

POLITICAL ELITE STUDIES : A SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON MAJOR CONCEPTS AND METHODS

Thavan Voratheputipong

I. Introduction

Purpose and Scope of the Study

Political elite study is a field of studies of political leadership.¹ There is a poor mesh between facts and theories in studies of political elite and power. Political elite are not carefully defined, except, frequently, in terms of power.² This paper is primarily intended to review some of the major concepts and methods for obtaining facts in political elite studies -- a field in which "theories with little factual support" -- have been replaced by masses of facts with little theoretical structure.³ What are some of the major concepts of political elite? Could the concepts of political elite be studied exclusively? Or are they closely related to other concepts and thus could not be studied separately? How could we collect facts relating to political elite studies? Is each method for collecting data adequate in itself? Or do we have to use a combination of various techniques in order to solicit more reliable facts?

We would suggest that there is basically nothing wrong with the concepts and methods. The only problem is, perhaps, they simply have not been properly fitted together in a more coherent structure. This paper attempts to reduce such a problem and also point the ways to obtaining the right facts.

Methodology

As mentioned previously, this paper concentrates on a view of some of the major concepts and methods in political elite studies. In so doing, a survey of literature on the concepts and methods is done. Since the literature on concepts and methods in the field of studies of elite is voluminous, it is, therefore, intended to review only some of the most popular literature on major concepts and methods in this field. As the topic implies this paper is a documentary research.

II. Major Concepts of Political Elite and Other

Related Concepts

Major Concepts of Political Elite

Major concepts in the field of studies of political elite can be divided into those which pertain to what elite do and those which pertain to who they are and what their place in the political structure. The term "elite" itself refer to who they are, as does the term "ruling class" or "governing class". But elite manipulate "power," "influence," and "opinion". Therefore, sometimes elite are said to have power or influence so that the set of persons comprising the elite determines the characteristics of power and its use.¹ This section discusses the major concepts of political elite.

In contrast to the concept of power, the concepts of "elite" have never been given particularly formal treatment by contemporary social scientists.² The set of indicators are important rather than the concept itself. Because of such a focus, there is much disagreement about what the appropriate set of indicators is. As Sereno comments, "We may state what an elite is, but it is much more difficult to find out who are the elite."³

There seem to be three types of definition of elite—statistical, functional, and structural. Frequently, these categories are combined, and often the definitions contain explicit or implicit propositions.

1. Statistical definition. Statistical definitions of elite are exemplified by Lasswell's definition : "The few who get the most of any value are the elite."⁴

Similar to functional definitions (to be discussed later), statistical definitions of elite are derived from classificatory concepts—i.e., the concept of elite is defined explicitly or implicitly in terms of some other primary concepts. The vagueness and variety of definitions of elite are thus caused partly by reliance upon some primary concepts—usually power or influence. As a result, the problem of finding indicators tends to be passed on to the primary concept.⁵

In principle, the measurement in statistical definitions seems to be quite straightforward. That is, one lists all persons in rank order of possession of an attribute, such as power, religiousness, or what have you. Those who are the top N per cent (N is an arbitrary number) are then called the elite.⁶

2. Functional definition. In a functional definition of elite, Rosenau seems to prefer a more specific notion of opinion maker; "Those who occupy positions which enable them to transmit, with some regularity, opinions about foreign issues to unknown person."⁷ Keller's functional definition, on the other hand, more obviously contains a fundamental proposition :

The term elite refer first of all to a minority of individuals designated to serve a collectivity in a socially valued way ---. Socially significant elite are ultimately responsible for the realization of major social goals and for the continuity of the social order.⁸

But Dahl, in his critique of the ruling elite model, defines elite as "those who more frequently make certain types of decisions."⁹ His definition of elite, thus, combines statistical and functional definitions.

Unlike the measurement in statistical definitions, the primary concept of functional definitions concerns some outputs of the elite rather than attributes of the elite themselves. To find a functional elite, all outputs of a relevant category or system are listed. Those persons who are said to have caused more outputs, or more important outputs are then called "elite." The term "importance" is defined in some way other than frequency.¹⁰

3. Structural definition. Structural definitions of elite are more likely to be complex. Because structural concepts are felt to be theoretically inadequate, other concepts, especially power and influence are usually added to the definition. Moreover, since these definitions consist of more than one concept, they either contain propositions which link the concepts, or at least the concepts imply a complex property space.¹¹ For instance, Friedrich offers an example of a structural definition as follows :

A political ruling or governing elite may be defined as follows : it is a group of persons who are distinguished by exceptional performance in politics, who effectively unite (monopolize) the rule of a particular community in their hands, who possess a sense of group cohesion and a corresponding esprit de corps, usually expressed in cooptation --- a political elite excels in the ability to secure power and rule.¹²

From the above - mentioned definition, two key concepts are invoked --- power and group. Each is defined by a series of subconcepts which require more space for a further series of implied reduction statements. A group is, thus, defined as a unit which has a high probability of possessing cohesion, an esprit de corps, and cooptation. Power is defined functionally as an output of rules or decisions, and statically as possession of the attributes of potential power and exceptional political performance. In the attribute space, formed by cross-classifying power and group, only the conjoint cell is said to be an elite, though some theorists would reserve the concept "ruling class" for this cell.¹³ Therefore, sets of persons who have power, but who are not members of a cohesive group are excluded by Friedrich from the category of elite.

Mills, on the other hand, specifically excludes the notion of a self-conscious group, a matter which he prefers to test separately.¹⁴ To him, the key structural concepts are positions or statuses. Here is his structural definition of elite.

--- the power elite, is composed of men (who) 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. ---. They are in command of the major hierarchies and organizations of modern society ---. They occupy the strategic command posts of the social structure in which are now centered the effective means of the power and the wealth and the celebrity which they enjoy.¹⁶

As may be seen from the above definition that power, though never specifically defined, is apparently the potential to make important decisions, regardless of whether such potential is actually translated into action. This definition of elite is also statistical, for it implies the proposition that in addition to power, the elite have more whether it is people want.

In brief, structural definitions seem to use more reduction statements than do pure statistical or functional definitions because they subsume such definitions. In addition to invoking some of the social conditions for power, structural definitions imply some notion of power as an effect or output as well as some statements about what is being manipulated.¹⁶ They tend to introduce another social unit—a governing or ruling class.¹⁷ In actuality, the definitions are adequately complex so that the investigator is tempted not to measure separately the implications of each reduction statement, but rather to locate the particular structural unit noted and merely announce it as powerful.¹⁸

Other Related Concepts : Power and Influence

As mentioned earlier, the concept of power seems to be responsible for many of the problems in the study of elite. This is partly because the concept lies at the very root of political theory and so each theorist tends to develop his own definition of power. For a comparison of some recent definitions of power see Riker.¹⁹ But some what different approaches are taken by sociologists. For instance, for general reviews of the concept, see Rose,²⁰ Parsons,²¹ Danzger,²² Kornhauser,²³ Spinrad,²⁴ and Clark.²⁵

However, the basic reason for the multiplicity of definitions, is that power, as it is used by social scientists, is a disposition concept. Hampel, for instance, states :

The property term "magnetic" is an example of a disposition term: it designates, not a directly observable characteristic, but rather a disposition, on the part of some physical objects, to display specific reactions (such as attracting small iron objects) under certain specifiable

circumstances (such as the presence of small iron objects in the vicinity). The vocabulary of empirical science abounds in disposition terms ----.²⁶

The property of being magnetic is obvious enough if there happens to be a small iron object in the vicinity of, say, a bar magnet. But suppose the magnet is at the bottom of a lake, how do we now define magnetism? In the same token, how can one tell if a person, role, or group is powerful? One can tell only if specified "test conditions" are met. For instance, if X and Y are in a committee-voting situation, then X is more powerful than Y if, and only if X more frequently casts the deciding vote.²⁷ This kind of partial, conditional definition is called a "reduction sentence."²⁸ Generally, the term "power" can not be eliminated in favor of the terms in the definition. Rather the "indeterminacy in the meaning of a term introduced by a reduction sentence may be decreased by laying down additional reduction sentences for it which refer to different test conditions."²⁹

Reduction sentences also imply an empirical generalization.³⁰ Let us continue with the example of power in a committee-voting situation, "the participant's chance to be the last added member of a minimal coalition ---- is highly attractive presumably because of the last added winner can control the form of distribution of the winnings."³¹ Obviously, this presumption can be empirically tested whether it is true or not.

The various definitions of power currently used by social scientists have the characteristics of reduction sentences, but they are incomplete sentences. At least six elements of power are invoked by the present literature. (But for a somewhat different dimensions of power, see Clark).³² The first three have to do with the act of power itself -- who does what to whom. The second three specify the social setting of the act -- when, where, and under what conditions it occurs. The social setting of power may be considered as equivalent to the motivation for exercising power.³³

A. The Act of Power.

1. Who is said to have power -- individual persons, roles, or statuses, or collectivities?³⁴

2. What is being manipulated -- the acts of particular people;³⁵ the utilities of people;³⁶ or the general course of events.³⁷ Although any event or any utilities can be expressed as the consequence of the acts of individual people, there seems to be a practical difference if one thinks about manipulating people, their rewards, or the course of events. If an emphasis is exclusively placed upon manipulating people, then there is a greater tendency to view power in any system as a fixed sum in which if A has a lot of power, B must have less. However, if rewards or events are manipulated, it is possible to increase or decrease the total amount of power within a system so that a change in A's power may or may not signal a change in B's relative power.³⁸

3. To whom does power have consequences -- the self, other people, or other roles, or other collectivities.³⁹ Again, systems are composed of individual units -- either people or collectivities. But there are both theoretical and practical differences if networks and systems rather than individuals are said to be affected by power.

B. The Social Setting

4. When or whether power is an ability or potential ability to have an effect or represents an actual effect.⁴⁰

5. Where -- the sectors, areas and institutional areas for which particular units can have or do have certain consequences.⁴¹ Definitions of power as the exercise of legitimate authority are especially clear as to the boundaries of power.⁴²

6. Under what conditions -- the institutional, organizational, and moral constraints on the use of power.⁴³

Given the current state of theory and data about power, the concept is specified when a set of empirically true reduction statements is developed which has something to say about each one of these aspects of power and thus specifies both necessary and sufficient conditions for its existence. Whether or not these reduction sentences or indicators are such that they yield a unidimensional concept of power, or group themselves into two or more dimensions, is a matter which must be settled empirically, and may rely upon the nature of the social system in which power is exercised. The implication for the study of power is presently obvious. A good study must have multiple indicators of power, as well as some way to test whether or not the indicators fit together.⁴⁴ The six elements of power previously discussed are not themselves reduction statements but, rather, represent a formal classification of reduction statements that have proposed in the literature.

With respect to the concept of influence, much of what has been said about power can be said about influence.⁴⁵ Similar to the concept of power, the concept of influence is also a disposition concept, and the six formal elements of power also classify reduction statements dealing with influence. If influence is said to be a "generalized mechanism of persuasion,"⁴⁶ then it is difficult in actuality to distinguish between power and influence, unless power is defined as legitimate authority only. Rose, for instance, states: "We recognize a theoretical difference between "influence" and "power," but feel obliged to blur the distinction for purposes of our study of images and perceptions of these social phenomena."⁴⁷

It is, nevertheless, a poor strategy in the study of elite to abandon the concept of influence. Because from the standpoint of the theory of action, it is very important that a person feels another has influence over him, that in a given action he "takes into account" another person's opinions or feelings, even if the final action is only partially determined by another person's wishes or opinions.⁴⁸ Influence concerns the extent to which a person provides some of the framework within which

outcomes occur, and it involves communication about values. Thus Lasswell and Kaplan define power as participation in making decisions and influence as having value position potential.⁴⁹ Since several groups in society have value potential, a study of influence tends to broaden the set of people who constitute the elite -- a consideration which leads us into the topic of elite, power elite, opinion leaders, and ruling classes,⁵⁰

III. Methods in Political Elite Studies

In section II, the major concepts of political elite studies and the problems of measurement have been discussed. Also, other related concepts, especially power and influence both of which are responsible for the many difficulties in the study of political elite have been mentioned. In this section, we will explore the chief methods in political elite studies and discuss the strength and weakness of each technique. There seem to be three major methods in use in the study of political elite -- the reputational, decisional, and positional methods.

Reputational Method

Our analysis of current methods of studying political elite begins with the one closest to the social circle method.¹ In the reputational technique, a preliminary list of the elite is constructed with the aid of informants and documents. Practically, this first list often consists of positional elite. This is because of the assumption that the best judges of who have power and influence are the power elite themselves. This list is then shown to those named on the list and perhaps to other important persons. The judges may now rank the persons on the list and/or they may be asked to name other persons who should qualify for such a list, but were not placed upon it. The other influentials who are named (or who are named sufficiently often) are then interviewed and shown the list, and they are too asked to suggest other influentials. Such a process stops when some criterion is reached, usually when a significant proportion of the same persons is repeatedly named.²

Clearly the reputational technique meets many of the requirements for circle measurement. Its most important advantage is that it can be considered a snowball sample. A snowball sample is a device for obtaining an open-ended sociometric. Beginning with a given list, usually a sample of some universe, each respondent is asked to name several others who are then interviewed and so on.³

The basic problem with many reputational studies is that they have not been formally conceptualized as snowball samples and hence have not always maintained adequate controls over the snowball process. The feeling that reputational studies err because the elite play favorites in their nominations of other elite⁴ or that they offer only perceptions of power⁵ is currently seen as an advantage rather than as a disadvantage. The "error" helps to trace the linkages in the power circle. On the other hand, some of the most serious criticism of the reputational method results from the lack of clarity with which the snowball technique is used.

Particularly, the basis on which the circle is extended is not always clear, because the reputational method attempts to discover four things simultaneously. These include the general formal structure of power, the general informal structure, the perception of formal and informal power, and the particular formal and informal interaction partners of members of the power circle. Theoretically, there is no reason why a single study can not accomplish all these aims. However, if the goals have not been properly conceptualized in advance, as they in general have not, the result is likely to be confused.⁶

Decisional Method

The decisional technique is simply another snowball sample. This method does not work with some general or hypothetical influence links, but with influence upon specific historical issues as linkages. The starting points of snowball sample are drawn in two steps. First, a list is made with the aid of documents and informants of important recent community decisions. Then, with the aid of documents and/or informants, a list is drawn of persons who are thought to have participated in the decision. Again, this often a positional list. These persons are then interviewed or documentary evidence is consulted, partly, to ascertain their exact role, if any, in the decision or series of decisions.⁷

While reputational studies usually ask respondents to rate the importance of other respondents, most decisional studies do not do the analogous thing—they do not ask respondents to rank the importance of the various decisions.⁸ But they do ask informants for a list of others who participated in the decision in certain ways. If new names not previously on the investigator's list are given by the interviewees, these new persons are also interviewed. Again, the process discontinues when some criterion of repetitiveness is reached.⁹

Once a decision study is seen as an open-ended sociometric a number of new problems emerge. By failing to conceptualize decision studies as snowball samples, investigators have tended not to conceptualize the role of the decision-maker respondent. He may be asked to act as an informant and to name people who generally participated in a decision. But he may also serve as a respondent and may report the persons who influenced him, whom he influenced, and with whom he interacted in particular ways at particular times in the decision. Although these distinctions may not matter much in a very small power elite, more complex situations will yield quite different lists of people for different modes of interaction and influence. Decisional methods thus tend to give a false sense of precision. They too are subject to sociometric "error." In addition, it is difficult to ascertain the grounds upon which persons are drawn into the sample, because the dimension upon which the snowball is expanded is usually not clearly noted. Moreover, the network aspect of decision-making is usually unavailable in decision studies. At

best, the data are examined only in terms of the overlap between participants in one decision and participants in another. Finally, the problem of sampling decisions has been often stated.¹⁰

Positional Method

The third important technique in political elite studies is positional method. Similar to other methods discussed previously, this method has used social circle methods. In the most ambitious application, closed system sociometrics are used. The entire list of positional or decisional elite derived from a previous research step is shown to those on the list who are then asked to indicate whom they know and in what capacities.¹¹ This method indeed gives closure, but apart from its cumbersomness (such as examination of the list may use up a major part of the hour or so one can get from most elite), this very closure brings about problems. Particularly, one of the chief characteristics of a social circle -- its informal boundaries -- is lost. In actuality, this means that once assembled, the initial list can not be self-correcting like that of a snowball sample. However, there are many indirect ways of demonstrating common social circle membership, and positional methods have proved most ingenious in tracking these down, though no one study has used all methods.¹²

IV. Conclusion

This paper is an attempt to survey the literature on the major concepts and methods for obtaining facts in elite studies. It is found that political elite are not carefully defined, except, frequently, in terms of other primary concepts usually power or influence. The vagueness and variety of definitions of political elite are thus caused partly by reliance upon other primary concepts and the problem of finding indicators tends to be passed on to such concepts.

Since the concept of political elite is closely related to other concepts, especially the concept of power, it is a poor strategy in political elite studies to abandon the concept of power. It is a surprise, however, to find that the current methods for studying political elite make little use of classic notions of power. This is in part because of the difficulty of applying the concept of power. Power is a disposition concept and it is most difficult to define in ways sufficiently precise so that it can be measured. As such, it can only be specified through a large series of reduction sentences.

At present, there seem to be three chief methods in political elite studies -- the reputational, decisional, and positional methods each of which has both advantages and disadvantages. Though no single study has used all these techniques, it is suggested that a combination of various methods be used so that it will be helpful to an investigator in gathering the right facts.

Footnotes

Part I

1. Glenn D. Paige, "Introduction," in Glenn D. Paige (ed.), *Political Leadership : Readings for an Emerging Field* (New York : The Free Press, 1972), p. 8.
2. Charles Kadushin, "Power, Influence and Social Circles : A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Makers," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33, No. 5 (October, 1968) : 685.
3. Dankward A. Rustow, "The Study of elites : who's who, when, and how," *World Politics* 18 (August, 1966) : 716.

Part II

1. Charles Kadushin, "Power, Influence and Social Circles : A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Makers," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33, No. 5 (October, 1968) : 685.
2. Harold Lasswell, "Introduction : The Study of Political Elites," in Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner (eds.), *World Revolutionary Elites : Students in Coercive Ideological Movements* (Cambridge : Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), p. 4; and T. B. Bottomore, *Elites and Society* (New York : Basic Books, 1964), Chapter 1.
3. Renzo Sereno, *The Rulers* (New York : Praeger, 1962), p. 79.
4. Lasswell, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
5. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 688.
6. Bottomore, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.
7. James N. Rosenau, *National Leadership and Foreign Policy : A Case Study in the Mobilization of Public Support* (Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 6.
8. Suzanne Keller, *Beyond the Ruling Class : Strategic Elites in Modern Society* (New York : Random House, 1963), p. 4.
9. For further information, please see Robert A. Dahl, "A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model," *American Political Science Review*, 52 (1958) : 463-69.
10. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 688.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 689.
12. Carl J. Friedrich, *Man and his Government* (New York : McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 316.
13. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 689.
14. C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 283.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
16. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 689.

17. For further information, please see Bottomore, *op. cit.*
18. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 689.
19. William Riker, "Some ambiguities in the notion of power," *American Political Science Review*, 58 (June, 1964) : 341-49.
20. Arnold M. Rose, *The Power Structure* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 43-53.
21. Talcott Parsons, "On the concept of political power," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power* (2nd ed., New York : The Free Press, 1966), pp. 240-265.
22. Herbert Danzger, "Community power structure : problems and continuities," *American Sociological Review*, 29 (October, 1964) : 707-717.
23. William Kornhauser, "'Power Elite' or 'veto groups'," in Bendix and Lipset, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-18.
24. William Spinrad, "Power in local communities" *Social Problems*, 12 (Winter, 1965) : 335-56.
25. Terry N. Clark, "The concept of power," in the same author (ed.), *Community Structure and Decision Making* (San Francisco : Chandler, 1968), pp. 45-87.
26. Carl G. Hempel, "Fundamentals in concept formation in empirical science," in *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, Vol. 2, No. 7 (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. 24.
27. Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 341.
28. Hempel, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-29.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
31. Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 341-42.
32. Those who are interested in a somewhat different set of dimensions, please see Terry N. Clark, "The concept of power : some overemphasized and underrecognized dimensions," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (December, 1967) : 271-286.
33. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 686.
34. In Parsons's definition (1966 : 242), the Unit could be a collectivity; in Marsh's definition (stated in Riker, 1964 : 342), the unit is a role. In most other definitions, the Unit is assumed to be an individual person.
35. Dahl as explicated in Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-343.
36. See Karlsson as quoted in *ibid.*, p. 343.
37. Shapely-Shubik as quoted in *ibid.*, p. 344.
38. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, pp. 386-87.
39. Although all definitions of power imply that the unit said to have power ultimately derives some benefit from the exercise of power, the immediate goal of the use of power differs. Riker (in Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 344.) notes that the Shapely-Shubik definition is related to ego's ability to increase his own

utility, whereas Karlsson's definition deals with ego's ability to decrease other's utilities. The implications of other definitions are not quite as clear. Parsons (in Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 244.), on the other hand, is more interested in the consequence of power for entire social system.

40. This difference lies at the crux of the argument between reputational and decisional modes of measuring power. Spinrad discusses this essentially in terms of motivation of powerful individuals or groups to intervene in any particular decision. For further information, please see Spinrad, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-28; and see also Danzger, *op. cit.*, pp. 712-14.
41. Danzger, *ibid.*, pp. 715-17.
42. See Parsons, *op. cit.*
43. See Kornhauser, *op. cit.*
44. For further detail, please see Clark, "The concept of power : some overemphasized and underrecognized dimensions," *op. cit.*, pp. 271-86; and see also the same author, "The concept of power," *op. cit.*, pp. 45-87.
45. Those who are interested in a general review of the concept of influence, please see Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, leadership, control," in James G. March (ed.), *Handbook of Organizations* (Chicago : Rand McNally, 1965), pp. 1-47.
46. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
47. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 300.
48. For further information, please see Talcott Parsons, et al, *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1954).
49. Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1963), pp. 58 and 73.
50. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 688.

Part III

1. A social circle has three defining characteristics, two of which are positive, and one, negative : (1) A circle may have a chain or network of indirect interaction such that most members of a circle linked to other members, at least through a third party. It is thus not a pure face-to-face group. (2) The network exists because members of the circle share common interests -- political or cultural. (3) The circle is not formal -- e.g., there are (a) no clear leaders, although there may be central figures; (b) no clearly defined goals for the circle, though it almost always has some implicit functions; (c) no definite rules which determine modes of interaction, though there are often customary relationships; and (d) no distinct criteria of relationship. For further information, please see Charles Kadushin, "The friends and supporters of psychotherapy : on social circles in urban life," *American Sociological Review*, 31 (December, 1966) : 786-802.

2. Charles Kadushin, "Power, Influence and Social Circles : A New Methodology For Studying Opinion Makers," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33. No. 5 (October, 1968) : 693-94.
3. Leo A. Goodman, "Snowball sampling," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32 (1961) : 148-170.
4. Robert Presthus, *Men at the Top : A Study in Community Power* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 110.
5. Arnold M. Rose, *The Power Structure* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1967).
6. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 694.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 694.
8. See Robert Agger, et al., *The Rulers and the Ruled* (New York : Wiley & Sons, 1964).
9. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 694.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 695.
11. For further information, please see Frank Bonilla and J.A. Silva-Michelena, *Politics of Change in Venezuela Volume I. : Strategy of Research on Social Policy* (Cambridge : MIT, 1967); Floyd Hunter, *Top Leadership, U.S.A.* (Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1959); and Agger, *op. cit.*
12. Kadushin, *op. cit.*, p. 695.