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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In all societies a group of people consistently fulfill the essential functions of leadership. But this group in all societies—advanced and primitive, democratic and despotic, capitalist and socialist—consists of a few men who exercise great power. This is true whether such power is exercised in the name of the people or not.

A great deal of contemporary research in community politics, power and society, elite composition, power structure, recruitment, social change and leadership group, has centered around questions of: Who should rule? On the basis of what principle of selectivity should political decision-makers be chosen? How do citizens move into and out of the top circles? What social interests and political viewpoints dominate within governing groups? What criteria guard entry? Are there opportunities to rise to the top of the institutional structure of society for individuals from all classes, races, religions and ethnic groups through multiple career paths in different sectors of society? Or, are opportunities for entry into top
circles limited to white, Anglo Saxon Protestant, upper, and upper-middle individuals whose careers are based primarily in industry and finance...?

The history of political thought in large part has become the history of man's attempt to find logical and acceptable answers to these basic questions.

This present study has two major goals: First, and foremost, it tries to test several propositions about leadership with empirical data obtained in a study of local leaders and citizens in several municipalities undergoing governmental regime change as a result of Pennsylvania's "Home Rule and Optional Plans Law". In this regard, we shall contrast the social characteristics of the Study Commissioners and citizens involved in the Home Rule process. It is our aim that through this comparison we can clarify some main criteria of elite recruitment.

Second, it should be understood that a sophisticated and empirically valid theory of elite leadership requires a clear and careful analysis, interpretation and definition of the key concepts of "elite" and "power". Therefore, before moving to the focus of our study it is necessary to deal adequately with the problem of the conceptualization and definition of these concepts.
Intellectual Concerns and Theoretical Background

Elitism is not a new term nor a modern innovation. The term has been of concern to most of the political philosophers throughout the ages. Plato introduced elitism as being in the nature of biological reality, while Aristotle changed the basis of his elitism to sociological grounds by asserting that the growth of knowledge is stimulated by a leisure class that has time to think and rule.

Mosca (1939), one of the classical elite theorists viewed elitism as a logical necessity in any social organization by stating that:

In all societies from societies that are very meagerly developed and have barely obtained dawning of civilization down to the most advanced and powerful societies—two classes of people appear—a class that rules and a class that is ruled. (G. Mosca, 1939, p. 50)

For Mosca elitism is explained by the nature of social organization. Separate individuals are incapable of ruling a social system. An organized group appears to be more powerful than a single man, therefore there will always be an incentive for minorities to organize themselves in order to gain power.

Pareto (1930) viewed elite as the best in any particular field, concerned himself more with the relation between the small governing elite and the rest of
the society. According to Pareto the elite is divisible into a governing and a nongoverning section; the rest of the society forming the nonelite or mass. Pareto was particularly interested in the composition of both the elite proper and the nongoverning elites—the circulation by individuals from one to another and the gradual replacement of a governing elite by another became a method by which he explained how power in society is transferred.

Robert Michels (1966), one of the classical elite theorists tended to concentrate on a particular aspect of Mosca's general theory of "ruling class" (party leaders). He viewed structure of leadership and organization as the very basis of advanced society and which, in his opinion, necessarily entailed the existence of elites. In his account, with the growth of a sophisticated economy, characterized by the division of labor, the skills needed to organize and maintain society become highly specialized and only a small group seems to be capable of exercising them. This is true of all advanced societies, including democratic ones and leads to the establishment of elites who acquire and retain such skills.

Both the "classical" and "contemporary" theorists who discuss and describe the phenomenon of the "ruling
class" or "ruling elite" use the term in two different ways: One group of writers uses the term "ruling class" to mean that cooperating minorities consciously dominate the society—this is the conspiratorial hypothesis. Marx, Mills, Hunter and others use the term in this way. The second use of this term refers only to the fact that decisions in society will inevitably be made by minorities within the major social organizations. Here there is no assumption of purposive organization of exploitive collaboration among these different minorities. Machiavelli, Saint Simon, Raymond Aron, Dahrendorf belong to this group of writers.

It is clear, however, that central to the elite theory are the concepts of the "few" and the "many". Hamilton (1797); Bryce (1924); Mosca (1939); Lasswell (1952); set forth their reasons for believing that in all societies and organized groups decisions and direction rest in the hands of a few men. Many are those who do not participate effectively in decision-making and hence are powerless. From the elite theorists' point of view, elitism was and remains a theoretical justification for the existence of a society with ruling and ruled classes.

In adopting the notion of "few" and "many" Zeigler and Dye (1972, pp. 4-5) summarized some of the central
ideas of elite theory:

1. Society is divided into the few who have power and the many who do not. In all societies only a small number of persons can make decisions for the larger group. But it is particularly true that in large, urban, industrial, bureaucratic, and technologically advanced societies, power is organized and concentrated in a small number of individuals who occupy the top positions in the corporate, financial, government and military organizations of society.

2. The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproportionately from the upper socio-economic classes of society, and own or control a disproportionate share of societal structure--industry, commerce, finance, education, the military, communications, civic affairs, and law.

3. The movement of nonelites to elite positions must be slow and continuous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only nonelites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles. Elitism does not mean that individuals from the lower classes cannot rise to the top. In fact, a certain amount of "circulation of elites" is essential for stability of the elite system. However, only those nonelites who have demonstrated their commitment to the values of the dominant elite can be trusted with power.

4. Elites concur on the basic values of the social system and the importance of preserving the system. The range of issues on which they disagree is very narrow in comparison with the range of matters on which they agree.

5. Public policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the prevailing values of the elite. Changes in public policy are incremental rather than revolutionary, and come about when elites change their own values. These changes are slow and marginal rather than rapid and revolutionary.
6. Elites are subject to relatively little direct influence from the masses, which are largely passive, apathetic, and ill-informed. Mass sentiments are manipulated by elites more often than elite values are influenced by mass sentiments. Democratic institutions, elections, parties, and interest groups, are important primarily for their symbolic value—they help tie the masses to the political system—hence the masses have, at best, only an indirect influence over the decisions of the elite.

It seems quite clear that elite theory in its classical form is a normative theory of politics and has been of importance for social and political analysis.

Having provided a brief description of the intellectual concerns and theoretical background of elite theory, we shall consider the key concepts of "elite" and "power".

Concept of Elite

In the literature on the composition of elites, there are problems about defining precisely who the elites are. As soon as the word "elite" is used, difficulties arise since there are so many different conceptions of what the term ought to mean. For example, Lasswell and Learner (1965, p. 41) define the term by stating:

A great variety of definitions—contemplative, manipulative, conceptual and operational—have been and doubtless will be given to the elite category.... Most simply, the elite are the influential.
Suzanne Keller (1963, p. 3), the author of Beyond the Ruling Class prefers a rather mystical notion of the term:

Here the term elites refers first of all to a minority of individuals designated to serve a collectivity in a socially valued way. Elites are effective and responsible minorities—effective as regards the performance of activities of interest and concern to others to whom these elites are responsive.

Dunner (1964, p. 163) the author of Dictionary of Political Science rests content with what is perhaps the simplest and most general definition of the term:

Elite is a descriptive term designating those who hold high positions in a society. Any society will have several special elites—as many as there are values widely cherished in the society. There may be special elites by virtue of their large shares in such values as knowledge, authority, wealth. The general elite is composed of those who hold large shares in several of its major values.

In defining the concept of elite it is necessary to consider the wide range of definitions. Presumably these definitions can be divided into two major categories. The first category contains the notion of those who maintain the values of hierarchy, order and excellence—this is the normative approach. Pareto, Michels, Bottomore, Aron, and others, use the term in this way. The second group of writers uses the term "elite" to mean that those who have power are elites—power which they gain through the institutional
hierarchies of society—this is the power approach. 
Mills, Bell, Dye, and others, belong to this category.

According to the first category an "elite" is a small group of individuals within a society, who may be socially acknowledged as superior in some sense and who influence or control some or all of the other segments of the society. V. Pareto, one of the propagators of the normative approach defining the elite simply as the best in any particular field (it can be an aristocracy of saints or an aristocracy of brigands), concerns himself more with the relation between the small, governing elite and the rest of the society. In his account the elite is divisible into a governing and a nongoverning section; the rest of society forming the nonelite or mass. (Pareto, 1935, p. 2034)

C. W. Mills (1956) one of the proponents of the power approach sees an elite as those who have most of what there is to have, wealth, power and prestige, which they gain through the institutional hierarchy of society such as army, business and politics. They accept one another, understand one another, tend to work and to think, if not together, at least alike. Respectively, as Mills (1956, pp. 4-11) argues,

Elites are in positions to make decisions having major consequences. Whether they do or do not make such decisions is less important than the fact that they do occupy such pivotal positions;
their failure to act. Their failure to make decisions is itself an act that is often of greater consequence than the decisions they do make.

T. Dye (1976) defines the elite in the same way as Mills does—simply as those individuals who occupy the top positions in the institutional structure of society.

In developing an operational definition of a national elite, Dye (1976, pp. 12-13) divides society into three sectors—corporate, governmental, and public interest. In the corporate sector, Dye's operational definition of the elite is those individuals who occupy formal positions of authority in institutions that control over half of the nation's total corporate assets. The corporate sector includes industrial corporations; utilities, transportation, and communications; banking and insurance. In the governmental sector, Dye's operational definition of the elite is those individuals who occupy formal positions of authority in the major civilian and military bureaucracies of the national government. The governmental sector includes president and vice-president; secretaries; White House presidential advisors and ambassadors-at-large; congressional committee chairpersons and ranking minority committee members in the House and Senate; House and Senate majority and minority leaders; Supreme Court justices;
economic advisors and members of Federal Reserve Board. In the public interest sector, Dye's definition of the elite is those individuals who occupy formal positions of authority in the mass media, the prestigious law firms, the major philanthropic foundations, the leading universities, and the recognized national civic and cultural organizations.

From the foregoing general definitions, we can say that the economic elite consists of those who have the largest share of the privately owned or those economic assets of a society.

The term political elite means many things to different writers. A very general definition describes the political elite as:

Those with large shares in the distribution of power—whether through elective or appointive office, or indeed whether through influence exercised without office. (Dunner, 1964, p. 162)

It is clear, however, that if the term elite is used simply to denote those who occupy senior positions of formal authority in various institutions, then the characteristics of elites can be examined and their relationships to class structure analyzed. And as Aron (1967), Bottomore (1966), Giddens (1972) in their consideration of this aspect of the subject have emphasized, the problems of the recruitment, structure, and power of elites are all points for empirical
investigation.

Concept of Power

No satisfactory theory of elites is possible without a prior theory of power.

Admittedly, the systematic study of power and elites is a frustrating task. Political scientists Herbert Kaufman and Victor Jones once observed:

There is an elusiveness about power that endows it with an almost ghostly quality. It seems to be all around us, yet this is 'sensed' with some sixth means of reception rather than with the five ordinary senses. We 'know' what it is, yet we encounter endless difficulties in trying to define it. We can 'tell' whether one person or group is more powerful than another, yet we can not measure power. It is as abstract as time yet as real as a firing squad. (Kaufman and Jones, 1954, p. 202)

It seems obvious, however, that power appears to be elusive and consequently elites are difficult to identify, particularly in a society like the U.S. Scholars have faced too great difficulty in finding an operational definition that actually identifies men at power.

Elite theorists' interpretation of power in contemporary America emphasizes the following ideas:

1. High positions in industry, finance, government, education and the military involve control over the nation's resources and have, therefore, great potential of power.

2. Power is exercised when the institutional
structure of society limits the scope of public decision-making so as to prevent the consideration of issues which are seriously detrimental to the values and interests of the elite.

3. Elites are recruited disproportionately from the upper socio-economic class in society.

4. There is considerable overlap in high elite positions. Top governmental elites are generally recruited from key posts in private industry and finance, and these same men have also often held influential positions in education, arts and sciences, and social, civic, and charitable associations.

5. Economic power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of those few men who occupy key posts in giant corporations.

6. The economic system is inextricably intertwined with the political system. No clear division exists between governmental, business, and military enterprise. (Lasswell, 1965; Mills, 1956; Keller, 1963; Zeigler and Dye, 1972; Dunner, 1964)

The concept, method and distribution of locating power in Western democracies has been subject to debate and dispute since the 1950's. Those who have investigated a society's distribution of power fail to find anything resembling a ruling class, power elite or even a dominant group. Instead they generally conclude that power seems to be fragmented amongst a number of competing elite groups, none of which possess more than temporary ascendancy in more than one issue-area. Lower class groups and the mass electorate generally have some degree of influence, therefore, because they
have access to political organizations which have the capacity to override economic and cultural power. This is the political scientist's approach, the best known example being Dahl's *Who Governs?* (1964). Yet a radically different picture of the same or very similar societies has been painted by those (usually sociologists) operating with alternative concepts and methods of locating power. The "social background approach" which infers the distribution of power amongst social groups from the social origins and affiliations of those occupying, elite posts, normally concludes that power is concentrated amongst the economically dominant (Guttmann, 1963; Domhoff, 1964).

Respectively, as some scholars (e.g., Mills, 1950; Schultze, 1961; Dye, 1976; Berle, 1967) believe power does not seem to be an attribute of individuals, but rather of social organizations. Nor it is an individual act, but rather the capacity for control in society which is gained by occupying positions and roles in the social system. This nation reflects Max Weber's classic formulation of the definition of power:

> In general, we understand by 'power' the chance of a man or of a number of men, to realize their own will in a communal act, even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action. (Wever, 1946, p. 180)

"Chance" means that one must have the "capacity"
to effect his will before he can be said to have power. Viewed in this fashion, power is not so much the act of control as the potential to act—the social expectation that such control is possible and legitimate—that defines power.

Thus, as most of the scholars believe, through social institutions individuals gain power and ability to exercise it as well. Berle (1967, p. 92) in analyzing the institutional basis of power points out:

Power is invariably organized and transmitted through institutions. Top power holders must work through existing institutions, perhaps extending or modifying them, or must at once create new institutions. There is no other way of exercising power unless it is limited to the range of the power holder's fist or his gun.

Accordingly, power will denote the capacity or potential of persons in certain statuses to set conditions, make decisions, and/or take actions which are determinative for the existence of others within a given social system.

In dealing with the phenomenon of power, Giddens (1974, p. 5) argues that "we must differentiate how far power—meaning 'effective' power—is diffused in society, and how far, alternatively, it is centralized in the hands of elite groups."

It is often held, however, to be characteristic of modern societies that there are quite narrowly
defined limitations upon the areas within which elite groups are able to exercise power. Harmon Zeigler (1972, p. 6) in his consideration of this aspect of the subject has said:

For modern pluralism although political influence in society is unequal, power is widely dispersed. Frequently, access to decision-making is based on the level of interest people have in a particular decision, and because leadership is fluid and mobile, power depends upon one's interest in public affairs, skill in leadership, information about issues, knowledge of democratic problems, and skill in organization and public relations.

It is true, however, that unlike elitist theorists, pluralism believes there are multiple leadership groups within society. Those who exercise power in one kind of decision do not necessarily exercise power in others. Therefore, no single elite dominates decision-making in all issue areas.

Significance of the Problem

As a matter of fact the universality of the inevitability of elites are prominent themes in the works of scholars throughout the ages. Perhaps the significance of elites is well stated in a passage from Kenneth Prewitt and Alan Stone (1973, pp. 2-5):

The history of politics is the history of elites. To understand the culture of society is to first understand the character of the ruling elite; to describe social change is to first describe changes in the structure and the composition of the ruling elite; to explain social policies
is to first explain the commitments of the ruling elite.

This paper attempts to contribute to a more complete view of elite leadership by analyzing the social background of the "home rule elite" and contrasting them with citizens.

The significance of this study relied on the following facts: First, this study tries to deal seriously with the problem of the definition of "elite" and "power". As a matter of fact, in most of the studies about elite recruitment, authors move to the focus of their articles before they deal adequately with the problem of the conceptualization and definition of "elite" and "power". Second, not much attention has been directed toward the "home rule elite". This study focuses mainly on social characteristics of "Home Rule Study Commissioners" and examines the criteria of elite recruitment as well.

The study of the social backgrounds of decision-makers in "home rule process" may contribute to a deeper understanding of the actions and decisions of those in positions of political authority. Studies of recruitment are important and necessary because since they document the differential distribution of life-chances, they analyze a key link between elites and class structure.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The main purpose of this chapter is to review empirical literature on elite recruitment.

Methods and assumptions in studies of elites fall generally into four categories—the institutional approach, concerned with the leaders of important social institutions, the recruitment approach, concerned with the social background and characteristics of incumbents in elite positions, the reputational approach, a sociometric selection of influentials, and the decision-making approach, the reconstruction of those taking part in the resolution of a major issue. The first two methods, favored by sociologists, start from an assumption about who the elites are, based on previous information and theory. In the latter two approaches used most commonly by political scientists, the purpose of the research is to determine who the elites are. Since the purpose of this study was to examine the social characteristics of the elites involved in the "home rule" process in Pennsylvania, it might appear that our study was within the recruitment approach.

Recruitment approach focuses mainly on the social background and characteristics of incumbents in elite
positions. This approach begins with an assumption about who the elites are, in accordance with previous theory and information. The impact of social background upon the recruitment of political decision-makers, elites' usual skills and personality characteristics, and the effects of these characteristics on the conduct of government are of primary concern to this approach.

Recruitment approach, however, has received some criticism from some scholars. Beth Mintz (1976), Peter Freitag (1976), Carol Hendricks (1976), Michael Schwartz (1976), have argued that investigations of social background have limited utility in relation to the power structure debate. This approach, as some scholars point out, when used as a primary research strategy can neither resolve the debate nor address the general question of who wields power. It has been argued that "social background approach do not take into account the possibility that individuals may not, in all cases, represent the social groups from which they are recruited." (Mintz, Freitag, Hendricks, Schwartz, 1976, p. 314)

The analysis of social backgrounds, however, does not mean that this approach has no utility whatsoever. Their impact has been and can be very great, when viewed in the proper perspective. It can be useful in dealing
with specific issues implicit in elite research. The value of this type of method is found in its ability to disprove certain subarguments used to describe the broader theories: Matthews (1954, pp. 4-5) argues that:

The study of the social backgrounds of political decision-makers contributes to a deeper understanding of the actions and decisions of those in positions of political authority. This type of study can provide the foundation for a clear appreciation of the decision-making process and why decision-makers decide the way they do. It may make it possible for political scientists to derive a more reliable picture of how decision-makers are selected. It may contribute another perspective to the study of the relationship between social and political change.

Finally, the value of this approach is found in its ability to demonstrate the existence of blocks to access to public office and to explain why most people are not decision-makers rather than why a few people are.


These studies consistently show that top
institutional leaders are atypical of the American public. They are recruited from the well-educated, prestigiously employed, older, affluent, urban, white, Anglo-Saxon, upper and upper-middle class male populations of the nation.

Virtually all contemporary theorists of elite recruitment fall into three major categories: First, the ideas of Mosca, Mills, Hunter, Matthews, Galbraith, and Dahl as well as the theories of stratification, suggest that in a society with a class or caste system, political decision-makers normally will be selected from among those individuals of high social status. Second, writers as different in background and approach as Machiavelli, Bertrand Russell, Timasheff, and Lasswell, assert that political decision-makers normally will possess a political personality. They argue that an individual becomes a political decision-maker because of certain personal qualities or traits. Allport (1924, pp. 422-423) sees these qualities in physical strength, ascendance, high mobility, energy, restraint, intelligence, tact, social participation: for Bogardus (1942, p. 12) these qualities are: imagination, foresight, flexibility, versatility, and inhibition. Stogdill (1948) concludes that the characteristics most often associated with leadership are capacity, achievement,
responsibility, participation, and status. Third, the same group of thinkers make the common sense point that political decision-makers must possess certain skills and capacities in order to achieve their positions, and they suggest that the skills required for adequate performance of the job are changing. For example Morris Janowitz (1960) sees a shift from authoritarian domination to greater reliance on manipulation, persuasion and group consensus in the military establishment. Lasswell views a shift from skill at persuasion to skill in coercion. Pareto in a more elaborate theory predicted much the same development.

Social Status, Skills, Change in Required Skills for Adequate Performance and Elite Recruitment: Review of Some Works

In many discussions about elite recruitment writers as different in background and approach as Mills, Hunter, Matthews, Dahl, Galbraith, and Janowitz and others, argue that political decision-makers normally will be chosen in accordance with their social status and the skills required for the adequate performance of the job. C. W. Mills (1956) has been concerned with the social backgrounds of decision-makers. He has reasoned that if decision-makers can be shown to come from the same elite social or economic background, that they
will exhibit a uniform orientation representing the needs of that small elite.

In his view, the period in America since World War II has been dominated by the ascendence of corporation and military elites to positions of institutional power. These "commanding heights" allow them to exercise control over the business cycle and international relations. Power elites, according to Mills (1963, pp. 4-11), monopolize sovereignty in that political initiative and control stem mainly from the top hierarchical levels of position or influence through the communications system, the elite facilitates the growth of a politically indifferent mass society below the powerful institution.

In an influential book on power in Atlanta, Georgia, entitled Community Power Structure, sociologist Floyd Hunter (1953) described a pyramidal structure of power and influence in which most of the important community decisions are reserved for top-layer business and financial leadership. According to Hunter, admission to this circle of influentials is based primarily on position in the financial community. Hunter explains that the top power structure concerns itself only with major policy decisions and that the leadership of various substructures--economic, governmental, religion, educational, professional, civic, and cultural--then
communicate and implement those policies. In Hunter's description, decisions tend to float down from top policy-makers to government officials who then implement programs. According to Hunter, elected public officials are clearly part of the lower level institutional substructure that executes policy rather than formulates it.

In his significant study of power in New Haven, Connecticut, *Who Governs*, political scientist Robert Dahl (1961) admits that community decisions are made by "tiny minorities" who are not representative of the community as a whole in terms of social class. However, Dahl challenges the notion that the community elite system is pyramidal, cohesive, and unresponsive to popular demands. Dahl has studies major decisions in urban redevelopment and public education in New Haven, as well as the nominations for mayor in both political parties, and has identified a polycentric and dispersed system of policy-makers. Influence is exercised from time to time by many elites, each exercising some power over some issues but not over others. The business and financial elite, for example, is only one of many influential groups. Dahl admits that leaders are of higher social status than the rest of the community and that such people possess more of the skill and quality required of democratic leaders. Obviously, Dahl's New
Haven parallels the pluralist model, but it is important to observe that it is not a democracy in the sense of complete participation. Not all of the citizens of New Haven participate fully in the decisions that effect their lives, and not all of the citizens have a relatively equal opportunity to influence public policy.

Political scientist Donald Matthews in the now classic study, *The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers* (1954) provides convincing evidence that America's governmental leaders are drawn from the upper socio-economic strata of society. "The log cabin to White House myth is rather far from the truth.... For the most part, political decision-makers are far from the common man, in either their origins, or their achievements." (D. Matthews, 1954, p. 28)

Matthews documents these conclusions with data on the background of presidents, vice presidents, cabinet officials, high-level civil servants, U.S. Senators and congressmen, state governors and legislators. However, at the end of this study, he has added a little essay discounting the importance of his own findings. True to the pluralist tradition, Matthews argues that the class character of America's decision-makers is largely irrelevant and simply reflects the natural process of political recruitment in America. He also argues that
the unrepresentative nature of America's political
decision-makers does not free them from their account-
ability to the electorate.

Economist, diplomat, and presidential advisor,
John K. Galbraith (1967), whose own elite credentials
are impeccable, describes the interrelatedness of the
corporate and governmental "technostructure" in The
New Industrial State. Government and business, he
observes, are not really competitive. The modern cor-
poration and the state are inextricably associated with
each other. The line between public and private au-
thority in America is "indistinct and in large measure
imaginary". But he acknowledges that "this runs strong-
ly counter to the accepted doctrine" of pluralism, but
proceeds to accurately analyze the inter-dependent and
noncompetitive corporate and state relationships in
America.

In a thoughtful book on the American military,
entitled, The Professional Soldier, sociologist Morris
Janowitz (1960) carefully reviews the image and the
modern military establishment. Janowitz observes that
the traditional, stern, ethnocentric, narrow, authori-
tarian, military leader has been replaced in modern
times by a highly skilled, technically competent,
management-oriented, politically aware, public-relations
conscious, organizational leader. There has been a change in the basis of authority and discipline in the military establishment, a shift from authoritarian domination to greater reliance on manipulation, persuasion, and group consensus. There has been a narrowing of differences between military and corporate and governmental leadership. The traditional "military mind" so frequently ridiculed by liberal commentators, is no longer an accurate portrait of the modern professional military leader. But the passing of the traditional military figure may mean more, rather than less, military influence in national affairs, because the new professional soldier is much more conscious of his broad relationship with government and society. As a result of the complex machinery of warfare which has weakened the line between military and nonmilitary organization, the military establishment has come to display more and more the characteristics typical of any large scale organization.

Virtually all these studies agree that in a society with a class or caste system, elites are drawn normally from among wealthy, educated, well-employed, socially prominent "WASP" groups in society. Top institutional posts go to individuals who possess outstanding skills of leadership, information, and knowledge, and the
ability to communicate and organize. Finally, opportunities to acquire such qualities for top leadership are unequally distributed among classes. But lower class origin, the "pluralists" believe, is not an insurmountable barrier to high position (T. Dye, 1976, p. 148).

It is obvious, however, that recent social and economic changes stemming from the industrial revolution have had and will continue to have great impact on the characteristics of political decision-makers and on the way they perform their duties. Burnham sees the rise to political power of managers, Lasswell of military men and other coerçers, Mannheim, the rise of demagogues. While their predictions differ, they are all based on the conclusion that modern conditions place a heavy strain on political democracy and the democratic way of selecting political decision-makers. They point out many threats to democracy— incompetent decision-makers, irrationality, apathy, a lack of responsiveness and accountability to popular opinion, and suggest the crucial importance of competitive access to positions of authority and the existence of a pluralistic society as antidotes to political oligarchy.

Certainly the principal reason for the social political scientists interest in social backgrounds has been
to obtain thereby a better understanding of the behavior of decision-makers in office and a great insight into why they decide as they do. It was hoped that the consideration of the human factors would rescue political science from legalistic formalism. Taken as a whole, the research done on social backgrounds has not lived up to these expectations. Sometimes a new formalism of facts and figures has merely replaced the older legalism. Studies like Bailey's Congress Makes a Law and Truman's The Governmental Process, show that social background data, when used in conjunction with more conventional material and approaches, can help explain why important decisions are made. (See S. K. Baily, 1950 and D. Truman, 1951)

Hypotheses

A large part of the history of politics has been the story of elites. Man was always interested in asking such a question: "What kind of men become political decision-makers?"

Donald R. Matthews once wrote that:

This question cannot be answered by the assiduous collection of facts alone. Facts do not speak for themselves. Some kind of theorizing is essential to the development of knowledge. No one is able to appeal facts or see their significance without a theory or an hypothesis. (D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 6)
In our endeavor to find out the types of men who become political decision-makers, we are concerned that the facts make some sense. This can be done through analysis which selects and orders the fact according to certain criteria.

Therefore, the first step in an attempt to answer our question must be to examine the existing theories and hypotheses concerning the social backgrounds of political decision-makers. Furthermore, it is clear that a great deal more than relatively high social status is required in order to become a political decision-maker. Thus, other social requirements—age, sex, residence, political activity, etc.—often have as great influence on political opportunities as the class structure.

In order to give a clear picture of the elite recruitment pattern, in our attempt to describe the social characteristics of the "home rule elite" and contrast them with citizens, the primary focus will be based on the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis I - The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher educational level, on the average, than will registered voters.

Education is one of the crucial factors which has a great impact on elite recruitment.

Education seems to be especially important as a
prerequisite for demanding political jobs; several studies show that persons holding important public office are very likely to be well educated (college and professional degrees). (A. Anderson, 1953; Buck, 1953; Dogan, 1961; Schlesinger, 1957; Valen, 1961)

Education shows a consistent and significant positive relationship with each of the specific political acts and participation. (Agger and Goldrich, 1958; Agger and Ostrom, 1956; Agger, et. al., 1964; Allardt and lesonen, 1960; Almond and Verba, 1963; Benny, et. al., 1956; Berelson, 1954; Buchanan, 1956; Chambill, 1954; Converse and Dupeux, 1961; Dahl, 1961; Gronseth, 1955; Jensen, 1960; Key, 1961; Kornhauser, 1956; Kuroda, 1964; Lane, 1954; Lipsat, 1960; McPhee and Glaser, 1962; M. Miller, 1952)

Investigators and researchers have found that education has a greater impact on political behavior than the other components of SES (income and occupation). Why does education have such a strong effect on political behavior? The answer is simple. Because as L. W. Milbrath (1965, pp. 122-123) stresses:

1. The more educated person is more aware of the impact of government on the individual than in the person of less education.

2. The more educated individual is more likely to report that he follows politics and pays attention to election campaigns that is the individual of less education.
3. The more educated individual has more political information.

4. The more educated individual has opinions on a wider range of political subjects; the focus of his attention to politics is wider.

5. The more educated individual is more likely to engage in political discussions.

6. The more educated individual feels free to discuss politics with a wider range of people. Those with less education are more likely to report that there are many people with whom they avoid such discussions.

7. The more educated individual is more likely to consider himself capable of influencing the government; this is reflected both in responses to questions on what one could do about an unjust law and in respondent's scores on the subjective competence scale.

8. The more educated individual is more likely to be a member--and an active member--of some organization.

9. The more educated individual is more likely to express confidence in his social environment; to believe that other people are trustworthy and helpful.

Hypothesis II - The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher occupational level, on the average, than will registered voters.

Occupation is possibly of considerable importance in elite recruitment. Research upon the connections between inter and intra generational mobility indicates that what is most significant in determining the career chances of an individual is the occupation he attains on his initial entry into the labor market. (P. Blau and O. D. Duncan, 1962)
Goldthorpe has suggested what purports to be the sociology of elite may become just the sociology of occupations. (J. Goldshorpe in his discussion paper at Cambridge Elites Conference, see R. E. Pahl and J. T. Winkler, "The Economic Elite: Theory and Practice, 1974, p. 121.)

In many discussions about elite positions and power, many sociologists have assumed that those in elite roles had power by virtue of their office.

The more important the office, the higher the social status of its normal incumbents. Thus, incumbents in the top offices are mostly upper and upper-middle class people. (L. H. Zeigler and T. R. Dye, 1973, p. 75)

Occupation is a somewhat more tricky variable to interpret than education or income. What kinds of occupational distinctions are meaningful, and how can one compute quantitative differences in occupation (as one can for income and education)?

One way of handling occupation is to rank the statuses of the various occupations. Occupations closer to the center usually are perceived as having higher status than those on the periphery (L. W. Milbrath, 1965, p. 124). Usual way to create a status ranking is to have a random sample of citizens rate the prestige of occupations. Such ratings have quite high inter-rate
reliability, suggesting that there are widely shared beliefs about the prestige of occupations. Thus, persons of higher occupational status are more likely to participate in politics (Agger and Ostrom, 1956; Berelson, 1954; Banham, 1952; Buck, 1963; Campbell and Hahn, 1952; Dahl, 1961; Gronseth, 1955; Lane, 1959; McPhee and Glaser, 1962).

The following four criteria presented by Milbrath (1965, p. 125) theoretically seemed important in determining whether a person in an occupation would become active in politics, were used to create an index of occupational propensity toward politics.

1. Does the job provide an opportunity (freedom of schedule and blocks of time) for political action?

2. Does the job require or develop skills (largely verbal) that can be transferred to politics?

3. Is the job sufficiently affected by political decisions that job occupants would feel it important to become active in politics to protect or enhance their positions?

4. Does the position become vulnerable if the occupant engages in politics; in other words, might a job holder have to pay a cost in anxiety or defense if he should participate?

Specific jobs were rated as high, medium, or low on each of the criteria by a board of judges. Simple weights were applied (1, 2, 3, with scoring for the last criterion reversed, and scores were summed for the four criteria). Lawyers, as an example, were scored high on
the first three criteria, but medium on the last. (L. W. Milbrath, 1965, p. 125)

Turning now to somewhat more specific occupations, several studies show that professional persons are the most likely to get involved in politics (Anderson, 1935; Buck, 1963; Guttsman, 1951; Jensen, 1960; M. Miller, 1952; Schlesinger, 1957). The Evenson survey showed professionals most likely to be active in politics, followed by businessmen, lawyers, clerical, skilled, and unskilled workers in that order. (Jensen, 1960) Almost half of the state governors in the United States from 1870 to 1950 (456 of 995) were practicing lawyers. (Schlesinger, 1952)

Perhaps the best way to place in proper perspective the impact of class structure upon the recruitment of political personnel, is to note that other social factors such as age, sex, marital status, religion, race, residency, trust, political participation and membership in voluntary associations, etc., have a substantial effect as well.

These variables not only clarify the channels and patterns of entry to elite position, also they represent elite and nonelite characteristics.

Hypothesis III - The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold high income level, on the average, than will registered voters.
Involvement in decision-making also is affected by membership in voluntary associations. Private associations serve as major channels for involving people in politics. They are the mechanisms for creating and maintaining the consensus necessary for a democratic society (S. M. Lipset, 1960, p. 7). These organizations serve a number of functions: they are a source of new opinions; they can be the means of communicating ideas to a large section of the citizenry; they train men in political skills and so help to increase the level of interest and participation in politics. (S. M. Lipset, 1960, p. 52) Men who belong to associations are more likely than others to give the democratic answer to questions concerning tolerance and party systems, to vote to participate actively in politics. Since the more well-to-do and better educated a man is, the more likely he is to belong to various voluntary organizations. The propensity to form such groups seems to be a function of level of income and opportunities for leisure within given nations. (E. Banfield, 1958)

The fact that membership in non-political voluntary associations is class-linked has important political consequences. W. L. Warner has documented the important role of those organizations in linking the citizens to other community institutions. (W. L. Warner, 1941,
Those participating in one specific type of organization were more likely to be active in others, to attend political meetings, to read more, to have more friends, and so on. (S. M. Lipset, 1960, p. 202)

Hypothesis V - The Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, be older than will registered voters.

One of the most striking characteristics of American political decision-making is their advanced age. (D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 33) Presidents are most often elected to office when they are from 55 to 59 years of age, and a vast majority of Supreme Court Justices, Senators, Representatives, and top-level civil servants are over 50. (H. C. Lehman, 1953, pp. 163-164; C. A. M. Eving, 1938, p. 69; R. Bendix, 1949, p. 23; M. McKinney, 1942, p. 68)

Younger people are not likely to become enmeshed in politics until they have become established in a job, a home, and start to raise a family. (L. W. Milbrath, 1965, p. 133) Involvement in decision-making and political participation rise gradually with age, reaches its peak and levels off in the forties and fifties, and gradually declines above sixty. (Allardt and Buurn, 1956; Benny, 1956; Campbell, 1960; Jensen, 1960; Kurada, 1964; Lipset, 1960)

Hypothesis VI - A greater proportion of males will be found among Home Rule Study Commissioners than will be among registered voters.
The traditional division of labor which assigns the political role to men rather than women, has not vanished. The finding that men are more likely to participate in politics than women, is one of the most thoroughly substantiated in social science. (Agger, 1964; Allardt, 1956; Almond and Verba, 1963; Kurada, 1964; Lane, 1959; Pesonen, 1960; Pesonen, 1961; Rakkan, 1962)

Until recently women were unknown among the decision-makers, and more than thirty years after the granting of federal suffrage, very few can be found in high public office. (D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 33) Benny and Geiss (1950), Berelson (1954) and Lazarsfeld (1944) have found that men are more likely to be psychologically involved in politics than women.

Taken together, this age and sex discrimination limits the number of Americans with good chances of becoming decision-makers as much as, or even more than class discrimination.

Hypothesis VII - Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, have lived longer in their communities than will registered voters.

Another variable that effects the involvement in decision-making is the length of residency. Milbrath (1965, p. 133) argues that,

Persons who are well integrated into their community tend to feel close to the center of community decisions and are more likely to participate in politics.
One evidence of this is that the longer a person resides in a given community, the greater the likelihood of his involvement in decision-making process. (Agger, 1964; Allardt and Bruum, 1956; Birch, 1950; Buchanan, 1956; Lane, 1950; Lipset, 1960)

Similarly it seems that high public officials originate in unusually large numbers in rural areas and small towns, and that those with early urban environments suffer from a political disadvantage. On the other hand, disproportionately large numbers of political decision-makers reside in urban areas and are as a group more geographically mobile than the average American. (M. Smith and M. L. Brockway, 1940, pp. 511-525; D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 78; R. Bendix, 1949, p. 27)

Hypothesis VIII - A greater proportion of Home Rule Study Commissioners will be Protestant than will registered voters.

Involvement in politics and decision-making is also affected by religion. An American's chance of becoming a decision-maker is heavily influenced by his religion. (D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 26) "If you aspire to political-elite status" points out Prewitt and Stone (1973, pp. 137-138), "it is advantageous to be Protestant (and more specifically, of Episcopalian or Presbyterian upbringing)."

Matthews (1954, p. 86) has found that Protestant
denominations with congregations of high social status (Congregational, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Unitarian) possess about twice the number of Representatives and Senators of the 81st Congress they would have if Congressmen were completely representative in their religion. The Methodists, Lutherans, and Baptists have about the right number. On the other hand, Roman Catholics have only $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ and Jews $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{6}$ the number of Congressmen they should have if the Congress is to be a religious cross section of the nation. "As far as the Senate and House," writes Matthews, "are concerned, a Protestant has better than average opportunities while Catholics and Jews have more limited ones." (D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 25)
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter explains the procedures used in data collection, measurement of the variables, and the data analysis.

Data

The data were originally obtained in a study of local leaders and citizens in several Pennsylvania municipalities undergoing governmental regime change as a result of Pennsylvania's home rule and optional plans law. Telephone and personal interviews were used for obtaining necessary information from randomly chosen samples of registered voters in seven Pennsylvania municipalities during 1972-1974. In the original research a combined panel and cross sectional design was utilized. The wave of interviews were held during the two different periods. The first interview was held during the two-week period just before the November, 1972, election. The sample of 100 in each municipality (State College, McKeesport, Penn Hills Township, Allegheny County, and Ferguson Township) was interviewed over the telephone.

The second wave of interviews were held in the same
municipalities just before November, 1973, and in the spring, 1974. Like the first interview, the second survey made contact with 100 people in each municipality. Interviews were also held in November, 1973, and in the spring of 1974 in Bellefonte and O'Hara Township. A sample of 100 in each municipality was interviewed over the telephone. Respectively, for each one of these municipalities the number of cases appeared to be: 90 and 87.

The main purpose of the survey was to examine the general attitude of people toward the "home rule" issue. Moreover, a series of extensive personal interviews with various community leaders, major municipal officials and the study commission members were held in each municipality during the two-week period before the second balloting. The main purpose of the survey was to create a picture of the kinds of people that comprise a study commission and the values, interests, and backgrounds they shared.

The seven Pennsylvania municipalities that were chosen for study were quite diverse. These municipalities include:

1. Allegheny County - The largest municipal unit in Western Pennsylvania, is a highly urbanized county. Pittsburgh is the dominant city of Allegheny County. The size of population is over 1.6 million. Major features of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County are those...
of heavy industry specialty, steel and aluminum, and financial activity. Democratic Party is the dominant party in the county and three elected county commissioners govern the county.

2. O'Hara Township - is located within Allegheny County as a suburban community. O'Hara is characterized as a residential suburb of Pittsburgh and geographically divided by the borough of Fox Chapel. It is center for some technological industries and financial activity. O'Hara has a population size of over 9,000 which is growing rapidly. O'Hara is predominantly Republican and is governed by a five member township commission.

3. Penn Hills Township - is a residential suburb of Pittsburgh. It is a center for some industrial and commercial activity. Penn Hills is among the largest townships in terms of population in the Commonwealth with a population of 63,000. It is predominantly Democratic and is governed by nine township commissioners elected by word.

4. The City of McKeesport - center for a steel industry is an older city with a population of 38,000 which has experienced general economic and population decline over the past decades. It is predominantly Democratic and is governed by a commission form of government.

5. The Borough of State College - is the center of the Pennsylvania State University. State College is the largest municipality in Center County with a population of 34,000. Democratic Party is the dominant party in State College. The borough is governed by a mayor-council form of government with an appointed manager handling all administrative duties.

6. Ferguson Township - is typified by its agricultural land, forest area, and small villages and, recently by rapidly growing residential developments. With a population of 6,500, Ferguson is heavily Republican and governed by three supervisors elected at-large.

7. The Borough of Bellefonte - is an older and
more established community with a population of 6,800. Bellefonte has a few small industries. It is predominantly Republican and governed by a major-council form of government.

**Operationalization of Variables**

**Education**

In measuring the level of education, the number of years of formal schooling was used. Thus, the level of education will be operationalized by the following item:

How many years of education have you had?

**Income**

In operationalizing income, the annual family income is considered. This item will be measured by the following question:

What was your approximate family income for the past year--before taxes?

- ( ) Less than $5,000
- ( ) Over $5,000
- ( ) Over $10,000
- ( ) Over $15,000
- ( ) Over $20,000
- ( ) Over $25,000

**Organizational Membership**

In measuring this item, the total number of organization memberships will be used without considering the kind of organization. Choices of response are divided into three levels: (1) no organization membership,
(2) one organization membership, and (3) two or more organization membership.

**Occupation**

In measuring occupation the prestige level of occupation is used. Thus, the two-digit occupational classification of the 1960 Hodge-Siegel-Rossi prestige scores will be utilized.

**Religion**

Religion will be identified as the church preference. Choices of response are divided into four types: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or no preference. This item will be operationalized by the following question:

Do you have a religious preference?

( ) Yes  ( ) No
If yes, specify______________

**Length of Residence**

This item will be measured by the number of years that the respondent had spent in his/her community.

**Sex**

Sex of respondent was simply recorded by the interviewer.
Age

Respondents were asked the year in which they were born.

Method of Data Analysis

Research studies differ in such things as the type of data collected, the kind of measurement used, and the nature and the number of groups used. These factors help decide which statistical test is appropriate for a particular research study.

The present study concerns itself with two independent groups, namely the study commissioners and the citizens. The major aim of the study is to examine the social characteristics of the study commissioners and contrast them with citizens.

Since the nature of data determine the level of measurement, it appears that except for sex, religion and income, the measurement is at the interval level. Thus, variables like education, age, occupation, prestige, length of residency, organization membership are treated as interval data. On the other hand, sex, religion, and income are treated as categories and are measured at the nominal level.

Consequently, the nature of the data and the level of measurements make the t-test and chi-square
appropriate choices as statistics for this study.

Use of the t-test requires that we assume: the two groups are independent; the populations are both normally distributed and have the same variances; and the samples are drawn at random. It should be mentioned that, although in reality these assumptions are impractical, for technical reasons we make these assumptions. For instance, in reality these two groups are not completely independent. Commissioners are also citizens of their communities and, in theory, eligible to be elected for the citizen sample. In fact, the small size of the commissions group kept this from occurring.

The purpose of using a t-test is to determine whether the mean of the group I (citizens) is significantly different from the mean of the group II (study commissioners).

Since three of our hypotheses are measured at the nominal level (e.g., sex, religion, income), we shall make use of chi-square test in order to test these hypotheses. The purpose of the chi-square test is to determine whether there is a significant difference between the frequencies expected under independence and the observed frequencies in our categories.

It should be mentioned that in both the case of the t-test and chi-square, .05 will be used as the
level of significance.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

This chapter will present data relevant to the major hypothesis as well as an interpretation and discussion of these data. In doing so, we shall describe and analyze the social characteristics of Study Commission members as well as citizens. Finally, tests of research hypotheses will be carried out by comparing the characteristics of study commissioners and citizens.

Social Characteristics of Home Rule Study Commissioners

The data indicate that in certain respects the Study Commissioners did differ markedly from citizens in our seven municipalities.

Education, a first measure of social status, illustrates the relatively high social status of the Study Commissioners (see Table 1). Two point five percent of the Study Commissioners only have a less than high school education, 8.5% have at least high school education, but 13% possess a college degree and 76% have gone beyond the college degree and done some advanced or graduate work.
**TABLE 1**

Education of Study Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced or some education beyond college</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 120

Just as Study Commissioners tend to be drawn from the upper education strata, they also appear to be fairly well-off financially (see Table 2). Only 1% of the Study Commissioners have a less than $5,000 yearly income, 6% have at least over $5,000 and 14% possess over $10,000 annual income, but 31% have a yearly income $15,000 and 48% have gone beyond $20,000 yearly income.
TABLE 2  
Income of Study Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $15,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $20,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $25,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113

Although a very wide range of occupations such as professors, teachers, public officials, housewives, laborers, engineers, clergymen, newspapermen, social workers, and others were included among the study commissions, the most common occupations of study commissioners were those of businessman and lawyer (see Table 3). More than 56% of the commission members were either businessmen or had professional occupations; 26% had semi- or nonprofessional occupations, but 18% had only low-status professions.
TABLE 3
Occupation of Study Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business - Professional</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi- or Nonprofessional</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-status</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 101

As the data reveal, a typical commission member is a middle-aged male. The average age of the members was generally in the mid-forties ($\bar{x} = 45$). Of those who gained a seat on a government study commission, 82% were male.

The data also indicate that the commission members were long-term residents of their community. The mean score of length of residency for the study commissioners was 27.

As is shown in Table 4, a high proportion of study commissioners are Protestant (46%), 22% tend to be drawn from Catholic domination and only 10% of study commissioners are Jews, but 17% of the members have no religious preference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion of Study Commissioners</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious preference</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 101

The data also indicate that study commission members appear to be among the most active members of their communities. Most of them have had extensive involvement in organizations and many have been involved in local governmental matters (see Table 5). Twenty-three percent of commission members belong to one or two organizations, 42% have membership in 3 or more organizations, and 35% belong to 5 or more.
TABLE 5
Organization Membership of Study Commissioners

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 112

Social Characteristics of Citizens

As previously mentioned in certain respects the social characteristics of citizens differed markedly from study commissioners. The data indicate that in contrast to the commission members citizens have relatively low education and social status (see Table 6). Only 22% percent have a less than high school education, 43% have at least high school education, but only 15% have a college degree and 20% have gone beyond the college degree in their education.
TABLE 6

Education of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced or some education</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 352

Just as citizens tend to be drawn from the lower education strata, they also appear to have low income rate (see Table 7). Twenty-four percent only have a less than $5,000 yearly income, 25% have over $5,000 and 26% possess at least over $10,000 annual income, but 13% only have yearly income over $15,000. As the data reveal only a small proportion of citizens (12%) have had yearly income over $20,000.
TABLE 7
Income of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $15,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $20,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $25,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 406

Although a very wide range of occupations existed in citizens, over half of them (60%) indicated that they have low-status occupations. Twenty-three percent of citizens had either semi- or nonprofessional occupations and occupations of 17% of citizens were those of businessmen or professionals.
TABLE 8
Occupation of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business - Professional</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi- or Nonprofessional</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-status</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 284

The data indicate that the average age of citizens was 45. Sixty-six percent of them were male and 34% were female. Compared with the commission members, citizens were not long-term residents of their community ($\bar{x} = 24$). As is shown in Table 9, 38% of citizens are Catholics, 41% are Protestant, 2% are Jews and 16% have no religious preference.
TABLE 9
Religion of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion of Citizens</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious preference</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 457

In contrast to the commission members, citizens do not appear to be active in their communities. As is shown in Table 10. Citizens were not as likely as the study commissioners to be involved in several organizations. Over 2/3 (62%) of citizens indicated that they belong to no more than 1 or 2 organizations, but 23% were active in 3 or more organizations and 15% were members of 5 or more organizations.
TABLE 10
Organization Membership of Citizens

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 556

In summary, all of the evidence points to the generalization that in terms of occupational, income and education status, the commission members tended to rank toward the upper status levels more than did citizens. In contrast to citizens, the study commissioners were long-term residents of their communities. They also tended to be much more organizationally involved than citizens and many had previous governmental experience.

Having offered a comparative profile of the study commission members and citizens; we now turn to an examination of our research hypotheses.

**Research Hypothesis I:** The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher Educational level, on the average, than will registered voters.
Result:  No. of Cases  Mean  S.D.  Degree of  One
          Freedom  Tail Prob.
Group I  531  13.8512  3.263  128.64  0.000
(Citizens)
Group II 121  17.4050  8.265
(Study Commissioners)

Statistical Decision: Since our one tail probability (0.000) is smaller than our predetermined level of significance (.05), we reject the null hypothesis. Thus, the results show that there is significant difference between Group I and Group II mean scores, that is, Group II has higher education, in average, than Group I.

Research Hypothesis II: The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold a higher occupational level, on the average, than will registered voters.

Result:  No. of Cases  Mean  S.D.  Degree of  One
          Freedom  Tail Prob.
Group I  410  49.2171  17.280 144.78  0.003
(Citizens)
Group II  96  54.6042  16.064
(Study Commissioners)

Statistical Decision: Since the predetermined level of significance (.05) is greater than one tail probability (0.003) we tend to reject the null hypothesis in the favor of the research hypothesis. Therefore, the results depict that Group II, on the average, has higher occupational prestige score than Group I.
Research Hypothesis III: The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher income level, on the average, than will registered voters.

Result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I (Citizens)</th>
<th>Group II (Commissioners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>20% (81)</td>
<td>.90% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>24% (98)</td>
<td>6.20% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000</td>
<td>28.30% (115)</td>
<td>14.0% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $15,000</td>
<td>14.90% (60)</td>
<td>31.0% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $20,000</td>
<td>12.80% (52)</td>
<td>47.80% (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 106.93 \]
\[ df = 4 \]
Level of Significance = .05 Table Value = 9.49

Statistical Decision: Since our chi-square value (106.93) is greater than table value (9.49) under predetermined level of significance, we tend to reject the null hypothesis in the favor of research hypothesis. Thus, according to results the difference between level of income in both groups is not due to chance and there is a real difference between them. That is, a higher level of income will be found in Group II than in Group I.
Research Hypothesis IV: The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold more memberships in voluntary associations, on the average, than will registered voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result: No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I (Citizens)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1.6705</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II (Study Commissioners)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.0357</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Decision: Since our predetermined level of significance (.05) is greater than our one tail probability (.000) we tend to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis. Therefore, the results depict that Group II, in average, has higher organizational membership than Group I.

Research Hypothesis V: The Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, be older than will registered voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result: No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I (Citizens)</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>47.3396</td>
<td>15.008</td>
<td>184.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II (Study Commissioners)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45.8319</td>
<td>12.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Decision: Since our one tail probability (0.1345) is greater than the predetermined level of significance (.05) we must retain the null hypothesis. Thus, the results show that the difference between average age of two groups is not so great as to be
statistically significant. It is also in the wrong direction. Commissioners were slightly younger, on the average, than citizens.

Research Hypothesis VI: A greater proportion of males will be found among Home Rule Study Commissioners than among registered voters.

Result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.7% (715)</td>
<td>81.6% (111)</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.3% (373)</td>
<td>18.4% (25)</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n^2 = 13.912 \]
\[ df = 1 \quad \text{Level of significance} = .05 \quad \text{Table value} = 3.84 \]

Statistical Decision: Since our chi-square value (13.912) is greater than table value (3.84) under predetermined level of significance (.05), we tend to reject null hypothesis in the favor of research hypothesis. Thus, according to results the difference between proportion of males in both groups is not due to chance and there is a real difference between them. That is, a greater proportion of males have been found in Group II than in Group I.
Research Hypothesis VII: Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, have lived longer in their communities than will registered voters.

Result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I (Citizens)</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>24.4102</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>186.97</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II (Study Commissioners)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>27.1111</td>
<td>19.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Decision: Since our one tail probability (0.090) is greater than predetermined level of significance (.05) we must retain the null hypothesis. Therefore, results depict that the difference between average length of residency of two groups is not so great as to be statistically significant. The difference is however, in the right direction.

Research Hypothesis VIII: A greater proportion of Home Rule Study Commissioners will be Protestant than will registered voters.

Result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I Citizens</th>
<th>Group II Commissioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>41.6% (190)</td>
<td>45.5% (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Protestant</td>
<td>58.4% (267)</td>
<td>54.5% (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n² = .533</td>
<td>100% 457</td>
<td>100% 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n² = .533 df = 1 Level of significance = .05 Table value = 3.84
Statistical Decision: As results depict, the table value (3.84) under predetermined level of significance (.05) is greater than our chi-square value (.533). Therefore, we must retain the null hypothesis. That is, the difference between the proportion of Protestants in both groups is not statistically significant. Again, however, the difference is in the right direction.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

What we have attempted thus far in this thesis, can be briefly summarized. The general goal of this study can be seen as two-fold. One aim was to contrast the social characteristics of the Study Commissioners and Citizens involved in the Home Rule process through testing several propositions and thereby, clarify some main criteria of elite recruitment. A second aim of this study was to explore certain notions centered around the ideas of "elite", "power" and "leadership structure". Stated another way, we felt that before moving to the focus of our study, it was necessary to deal adequately with the problem of the conceptualization and definition of the key concepts of "elite" and "power".

In this study we provided a brief discussion of the intellectual concerns and theoretical background of elite theory. Major classical and contemporary elite theories were discussed and their implication to the empirical studies were analyzed. We found that, in the literature on the composition of elites, there were problems with defining precisely who the elites are. In order to avoid misunderstanding, confusion and
disarticulation, we tried to divide these definitions into two major categories—the normative approach and the power approach.

According to the normative approach an elite was a small group of individuals within a society who maintain the values of hierarchy, order and excellence and who influence or control some or all of the other segments of the society.

The power approach, on the other hand, defined an elite simply as those individuals who occupy the top positions in the institutional structure of society. We found that the later definition of the term was more commonly used and accepted in the contemporary literature on the elite studies than was the former definition. Finally, we reached a conclusion that if the term elite is used to denote those who occupy senior positions of formal authority in various institutions, then the characteristics of elites can be examined and their relationship to class structure analyzed.

In dealing with the phenomenon of power, we faced a great difficulty in finding an operational definition that actually identifies men of power. In contrast, we did find out that power does not seem to be an attribute of individuals, but rather of social institutions. It seemed to be the capacity for control in
society which is gained by occupying positions and roles in the social system. Accordingly, it was concluded that power will denote the capacity or potential of persons in certain statuses to set conditions, make decisions, and/or take actions which are determinative for the existence of others within a given social system.

We argued that methods and assumptions in elite studies fall generally into four categories: The institutional, the recruitment, the reputational, and the decision-making approaches.

Since the purpose of this study was to examine the social characteristics of the study commissioners and citizens involved in the home rule process, it appeared that our study was within the recruitment approach. This approach, as was discussed earlier, focuses mainly on the social background and characteristics of incumbents in elite positions. This approach begins with an assumption about who the elites are, in accordance with existing theories and information. The value of this approach was found in its ability to demonstrate the existence of blocks to access to public office and to explain why most people are not decision-makers.

After carefully analyzing and contrasting the
existing theories and researches regarding the variety aspects of leadership, several propositions were generated and formulated for this study. It should be mentioned that we were not able to test all the hypotheses drawn from the existing theories because of the limitation of our data. The hypotheses tested in this study were:

1. The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher educational level, on the average, than will registered voters.

2. The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher occupational level, on the average, than will registered voters.

3. The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold higher income level, on the average, than will registered voters.

4. The Home Rule Study Commissioners will hold more memberships in voluntary associations, on the average, than will registered voters.

5. The Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, be older than will registered voters.

6. A greater proportion of males will be found among Home Rule Study Commissioners than among registered voters.

7. Home Rule Study Commissioners will, on the average, have lived longer in their communities than will registered voters.

8. A greater proportion of Home Rule Study Commissioners will be Protestant than will registered voters.

This study made use of data which were originally collected in order to study local government change with
respect to home rule in seven Pennsylvania municipalities. Telephone interviews were used for obtaining necessary information from randomly chosen samples of registered voters in those municipalities during 1972-74. A combined cross-sectional and panel design was utilized in the original research. The main purpose of the survey was to examine the general attitude of people toward the "Home Rule" issue.

Moreover, a series of extensive personal interviews with various community leaders, major municipal officials, and the study commission members were held in each municipality during the two-week period before the second balloting. The main purpose of the survey was to create a picture of the kinds of people that comprise a study commission and the values, interests, and backgrounds they shared.

The seven Pennsylvania municipalities that were chosen for study were quite diverse. These municipalities included: Allegheny County; O'Hara Township; Penn Hill Township; the City of McKeesport; the Borough of Bellefonte.

In this study the t-test and chi-square test were used in testing our hypotheses.

The data indicated that in certain respects the Study Commissioners did differ markedly from citizens
in our seven municipalities. The data revealed strong support for most of the hypotheses. Only in three cases the data depicted no support for the hypotheses.

In accordance with the results drawn from the data, the Home Rule Study Commissioners did hold higher educational level, income, occupational prestige score, and organizational membership, on the average, than did registered voters. Also the data revealed that a greater proportion of males have been found among study commissioners than among registered voters.

As was pointed out earlier, in three cases the hypotheses were not supported. The data revealed no support for differences in age, length of residency and religion between study commissioners and registered voters.

Contradictory to hypothesis V, the difference between average age of two groups was not so great as to be statistically significant. Commissioners tended to be slightly younger, on the average, than registered voters. Also there was a lack of support for the hypothesis VII. The difference between the average length of residency of two groups was not so great as to be statistically significant. Finally, the data revealed no support for the hypothesis VIII. The difference between the proportion of Protestants in both
groups was not statistically significant, although slightly more of the study commissioners were Protestant than were registered voters.

Conclusion

The empirical evidence presented in Chapter IV supports five of the eight hypotheses tested in the current study. It can be concluded that the study commissioners tend to differ markedly from citizens in certain respects. Specifically, the study commissioners tended to have higher socio-economic status (as measured by education, occupation prestige, and income) and to possess more memberships in voluntary associations than did registered voters. In addition, there was a greater proportion of males among the study commissioners than was among registered voters. However, they did not differ in a statistically significant sense from registered voters in terms of age, average length of residency, and religious background.

Hypothesis I which predicted that the study commissioners will hold higher educational background, on the average, than will registered voters, was supported by the data. This finding is consistent with findings of previous studies (e.g., A. Anderson, 1953;

All these studies point to the fact that education is one of the important factors which has a great impact on elite recruitment. It seems to be especially important as a prerequisite for demanding political jobs. Persons holding important public office are very likely to be well educated (college and professional degrees). Education also shows a significant and consistent positive relationship with each of the specific political acts and participation and has a greater impact on political behavior.

Hypothesis II, which predicted that the study commissioners will hold higher occupational prestige, on the average, than will registered voters, was supported by the data. The most common occupations of study commissioners were those of businessman and lawyer. More than 56% of commission members were either lawyers and businessmen or had a prestigious professional occupation (see Table 3 in Chapter IV).

It is true that occupation is of considerable importance in elite recruitment. It was pointed out
earlier that many sociologists, especially the advocates of the "power approach", have assumed that those in elite roles had power by virtue of their office.

Our finding is, however, consistent with findings of previous studies (e.g., Schlesinger, 1952; Miller, 1952; Campbell and Hahn, 1952; Anderson, 1955; Agger and Ostrom, 1956; Schlesinger, 1957; Jensen, 1960; Dahl, 1961; Blau and Duncan, 1962; Lane, 1962; Milbrath, 1965; Zeigler and Dye, 1973; Goldthorpe, 1974).

These studies indicate that occupation has a greater impact on political behavior and there are widely shared beliefs about the prestige of occupations, that is, persons of higher occupational status are more likely to participate in politics. These studies also point to the fact that the incumbents in the top offices are mostly upper and upper-middle class people.

Turning to somewhat more specific occupations, our finding is consistent with findings of several studies (Anderson, 1953; Buck, 1963; Guttsman, 1951; Jensen, 1960; Miller, 1952; Schlesinger, 1957; Matthews, 1954; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; Dye, 1976), indicating that professional persons are the most likely to get involved in politics and to be recruited for the higher positions, followed by businessmen, lawyers, clerical, skilled and unskilled workers in that order.
Hypothesis III, which predicted that the home rule study commissioners will have higher incomes, on the average, than will registered voters, was supported by the data. More than 48% of the study commissioners had a yearly income over $20,000, but only 12% of citizens had more than $20,000 annual income. This finding is consistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g., Riesman and Glazer, 1950; Miller, 1952; Matthews, 1954; Gronseth, 1955; Agger and Ostrom, 1956; Campbell, 1960; Lipset, 1960; Dahl, 1961; Valen, 1961; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; Dye, 1976).

It is true that wealth plays a significant role in political behavior. Previous studies reveal that income is positively correlated with political participation and recruitment. Their prediction along with ours, is consistent with a notion that in the capitalist culture which has evolved in America since the industrial revolution, wealth means importance, accomplishment, and achievement. And the universality of this belief helps to make it so.

Hypothesis IV, which predicted that the study commissioners will hold more memberships in voluntary associations, on the average, than will registered voters was supported by the data. Study commission members appeared to be among the most active members.
of their communities. Most of them have had extensive involvement in several voluntary organizations and many have been involved in local governmental matters. More than 77% of them belonged to 3 or more organizations. In contrast, registered voters were not as likely as the study commissioners to be involved in several organizations. Only 38% of them were active in 3 or more voluntary associations. This finding appears to be consistent with the findings of other studies (W. L. Warner, 1941; B. Banfield, 1958; S. M. Lipset, 1960; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; T. Dye, 1976). These studies indicate that involvement in politics and decision-making is affected by membership in voluntary associations. These associations serve as major channels for involving people in politics. They are one of the major mechanisms for creating and maintaining the consensus necessary for a democratic society. Major functions of these organizations, according to these studies are: They serve as a source of new opinions; they can be the means of communicating ideas to a large section of the citizenry; they train persons in political skills and so help to increase the level of interest and participation in the politics.

Hypothesis V, which predicted that the study commissioners will, on the average, be older than will
registered voters, was not supported by the data. The study commissioners appeared to be slightly younger, on the average, than citizens. This finding, however, appears to be inconsistent with the findings of other studies (e.g., C. A. M. Eving, 1938; M. McKinney, 1942; R. Bendix, 1949; H. C. Lehman, 1953; D. R. Matthews, 1954; Allardt and Buurn, 1956; Benny, 1956; Campbell, 1960; Jensen, 1960; Lipset, 1970; Kurada, 1964; Milbrath, 1965; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; T. Dye, 1976). These studies, however, point to the fact that one of the most striking characteristics of American elites is their advanced age. Involvement in politics and recruitment for higher positions, as is indicated by above studies, rise gradually with age, reaches its peak and levels off in the fifties and gradually declines above sixty.

Hypothesis VI, which predicted that a greater proportion of males will be found among home rule study commissioners than will be among registered voters, was supported by the data. More than 80% of the studies commissioners were male, as compared with 65% of registered voters of the same sex. This, perhaps, points to the fact that the traditional division of labor which assigns the role of political decision-making to men rather than women, has not vanished. Our finding is consistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g.,
Lazarsfeld, 1944; Benny and Geiss, 1950; Berelson, 1954; Lane, 1959; Pesonen, 1960; Pesonen, 1961; Rakham, 1962; Almond and Verba, 1963; Agger, 1964; Kurada, 1964; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; T. Dye, 1976). The finding that men are more likely to participate in politics than women, is one of the most thoroughly substantiated in social science.

The exact reason for sex differences in political participation and recruitment is not clear. One factor involved may be the nature of the division of labor and assignment of the political role to men rather than women. Moreover, Benny and Geiss, 1950, have found that men are more likely to be psychologically involved in politics than women.

Hypothesis VII, which predicted that the home rule study commissioners will, on the average, have lived longer in their communities than will registered voters, was not supported by the data. Although the results were in the anticipated direction, the difference between average length of residency of two groups was not so great as to be statistically significant. The study commissioners, however, appeared to be slightly long-term residents of their community than did registered voters.

This finding, in statistical sense, however, is
inconsistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g., M. Smith and M. Brockway, 1940; R. Bendix, 1949; Lane, 1950; Birch, 1950; Matthews, 1954; Buchanan, 1956; Allardt and Bruum, 1956; Lipset, 1960; Agger, 1964; Milbrath, 1965; Prewitt and Stone, 1973; Dye, 1976).

As these studies point out, the length of residency is one of the important variables which effects the involvent in decision-making and politics. The longer a person resides in a given community, the greater the likelihood of his/her involvement in decision-making process. Furthermore, several studies\(^1\) have found that a disproportionately large number of political decision-makers are long-term residents of their communities and are as a group more geographically mobile than the average citizens.

Although the results were in the anticipated direction, Hypothesis VIII, which predicted that a greater proportion of home rule study commissioners will be Protestant than will registered voters, was supported by the data. The commissioners, however, appeared to have more Protestant denomination, on the average, than did registered voters. But this difference was not so great as to be statistically significant.

\(^1\) See for example, M. Smith and M. Brockway, 1940, pp. 511-525; D. R. Matthews, 1954, p. 78; R. Bendix, 1949, p. 22.
In spite of lack of support for this hypothesis, an alternative explanation of the current findings is available.

Among the home rule study commissioners per se, Protestant denominations possessed about 46% of the number of the commission members. This finding is consistent with the findings of several studies.\(^1\) Overall contention of these studies is that, religion heavily affects both political participation and political recruitment. Also an individual's chance of becoming a political decision-maker is heavily influenced by his/her affiliation to the Protestant denomination. Prewitt and Stone (1973, pp. 137-138) conclude that it is advantageous to be Protestant and more specifically of Episcopalian or Presbyterian upbringing, if one aspires to political-elite status.

The exact reason for religious differences in political participation and recruitment is not clear. But, as some studies indicate, a Protestant has better than average opportunities in achieving political-elite status, while Catholics and Jews have more limited ones.

As was previously pointed out, this research began to contrast the social characteristics of the study commissioners and citizens involved in the home rule

process through testing eight hypothesis. These hypothesis were generated from the theoretical propositions and related literature previously discussed. Also, it was hypothesized that by examining some of the social background variables and empirically measuring their importance, it would be likely to clarify some major criteria of elite recruitment.

The empirical evidences presented in this study revealed that the study commissioners tended to differ markedly from citizens in several respects. The results drawn from the test of hypotheses depicted that the study commissioners tended to have higher socio-economic status (as measured by education, occupation prestige, and income) and to hold more memberships in voluntary associations than did registered voters. Moreover, there was a greater proportion of males among the study commissioners than was among registered voters. All these findings, as was noted earlier, were consistent with the findings of previous studies.

Surprisingly, inconsistent with the findings of previous studies, the home rule study commissioners did not differ in a statistically significant sense from registered voters in terms of age, length of residency and religious background.

From the foregoing evidences drawn either from this
study or others, it is generalizable that:

1. On the basis of certain principals of selectivity political decision-makers are chosen/recruited.

2. Political decision-makers are not typical of the average citizens who are governed.

3. Not only are the decision-makers generally drawn/or recruited from the upper socio-economic classes of society, they are unrepresentative in terms of family background, social status, sex, formal education, occupation, organizational membership, level of income, religious background, race, age, length of residency, political connections, and viewpoint.

4. There are unequal opportunities to rise to the top of the institutional structure of society for individuals from all classes, races, religions and ethnic groups. And unequal opportunities illustrate the basic principal of elite recruitment in a democracy.

Thus, some social and political scientists have been led to suggest that the process by which elites are recruited is a highly selective one in that it tends to

---

1 Contradictory to the findings of previous studies, the home rule study commissioners were representative in terms of religious background.

2 This variable was not included in this study.

3 Inconsistent with the findings of previous studies, home rule study commissioners were representative in terms of age.

4 Contradictory to the findings of previous studies, the commissioners were not unrepresentative in terms of length of residency.

5 Both variables were not included in this study.
produce a body which is at once homogenous and unrepresentative of the societies of which it is a part. French political scientist, Maurice Duverger (1951, p. 133) has gone still further and claimed that "the leadership of political parties...is democratic in appearance and oligarchic in reality." Some argue, however, that regardless of the oligarchic nature of political leadership, decision-makers can be representative of the societies of which they are a part.

Most studies point to the fact that elite group develops its own patterns of communication, interests and goals, techniques for self-perpetration and social-izing of newcomers. Above all, the elite is supposed to be socially congruent and unrepresentative of the societies of which it is a part. Thus, the elite as a single self-conscious group develops its own self-interest orientation, becomes, to quote Samuel J. Eldersveld (1974, p. 118) "a social class in its own right, and uses a variety of clever tricks to exploit the party and keep the rank and file at bay".

Whether the recruitment of elites is democratic in appearance and oligarchic in reality or the elite as a single self-conscious group develops its own self-interest orientation, few can agree that the political decision-makers are typical of the average citizens.
Our aim in this study was not to prove or disprove the democratic or oligarchic nature of elite recruitment, but rather was to contrast and compare the social characteristics of elites and nonelites.

Our endeavor in this study was to clarify some major factors involved in elite recruitment. Data limitation and lack of sufficient information, however, did not allow us to take into account all the possible effective and important variables involved in elite recruitment. It is quite obvious that the process in which the recruitment of decision-makers occur is a multidimensional one. Prewitt (1965, p. 96) suggests that existing hypotheses about political recruitment and socialization can be divided into four types.

1. Hypotheses stressing the relationship between the stratification system and leadership selection.

2. Hypotheses stressing the tendency for persons with skills appropriate to the functional needs of society to be recruited for political posts.

3. Hypotheses stressing the self-selective tendencies of certain types of people.

4. Hypotheses stressing the frequent and intimate contacts of a small portion of the general population with political matters.

Most of the studies about elite recruitment and socialization, including the current study, fall into the group one (hypotheses about the relation of social
stratification to political recruitment).

Although only a few studies can be placed into three other Prewitt's classification, these hypotheses appear to have an equal importance in elite socialization and recruitment as compared with Prewitt's first classification. For example, self-selective tendencies of political leaders and more specifically Harold Lasswell's ideas about a political personality type as well as differential socialization experiences, in my opinion, are critical variables for leadership selection. Because, not many but few percentage of the population is in frequent and intimate contact with political matters and as Prewitt (1965, p. 109) suggests "these most likely to select themselves or to be selected for public office are those overexposed to politics as youth or adults".

Moreover, other variables such as political trust, ethnic background, elite schools, and above all, political viewpoints may well play a significant role in socialization and recruitment of decision-makers. Specially political belief appears to be a critical variable in recruitment process. According to Prewitt and Stone (1973, p. 159) "social origin, status, and achievement do not guarantee entry, because not only who you are and what you achieve, but what you believe
operate as screening and selecting devices". As was mentioned earlier, the process of elite socialization and recruitment is not a one-dimensional process and variety of factors can be accounted for this process. Due to the nature of the data, the current study was unable to formulate and to test empirically all the important and critical hypotheses about socialization and recruitment of the home rule elite. What we did was to generate some hypotheses from major elite theories and research and then test them against the real world. In this regard, several variables were emphasized. They include: education, level of occupation, income, organization membership, age, sex, length of residency, and religion.

No doubt the above variables are critical in the recruitment process, but one should admit that they are not the only factors involved in this process. As was pointed out before, other factors must be considered and tested. Future studies, perhaps, can include all possible and available variables important to elite recruitment and socialization. Stated another way, every dimension of the process of elite recruitment and socialization must be realized and accounted for. If so, then one can admit that there is a reliable ground for establishing a conclusive pattern of elite socialization.
and recruitment.

The present study in spite of its limitation, however, has been worthwhile. First, it attempted to compare and contrast the social characteristics of home rule commissioners with that of registered voters. Second, it tried to indicate that the home rule elite tends to differ markedly from registered voters in certain respects. Third, it indicated that on the basis of certain principle of selectivity home rule commissioners are recruited. Fourth, this study tried before moving to the focus of its study to deal adequately with the problem of the conceptualization and definition of the key concepts of "elite" and "power". Fifth, it attempted to establish some new possible directions for future research. Sixth, it did find a conclusive support for most of the proposed hypotheses. Finally, if one accepts that a fundamental objective of the social science is to test plausible theories against the real world, this thesis could be interpreted as an attempt to do so.

While the relationships found in this research were rather strong and significant and there was conclusive support for most of the hypotheses, replication is always desired. Also it would be helpful to have some research conducted similar to this study but in a
different setting with a different dimension of socialization and recruitment. For example to what extent are self-selective tendencies of political leaders and differential socialization experiences critical variables for leadership selection?

Although there exists a good deal of empirical research about elite socialization and recruitment, few can be convinced that, as a whole, they have advanced knowledge about political behavior. Most of them can not be compared to each other except in the most superficial ways since key terms such as elite and socialization are used differently. Rustow (1966, p. 716) points out that

Most recent students of elites, however, have lacked the intellectual breadth and sophistication of Michels or Lasswell, let alone of Marx. Theories with little factual support therefore have been replaced by names of facts with little theoretical structure.

Clearly the investigation of elite socialization and recruitment deserve great attention from social and political scientists. Obviously, the possibilities for additional research in this area are numerous and require further theoretical sophistication and empirical investigation.
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