

*PLS 592—Structure and Distribution of Power in American Communities*

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Elite Pyramid</i>	<i>Elite Multiple Pyramid</i>	<i>Polythetic, many structures</i>	<i>Pluralistic</i>
<i>Group Domination</i>	Economic and Social Notables, Local Elite in most areas dominate	Narrow Class or Values dominate not specific elites, traditional values or social character rules	Groups that dominate vary by substantive policy area, all types of groups have power	Individuals rather than groups are more important
<i>Visibility of Decisions</i>	Covert, behind the scenes, usually not elected	Overt, elected	Combination of overt and covert	Overt, ballots, referendums, direct democracy
<i>Scope of Influence</i>	Dominate all major substantive areas	Dominate all major substantive areas	Specialized by substantive, little overlap	Areas are constantly changing
<i>Extent of Mass Participation</i>	Minimal	Some to ratify dominant values	Varies by area	Few barriers to participation
<i>Stability and Cohesiveness</i>	Stable over time	People change but values do not	Stable within areas	Unstable
<i>Other</i>	Why are so few so powerful?	How often do dominant values change?	Functional fiefdoms?	Is there a power structure at all
<i>Examples</i>	Atlanta, small towns	Homogeneous suburbs	Bigger cities	Small to medium highly educated communities

*Methodology for studying power:*

*Potential vs. Actual Power*

*Forms of power (institutional positional, reputational, personal/issue, veto*

Study decisions and participation

Study the reputation for power

Study the Organizational Charts

Participant observation and case studies

Combination of strategies

***Regime Theory, most popular in last 20 years:***

- ✍ ***Dynamics of local business and government collaboration, with business and political leaders pursuing their aims in concert and not alone. Coalitions are the heart of Regime Theory. Regime mobilizes only where consensus can be reached. It is not a zero-sum game.***
- ✍ Informal yet relatively stable group with access to institutional resources which allows them to make governing decisions
- ✍ Collaboration is formal but also informal networks
- ✍ Bridge the divide between popular control of govt and private control of resources
- ✍ Are stable and can span a number of administrations
- ✍ Distinctive policy agendas can be identified
- ✍ Configuration of participants and groups will vary from place to place, need a score-card
- ✍ Consensus formed based on interaction and structuring of resources
- ✍ May not feature complete agreement over beliefs but they have a history of regular collaboration
- ✍ Positive pro-active not negative pluralism where you merely veto things