M. Herbert Danzger in "Community Power Structures: Problems and Continuities," *American Sociological Review* 29 (October 1964): 707-717 and A. M. Rose in *The Power Structure: Political Process in American Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).

<sup>16</sup>William V. D'Antonio and Eugene C. Erickson, "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," *American Sociological Review* 27 (June 1962): 362-376. They arrive at these conclusions after utilizing the reputational approach in a five-year study of two cities along the U.S.-Mexican borderline.

<sup>17</sup>William A. Gamson, "Reputation and Resources in Community Politics," *American Journal of Sociology* 72 (September 1966): 122.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 131. For a concise discussion of the major issues that emerged from the reputational approach during the 1950s and early 1960s see Charles M. Bonjean and David M. Olson,

"Community Leadership: Directions of Research," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 9 (December 1964): 278-300.

<sup>21</sup>See Warner Bloomberg, Jr. and Moriss Sunshine, *Suburban Power Structures and Public Education* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963); Robert Dahl, *Who Governs; Democracy and Power in an American City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961); L. C. Freeman et al, "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches," *American Sociological Review* 28 (October 1963): 791-798; Jennings, *Community Influentials*; Rosco C. Martin et al, *Decisions in Syracuse*, (Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1964); H. M. Scoble, "Leadership Hierarchies and Political Issues in a New England Town," in Janowitz *Community Political Systems*; Aaron Wildavsky, *Leadership in a Small Town* (Totowa, N.J.: Bedminster Press, 1964); and Raymond Wolfinger, *The Politics of Progress* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

<sup>22</sup>Schultze, *Urban and Community Politics*, pp. 260-261.

<sup>23</sup>Polsby, *Community Power and Political Theory*, p. 113.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>25</sup>Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Decisions and Non-Decisions: An Analytical Framework," *American Political Science Review* 57 (September 1963): 622. See also their "Two Faces of Power," *American Political Science Review* 61 (December 1962): 947-952.

<sup>26</sup>Raymond Wolfinger, "Non-Decisions and the Study of Local Politics," *American Political Science Review* 65 (December 1971): 1063-1080.

<sup>27</sup>See Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).

<sup>28</sup>Aiken and Mott, *The Structure of Community Power*, p. 197.

<sup>29</sup>See Thomas Anton, "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 7 (March 1963): 425-457; William V. D'Antonio, Howard J. Ehrlich, and Eugene C. Erickson, "Further Notes on the Study of Community Power," *American Sociological Review* 27 (December 1962): 848-854; Howard J. Ehrlich, "The Reputational Approach to the Study of Community Power," *American Sociological Review* 26 (December 1961): 926-927; Frederick W. Frey, "Comments on Issues and Non-Issues in the Study of Power," *American Political Science Review* 65 (December 1971): 1081-1101; and Andrew A. McFarland, *Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969).

<sup>30</sup>G. William Domhoff, *Who Really Rules? New Haven and Community Power Reexamined* (Santa Monica, CA.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1978), p. 113.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

<sup>33</sup>L. Vaughn Blankenship, "Community Power and Decision-Making: A Comparative Evaluation of Measurement Techniques," *Social Forces* 43 (December 1964): 207-216.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 208.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>36</sup>John Walton, "Discipline, Method and Community Power: A Note on the Sociology of Knowledge," *American Sociological Review* 31 (October 1966): 688.

<sup>37</sup>Murray Stedman, *Urban Politics*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, 1975), p. 221. This point is also supported by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras in "Community Power, Power Studies, and the Sociology of Knowledge," *Human Organization* 29 (Fall 1970): 204-218. An opposite view is taken by Terry N. Clark et al in "Discipline, Method, Community Structure and Decision-Making: The Role and Limitations of the Sociology of Knowledge," *American Sociologist* 3 (August 1968): 214-217.

<sup>38</sup>Blankenship, "Community Power and Decision-Making," p. 216.

<sup>39</sup>Kenneth Prewitt and Alan Stone, *The Ruling Elites* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973).

<sup>40</sup>Presthus, *Men at the Top*, p. 430.

<sup>41</sup>Schultze, *Urban and Community Politics*, pp. 264-265.

<sup>42</sup>Rose, *The Power Structure*, p. 297.

<sup>43</sup>David Ricci, *Community Power and Democratic Theory: The Logic of Political Analysis* (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 205.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 210.

<sup>45</sup>John Walton, "The Vertical Axis of Community Organization and the Structure of Power," *Social Science Quarterly* 48 (December 1967): 353-368.

<sup>46</sup>Robert R. Alford, "The Comparative Study of Urban Elites," *Urban Research and Policy Planning*, Leo F. Schnore and Henry Fagin eds. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1967).

<sup>47</sup>Terry N. Clark, "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where and When," *The Sociological Quarterly* 8 (Summer 1967): 291-316.

<sup>48</sup>Peter H. Rossi, "Power and Community Structure," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 4 (November 1960): 394-401.