

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF TEXAS COMMUNITY WATER LEADERS:
A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

by


Martha A. Copp

Department of Sociology

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the
University Undergraduate Fellows Program

1983-1984

Approved by:



Dr. Ruth C. Schaffer



Dr. Albert Schaffer

April 1984

ABSTRACT

TITLE: Toward A Typology of Texas Community Water Leaders: A study of Leadership characteristics.

FELLOW: Martha A. Copp, Sociology major

ADVISORS: Drs. Ruth and Albert Schaffer, Professors of Sociology

The project will analyze data on water leaders in Texas communities involved with developing and constructing U.S. Army Corps of Engineers water projects. Socioeconomic characteristics, extent of power both within and outside the community, interaction with significant others, and evaluation of contributions made to water project completion will be the focus of analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisors, to whom I am most indebted, for their encouragement and support. Dr. Ruth Schaffer helped me in so many directions at once. I am glad she accepted the responsibility of being my mentor and instructor for these eight to nine long months.

I would also like to commend the University Undergraduate Fellows Program for making our transitions as Fellows as painless as possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
INTRODUCTION	1
AREAS AND EMPHASIS OF RESEARCH	2
THE TYPOLOGY AS A THEORY AND RESEARCH TOOL	3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
METHODOLOGY.	8
1973 Methodology.	8
Data Base.	8
1983 Methodology.	9
Updating the data.	10
DATA AND ANALYSIS.	12
Description of the Sample	12
Characteristics of the Study Sample	14
Age Distribution	14
Sex Distribution	14
Educational Attainment	14
Income Distribution.	15
Occupation	19
Organizational Membership.	23
Board Membership	25
Bank Board Membership.	26
Prestigious Boards and Office Membership	30
Leader Arena of Influence.	33
Water Leader Level of Contact.	35
TYPOLGY OF COMMUNITY WATER LEADER CHARACTERISTICS	38
CONCLUSION	39

TABLES

1	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES IN 1973	16
2	SEX DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES	17
3	DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAIN- MENT IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES	18
4	DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS BY INCOME LEVEL IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES	21
5	DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES BY OCCUPATION.	22
6	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH WATER LEADERS BELONGED FOR THOSE LEADERS WHO REPORTED DATA ON THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION.	24
7	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WATER LEADERS HOLDING BOARD MEMBERSHIPS WHO PROVIDED DATA ON THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION.	27
8	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WATER LEADERS HOLDING POSITIONS ON BANKS BOARDS WHO PROVIDED THIS ORGANIZATIONAL DATA. . .	29
9	NUMBER OF PRESTIGIOUS BOARD MEMBERSHIPS OR OFFICES HELD BY WATER LEADERS BY COMMUNITY	32
10	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF COMMUNITY/DAM WATER LEADERS WITH INFLUENCE ON THE LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS . . .	34
11	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF COMMUNITY/DAM WATER LEADERS BY THE NUMBER OF LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL CONTACTS. . . .	37
	REFERENCES	42
	VITA	44

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF TEXAS COMMUNITY WATER LEADERS:
1
A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

INTRODUCTION

Water is the only natural resource that is past, present, and future, all at once. It is one of the most vital issue areas of our society because it may act as a catalyst in almost every social situation of economic import. In the movie Chinatown, we see a fictionalized version of California water politics; brutal in the extreme, but not too far removed from the fact that water is essential in and of itself. In practically every state, interested groups of people initiate action on water resources that will either make or break their communities--either they will get the water they need and they grow or they do not and they decline, seeing the water go to someone else as their community is left far behind.

Within those interested groups of people who are working to get water, certain individuals stand out. In Chinatown, it was a vicious sort of character who was in control. Elsewhere, and "elsewhere" means Texas, there were certain individuals who were driven less rapaciously and more altruistically. These were men who pushed and prodded their local communities and government agencies to begin water resource development projects.

These special individuals are what I mean by "water leaders." They are a very unique group of individuals whose personal characteristics are of primary interest to me in my research project. Very few studies of water leaders have been made, but the existence and uniqueness of water leaders is not to be questioned (Schaffer, Schaffer, and Halter, 1981). The factors identified that make these leaders stand out in their communi-

1 The style used is that of the American Sociological Review.

ties will be used in developing a typology of the Texas community water leader.

AREA AND EMPHASIS OF RESEARCH

The focus of interest in this study were the approximately sixty community "water leaders" responsible for the development and construction of six major water projects by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Texas between 1939-1974. Knowledge of, and primary data on these leaders came from an interdisciplinary dam impact study to which Dr. Ruth Schaffer had contributed in 1973. The study is discussed in greater detail below. The socioeconomic background of these leaders, the extent of their power within and outside their communities, and their interaction with other water leaders was investigated. The significance of their contribution is known: the construction of these major water projects was due to their actions.

Socioeconomic background characteristics included age, sex, education, income, organizational affiliations, occupation, and previous leadership roles. The extent of power² possessed by each leader was determined by exploring their significant contacts with local, state, and national leaders. Significance of leader contributions was measured by their role in the completion of the projects. With this data in hand, comparisons of leaders at different levels of community influence and in different sized communities were made with the objective of developing a typology of leadership in the water field.

Original data for the study were collected from three major sources: files of public and private organizations such as municipal departments (mayor's office, water, utility), county clerks, and the Chambers of

² Power was defined as the leaders' ability to get other individuals, groups, or organizations to do as they wish.

Commerce; questionnaires administered to leaders from dam communities; and seventy indepth interviews with community leaders and agency personnel concerned with project development and nondevelopment, such as the various river authorities and the Corps of Engineers. The fifty-six leaders of particular research interest to me were selected for interviewing by a combination of positional, decisional, and reputational techniques. The following methodological steps were undertaken: (1) review and content analysis of 70 leader interviews; (2) tabular and statistical analysis of data on leader characteristics from the 1973 and 1984 studies (described below); (3) use of Who's Who's in the Southwest, Texas Banking Directory, Chamber of Commerce file materials, etc.; (4) leader interviews in the 1983-84 study for recovery of vital 1973 leader information; and (5) development of a leadership typology.

THE TYPOLOGY AS A THEORY AND RESEARCH TOOL

Typologies, or "constructed types" have been used in sociology and other academic disciplines for a long time. A typology is a classification device that clarifies and gives meaning to diverse but interrelated objects or phenomena. It is an abstract construct that tries to reflect a "generalized reality" of items or events that could not otherwise be compared or evaluated.

John C. McKinney (1966) defines the typology, or the constructed type, as "a purposive planned selection, abstraction, combination, and (sometimes) accentuation of a set of criteria with empirical referents that serve as a basis for comparison of empirical cases." Later on he adds, "The constructed type is a pragmatically devised system of characteristics, made up of abstracted elements and formed into a unified conceptual pattern

wherein there may be an intensification of one or more attributes for purposes of utility."

The tradition of typology formation has been integral to the development of sociology and many other disciplines. A great number of frequently-occurring concepts can be viewed as typologies that envelop variations of empirical reality. For example, the concepts of professionalism and violence can vary along a continuum. If placed in a relationship together, they can be used to form a typology that can envelop practically all forms of criminal behavior. Each of the two concepts can vary independently; at different locations on the continuum one can have an unprofessional thug, a pickpocket, or a member of the mafia.

Typologies have been frequently employed in both theory construction and in empirical research. A third area of use of the typology is in the application of the knowledge which such a constructed type imparts. For instance, marketing has benefitted enormously from the use of typologies in targeting advertisements on potential populations--populations that were unreachable until research determined the nature of the characteristics which they held in common.

Another application of typology can be found in the biological sciences, particularly in the taxonomy of plants and animals. In this field, "type specimens" are used as measuring devices against which other forms in the population can be compared. The type specimen is an empirical form of typology in that it is comprised of a set of characteristics that refer to those held by an actual population of organisms. It is implicit in the notion of the type specimen that the expressions of these characteristics are subject to natural variations, as they would be in a typology.

Some famous sociological works have employed typologies. Max Weber coined the phrase "ideal type," which is generalized and abstract, but only a level above individual reality. Weber (1964) used the ideal type in his formulation of four different types of social action (traditional, non-rational, principled, and rational). Using the four types, Weber could simplify social behavior for the purpose of analysis. The ideal types were not limitations on the variation of social behavior, but instead were guidelines for measuring the variation. Another type concept developed by Weber and used by social scientists in a wide range of disciplines is that of the bureaucracy (Gerth and Mills, 1946). Weber outlined the generalized characteristics and consequences of bureaucracy and his work had and still has a lasting effect on theory and research.

Emile Durkheim, a French contemporary of Weber, developed a typology in his conception of the division of labor of societies (1964). He described two kinds of societies: mechanical and organic. Very few societies could be of one type or another, but most societies have degrees of these two "ideal types." Other sociologists who have used typologies are Howard Becker (1950), who constructed a typology of sacred vs. secular societies; Charles Horton Cooley (1929), who developed the construct and concept of the primary group, which has greatly enhanced our understanding of the socialization of individuals; and Ferdinand Tönnies (1957), who developed one of the most frequently used typologies, that of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft societies.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It was mentioned previously that very few studies of water leaders have been conducted. However, literature relevant to the topic at hand is

not necessarily so limited. Studies on leadership, power, community power structures, contacts and levels of influence, etc., are well-represented in the literature. Three areas are most important to this study: Robert Merton's discussion of local vs. cosmopolitan leaders, and Roland L. Warren's presentation of vertical and horizontal leadership patterns. Here again we see the employment of type construction by sociological theorists dealing with empirical problems.

Robert Bierstedt's "Analysis of Social Power" (1951), isolates the concept of power from prestige, influence, dominance, and rights. Two concepts are closely related to that of power: force and authority. Each of these concepts may be used to define what power is. Force is the "application of sanctions" or "the reduction...of alternatives to the social action of one person or group by another person or group." A definition of social power in terms of force would be that "power itself is the predisposition or prior capacity which makes the application of force possible." Authority is "institutionalized power," and is the transformation of social power by means of formal associations. In informal associations, power is uninstitutionalized and is not transformed into authority, remaining as "influence."

Bierstedt locates three sources of power that are relevant to this study:(1) numbers of people, (2) social organizations, and (3) resources. These three sources can be applied to the current research project in order to facilitate the understanding of why certain organizations, people, and communities were more successful than others in exercising their power during the dam development process.

Two authors have contributed to our understanding of leadership pat-

terns: Robert K. Merton and Roland L. Warren. Merton's essay on local and cosmopolitan leaders (1977) emphasizes the two types of orientation toward the community. Local leaders are "influentials" with predominantly parochial interests who are not concerned with problems beyond their community. Cosmopolitan leaders feel more a part of the society at large than of their community of residence. Both types of leaders have a direct effect on community participation in issue areas, both locally and in the greater society. Both types of leaders interact at the local level and synthesize community action.

Roland L. Warren's formulation of vertical and horizontal patterns of community leadership (1978) is similar to Merton's typology of influentials, except that the patterns can be extended to organizations as well as leaders. Every community has ties through its organizations to the society at large. These ties are called vertical patterns of the community. Local units also have close ties to each other and are labeled horizontal patterns. Leaders may exhibit these patterns of contacts either through their social organizations and affiliations, or through their occupations. For effective community leadership, both organizations and influential individuals need vertical and horizontal patterns of communication. If a leader does not personally have influential ties, either horizontally or vertically, he seeks to cultivate them through contacts with both organizations and other leaders who do possess these ties. In this sense, vertical and horizontal patterns interact to form a system of communication and action for the community.

Both Merton's and Warren's conceptions of orientation and leadership patterns have application in the study of community water leaders. With

the aid of these two frameworks, the importance of influence and contact levels of leaders is explained. Also explained is the recurrence of key organizations as vehicles of community planning and power. It appears that the interaction of leadership characteristics with these patterns of orientation and communication helps account for the foresight that water leaders possessed and also for their successes in dam and reservoir development.

METHODOLOGY

The data on the personal characteristics of Texas Water leaders were collected at two different time periods--in 1973 and 1983-84. The main distinction between these two periods is that the 1973 methodology was designed to collect supportive data and information on leader views of a dam's impact on the community. The personal data on Texas community water leaders collected in 1973 was not analyzed in depth. The 1983 part of the methodology analyzed the leader data with respect to personal characteristics and leader action to determine whether it is possible to develop a typology of community water resource-oriented leadership. Additional data was collected, when possible, to update the 1973 materials.

1973 Methodology

Data Base

As part of an interdisciplinary team organized by the late Dr. Earl Cook, Dr. Ruth Schaffer undertook a reservoir impact study of the twenty-one U.S. Army Corps of Engineer Dams in existence in Texas in 1973 (Schaffer, 1974). A letter of inquiry was sent to the presidents of banks and the executive directors of Chambers of Commerce in each community in Texas within ten to twenty miles of a Corps dam asking them to help identify important community leaders who either assisted their communities

to secure a reservoir or who were involved in fostering economic development based on the construction. In communities without Chambers, letters were sent to the presidents of Lions and Rotary Clubs.

A questionnaire designed to gather information on leader action and personal characteristics received 415 responses from community leaders. Respondents were also requested to inform the researchers of additional leader names. On the basis of questionnaire information, all leaders receiving four or more mentions were interviewed. Leaders in the high economic growth potential areas of central Texas (Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972) extending from New Braunfels to the Dallas metropolitan area were interviewed. The interviews ranged in length from one to four hours. Leader names not previously mentioned in the earlier contacts were added during field interviews, especially in the Dallas area.

1983 Methodology

The present research utilized 70 in-depth interviews and the questionnaire socioeconomic data from the 1973 study described above. Personal information on each water leader's activities in a dam's acquisition, planning, and development came from the in-depth interviews and from interviews with other leaders in their respective communities. Socioeconomic data such as age, sex, income, occupation, education, hometown, organizational memberships (service, business, civic, and professional associations, etc.) and board memberships (bank, corporation, club, etc.) came from the questionnaires.

Collectively, the questionnaires and interviews provided information on how much a leader understood the ensuing changes within the community

before, during, and after dam construction. This is especially important in the classification of a respondent as a community water leader. The criterion determining active involvement in water resources was that a leader demonstrate knowledge and awareness of the problems and the solutions to a community's water needs. Another area tapped in the interviews and questionnaires was whether or not a water leader had powerful "colleagues," either in his community or in the national, state, and local government.

Updating the data

A study of water project impact in the United States, conducted through water project leaders--both professional and lay leaders, permitted the researcher to update information on a number of Texas water leaders who were active in the 1973 study and were still living and locatable. The leaders were critically evaluated to determine whether or not each individual actually was a community water leader. This was a necessary step, because not all of the individuals sampled were active on a long term basis or identified by local and extralocal leaders as water leaders. Some assisted the key leaders, acting to "swell the crowd," showing regional and national decision makers the extent of local support. Important prerequisites for classification as a "water leader" were that they possess knowledge of the water resource needs of their community, that they act on their knowledge of water resource development to initiate change, and that they understand the processes involved in water resource development (e.g., knew who the other actors were in the total picture). This last requirement may seem a little vague, but it is not. After examining quite a few of the interviews, some statements reveal that the individual did not know

how the dam came to be built, or who was in favor of its construction, or who benefitted from its existence in the community. Other community leaders appeared late on the scene--they came after the water problems of the community were already solved.

A first step was to reduce the sample to one of "actual" water leaders. This smaller group was then subjected to careful examination: personal characteristics were analyzed by community of origin and summarized by dam or cluster of dams. The end product of the cross-tabulation was the construction of a typology of leader characteristics. Of special importance to the construction of the typology based on leader characteristics was the determination of whether differences existed in terms of community size and by dam project. For example, do water leaders from Somerville have the same number of contacts at the state level as leaders from Dallas? Does New Braunfels have the same number of actual leaders as Waco? Are the leaders in Dallas predominantly members of bank boards, and are the leaders in Somerville predominantly the executives of the Chamber of Commerce?

If significant differences do occur among communities of different sizes or among dam sites which encompass large or larger metropolitan centers, then this would suggest that a typology be constructed with community size as a basic organizing principle. If differences do not appear between the leaders from communities of differing sizes, then the typology could be organized to fit all communities regardless of size; the typology would then be a typification.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

Description of Sample

After careful evaluation of the 70 in-depth interviews, the researcher distinguished the actual water leaders from the information givers who had been included in the 1973 dam impact study. The researcher wished to include only those interviewees who were active leaders and not information givers; the 1983-84 sample was consequently reduced to 56 leaders.

The sample of leaders in 1973 was more than just a "sample" of the population of water leaders from each community. Field recovery allowed access to the total population of leaders in the eleven study communities. The 1973 researchers continued to add to their list of leader names through interviewing until they were convinced that all of the living water leaders had been interviewed. One exception occurred in Brenham, where a water leader had been contacted on numerous occasions and several appointments had been rescheduled. His unpredictable daily schedule as county judge and his failing health prevented the researcher from securing an interview.

This researcher was able to conduct an interview in 1983 with a community leader from Caldwell who knew the deceased judge well. The interview brought the Brenham leader's contributions into perspective against those of his peers from Somerville, Brenham, and Giddings, with respect to community planning of the Somerville Dam project. Because this leader was not unknown to the researchers in 1973, it can be said that the activities of the total population of water leaders had been reconstructed for each of the eleven dam communities.

The fifty-six leaders came from the communities of Somerville, Brenham, Giddings, New Braunfels, Waco, Farmers Branch, Rockwall, Lewisville,

Denton, McKinney, and Dallas. The dams that they successfully pushed for were Somerville, Canyon, Waco, Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine, and Lavon. The "Somerville Dam area" was comprised of the first three communities. Canyon Dam's leaders were from New Braunfels and Canyon acting in concert. The leaders from the city of Waco were responsible for the development of Waco Dam. Dallas leaders provided the stimulus for Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine, and Lavon. The Dallas leaders teamed up with water leaders from Denton, Farmers Branch and Lewisville in the planning for Garza-Little Elm Dam; with Farmers Branch and Lewisville for the Grapevine Dam; and with McKinney and Rockwall leaders in the planning for Lavon Dam. Since the action on the last three dams was heavily controlled by Dallas leaders, and since Dallas leaders frequently were the initiators of the dam planning, this area of the three dams and all of their related communities will be referred to as the "Dallas dams area."

Verification of the water leaders who were active during the time of the 1973 study and earlier came from various sources. First, all of the water leaders verified who their colleagues were; second, interviews conducted in 1983-84 verified the leaders from the Somerville Dam area and the leaders from Rockwall. A third source verified key leaders from Dallas who were extremely active in the development of their city. Carol Estes Thometz monograph on the power structure of Dallas (1963) gives "profiles of power" of some of these men. These points of verification served as random checks of the leadership in the dam communities. They indicate that the population of leaders studied in 1973 and in 1983-84 was covered completely in the field.

Characteristics of the Study Sample

This section presents the distributions of personal characteristics in tabular form. Each table is discussed in the accompanying text.

Age Distribution:

Age of the total group of leaders peaked in the 50-59 year old range; approximately 38 percent of the leaders from all communities were in their fifties (Table 1). None of the leaders were under 30 years of age, and just under 9 percent of the total sample was in the 30-39 year age bracket (Table 1). This means that water leaders were predominantly the older, more mature members of their communities. Active leaders possessed power and influence which had taken time to amass. Young leaders could not match their older counterparts in power within the community because they lacked the essential ingredients of age and experience.

Sex Distribution:

Over ninety-eight percent of the water leaders were males (Table 2). One woman participated actively in the community, but her role was actually complementing that of her husband, another community leader. Other than in paired relationships, no females were named as leaders (Table 2).

Educational Attainment:

In Somerville, 57 percent either had a high school diploma or a college degree. In New Braunfels, 60 percent of the leaders had graduated from high school, had attended college, or were college graduates. Thirty percent had earned graduate degrees. In Waco, 57 percent of the leaders were college graduates. In total, 86 percent of the Waco leaders were college graduates, had attended graduate school, or had earned graduate

degrees. In Denton, 50 percent had attended college or had a college degree, and 33 percent had received master's degrees. In Dallas, 77.8 percent were college graduates, attended graduate school, or had received master's degrees (see Table 3).

Only one leader out of the total group, from Denton, received less than a high school education, and he was in his seventies. Farmers Branch and Somerville did not have any leaders who studied beyond the level of college graduation. The rest of the communities either had one, two, or three leaders who studied past the level of college graduation. None had a greater proportion of leaders earning master's and doctoral degrees than those earning less than graduate degrees. The total group's educational attainment peaked in the category for college graduates.

Clustering of educational attainment occurred in New Braunfels, Waco, and Dallas. The rest of the communities had educational distributions that were more dispersed. Of the clustered communities, Waco and Dallas leaders had higher levels of education.

Income Distribution:

Over 55 percent of the leaders in the Somerville dam area earned an income of \$50,000 or above. Of those Somerville Dam area leaders who gave information on their income, all earned more than \$20,000 a year. In New Braunfels, all of those leaders providing income information made over \$10,000 a year. Out of the total group of leaders, including those who did not provide income information, 50 percent earned greater than \$20,000 a year, and 20 percent earned \$50,000-\$99,999 per year. Approximately 86 percent of the Waco leaders earned between \$20,000 and \$99,999 with 28.6 percent earned \$50-99,999 a year in annual income for 1973. Roughly 67

TABLE 1

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES IN 1973

COMMUNITY	Age Distribution													
	30-39		40-49		50-59		60- 69		70+		Unknown		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Giddings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	0	0.0	2	22.2	3	33.3	3	33.3	1	11.1	0	0.0	9	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	1	10.0	5	50.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	100.0
Waco	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	85.7	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
Rockwall	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3	100.0
Lewisville	3	37.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	37.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	8	100.0
Denton	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	100.0
McKinney	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	2	22.2	4	44.4	2	22.2	1	11.1	0	0.0	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	4	13.3	4	13.3	9	30.0	8	26.7	4	13.3	1	3.3	30	100.0
Grand Total	5	8.9	11	19.6	21	37.5	12	21.4	6	10.7	1	1.8	56	100.0

TABLE 2

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES, 1973

COMMUNITY	Male		Female		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	6	87.5	1	12.5	7	100.0
Brenham	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Giddings	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	8	90.0	1	10.0	10	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	10	100.0	0	0.0	10	100.0
Waco	7	100.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
Rockwall	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
Lewisville	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0
Denton	6	100.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
McKinney	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Dallas	9	100.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	30	100.0	0	0.0	30	100.0
Grand Total	55	98.2	1	1.8	56	100.0

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITY	Educational Attainment																	
	0-8		High School Graduate		College 1-4		College Graduate		Grad. Work		Master's Degree		Doctoral Degree		Unknown		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	42.9	7	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Giddings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	0	0.0	2	22.2	0	0.0	2	22.2	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	33.3	9	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	0	0.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	1	10.0	10	100.0
Waco	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	4	57.1	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	100.0
Rockwall	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Lewisville	0	0.0	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	37.5	8	100.0
Denton	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
McKinney	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	44.4	2	22.2	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	22.2	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	1	3.3	4	13.3	2	6.7	8	26.7	3	10.0	3	10.0	2	6.7	7	23.3	30	100.0
Grand Total	1	1.8	10	17.9	4	7.1	16	28.6	6	10.7	6	10.7	3	5.4	11	13.6	56	100.0

percent of the Dallas leaders earned above \$30,000 a year in annual income, with 22 percent earning over \$100,000 (Table 4).

Counting only those leaders from the smaller Dallas dam area communities who provided income information in 1973, the majority (36.0 percent) earned between \$10,000 and \$19,999 per year, with none earning above \$100,000 (Table 4).

The Somerville Dam area, Waco, and Dallas had no water leaders earning under \$20,000 a year. At least 57 percent of the leaders from each of these communities earned above \$30,000 annually (Table 4). The mean income for the total group of leaders occurred at approximately the \$50,000-\$99,999 per year level in 1973 dollars (Table 4). This high income bracket indicates that the majority of the leaders were quite well-off in their communities.

Occupation:

Positions in education and the occupation of ranching/farming were held by the smallest percentages of water leaders in the total leadership group (3.6 percent of the total, for each). Occupations in commerce were held by the highest percentage of water leaders (41.1 percent). Banking and real estate were the second and third most frequently mentioned occupations with percentages of 19.6 and 16.1, respectively. The professional and public service occupational categories had low percentages of 8.9 and 7.1, respectively (Table 5). The category of commerce can be expanded to include banking and real estate; if so, commerce as an occupation would account for 76.8 percent of the total leadership group.

Commerce became increasingly frequent as community size increased. In Somerville, commercial occupations were held by 28.6 percent of the leader-

ship group. In Waco, 57.1 percent of the water leaders were engaged in commerce occupations. Dallas, the largest of all of the communities, had a high of 77.8 percent of the water leaders holding commercial occupations (Table 5).

Commercial occupations include executive positions in industrial companies, executive positions on River Authorities, professional lobbying, executive positions in car dealerships, and ownership of a variety of business enterprises. Being in an executive position or in one of business ownership permits the leader the luxury and freedom of spending time on community activities without jeopardizing their occupational activities. As water activities increase in importance and community emphasis, greater demands are made on the free time and financial resources of the water leader (Schaffer, Schaffer, and Halter, 1981).

There is a clear indication that the water leaders undergo a shift in types of leader occupations as community size changes. As community size increases, the percentage of leaders engaged in commerce increased significantly. It was noted that in the smaller communities real estate was an important occupation among water leaders (Table 5). A plausible explanation for this occurrence lies with leader interests. In smaller communities, leaders often spoke of the profits to be gained from increases in land values around a reservoir. This fact may have influenced the leader involvement of realtors in reservoir development. In the larger communities, leaders were primarily concerned with securing a reliable water supply for the future growth of their metropolitan areas. The large community would experience gains in commerce, whereas the smaller community would experience its profits in land prices upon dam completion.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS BY INCOME LEVEL IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES 1973

COMMUNITY	INCOME LEVEL															
	0-9,999		10,000 19,999		20,000 29,999		30,000 49,999		50,000 99,999		100,000+		Unknown		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	1	14.3	2	28.6	7	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Giddings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	11.1	3	33.3	2	22.2	2	22.2	9	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
Waco	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.5	2	28.5	2	28.5	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	100.0
Rockwall	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	100.0
Lewisville	0	0.0	2	25.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	4	50.0	8	100.0
Denton	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
McKinney	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	2	22.2	2	22.2	2	22.2	2	22.2	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	1	3.3	5	16.7	4	13.3	4	13.3	5	16.7	2	6.7	9	30.0	30	100.0
Grand Total	1	1.8	6	10.7	9	16.1	8	14.3	12	21.4	4	7.1	17	30.4	56	100.0

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF WATER LEADERS IN SELECTED TEXAS COMMUNITIES
BY OCCUPATION

COMMUNITY	Occupation															
	Education		Commerce		Real Estate		Ranching/ Farming		Banking		Public Service		Professional		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	2	28.2	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Giddings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	0	0.0	2	22.2	3	33.3	1	11.1	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	11.1	9	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	2	20.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	10	100.0
Waco	0	0.0	4	57.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.5	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	3	100.0
Rockwall	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	100.0
Lewisville	0	0.0	3	37.5	2	25.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	8	100.0
Denton	0	0.0	3	50.0	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
McKinney	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	7	77.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	11.1	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	0	0.0	15	50.0	3	10.0	1	3.3	5	20.0	3	10.0	3	10.0	30	100.0
Grand Total	2	3.6	23	41.1	9	16.1	2	3.6	11	19.6	4	7.1	5	8.9	56	100.0

Organizational Affiliation:

Distribution of organizational affiliation for those leaders who reported this type of data does not reflect consistent variation by community size, but a general pattern appears through most communities. The majority of Somerville's leaders belonged to 1 to 3 organizations. The water leaders in two other communities, New Braunfels and Denton, belonged from between 4 to 8 organizations. Rockwall leaders were split equally between the three different categories, reflecting the differences in the three leaders' influence and experience. The Farmers Branch leaders, also living in a small community, were equally split between leaders who belonged to 1 to 3 and 9 to 14 organizations. Brenham, New Braunfels, Waco, Farmers Branch, Rockwall, Denton, Lewisville, and Dallas each had one leader who belonged to 9 to 14 organizations, suggesting that all of the communities except the smallest, Somerville, had very active community water leaders (Table 6). In this case, Somerville is an exception to the general trend of the total leadership population. A little less than two-thirds of the total population provided organizational membership data. Stating that variation in the distribution of membership varied according to community size might be a bold assumption, since some of the leaders who had assumed very influential roles in the acquisition of the water projects in their communities either did not report organizational information or they did not report all the organizations to which they belonged at the present and in the past. One leader stated that he belonged to "too many organizations to bother with," when he was asked to provide the researcher with a list. The communities of Dallas, Denton, Waco and New Braunfels were larger than the rest of the communities in 1973. Each of these has a greater per-

TABLE 6

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH WATER LEADERS BELONGED FOR THOSE
LEADERS WHO REPORTED DATA ON THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION¹

COMMUNITY	Organizational Membership									
	0		1 - 3		4 - 8		9 - 14		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam totals	0	0.0	3	20.3	1	20.0	1	20.0	5	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	100.0
Waco	0	0.0	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	6	100.0
Farmers Branch	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	2	100.0
Rockwall	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
Lewisville	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6	100.0
Denton	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	5	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
Dallas Dams	0	0.0	8	40.0	7	35.0	5	25.0	20	100.0
Grand Total	0	0.0	13	36.1	15	41.7	8	22.2	36	100.0

¹ No leaders in Giddings and McKinney provided information on organizational membership.

centage of their leaders in the 4 to 8 organizations category than in other categories.

Of the total group of leaders who provided data on their organizational affiliation, roughly 42 percent belonged to 4 to 8 organizations (Table 6). This means the majority of leaders were quite active in their communities. The organizations that were listed were well-respected civic groups, generally reflecting considerable status. The leaders who listed the smallest numbers of organizations were mostly in their late sixties and seventies and had retired some years earlier. These older leaders were key figures in the development of dams in several communities. By the seventies they had reduced their activities within their communities substantially. Since the length of time it takes from initial conceptualization to construction of a major project averaged 15 to 20 years in Texas, a number had been active in the pursuit of the dam since their younger years (Table 6).

Board Membership:

The analysis of board memberships is based on the data supplied by 36 out of the 56 water leaders. There was no noticeable variation in percentage of leaders in board positions by community size. Leaders in Somerville, and Farmers Branch all were on 1 or 2 boards as were 80 percent of the leaders in New Braunfels, 67 percent of the leaders in Rockwall, and 50 percent of the leaders in Dallas and Lewisville. Denton, Waco, and Brenham--with one leader-- were the only communities that had very small percentages of their leaders on so few boards (Table 7). Denton and Brenham had none.

In the 3-5 board category, Somerville, New Braunfels, Farmers Branch,

and Rockwall had no leaders. Approximately 16.7 percent of Lewisville's leaders belonged to 3-5 boards. In Dallas, 25 percent of the leaders belonged to 3-5 boards, while an additional 25 percent belonged to 6-9 boards. Waco also had an equal number of leaders, 33.3 percent, in both 3-5 and 6-9 boards. The one leader identified in Brenham belonged to 6-9 boards. In Denton, 80 percent of the leaders were active on 3-5 boards--more than in any other community.

When comparing the number of board memberships held by water leaders by community, Waco had a greater percentage of leaders belonging to the largest number of boards than any other community, including Dallas (Table 7).

For inclusion in the typology, the majority of water leaders from all communities studied belonged to one or more boards. With the exception of Brenham and Denton, all of the nonmetropolitan communities had a majority of their leaders on one or two boards.

Bank Board Membership:

Reviewing the findings in Tables 6, 7, and 8, that describe the water leaders who provided information on their organizational membership, it is important to note that the leaders who did not provide this data were as important and often more important than the water leaders providing the data. For example, several Dallas leaders were associated with key financial interests. The fact that they did not provide complete data on their organizational affiliation made it impossible to include them in the analysis. Table 9 includes any and all positional information that the interviewers received during the course of the study and additional information secured by the present research fellow. This table described in the

TABLE 7
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WATER LEADERS HOLDING BOARD MEMBERSHIPS
¹
WHO REPORTED DATA ON THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

COMMUNITY	Board Membership											
	0		1		2		3		4		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	4	100.0
Brenham	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
=====												
Somerville Dam totals	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	5	100.0
=====												
New Braunfels & Canyon	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	5	100.0
=====												
Waco	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	6	100.0	6	100.0
=====												
Farmers Branch	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Rockwall	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	100.0	3	100.0
Lewisville	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	100.0	6	100.0
Denton	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	5	100.0
Dallas	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	4	100.0
=====												
Dallas Dams	3	15.0	9	45.0	6	30.0	2	10.0	20	100.0	20	100.0
=====												
Grand Total	4	11.1	18	50.0	8	22.2	6	16.7	36	100.0	36	100.0

¹ No leaders in Giddings and McKinney provided information on board membership.

next section of text, compensates for the tables that can only account for data reported formally.

Bank board membership in most American communities is the most prestigious type of organizational membership. It is the tangible evidence that a leader has reached a paramount position in the status hierarchy (Schaffer and Schaffer, 1970). Water leaders who were on bank boards played key roles in reservoir development and planning. Of the leaders who provided the necessary data, only in Farmers Branch and Brenham did any leaders not have bank board positions. Since the position is so prestigious and since these positions with key banks are so few in number, it is hardly surprising that the greatest percentage of the total group of leaders were on no bank boards.

Waco and Denton were the only cities in which the majority of water leaders were on bank boards. The Somerville Dam area equalled New Braunsfels and Denton in the percentage of their water leaders on one bank board, 40.0 percent (Table 8). Leaders from Waco and Lewisville had equal proportions of leaders on one bank board, 33.3 percent. In Dallas, where more than half of the leaders did not respond, a low of 25.0 percent of the leaders sat on one bank board. Denton, Waco, and Lewisville were the only communities having water leaders on two bank boards. Denton and Waco had the same number of leaders in this category, although their percentages were not equal, 40.0 and 33.3 percent respectively (Table 8).

In regard to the typology, bank board membership was common in all large communities and most of the small communities. Leadership on bank boards did not increase with community size because key bank board membership is associated with the leaders prestige in the community rather than

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WATER LEADERS HOLDING POSITIONS ON BANK BOARDS
 WHO PROVIDED THIS ORGANIZATIONAL DATA¹

COMMUNITY	BANK BOARD MEMBERSHIP							
	0		1		2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Brenham	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
Waco	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	6	100.0
Farmers Branch	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
Rockwall	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	100.0
Lewisville	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	100.0
Denton	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	5	100.0
Dallas	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	11	55.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	20	100.0
Grand Total	19	52.8	11	30.6	6	16.7	36	100.0

¹ No leaders in Giddings and McKinney provided information on board membership.

size of the community.

Prestigious Board and Office Memberships:

Table 9 presents the numbers of positions held by community water leaders in prestigious, high status-giving organizations. The organizations considered high status and prestigious in this study and thus offering the leader who possessed membership the best opportunity to operate from a power base in the acquisition of dams, were Chamber of Commerce executive offices, bank-board memberships, river authority boards, (e.g., Brazos, Trinity), public utility boards, and offices in water organizations. The water leaders in all of the communities studied belonged to these types of organizations--some more than others.

Chamber of Commerce executive offices were fairly consistent in distribution between communities. Waco had a higher number of leaders involved as Chamber of Commerce executives, past and present, than the rest of the communities. Three Waco Chamber of Commerce executives had moved from that position to the presidency of the three most influential banks in the community. These network alliances with the community power structure accounts, in part, for the importance of the Waco Chamber and its ability to assemble power on behalf of water development. For example, following the end of the World War II, several water projects in the state were on the agenda for construction ahead of Waco. Congressional and agency pressure moved Waco to first place and the Waco dam was the first constructed after that war.

Bank board placement was highest in four communities: Dallas, Waco, Denton, and Lewisville. River authorities were only important organizations in two communities, Waco and Dallas. Waco is the headquarters for

the Brazos River Authority and the Dallas/Fort Worth metropolitan areas were the chief cities for the Trinity River Authority. One of the Dallas leaders was its first president. Utility boards were important economic organizations in the Somerville Dam Area, New Braunfels, and Denton. Generally, however, their frequency is minimal (Table 9).

Officials of water organizations exhibit an interesting distribution in the Dallas area. Their frequency in the communities of Dallas, Rockwall, and McKinney was quite large. The number of positions held by these leaders was high because in each community key leaders had helped to create some, if not all, of the active water organizations in the area. These leaders interacted with each other by offering their support and influence in the effort to solve the water problems in the Dallas metropolitan area.

The majority of leadership positions in the Dallas dams area were in water organizations; close behind in order of importance were the number of bank board positions held. Chamber of Commerce executive offices were third in importance (Table 9).

Of the total group of leaders, the difference in frequency between positions held in water organizations and bank boards was less than that for the Dallas dams area leaders. In addition, bank boards ranked slightly ahead of water organizations in the number of positions for the total population. Chamber of Commerce executive offices formed nearly 20 percent of the total positions (Table 9). The Chamber of Commerce was used as an organizational vehicle for issue action by water leaders. Bank boards indicated leader prestige, contacts, and influence. Water organization office holding meant active participation, knowledge, and dedication by the

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF PRESTIGIOUS BOARD MEMBERSHIPS OR OFFICES
HELD BY WATER LEADERS BY COMMUNITY

COMMUNITY	AREAS OF PRESTIGIOUS MEMBERSHIP										Total	
	Chamber of Commerce Office		Bank Board		River Authority Board		Utility Board		Water Org. Office			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	1	25.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Brenham	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
Giddings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	2	25.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	8	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	2	33.3	3	42.9	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	16.7	7	100.0
Waco	4	22.2	7	38.8	4	22.2	0	0.0	3	16.7	18	100.0
Farmers Branch	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Rockwall	3	33.3	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	44.4	9	100.0
Lewisville	1	14.3	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
Denton	2	18.1	7	63.6	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	18.1	11	100.0
McKinney	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	6	100.0
Dallas	2	10.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	11	55.0	20	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	9	16.7	20	37.0	2	3.7	0	0.0	23	42.6	54	100.0
Grand Total	17	19.5	32	36.8	6	6.9	4	4.6	28	32.2	87	100.0

leaders to water issues.

Leader Arena of Influence:

The levels of influence of the water leaders were evaluated through the use of the leader interviews--leaders speaking of their own activities and leaders speaking of these activities when reconstructing the stages of decisions that occurred in each community or dam area leading to successful dam construction. The activities of a leader were verified by the repetition of his activities in an interview with another community leader, citizen, or through documents in such offices as the local Chamber of Commerce files or in the library of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.

All of the leaders had influence on the local level through membership in key civic organizations, and all had been named in the selection process as leaders who had been at least locally instrumental in bringing about dam planning and construction.

At least half, 55.4 percent, of the leaders possessed statewide influence. The communities with over half of their water leaders possessing statewide influence were Brenham, Giddings, Waco, Rockwall, Lewisville, Denton, McKinney, and Dallas (Table 10). Leaders with national influence represented 32 percent of the total leadership group. In some communities almost all of the leaders had some national influence enabling them to utilize power more effectively to ensure dam development (Table 10).

Both of the leaders in Brenham and Giddings, and two leaders from Somerville had accumulated quite a bit of "social capital" with their Senator (and later the President), Lyndon Baynes Johnson. Influence with him greatly enhanced their chances for success in lobbying for federal dam

TABLE 10

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF COMMUNITY/DAM WATER LEADERS WITH INFLUENCE ON THE
LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS, 1973

COMMUNITY	LEVELS OF INFLUENCE							
	Local		State		National		Total Leaders	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	7	100.0	2	28.6	2	28.6	7	100.0
Brenham	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Giddings	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	9	100.0	4	44.4	3	33.3	9	100.0
===== New Braunfels & Canyon	10	100.0	3	30.0	10	10.0	10	100.0
===== Waco	7	100.0	7	100.0	4	57.1	7	100.0
===== Farmers Branch	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
Rockwall	3	100.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0
Lewisville	3	100.0	4	50.0	2	25.0	8	100.0
Denton	6	100.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
Dallas	9	100.0	7	77.8	6	66.7	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	30	100.0	17	56.7	10	33.3	30	100.0
===== Grand Total	56	100.0	31	55.4	18	32.1	56	100.0

construction funding. In Waco, several leaders were personal friends of LBJ and of Senator Pickle, as well as exhibiting strong leadership records in their own right. Dallas and Dallas dams area leaders had influence with their United States Congressmen and Senators. The leaders from Rockwall, McKinney, and Dallas especially had influence with Congressman Sam Rayburn. He was a key to their success, especially since he saved one of their dams from elimination (Lavon).

All of the leaders who had state and national influence spent their own money to make frequent trips to Washington, D.C. to obtain federal funding approval--trips usually were made every year until the completion of the project.

For the typology, water leaders all had local influence. Statewide influence was held by greater than half of the leaders. National influence was possessed by roughly a third of the leaders. In those communities with very strong state level influence, national influence could also be expected to be above the norm.

Water Leader Level of Contact:

Levels of contacts that water leaders possessed were primarily determined from interview materials, from questionnaire updates, and current interviews that the fellow conducted. As previously mentioned, small community leaders had influential ties to Lyndon B. Johnson, especially when he was a Senator. In fact Johnson sent letters to at least ten of the water leaders in this study informing them, after his accession to the presidency, that he would no longer be able to respond to their needs as he had in the past. "I am now the president of all of the people."

The similarity between Tables 10 and 11 rests with the definition of

"influence" and "contacts." All leaders with influence at designated levels would also have contacts on this level. If leaders had contacts at higher levels, they did not necessarily have influence as well. Since local contacts were possessed by all the leaders, the distribution was 100.0 percent (Table 11). At the state level, 82.0 percent of the total group of leaders had contacts. the lowest percentage of state contacts was in Somerville (57.0 percent) and the highest percentages of ontacts (100.0 percent) were in Waco, Rockwall, and McKinney (Table 11). Dallas and Lewisville both had approximately 88 percent of their leaders possessing state-level contacts. Two-thirds of the leaders in Denton and Farmers Branch had state-level contacts.

The water leaders with national contacts represented just under 45 percent of the total group. All of the leaders in Waco, McKinney, Brenham, and Giddings had national contacts. Dallas and Rockwall had an equal percentage of their leaders possessing national contacts. The communities with the smallest percentages of water leaders having contacts at the national level were Denton, Lewisville, New Braunfels, and Somerville. All communities save one, Farmers Branch, had leaders with national contacts. Without these leaders' contacts, water projects like dams and reservoirs would have been much more difficult to bring to fruition.

For the typology, successful dam development required that a majority of the community leaders have state-wide contact, and that at least some leaders in every community have national contacts. the communities without the quality of contacts at state and ntional levels could not protect or serve their water interests if they had to bargain either with the federal government or with other communities. Larger number of contacts can trans-

TABLE 11

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF COMMUNITY/DAM WATER LEADERS WITH CONTACTS ON THE
LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS, 1973

COMMUNITY	LEVEL OF CONTACT							
	Local		State		National		Total Leaders	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Somerville	7	100.0	4	57.1	2	28.6	7	100.0
Brenham	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Giddings	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Somerville Dam Totals	9	100.0	6	66.7	4	44.4	9	100.0
New Braunfels & Canyon	10	100.0	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	100.0
Waco	7	100.0	7	100.0	7	100.0	7	100.0
Farmers Branch	3	100.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	3	100.0
Rockwall	3	100.0	3	100.0	2	66.7	3	100.0
Lewisville	8	100.0	7	87.5	2	25.0	8	100.0
Denton	6	100.0	4	66.7	1	16.7	6	100.0
Dallas	9	100.0	8	88.9	6	66.7	9	100.0
Dallas Dams Total:	30	100.0	25	83.3	15	50.0	30	100.0
Grand Total	56	100.0	46	82.1	25	44.6	56	100.0

late into greater power potential. In 1973, Farmers Branch was having great difficulty in securing water from Dallas; they would have been more successful had their leaders possessed more influence, power and contacts--as well as early vision concerning area growth.

TYOLOGY OF COMMUNITY WATER LEADER CHARACTERISTICS

The foregoing findings can now be pulled together in constructing an empirical typification of the water leader.

The Texas community water leader is characterized by advanced age in contrast to other individuals in the community. This means that he is generally in his fifties. The sex of the leader is invariably male. The educational attainment of the Texas water leader is college graduation. The income of the community water leader is well above the mean family income of his community. He is well-off, if not wealthy. If the leader resides in a small community, his occupation is most likely in banking or real estate; if his occupation is commercial, then he is an owner of a flourishing company that the community depends upon. If the leader resides in a large metropolitan area his occupation is either commercial, or in banking; in contrast to the small town, the "company" is a corporation and the bank is a major financial institution. The community water leader belongs to a number of organizations, all of which are prestigious community associations--they may range from social, to religious, to professional, to charitable. The water leader sits on from one to two boards of prestigious community or regional organizations. The more influential he is, the more key board positions he controls. Bank board membership is not assured for all water leaders, but it is a key resource of the most influential of community leaders. Bank board membership provides prestigious

business and social contacts for the water leader that he can consolidate with his own influence in the planning and development of successful water projects.

The water leader will occupy key leadership positions in his community. Depending on community size and its political importance to the state, these key positions can vary. Most frequently, the positions are Chamber of Commerce executive offices, bank boards, water organization offices, and alternatively, River Authority boards and public utility boards.

The levels of influence of the key water leaders are local and state. The more influential a leader is, however, the higher the probability that his influence will extend to the national level, especially if he is from a larger metropolitan area. The water leader's contacts are an extension of his influence. If he is already influential at the local and state level, his contacts invariably reach the national level. If he already has national influence, it goes without saying that he will maintain useful contacts at this level.

CONCLUSION

The typology of the Texas community water leader was actually a typification since only one major pattern with slight variations resulted from this analysis. This "one major pattern" is a very interesting point of departure for discussion. Each community had some or all of the characteristics present in its leadership.

Where the key community leadership lacked a specific characteristic, say national contacts, then it had leadership with a weaker power base. It has already been mentioned that Farmers Branch was having serious water

supply confrontations with Dallas. This problem stemmed from poor planning by leaders from Farmers Branch after dam development was already underway in the 1950's. They had underestimated the effect of the dam on their economy and had turned down ownership of some water rights as an unnecessary expense. When the population of the community grew so quickly, they realized their oversight. However, by this time Dallas was not willing to share its water.

If Farmers Branch had influential leaders with contacts in higher levels of government, they could have put more pressure on Dallas. It was just this sort of influence that a key Rockwall leader used on Sam Rayburn in deciding the location of Lavon Dam--the Rockwall leader's power and influence and contacts got the location over the interests of other leaders from Dallas.

These Texas community leaders were usually very astute entrepreneurs of water resources. Their successes can be attributed to their leadership capability, particularly in the mobilization of local dam support within their communities.

The utility of describing these important characterizations is in application of the typology. If a state or national agency has questions as to whether a project will ever reach development stages, all they need do is examine the key lay leadership involved. If the quality of the leadership falls far below the guidelines of this typology, then the state or national agency may well reconsider their arrangement with that community or group of communities. If the leadership is of greater quality than that outlined by the typology, then the agency should feel confident that the project will reach completion. Utilization of such a typology

could have great economic impact on an agency that has expensive projects stalled for decades because of "lack of community interest." This problem could just as easily be phrased "lack of key leadership" committed to water development since the presence of dedicated, active leadership is essentially a requirement of project completion. Likewise, communities can benefit from the utilization of this typology--if they feel their chances for securing a water project are weak, they can build up their support structure of leadership and renew their request for a water resource project. The next step in the refinement of this typology is to include a study of the leaders in communities with projects in court contentions or with project dismissals.

REFERENCES

- Becker, Howard
1950 Through Values to Social Interpretation: Essays on Social Contexts, Actions, Types, and Prospects. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Bierstedt, Robert
1951 "An analysis of social power." American Sociological Review 15: 730-738.
- Commission on Population Growth and the American Future
1972 Population and the American Future. Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cooley, Charles Horton
1929 Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Durkheim, Emile
1964 The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Crowell-Collier Publishing Company.
- Gerth, H. H., and C. Wright Mills, eds.
1946 From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McKinney, John C.
1966 Constructive Typology and Social Theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.
- Merton, Robert K.
1977 "Local and cosmopolitan influentials." Pp. 277-90 in R. L. Warren (ed.), New Perspectives on the American Community: A Book of Readings. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Schaffer, A., and R. C. Schaffer
1970 Woodruff: A Study of Community Decision Making. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Schaffer, Albert, Ruth C. Schaffer, and Gary M. Halter
1981 Social Impacts of McClellan-Kerr Navigation System: A Study of Public Sector Response to Water Resource Development. Fort Belvoir, Maryland: U. S. Army Engineer Institute for Water Resources.
- Schaffer, Ruth C.
1974 "Social impact of twenty-one Texas Corps of Engineer dams." Pp. 2.1-2.159 in Earl Cook (ed.), Reservoir Impact Study.

Dept. of the Interior. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government
Printing Office.

Thometz, Carol Estes

1963 Decision-Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas. Dallas: Southern
Methodist University Press.

Tönnies, Ferdinand

1957 Community and Society. Edited and Translated by Charles P.
Loomis. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press.

Warren, Roland L.

1978 The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally College
Publishing Company.

Weber, Max

1964 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Edited and
Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Crowell-Collier
Publishing Company.