

SELECTIVE SERVICE DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTION CLASSIFICATIONS:
A STUDY OF LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS IN KANSAS

by

WILLIAM PRATT CURTIS

B. A., Washington State University, 1968

959-5358

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Approved by:


Major Professor

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH THE ORIGINAL
PRINTING BEING
SKEWED
DIFFERENTLY FROM
THE TOP OF THE
PAGE TO THE
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED
FROM THE
CUSTOMER.**

LD
2668
T4
1972
C76
C.2
DOCUMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Selective Service System's Rationale for Deferments and Exemptions.	3
The Classification Process	7
Appellate Procedure.	11
Review of the Literature on Stratification and Selective Service.	13
The Problem.	21
II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS	22
The Selective Service Classifications.	22
The Dependent Variables.	25
The Independent Variables.	29
III. RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS.	41
The Conscientious Objector Deferment Classification: I-O and I-W.	41
The Student Deferment Classification: I-S and II-S	43
The Occupational Deferment Category: II-A and II-C	45
Reserve Classification: I-D.	48
Hardship Deferments: III-A	49
The I-Y Deferment Category	51
The IV-F Exemption	54

Chapter	Page
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY	57
Discussion of the Independent Variables	60
Suggestions for Further Research.	61
REFERENCES.	63
APPENDIX.	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Military Obligation Rates by Educational Attainment before Service for a Sample of Males in the United States Aged 27-34 in 1964	17
2. Military Obligation Rates by Father's Occupation before Service for a Sample of Males in the United States Aged 27-34 in 1964.	19
3. Percentages of Selective Service Registrants by Classification for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	24
4. Zero Order Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationships among Deferment and Exemption Categories for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	26
5. Factor Analysis of Selective Service Deferment and Exemption Categories for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	28
6. Factor Analysis of 14 Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	37
7. Zero Order Correlations between Conscientious Objector Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	42
8. Zero Order Correlations between Student Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	44
9. Zero Order Correlations between Occupational Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	46
10. Zero Order Correlations between the Military Reserve Classification and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	48
11. Zero Order Correlations between Hardship Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.	50

Table	Page
12. Zero Order Correlations between I-Y Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970	53
13. Zero Order Correlations between IV-F Exemptions and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970	56
14. Summary of the Results Showing the Relationships between Four Factors and the Deferment and Exemption Classifications for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The term "Selective Service" implies that men are chosen selectively for the armed forces. Furthermore, it suggests that men can be categorized in terms of their availability and in accordance with national military manpower requirements in such a manner as to produce minimal hardship or interference with civilian pursuits and responsibilities (Leinwand, 1970).

Military draft deferments and exemptions are as old as the country itself. During the Revolutionary War, some colonists laboring in what were considered crucial occupations received pardons from service. In the war between the states, men who lived in the North were able to hire substitutes to fight for them. The government of the South issued rather extensive occupational deferments. But, as the Civil War dragged on, the South was forced to do away with nearly all deferments because of military manpower needs. During World War I, men were given occupational, and, for the first time, student deferments. Until that time, very little consideration had been given to the idea of student deferments, except that students were generally thought to be too young to serve. In 1917, students under 21 were allowed to remain out of military service for three years in order to attend college. At the beginning of the World War II era, men could be deferred if their employment or activity was deemed critical to the welfare of the nation. College students were included in this category. As the war wore on, the military manpower requirements steadily increased and only those college students studying in critical fields such as engineering, science, medicine,

and theology were deferred.

After World War II, the President decided that the draft was no longer necessary, and in 1947 the draft law expired. However, due to the small numbers of men enlisting into the military, a new draft law with a sizeable number of deferment and exemption classifications was enacted in 1948. In November, 1969 the first major change in the existent draft law occurred. The lottery system was enacted with no immediate changes in deferment and exemption classifications. Today's draft is authorized by the Military Selective Service Act of September, 1971.

The paucity of research, empirical or otherwise, done on the Selective Service system, especially at the local board level, is truly incredible, since the draft is one of the major social and political institutions in this country. The Selective Service system is a compulsory institution in the sense that it is a regulatory agency which channels human actions similar to the way instincts mold animal behavior. As an institution, the Selective Service provides a means whereby human behavior is patterned or coerced to fit roles considered desirable by those controlling the society. In many instances, a large amount of deception occurs in making the individual believe he has been selected for an institutional role and that he has no other alternatives (Gerth & Mills, 1953; Berger, 1963).

How does the Selective system channel human behavior, coerce people to perform its roles, and convince people that there are no alternatives? A discussion of these facets of the Selective Service system may provide some answers to these questions. These facets are the system's rationale for deferments and exemptions, the classification process within the local boards, and the appellate system.

The Selective Service System's Rationale for Deferments and Exemptions

One justification of deferments was that drafting men without consideration for civilian occupation, educational program, family situation, etc., would be poor utilization of manpower. When General Hershey was the National Director of the Selective Service system, he made this rationale clear:

A complementary function [to induction] is to insure, by deferment, that vital activities and scarce skills are protected and that the patterns of civilian life generally are disrupted no more than necessary by exercise of duty and privilege of military service (U.S. Congress, 1966: 9620-9623).

In addition to this vital function, Hershey described another function of deferments--"channeling."

The term channeling refers to that process through which registrants are influenced to enter and remain in critical occupations, and in other essential activities in the national health, safety, and interest by deferment or prospect for deferment from military service (National Selective Service Headquarters, 1966: 16).

Selective Service channels thousands of young men through its deferment procedures into those fields of endeavor where there are shortages of adequately trained personnel Many younger engineers, scientists, technicians, and other skilled workers have been kept on their jobs through occupational deferments. Young male teachers are induced to remain in the teaching profession. The fields of medicine and dentistry also have benefitted from student and occupational channeling (National Selective Service Headquarters, 1965: 18).

There are several arguments against the Selective Service system's justifications for deferments. At first glance, protecting the nation's supply of manpower makes some degree of sense. But under today's manpower conditions, this protection may not be necessary. During World War II there was an urgent need for military manpower and at the same time there was a need for workers in the defense industries and other essential civilian occupations. At that time, deferments were probably necessary,

but they were still kept at a minimal level. The circumstances of World War II do not exist today, and there is practically no manpower shortage. One only has to look at current unemployment rates to confirm this fact. The World War II rationale for deferments seems highly questionable in view of the fact that today the population is substantially larger and the military is substantially smaller (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 55).

There is another problem with the protection rationale for deferments. During the past few years, local boards have deferred registrants with little or no consideration for which occupational skills were critical or in short supply. The most obvious instance is student deferments. In recent years the supply of college students has never been greater, but their protection has become practically automatic without regard to field of study or quality of performance. In addition to the student deferment, occupational deferments' protective function is questionable (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 55).

Before attempting to protect critical manpower in the "national health, safety, and interest," it would seem logical to take two steps. First, a precise definition of "national health, safety, and interest" is needed. The system has not attempted to make this phrase explicit. And, second, it would be necessary to decide systematically what types of manpower are critical. The system has drawn up a list of critical occupations which local board members could utilize in making deferment decisions. A Critical Skills List which was first published in 1955, revised in 1962, and amended in 1965 was known to be in existence until 1968 (Wamsley, 1969a: 110).

In one study done on seventeen local boards in 1966, it was noted that none of the boards observed used the list at meetings. In only two meetings

was the list referred to by asking the local board clerk to check on an occupation later. Several of the clerks in this study did not know about the list, and some indicated that they knew what it was, but never used it (Wamsley, 1969a: 110). Apparently, local board members did not feel themselves bound to the list. Perhaps as a consequence, the National Advisory Commission on the Selective Service (1967: 27) discovered that about one-half of the registrants who received occupational deferments were neither in a critical occupation nor an essential one as defined by the Department of Labor.

The methods by which local boards grant deferments is a major drawback for the rationale that a protective function is being served. In Wamsley's study, local board clerks frequently mention that board members were influenced by things they had read and what they assumed to be the national interest. Sometimes they utilized knowledge that they had gained through their own occupational experiences (Wamsley, 1969b: 88).

Similar questions arise with regard to the channeling function. To channel men rationally when it is not known where they should be channeled is absurd. The surest permanent deferment, which some people may wish to call an exemption, is the fatherhood deferment. The Selective Service fails to mention channeling men in this direction, but it is reasonable to assume that many have been. Furthermore, the system has consistently made a point of channeling, but it has never indicated which occupations have benefitted from this deferment policy.

In the last analysis, one must conclude that the protection and channeling purposes are mainly symbolic. They legitimate the practice of requiring some men to serve in the military while allowing others to remain at home.

Again, it must be asked what is the real function of deferments. One major function has been to limit the supply of available manpower (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 157). Carper (1967: 39) cites evidence that President Kennedy was persuaded by Hershey to defer married men to cut down on the manpower pool and hide the surplus. It was feared that the American public would begin to believe conscription unnecessary.

In addition, deferments appear to prevent adverse reaction to the draft and the entire Selective Service system. The large numbers of men represented in the college, occupational, and paternity deferments categories could potentially threaten the system. Men who are deferred or exempt from the draft are more likely to believe that compulsory service is fair, than are those who are not deferred. "To put the matter bluntly, deferments may have protected the draft and Selective Service more than they have protected the nation's manpower (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 157)."

The Selective Service system is in a tenuous position. Deferments cannot be granted to everyone because some men must be conscripted. The problem is to determine whom to draft and whom to defer while preserving support for the system.

No longer does the Selective Service system protect or channel to the extent that it did in the past. On April 23, 1970, President Nixon issued an Executive Order (No. 11527) which ended the granting of new II-A and II-C deferments for occupations and agriculture and III-A deferments for paternity.

Men holding such deferments were allowed to continue to do so as long as they continued to meet specified requirements. However, the Selective Service persists in channeling men into college, graduate school, medical

and dental schools, and the reserves (National Selective Service Headquarters, 1970: 7).

The data utilized in the present study were not greatly affected by Executive Order 11527, because it was compiled by the Kansas State Selective Service headquarters on September 23, 1970. In four months very few changes could have occurred.

The Classification Process

Now that some of the arguments for and against deferments have been presented, it is relevant to discuss the classification process. The local boards form the foundation of Selective Service. Most boards are composed of three to five male members who serve voluntarily without compensation in the county of which they reside. In most states, each county has at least one board, but Kansas, one of the exceptions, has several boards in rural areas which include as many as three counties.

According to formal bureaucratic procedure, board members are nominated by the governors of their respective states and appointed by the President. The means by which the Governor obtains his nominations vary. In many instances, the board members themselves select replacements. In other cases, the local board may request that the State Selective Service Headquarters furnish a new member, especially when there is difficulty in securing suitable replacements (Wamsley, 1969a: 117-119).

Selective Service organizational charts usually show that each local board has the services of a medical advisor, advisors to registrants, and appeal agents, who are all volunteers. The only paid members of the local board are the local board clerk and clerical staff (Yale Law Journal, 1966: 167-169; Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 33).

All classifications and decisions for induction are determined exclusively by the local boards. When every American male reaches the age of eighteen, he must register with his local Selective Service board. He is given a Selective Service number and a draft card which he must carry with him at all times.

After initial registration, local boards usually mail the registrant the Classification Questionnaire (SSS Form 100). This form is the registrant's first opportunity to claim deferment, exemption, and conscientious objector status. Within ten days from the date it was sent, Form 100 must be completed and returned to the local board (Tatum, 1971: 13).

Some local board clerks hand out Form 100 during registration and ask the registrant to fill it out immediately. In many instances the registrant may comply, especially if he does not know that he has a right to take ten days in filling it out. In general, the registrant should read the questionnaire carefully and answer all questions in detail. In addition, it is helpful to attach supporting evidence or statements to Form 100, because they could aid the board members in deciding upon the proper classification (Tatum, 1971: 17). The board itself may seek additional information from local, state and federal agencies. In some instances the board may ask the registrant to supply additional information or to appear before it. The registrant himself has the right to request such an appearance (McClosky, 1965: 19).

At this point it is relevant to ask what some of the factors are that influence the local board members in granting deferments and exemptions. Wamsley found that a major factor influencing decisions on classifications was a lack of information. In most instances local boards were not

personally acquainted with the registrant, had little or no information on national manpower needs, and did not investigate claims made by registrants. In short, the local boards were caught between conflicting policies of the national headquarters which expected the boards to implement a vaguely defined national manpower policy, while at the same time adjusting conscription needs of specific individuals. There is a problem of universalism vs. particularism. Because the boards lacked the necessary information to either make their decisions in a particularistic or universalistic fashion, they formed their impressions from the registrants' performances during interviews or from supporting letters in the draft file. In addition, seemingly insignificant attributes such as posture, grooming and demeanor became important in classification decisions (Wamsley, 1969b: 96).

Another factor suspected of influencing classification decisions was the predominantly middle class background of local board members. Davis and Dolbeare (1968: 57; 1969: 63), drawing on the National Advisor Commission and 1960 census data, concluded that local board members were representative of local elites--which probably results from self-perpetuating recruitment practices. In regard to education and utilizing 1960 census data, the researchers pointed out that only 12 percent of the U. S. male population over twenty-five years of age had four or more years of college, but more than 30 percent of all the local board members in the nation did. The researchers found a similar discrepancy in that 22 percent of the local board members held bachelor's degrees or higher and only 8 percent of the male population over twenty-five had reached the same educational level.

In 1966, black men were nearly nonexistent on local boards throughout

the country. At that time, blacks comprised about 11 percent of the male population, but only 1.3 percent of local board members were black. Blacks were particularly underrepresented on boards in the South. Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina had no black board members. Other Southern states had only a few black board members. Blacks in northern states were also grossly underrepresented on draft boards. In New York City, 3.3 percent of board members were black at a time when 14 percent of New York City was black (National Advisory Commission, 1967: 80-81).

In regard to occupations, two groups characterized the majority of local board members nationwide--professionals and proprietors-managers-officials. The latter occupation group was overrepresented three and one half times and the former twice as often as their occurrence in the employed male population (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968: 60).

Given that local board members essentially represented the middle class, it was not unreasonable to assume that their middle class values tended to influence decisions on Selective Service classifications. One study noted that during personal interviews, registrants were frequently "lectured or quizzed on the values of thrift, hard work, obedience to the law, morality, concern for parents; aliens were shown little sympathy in classification actions; college education was highly valued; efforts at material, social, and educational self-improvement were lauded. Members were cognizant of persons above them in class status and manifested even more awareness of those below them in status (Wamsley, 1969a: 122)."

The foregoing is evidence that the social characteristics of the board members plus the social characteristics of the registrants influenced

classification decisions. Although the present study did not deal with social data on board members, an attempt will be made to show that the social characteristics of local draft board jurisdictions are related to draft deferment and exemption categories.

Appellate Procedure

If a registrant has appeared before the local board and is denied a deferment or an exemption, he has the right of appeal. The local board does not have the power to refuse an appeal. Within thirty days after the notice of classification has been mailed, the registrant must make his appeal to the local board in writing. If there are no extenuating circumstances, the right to appeal expires. The board may, however, allow appeal after the expiration date if a registrant can present legitimate reasons for not filing on time.

A state appeal board exists in each federal judicial district and is composed of five unpaid civilians appointed by the President and recommended by the Governor. Five occupations are represented on the state appeal board--industry, law, medicine, labor, and agriculture (Office of the Federal Registrar, 1972: 19).

When a registrant makes an appeal, he faces a choice of appeal boards if he no longer resides in the same federal court district in which his draft board is located. When attempting to renew an occupational deferment, it was considered wise to appeal to the board whose jurisdiction included the place of work. An appeal board in one federal district is not likely to be concerned about a social worker shortage in another district. In other instances, it is difficult to know which appeal board to choose when one has a choice (Tatum, 1971: 23).

After an appeal is made, the local board sends the registrant's file to the appropriate appeal board. During the appeal proceeding, the registrant is not permitted to appear before the appeal board. After a ruling is made, the results are delivered to the local board. If the appeal board unanimously rules to reject a claim for deferment or exemption, the registrant has no further recourse within the Selective Service system, unless the State Selective Service Director decides that it is in the national interest or in the interest of justice to make an appeal to the President (Wilson, 1966: 2130).

However, if the state appeal board's decision is less than unanimous, the registrant himself has a right to appeal to the President's appeal board. This board is composed of three civilians appointed by the President. It functions as an entity separate from the National Director's office. The registrant is not allowed to make personal appearances before the Presidential board. Rulings are based solely on the material in the registrant's draft file. After the board rules on an appeal it does not state reasons for the decision, nor is it required to do so (Yale Law Journal, 1966: 172).

The rulings of the local boards are final by law except in the case of an authorized appeal. Similarly, the decisions of the appellate agencies of the Selective Service system are declared final by statute. The Selective Service laws are severe obstacles in the way of judicial review. Only by habeas corpus have the courts permitted review of draft classifications. And, writs have been issued only in defense of criminal prosecution for refusing to take the oath of induction or for refusing to report for induction (Wilson, 1966: 2134; Yale Law Journal, 1966: 173).

The alternative is not attractive. Invoking habeas corpus necessitates

a thorough utilization of all other remedies and the stakes are high. Losing a case for failure to report for induction could result in a five year prison sentence. In several instances, the courts have reversed local board classifications on the basis of procedural errors, however. In Steele vs. the U. S., the court reversed the board's classification for failure to post names and addresses of advisors and for failure to advise of deadlines for application for dependency deferments (Yale Law Journal, 1966: 173).

Now that the appellate process has been described, what does it mean in regard to individual registrants? In a sense, the function of the appeals system is largely symbolic. The appellate system probably convinces a substantial proportion of the American public aware of its existence that some degree of fairness pervades the Selective Service system. In actuality, this "guilty until proven innocent" system of justice is anything but fair. In order to take a draft classification case all the way to the Supreme Court, a thorough knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of the appellate system and substantial financial resources are crucial prerequisites. The appeals system is fairer for some than for others. It favors the well-educated, the well-informed, and the well-financed individuals.

Review of the Literature on Stratification and Selective Service

In 1966, Morris Janowitz stated that it was unfortunate that social scientists had avoided serious and systematic analysis of the Selective Service. At that time there was not one major study on the subject. Although social scientists have avoided researching the Selective Service system, it is entirely possible that many social scientists who attempted this type of research met considerable resistance from the system itself.

In the time that has elapsed since Janowitz issued his scathing

criticism, several social scientists have researched compulsory military service and attitudes towards it in the United States. From the fall of 1966 to the spring of 1969, Johnston and Bachman (1970: 5-19) conducted a national study on 2,200 randomly selected tenth grade boys using interviews, group-administered tests and questionnaires to collect data on attitudes toward war and military service. They found that about 20 percent of the men in the sample did not agree that the Vietnam war was important to protect friendly countries, nor did they agree that the U. S. must be willing to run any risk of war which might be necessary to prevent the spread of communism. When the respondents were asked how they would feel if they were drafted, 22 percent checked "I'd serve if I had to, but I wouldn't like it." And another 4 percent checked the more extreme statement, "I'd refuse to serve; I'd go to jail or leave the country first." Only 13 percent said, "I'd be happy to serve." The remaining 44 percent chose the neutral response, "I'd serve," indicating, perhaps, that they viewed military service as an obligation to the country, even if not viewed with enthusiasm.

Related to Johnston and Bachman's study, which clearly indicated that a large number of young men in the United States viewed compulsory military service in a negative fashion (i.e., they do not want to serve), was an empirical study conducted by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service from 1964 to 1966 (1967: 11-29). The study was entitled: In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? The Commission was composed of several social scientists and men representing academia, but they were heavily outnumbered, not surprisingly, by representatives of America's corporate business establishment, or perhaps more aptly, the military-

industrial complex.

The Commission, which was established by the executive, collected a tremendous amount of data on the entire Selective Service system by sending questionnaires to all of the approximately 4,000 local draft boards in the country. In addition, the Commission reviewed the administrative procedures governing enlistment into the Army Reserve and National Guard which had received widespread and often justified public criticism. Nevertheless, the content of the study appeared to be sound and rather comprehensive, although the data presented were primarily on the national, sectional and state levels and expressed in terms of absolute numbers and percentages.

The National Advisory Commission found that there was a great deal of variation in the socioeconomic status of the men who received deferments and exemptions. With regard to education, men who did not finish elementary school (less than eight grades) and black men who dropped out of high school were less likely to serve because most of them failed the written examination. On the other hand, graduate and professional students were less likely to be conscripted because many of them held student deferments until they reached age 26, became fathers, or received occupational deferments.

When the income variable was examined carefully in one state, the Commission discovered that high income areas usually had a high percentage of student deferments. In addition, local boards in high income areas contained the lowest proportion of registrants serving or who had served in the armed forces.

The study indicated that black men did not serve in the military out of proportion to their numbers in the United States population. However, a much larger percentage of blacks than whites were rejected for service,

primarily due to failures on written and physical exams. Although more blacks (50 percent) than whites (25 percent) in the age category examined were disqualified, 30.2 percent of the qualified black men were drafted, whereas only 18.8 percent of qualified whites were drafted in 1964. Two major factors accounted for a large part of this discrepancy. First, fewer black men got into officer programs--only 0.4 percent for qualified non-whites as contrasted with 4.3 percent of qualified whites. Second, a much smaller number of qualified black men (5.4 percent) than qualified whites (20.6 percent) were admitted to reserve programs.

The National Advisory Commission concluded that the various military reserves and National Guard units in many instances were used to escape regular military service and combat duty. Very few reserve units had been called to duty in the Vietnam war. Reserve units even admitted men when no facilities existed to train them. In addition, some men, e.g., professional athletes, were admitted to units for qualifications other than those which usually determined entry.

One of the most extensive individual level studies of the Selective Service and stratification was conducted by Albert Klassen at the National Opinion Research Center/University of Chicago from 1964 to 1966 (1966: 1-45). The data were gathered on self-administered questionnaires--102,000 from men in the armed forces, 3,000 from veterans, and 6,000 from non-veterans. The sample was limited to men aged twenty-seven and over because it was decided that if the Selective Service had not had an effect on an individual's life by that age, it probably would never have an effect. The analysis was

primarily descriptive.

When intermediate educational levels and rates of service were compared, the data indicated small differences in rates of service. From ninth grade through the B. A. or B. S. degree, the percent of those having served ranged from 65.7 to 73.5 percent (See Table 1). The percentage deferred varied only from 14 to 18 percent and disqualification rates ranged only from 11.8 to 18.0 percent for these intermediate levels of education.

Table 1. Military Obligation Rates by Educational Attainment before Service for a Sample of Males in the United States Aged 27-34 in 1964.

Education Attained	Deferred	Served	Overall Rejection Rate
Less than eight grades	22.7	30.3	58.7
Eight grades	23.3	50.5	32.6
9th, 10th or 11th grade	16.3	69.9	15.7
High school graduate	16.2	73.5	11.8
<u>College</u>			
Under two years	16.7	69.5	15.8
Two years or more	18.1	65.7	18.0
B.A. or B.S. degree	13.9	70.6	16.5
Graduate study	56.9	26.6	26.8

Source: Klassen, 1966: 15

Notes: The data shown in the table were adapted from the source. The sample was stratified according to men who were currently serving, who had served, and who had never served. Since these three groups were not weighted according to their proportion of the total population, the absolute percentages in the table should be disregarded. The relative size of the percentages is instructive. For the complete table and description of computation procedures see the source.

In sharp contrast to the intermediate education levels were the respondents who reported eight grades of education or less. The men in the

eighth-grade group were disqualified at a rate of 32.6 percent or about twice that of the intermediate group. As a consequence, their rate of service was 50 percent, only three-fourths of the overall average proportion of 64 percent.

In the less than eight grades category, it was found that almost three fifths of those examined were determined to be unfit, and as a result, only 30 percent ever served. The data also showed that the two lowest educational groups had one thing in common: almost one-fourth of each received deferments. The author attributed this to the fact that individuals in these groups were likely to come from farm populations which had a unique access to deferment in agricultural occupations.

In the highest educational category, attainment of graduate study, Table 1 indicates the lowest rate of military experience, 26.6 percent. And, except for the respondents in the lowest educational groups, the graduate students had the highest overall disqualification rate at 26.8 percent. In addition, about three-fifths of the respondents who had attained graduate education had received deferments. The author stated that it was a marvel that the rate of military service was as high as it was for this group given the types of careers that they usually entered.

When Klassen looked at fathers' education as related to sons' military experience, he found remarkably little variability. The conclusion was that by the time the respondents had reached adulthood their own educational attainment may have substantially reduced the effects of their fathers' education.

In regard to lower status white collar and blue collar occupations of fathers, Klassen found that their sons entered the military at nearly the

same rate (See Table 2). However, sons of blue collar fathers were rejected at a higher rate than were sons of lower status white collar fathers. In addition, lower status white collar sons received deferments at a rate nearly one-third higher than did the blue collar sons--19.3 compared with 15.5 percent. The author argued that lack of formal and informal education of the blue collar sons resulted in their higher rejection rate. Klassen also indicated that higher deferment rates of lower status white collar sons probably occurred because these men were more likely to pursue a college education.

Table 2. Military Obligation Rates by Father's Occupation before Service for a Sample of Males in the United States Aged 27-34 in 1964.

Father's Occupation	Deferred	Served	Overall Rejection Rate
High status white collar	23.3	63.8	15.2
Low status white collar	19.3	69.3	13.5
Blue collar	15.5	68.1	18.6
Farm	25.1	51.9	28.5

Source: Klassen, 1966: 34

Note: See notes on Table 1.

The data indicated that farm sons were a unique group. They entered the service at a lower rate than any other occupational category. Their unfitness rates and deferment rates were higher than those of any other occupational group. These findings were attributed to low levels of education among the farm population and their own unique deferment category--II-C.

Sons of high status white collar fathers had nearly the same rejection rate as those of low status white collar backgrounds--15.2 and 13.5 percent

respectively. These figures represented the lower end of the rejections rates. However, the high deferment rate of high white collar status sons (23.3 percent) was exceeded only by farm sons (25.1 percent). As a result, sons of high status white collar fathers entered the service at a somewhat lower rate (63.8 percent) than did low status white collar sons (69.3 percent). Klassen indicated that these findings probably reflect that the high status white collar group probably has more than its share of men attaining college and graduate study levels of education.

In his analysis of race, Klassen presented some remarkable findings in terms of deferments. The data showed nearly identical rates of deferments for whites and nonwhites--19.2 and 18.8 percent respectively. However, nonwhites were disqualified at almost twice the rate of whites--35 percent compared with 17.7 percent. This was reflected in the much lower rate of service for nonwhites (50 percent) compared with whites (65.7 percent).

To present a clearer picture of his findings, Klassen built a composite index of socioeconomic background and each socioeconomic level included occupation of fathers, education of fathers, and race of respondents. From this index, the general conclusions were that as one moved up the socioeconomic ladder, the rate of service decreased, rate of deferment increased, and rate of disqualification decreased (Klassen, 1966: 1-45).

Another study conducted on the Selective Service system by social scientists was done by Davis and Dolbeare. One part of their research involved collecting data by means of a detailed field study during 1965, 1966, and 1967 from all of the eighty local boards in the state of Wisconsin. The field study data was combined with census data for each local board jurisdiction in order to develop some indicators of the different effects of

socioeconomic characteristics on the draft.

In Wisconsin, local board data showed that registrants from higher income areas were less likely to serve in the military than registrants in low income areas. This was attributed to the fact that registrants in high income areas were more likely to hold student and occupational deferments.

When examining the thirty-seven boards in rural areas, it was found that low-income jurisdictions were extremely low in proportion of II-S deferments, distinctly high in I-Y and IV-F classifications, and high in hardship and dependency deferments. The authors inferred that the combined effect of these factors resulted in a rate of induction higher than the state median.

Jurisdictions with a high proportion of reservists (I-D) tended to be the areas with higher incomes and higher education. Wisconsin local boards with the lowest income jurisdictions had less than four percent of eligible men in the I-D classification (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968).

The Problem

The review of the literature suggests that very little research had been done on the relationship between socioeconomic variables and deferment and exemption categories in the Selective Service system at the local board level. The present research is primarily descriptive and attempts to show the effect of local board jurisdiction level socioeconomic variables on Selective Service deferment and exemption categories in Kansas.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The sample consisted of all the Selective Service registrants in Kansas from age eighteen to age thirty-five by classification for each local board as of September 30, 1970. The numbers of registrants in deferment and exemption classifications utilized as the dependent variables were obtained from the Kansas State Selective Service Headquarters. In Kansas there are eighty-four local boards, whose jurisdictions generally follow county lines. However, in the sparsely populated areas of the state, one local board may serve as many as three counties. Sedgewick and Wyandotte Counties both have two local boards and state headquarters combined these for administrative purposes in its classification report. Therefore, the number of observations for the present study was eighty-two.

The Selective Service Classifications

Class I

- I-A Available for military duty.
- I-A-0 Available for non-combatant military duty.
- I-C Member of the active armed forces, or commissioned officer in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or Public Health Service.
- I-D Qualified member of reserve component, or student taking military training, including ROTC and accepted aviation cadet applicants.
- I-O Conscientious objector available for civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.
- I-S Student deferred by law until graduation from high school or attainment of age twenty, or until the end of his academic year at a college or university.

- I-W Conscientious objector performing civilian work contributing to the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest, or who has completed such work.
- I-Y Unqualified for service except in time of declared war or national emergency.

Class II

- II-A Deferred because of essential employment (not available to new applicants, but renewable for men who qualified before April 23, 1970); or, deferred for full-time study in trade school, community or junior college, or approved apprenticeship program.
- II-C Deferred due to agricultural employment (not available for new applicants, but renewable for men who qualified before April 23, 1970).
- II-S College student deferment.

Class III

- III-A Deferred due to fatherhood (available on a renewable basis for men classified III-A before April 23, 1970, and who continue to live with their children); or, deferment due to hardship, available to those whose dependents would suffer if they were drafted.

Class IV

- IV-A Veteran whose military duty obligation has been completed; or, the only surviving son of a family in which the father or one or more sons or daughters were killed or died in the line of duty while in the armed forces, or subsequently died as a result of such service.
- IV-B Certain government officials deferred by law.
- IV-C Certain aliens who are exempt from the draft, including aliens not on immigration visas, until they have completed one year's residence; and alien registrants while outside the United States.
- IV-D Ministers and divinity students exempted from the draft.
- IV-F Not qualified for any military service.
- V-A Over the age of liability for any military service; twenty-six years old if never deferred; thirty-five for those who have held a deferment.¹

¹For a complete description of Selective Service classifications, see Code of Federal Regulations, No. 32, National Defense, Part 1600 to end, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972.

The percentages of Kansas Selective Service registrants by classification for the eighty-two local draft boards are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Percentages of Selective Service Registrants by Classification for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Classification	Percent of Total	Percent of Deferment Categories	N
I-A	7.65		21,787
I-Y	13.13	24.94	37,393
I-C	10.70		30,496
I-O	.17	.33	495
I-W	.49	.93	1,390
I-D	4.72	8.96	13,435
I-S	1.15	2.19	3,280
II-A	1.29	2.45	3,668
II-C	.23	.44	658
II-S	7.30	13.87	20,799
III-A	17.65	33.54	50,287
IV-A	15.57		44,356
IV-B	0.00	0.00	3
IV-C	.03	0.06	92
IV-D	.59	1.11	1,668
IV-F	5.88	11.17	16,746
V-A	13.46		38,341
Total	100.00	100.00	284,894

Source: Kansas State Selective Service Headquarters, 1970.

Note: The total N for registrants in deferment categories is 149,911.

The Dependent Variables

From the total number of Selective Service classifications, the deferment and exemption categories were separated out as a preliminary step in obtaining the dependent variables. The deferments and exemptions were as follows:

Class I	I-O, I-D, I-S, I-W, and I-Y
Class II	II-A, II-C, and II-S
Class III	III-A
Class IV	IV-B, IV-C, IV-D, and IV-F

Classifications IV-B, IV-C, and IV-D were discarded from the study because in combination they only constituted .62 percent of the total sample (See Table 3). The I-A category was not used in the analysis because it is not a deferment. In addition, classifications IV-A, I-C, and V-A were not utilized as dependent variables, because they were given to persons no longer eligible to be drafted.

By using the total number of deferments as the denominator to compute the percentage of registrants in each deferment category for each local board, the data was converted to interval level. In order to reduce the number of dependent variables further, it seemed logical to collapse the deferment and exemption classifications into the following categories:

1. Conscientious objectors (I-O, I-W)
2. Medical (IV-F, I-Y)
3. Student (I-S, II-S)
4. Occupational (II-A, II-C)
5. Hardship (III-A)
6. Reserves (I-D)

A zero order correlation matrix indicated that the proposed collapses could be made except in the case of IV-F and I-Y.

Table 4 indicates that the I-O and I-W classifications were essentially the same variable ($r = .89$) and were probably measuring the same thing.

This is not surprising, since both groups were composed of conscientious objectors. The only difference is that the registrants classified I-W were performing some type of alternative service.

Table 4. Zero Order Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationships Among Deferment and Exemption Categories for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	I-Y	I-O	I-W	I-D	I-S	II-A	II-C	II-S	III-A	IV-F
I-Y	--	-.09	-.13	-.07	.08	-.36*	-.27**	-.08	-.33*	-.38*
I-O		--	.89*	-.21	.05	-.07	-.17	-.05	-.20	-.12
I-W			--	-.23**	.01	-.07	-.17	-.04	-.20	.19
I-D				--	-.07	-.08	-.11	-.09	-.27**	-.05
I-S					--	-.12	-.11	.28**	-.31*	-.09
II-A						--	.48*	.00	.08	-.02
II-C							--	.02	.05	.07
II-S								--	-.43*	-.10
III-A									--	-.15
IV-F										--

*P < .01

**P < .05

Categories II-A and II-C were also highly correlated (.48) although not as highly as I-O and I-W. These two deferments were both occupational, but for different occupations. This is likely the reason for a somewhat lower correlation.

The I-S and II-S classifications correlated significantly, although somewhat lower than in both of the above cases. Although the two deferments were both for students, they were for different types of students in some instances. The II-S category included college students only and the I-S

category consisted of some college students plus high school students under age 20. The correlation was expected to be higher, but nevertheless it was still significant. High school students with I-S classifications were probably not as elite a group as college students, since most individuals finish high school. In fact, certain low SES people would probably keep I-S longer than high SES people, because of having been kept back a year or two in school. Hence, the low correlation between I-S and II-S could partly be explained by this phenomenon.

I-Y and IV-F correlated moderately ($-.38$), but negatively. Since they were both medical, mental and physical deferments, it was expected that they would correlate positively. Apparently, I-Y and IV-F were obtained by persons with quite different social characteristics.

The factor analysis lent further justification for collapsing the classifications in the fashion proposed (See Table 5). I-O and I-W had extremely high loadings on factor 1 as would be expected from their high correlation. The two variables were added to form the conscientious objector deferment category.

Three variables loaded highly on factor 2. As expected, II-A and II-C both had a high loading in the same direction. Consequently, the two variables were combined to form an occupational deferment category. Table 2 indicates that I-Y also loaded moderately on factor 2, but in the opposite direction from II-A and II-C. This probably means that people who received occupational deferments were unlikely to have mental and physical defects or undesirable characteristics such as a minor criminal record which would have qualified them for a I-Y classification.

On factor 3, I-S and II-S had very high positive loadings. For this

reason, the two were combined to form a student deferment category. Also loading highly on factor 3, but in the opposite direction from I-S and II-S was the III-A variable. This makes some sense, because most students were comparatively affluent and would not have been likely to qualify for a III-A hardship deferment. In further analysis, the III-A classification was utilized as a separate dependent variable.

Table 5. Factor Analysis of Selective Service Deferment and Exemption Categories for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
I-W	-.97				
I-O	-.96				
II-A		-.86			
II-C		-.79			
II-S			.80		
I-S			.70		
IV-F				-.93	
I-Y		.49		.67	
I-D					-.93
III-A			-.71		.53

Note: Only those loadings significant at the .01 level were shown.

Since both the I-Y and IV-F classifications were granted on the basis of medical, mental and moral defects, it was presumed that they would load highly on the same factor and in the same direction. This was not the case. Table 2 shows that I-Y and IV-F loaded on factor 4, but in opposite directions. This indicates that men totally disqualified for military service did not possess the characteristics which qualify an individual for a I-Y

deferment. In further analysis, both I-Y and IV-F were utilized as separate dependent variables.

Factor 5 reflected high loadings for the I-D (reserves) and the III-A (hardship) categories, but the loadings were in different directions. In the introduction to this study, it was noted that jurisdictions characterized by high proportions of I-D classifications were areas of high income and high education. Jurisdictions with high income and education levels were not likely to have large numbers of men who would qualify for a III-A hardship deferment. Because I-D had a very high loading on factor 5 by itself, it was designated as a separate dependent variable.

The zero order correlation matrix and the factor analysis, which is based on the correlation matrix, indicated that the following dependent variables were worthy of further analysis:

1. Conscientious objectors (I-O and I-W)
2. Occupational deferments (II-A and II-C)
3. Student deferments (I-S and II-S)
4. Hardship and paternity deferments (III-A)
5. Members of the military reserves (I-D)
6. Medical, mental, physical deferments (I-Y)
7. Medical, mental, physical deferments (IV-F)

The Independent Variables

By far the most frequently used indicators of socioeconomic position are derived from measures of education, occupation, income, and residence. Many social scientists have used them singly and in combination (Roach, Gross, Gursslein, 1969: 123). In the present research, the socioeconomic status of each local draft board jurisdiction was not directly measured, but operationally was presumed to be an attribute of the jurisdiction. Thus, the jurisdictions were stratified with respect to certain variables assumed to be highly correlated with socioeconomic status.

Most of the independent variables consisted of selected socioeconomic indicators by Kansas counties drawn from the 1970 census--General Social and Economic Characteristics and the General Population Characteristics. In addition to the census variables, several other indicators thought to be correlated with socioeconomic status were constructed.

Before describing and defining the independent variables, it is necessary to remind the reader that the local draft board jurisdictions in Kansas generally follow county lines, but not always. Kansas has 105 counties and, as noted previously, several of the eighty-two boards have jurisdictions which include up to three counties.

In nearly all instances in which a multiple county draft board exists, the independent county variables were standardized proportionately by population in order to design accurate measures. For example, the jurisdiction of local board #73 in Colby covers Logan, Rawlins, and Thomas counties. To obtain a proportionate figure of "percent rural-farm" for these counties the population of each county and the raw numbers of rural farm population were totalled. By utilizing the total population of the three counties as the denominator and the total rural farm population for the three counties as the numerator, a proportionate percentage was derived.

The selected independent variables for all local board jurisdictions were as follows:

1. Percent of the jurisdiction population listed as members of peace churches was derived from data collected by the Kansas Council of Churches (1964) and the National Council of Churches (1956). Both organizations obtained data on the numbers of people who were members of the various churches in all Kansas counties. The campus ministers at Kansas State

University were asked to indicate the churches which held religious doctrines which would not permit their members to serve in the armed forces. These churches were Mennonite, Church of the Brethren, Friends, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Seventh Day Adventist. For the purposes of the study, they were defined as peace churches.

The data is admittedly crude, and there were discrepancies in both sources. The 1956 data often listed people as members of peace churches when the 1964 data did not, and vice versa. Frequently, one or the other of the two sources failed to list the membership of a particular church in a particular county. In order to obtain the best indicator, whichever source which listed the largest membership for each peace church was included in the numerator and the 1960 county population was employed throughout for the denominator to derive the independent variable.

2. Percent rural-farm residence, according to the 1970 census, was all rural residents living on farms of ten or more acres from which the sales of farm products reached fifty dollars or more in the previous calendar year or people living on farms of less than ten acres from which sales of goods reached two hundred fifty or more dollars in the previous year.²

3. Percent rural non-farm residents in rural areas were defined as those who did not meet the rural farm definition.

4. Percent rural was derived by summing the percent rural-farm and the percent rural-non-farm. The 1970 census defined rural areas as incorporated

²Definitions for the independent variables were drawn from the 1970 census unless otherwise indicated.

or unincorporated places of less than twenty-five hundred inhabitants. Urban areas were places which were not rural.

5. Percent nonwhite included all respondents who did not classify themselves as white. The 1970 census did not have biological definitions of race. Instead, people indicated their race as the one with which they identified. The choices were: White, Negro or Black, American Indian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean, and other. Respondents who wrote in their race as Mexican, Puerto Rican, or any response in the "other" category suggesting Indo-European races were included in the white category.

6. Median school years completed were defined as the value which separated the county population into two equal groups with one having had more schooling and one having had less schooling than the median. For lack of a better procedure for obtaining an accurate figure in the local board jurisdictions containing multiple counties, a simple average of the median education was taken in these cases. The median education levels for each county in the multiple county draft boards were for the most part very similar.

7. The cumulative fertility rate was defined as the number of children ever born per thousand women aged thirty-five to forty-four. In instances where a local board jurisdiction consisted of multiple counties, the CFR was simply averaged to derive a figure for the entire jurisdiction.

8. Percent unemployed were civilians sixteen years old and over and who either were not working and had no job, or had a job but were not working at the time of responding to the census questionnaire; or, who were looking for employment four weeks prior to filling out the questionnaire and were available to accept a job. Also included in the percent unemployed category

were persons who had been laid off and were waiting to be called back to work.

Although the unemployment data was probably correct for most regular full-time workers, the 1970 census cautioned readers about a likelihood of error in marginal cases. For instance, students or housewives may not have indicated that they were unemployed if they only worked part-time.

9. Percent white collar workers including professional, technical, and kindred workers; managers and administrators, except farm; sales workers; clerical and kindred workers.

10. Percent people employed in manufacturing working in industry which produced furniture, lumber and wood products; primary metals; fabricated metals and machinery; motor vehicles; other durable goods; food and kindred products; textile mill and other fabricated products; printing, publishing, and allied industries; chemical and allied products; and other nondurable goods.

11. Percent of families with less than poverty income was adjusted for size of family, sex of family head, number of children under eighteen years old, and farm-nonfarm residence. In 1969, the poverty income levels set by the Federal Interagency Committee ranged from \$1487 for a female unrelated individual sixty-five years old and over living on a farm to \$6116 for a non-farm family with a male head with seven or more persons. The 1970 census defined a family as consisting of a household head and one or more other persons living in the same household who are related to the head by blood, marriage or adoption.

12. Percent families with income over \$15,000 requires no explanation.

13. Centrality as used in the present study refers to access to information which the largest city in the local board jurisdiction (a subsystem) receives from a regional center (the containing system). It is assumed that

there is more information concerning the various deferment and exemption classifications and how to obtain one in the jurisdictions which have highly central cities. For example, it was expected that the more central jurisdictions would have access to more draft counseling facilities, more doctors, more lawyers, and in general more knowledgeable people who could inform a young registrant of his legal right to a deferment or how to acquire one illegitimately.

The concept of centrality was originally derived from central place theory and the work of Christaller (1935; 1966 translation). He developed the proposition that community centers, which perform central functions for their outlying areas, are physically arranged in a network of unilateral hexagons. These community centers are called central places and are situated in the center of the hexagon. The rest of the hexagon is comprised of the hinterland of a central place. Christaller envisioned an overlapping system of hinterlands. The largest central places were presumed to contain, within their own boundaries, the hinterlands of smaller central places. Starting with the largest and moving down, each central place is presumed to have its own hinterland which contains a part of the hinterland of central places of the next lower order.³

In this study, the centrality scores were derived from the gravity model: $\frac{P_1 \cdot P_2}{D^2}$, where P_1 is the population of the city with the largest population in the local board jurisdiction and P_2 is the population of the largest city in the immediate containing system. The containing systems were more or

³For a review of central place theory, see J. Flora (1967: 2-8).

less arbitrarily defined by ordering the largest cities of the local board jurisdictions in terms of population size and then establishing cutoff points indicating four groups or orders of potential containing systems. Each group contained cities that were believed not to be dependent on each other except for the top two--Wichita and Kansas City--which was unavoidable. The Kansas City population included both Kansas City, Kansas, and Kansas City, Missouri, populations.

The most populous cities, Wichita and Kansas City, comprised Group 1. Topeka was the beginning of Group 2 because it is thought to be subsidiary to Kansas City. Junction City was the beginning of Group 3 because it is probably subsidiary to a city in Group 2--Manhattan. Goodland was the beginning of Group 4, because it is thought to be subsidiary to a city in Group 3--Hays.⁴

The containing system or regional center for P_1 is the closest city measured in miles on a road map to the city in a higher group or order. D is the distance between the subsystem and the containing system. It was assumed that the largest city in the jurisdiction, which in most cases was the city of the local board, was part of a network of central places.

The model assumes that the activity of the subsystem is oriented toward that of the containing system. This model is oversimplified, of course, because subsystem activity is not always confined to the incorporating system, and, in fact the boundaries may not be as sharp as is connoted by the terms "system" and "subsystem." Also, other systems may be interposed between a given subsystem and its containing structure so that direct interaction is significantly modified (Young, 1970: 304).

⁴For a population ranking of Kansas communities, see C. Flora (1971: 33-45).

14. Population size of the largest city in the local board jurisdiction was used as a rough measure of differentiation. Differentiation refers to the institutional patterning and structural complexity of this largest city. It was assumed that the more highly populated the city, the more highly differentiated it would be. For instance, highly differentiated cities usually would have such services as public transportation, secondary schools, central sewer systems, auditoriums where musical and theatrical performances were held, central water supplies, local post offices, officially titled head men, primary schools, police departments, fire departments, etc. (Young, et al., 1968: 344-351). The local board constituencies which contained highly differentiated cities were presumed to have more draft deferment information available than were the constituencies which contained less differentiated cities.

15. The data on percentage of families with children under six years of age was taken from the 1970 census. It was presumed to be related to the III-A hardship dependent variable. The data was proportionate for the multiple county draft boards.

16. Median income data was taken from the 1970 census. In multiple county jurisdictions a simple average of the median incomes for each county was taken.

A preliminary factor analysis including all the independent variables was run to determine their interrelationships. The cumulative fertility rate and the percent families with children under six years of age did not load highly on any of the factors. To improve the factor analysis, they were discarded. The final factor analysis, therefore, contained fourteen independent variables. The results appear in Table 6.

Table 6. Factor Analysis of 14 Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Percent rural	-.84*	-.39		
Percent rural nonfarm	-.79	-.32		
Percent rural farm	-.78*	-.38		
Percent unemployed	.87*			
Percent employed in manufacturing industries	.60*		.29	-.47
Poverty income		-.85*		
Median income		.84*	.37	
\$15,000 or higher income		.83	.35	
Median school years		.81*		
Percent white collar	.56	.68		
Centrality			.90*	
Percent nonwhite			.68*	
Population	.38		.67*	
Peace churches				-.93*

*Variables chosen for further analysis

Note: Only those variables significant at the .01 level were shown.

On factor 1, two distinct sets of variables had high loadings in opposite directions. The three rural variables were negatively related to what were assumed to be indicators of urbaneness--unemployment, manufacturing occupations and white collar occupations. This suggests that rurality and urbanness were opposite ends of the same dimension.

Factor 2 showed that all of the SES variables had positive loadings except for "percentage of families with less than poverty level income,"

which loaded highly in the opposite direction. Generally, individuals with low incomes are not characterized by high education, white collar occupations, etc.

The percent nonwhite, population, and centrality variables loaded highest on factor 3, indicating that these variables were rather similar. This seems reasonable, because in Kansas nonwhites tend to reside in the highly populated cities, which are usually the most centrally located cities.

Peace churches loaded on factor 4 by itself. None of the other independent variables had a loading as high as .50 on this factor. The zero order correlation matrix in Appendix A indicates that this is logical because none of the other independent variables had even moderate correlations with peace churches.

Following the results of the factor analysis, the independent variables were designated as belonging to the following factors:

Factor 1: Rural-Urban Factor

- a. Percent of population with rural farm residency in the local board jurisdiction.
- b. Percent of population with rural residency in the local board jurisdiction.
- c. Percent of population with urban residency in the local board jurisdiction (the residual of percent of population with rural residency in the local board jurisdiction).
- d. Percent of the civilian labor force unemployed in the local board jurisdiction (assumed to be an urban variable because it loaded in the opposite direction of the rural variables).
- e. Percent of the population in the local board jurisdiction employed in manufacturing industries (assumed to be an urban indicator because it loaded high in the opposite direction from the rural variables).

Factor 2: Socioeconomic Status

- a. Median school years of the population of the local board jurisdiction.
- b. Median income of the local board jurisdiction.
- c. Percent of families in the local board jurisdiction with less than poverty level income.

Factor 3: Centrality Factor

- a. Percent of nonwhite population in the local board jurisdiction.
- b. Centrality measure.
- c. Population of largest city in the local board jurisdiction.

Factor 4: Peace Church Factor

Percent jurisdiction population with peace church membership.

Although the centrality factor was the only factor expressly designed to measure access of constituency populations to deferment information from differentiated communities or from containing systems, the other three factors were assumed to indirectly measure access to information which would be beneficial in the acquisition of draft deferments. The peace church factor was presumed to measure access to information essential for obtaining a conscientious objector deferment. Draft board constituencies which had characteristics directly related to variables on the SES factor were likely to have more draft deferment information available than the constituencies with characteristics inversely related to variables on the same factor. People in high SES populations tend to read more books, magazines, and newspapers and to participate in a variety of formal and informal organizations. Finally, it was assumed that the urban jurisdictions would contain more draft deferment information than rural jurisdictions. Urban areas are more likely to have sympathetic physicians, lawyers, draft counselors, etc., who could give accurate advice and information concerning the acquisition of a draft deferment.

Since nearly all of the independent variables were individual-level aggregated variables (population and centrality were the only true group-level variables utilized in the research), the reader should be cautioned with regard to the ecological fallacy. Aggregated data may show statistical relationships which do not exist in the real world. For example, if a

deferment category correlated with high income (an aggregated variable), it could not be proved that high income people were receiving deferments at a higher rate. The relationship could be indicating that low income people in high income jurisdictions were receiving a large number of deferments. However, it is logical to believe that the former is the actual situation--if no reasonable alternative explanation is available.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

The main purpose of this study was to determine which aggregated socioeconomic indicators correlate highly with the Selective Service's deferment and exemption classifications in all of the local draft boards in Kansas. Seven dependent and eleven independent variables were selected and the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test the relation between each pair of variables. The results and interpretations are presented in this chapter.

The Conscientious Objector Deferment Classification: I-O and I-W

For the purposes of this study, the conscientious objector category was defined to include both the I-O and I-W classifications. Conscientious objection to military service has traditionally held a religious connotation. Prior to the 1967 draft law revisions, the major requirement for an I-O classification was convincing evidence of devout religious training and strong belief in a "Supreme Being," which could not allow military service. Although the "Supreme Being" clause was eliminated in 1967, conscientious objector applicants are still required to demonstrate religious convictions, but the definition of religion has become broader than in the past.

Due to the religious overtones of conscientious objection, it was predicted that membership in the traditional peace churches would be highly correlated with the conscientious objector classifications in the Kansas local board jurisdictions. It was also predicted that jurisdictions with high proportions of conscientious objectors would be linearly related to

independent variables that loaded high on the SES and centrality factors.

Table 7. Zero Order Correlations between Conscientious Objector Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	Conscientious Objectors
(Peace Church Factor)	
Percent of jurisdiction population with peace church membership	.83*
(SES Factor)	
Percent of jurisdiction population with less than poverty level income	-.20**

*P $\leq .01$

**P $\leq .10$

As suspected, the independent variable most highly related to the conscientious objector deferment category (.83, $p \leq .01$) was percent of the population in the local board jurisdiction who were members of traditional peace churches.

The implications of this relationship are noteworthy. In the review of the literature, it was discovered that no research had been done to attempt to account for the preponderance of conscientious objectors in local board jurisdictions. In the present research a strong indicator of conscientious objector deferments in Kansas was discovered. It is expected that this independent variable would be highly related to conscientious objector deferments in other states, but verification would require further research.

It was expected that the independent variables with high loadings on the SES and centrality factors would also be related to the conscientious objector category. Obtaining a CO deferment is not an easy task (Tatum, 1971). It requires knowledge of the existence of the deferment and how to go about

obtaining it. Logically, the jurisdictions characterized by high median income, high education, high centrality, etc., were thought to be more likely to have available the necessary information for registrants to recognize the possibility of obtaining a conscientious objector deferment.

Table 7 indicates that there was little support for the above assumption, except for one income variable--percent of families in the jurisdiction with less than poverty level income ($r = -.20$, $p < .10$). The relationship was negative; jurisdictions with a large proportion of poverty income people did not tend to have a high proportion of their registrants classified I-O and I-W. The converse might also be true; namely, that jurisdictions characterized by a low percentage of persons with poverty incomes tended to have high proportions of their registrants classified I-O and I-W.

In sum, it appeared that (1) most conscientious objectors were peace church related and (2) the existence of peace churches cannot be predicted by any of the other independent variables. This suggests that at the time the traditional peace churches were established in Kansas, the characteristics of the areas in which they were located may have been distinctly different from what they were in 1970.

The Student Deferment Classification: I-S and II-S

Past research indicated that local board jurisdictions with a high proportion of registrants deferred as students were characterized by high income (Davis & Dolbeare, 1968). Following the results of previous research, it was predicted that independent variables included in the SES factor would be linearly related to the student deferment category.

Table 8. Zero Order Correlations between Student Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	Student Deferments
(SES Factor)	
Median income of jurisdiction	.27*
Median school years of jurisdiction	.21**

*P $\leq$.02

**P $\leq$.10

Table 8 shows that the SES factor was the only factor containing variables significantly correlated with the dependent variable. This lends support for the prediction and to the research done by Davis and Dolbeare (1968), Klassen (1966), and the National Advisory Commission (1967).

Correlating highest with the dependent variable (.27, $p \leq .02$) was median income. The indication was that the jurisdiction with high median incomes tend to have a high proportion of their Selective Service registrants classified I-S and II-S. Since a great deal of money is required to support students in their educational endeavors, the relationship is not surprising.

The next variable which correlated significantly with the dependent variable (.21, $p \leq .10$) was the median educational level of the local board jurisdiction. The relationship suggests that the jurisdictions characterized by high median education levels had higher proportions of registrants in the student deferment categories. In areas where educational levels were high, there was likely to be more emphasis on education and therefore more student deferments.

The Occupational Deferment Category: II-A and II-C

Requirements for qualification for an occupational deferment are extremely vague. The ambiguity surrounding the II-A classification and the seldom existent and/or non-utilized critical skills list was discussed in Chapter I. The same vagueness and ambiguity pervades the II-C category. According to the regulations, II-C deferments were to be given to "any registrant who is employed in the production for market of a substantial quantity of those agricultural commodities which are essential to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest . . ." (Office of the Federal Registrar, 1972: 50).

Since both occupational deferments were supposedly granted on the basis of employment considered to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and since the predominantly middle class local board members autonomously decided what types of occupations met these criteria, it was predicted that the jurisdictions with a high proportion of occupational deferments would be directly related to the variables which reflected high loadings on the rural-urban, the SES, and the centrality factors.

Overall, Table 9 offers little support for the prediction. Variables which loaded on three factors (rural-urban, SES, and centrality) were significantly related to the dependent variable, but in the opposite direction predicted.

The rural farm variable, which loaded highly on the rural-urban factor, correlated highest with occupational deferments ($-.43, p < .01$). The implication is that local board jurisdictions characterized by a large rural population had large numbers of their Selective Service registrants deferred

on occupational grounds.

Also loading on the rural-urban factor and correlating highly with the dependent variable ($-.30, p < .01$) was the manufacturing variable. The inverse relationship suggests that local board jurisdictions which did not have high proportions of their civilian labor force employed in manufacturing industries had high proportions of their draft registrants in the occupational deferment category. Since rural areas tend to have fewer people working in manufacturing industries (See the Appendix), the finding suggests that in Kansas occupational deferments were being granted in rural areas.

Table 9. Zero Order Correlations between Occupational Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	Occupational Deferments
(SES Factor)	
Median income of jurisdiction	-.40*
Percent of jurisdiction population with less than poverty level income	.38*
Median school years of jurisdiction	-.25**
(Rural-Urban Factor)	
Percent rural farm population in jurisdiction	.43*
Percent of jurisdiction population employed in manufacturing industries	-.30*
(Centrality Factor)	
Percent nonwhite population in jurisdiction	-.23**
Centrality	.22**

* $P < .01$

** $P < .05$

Three independent variables loaded on the SES factor and were

significantly related to occupational deferments. These variables, indicating essentially the same thing, were: median income ($-.40, p < .01$); poverty income ($.38, p < .01$); and median school years ($-.25, p < .05$). The direction of these three relationships suggest that occupational deferments were being granted in jurisdictions where SES was low. In Kansas, which jurisdictions were related to indicators of low SES? The correlation matrix containing all of the independent variables (see the Appendix) clearly shows that the rural farm variable was highly correlated with low SES indicators: $-.42$ with median school years, $-.58$ with median income, and $.42$ with poverty income. This is further evidence that the preponderance of occupational deferments were strongly related to a rural phenomenon.

The centrality factor contained two independent variables moderately related to occupational deferments. Centrality itself correlated at $-.23$ ($p < .10$), and the nonwhite variable correlated at $-.22$ ($p < .10$) with the dependent variable. Since centrality and nonwhites correlated $.61$ with each other, it is assumed that they are both indicators of centrality in this instance. The negative relationship suggests that the local board jurisdictions characterized by low centrality had higher proportions of their Selective Service registrants classified II-A and II-C. Low centrality also indicates that these jurisdictions were isolated and not strongly tied into the larger communication network through such mechanisms as the mass media and public transportation.

What areas in Kansas were characterized by low centrality? Inspection of the correlation matrix in the Appendix clearly indicates that all three of the rural variables were highly related to low centrality. In short, the centrality factor, in addition to the rural-urban and SES factors, reflects

that occupational deferments in Kansas were largely a rural phenomenon.

Reserve Classification: I-D

I-D was defined as a deferment classification because enlistment in the military reserve programs results in six months or less of active duty. Although reservists are liable for call-up, they rarely serve the additional eighteen months required of a draftee. A shroud of unfairness has surrounded the I-D classification, especially during the Vietnam War buildup when reserve units were full and long waiting lists abounded.

Davis and Dolbeare (1968) found that jurisdictions in Wisconsin characterized by high income levels and high education levels had higher proportions of registrants classified I-D. The data in Table 10 offers some support for their findings in regard to education, but not to income.

Table 10. Zero Order Correlations between the Military Reserve Classification and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	Military Reserve Classification
(SES Factor)	
Median school years of jurisdiction	.18*

* $P < .10$

In Kansas local board jurisdictions, median education level correlated moderately with the dependent variable (.18, $p < .10$). This suggests that the jurisdictions characterized by high education levels tended to have a higher proportion of their registrants in the military reserves. That none of the other independent variables correlated significantly with the dependent variable is puzzling. Apparently, variables not included in this study were influencing the I-D classification. Having friends with power in the

community, such as business and political leaders, might have been an important indicator of reserve status. Presumably, powerful friends or connections would have been able to improve one's chances of admission to a reserve program. An example of this was the professional athlete who got into the reserves because team owners and other influential people had pulled strings for him or provided him with information necessary for acceptance into a reserve unit, i.e., where there was a unit with an opening.

Hardship Deferments: III-A

It was predicted that the hardship deferment would be directly related to variables in the rural-urban, SES, and the centrality factors. About one third of the Selective Service registrants in Kansas were classified III-A in 1970. Bradford (1967: 23) pointed out that in 1964 about one quarter of the registrants in the country were classified III-A and only a small percentage of this group was granted deferments on the basis of extreme hardship. The bulk of the III-A deferments were granted on the basis of fatherhood. Nationally in 1970, about one tenth of all Selective Service registrants were classified III-A (Semiannual Report, 1970: 19-30), but there was no way of knowing how many constituted extreme hardship or fatherhood deferments.

Bradford's claim with respect to national level data did not appear to hold for Kansas. On the whole, the relationships in Table 11 show that III-A deferments in Kansas local board jurisdictions were related to low socioeconomic indicators. This would tend to indicate that in Kansas, local boards granted deferments on the basis of extreme hardship, or that most of the fathers also qualified on the basis of extreme hardship.

Table 11. Zero Order Correlations between Hardship Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	Hardship Deferments
(SES Factor)	
Median income of jurisdiction	-.52*
Percent of jurisdiction population with less than poverty level income	.43*
Median school years of jurisdiction	-.42*
(Rural-Urban Factor)	
Percent rural population in jurisdiction	.39*
(Centrality Factor)	
Centrality	-.28**
Percent nonwhite population in jurisdiction	-.27**

*P < .01

**P < .02

Three independent variables that loaded highly on the SES factor correlated significantly with the dependent variable ($p < .01$). Median income correlated highest (-.52) and poverty income and median school years were next with correlations of .43 and -.42, respectively. These relationships indicate that local board jurisdictions with high proportions of hardship deferments were characterized by a large number of poverty income families and low average education. The question to be asked is what types of local boards were these relationships describing? The zero order correlation matrix showing the interrelationship of all the independent variables (Appendix) suggests the answer. Percent rural was highly related to low SES, correlating -.60 with median income, .45 with poverty income, and -.68 with median school years. A high percentage of hardship deferments seem to have

been given in the rural constituencies in Kansas.

Further evidence that hardship deferments predominated in rural constituencies is shown with respect to the rural-urban factor in Table 11. Loading highly on this factor and correlating significantly with the dependent variable (.39, $p < .01$) was the variable of percent rural. Since the hardship deferment was one of the classifications that local boards had complete control of in regard to issuance, the rural boards in Kansas may have viewed the hardship deferment as a way of protecting some of their registrants from the draft.

Table 11 shows that two variables which loaded on the centrality factor were significantly related to hardship deferments ($p < .02$). Both had similar correlations--centrality with $-.28$ and nonwhites with $-.27$. In this instance it is assumed that both variables were measuring centrality because they correlated highly with each other (.61) in the zero order correlation matrix (Appendix), which contains all the independent variables. Since the relationship between centrality and hardship deferments was negative, the implication is that local board jurisdictions with high proportions of hardship deferments were characterized by low centrality. This suggests that these jurisdictions did not have access to information from a containing system which would be useful in acquiring other types of deferments.

In what types of constituencies did low centrality predominate? The data in the Appendix clearly shows that low centrality prevailed in the rural areas. The overall picture with respect to hardship deferments reflects that it was primarily a rural phenomenon.

The I-Y Deferment Category

I-Y is a mysterious classification. It was manufactured in 1962 by

General Hershey in conjunction with the Pentagon when the Selective Service was about to be overrun with a huge group of new registrants born during the postwar baby boom. The meaning of the classification was vague and invited unlimited conjecture about why a man should be deferred somewhere between IV-F and I-A. "A man in I-Y is not too objectionable for war, not perfect enough for I-A in peacetime, but acceptable in an emergency." (Carper, 1967: 39).

Since almost no research has been done on the social characteristics of registrants in the I-Y classification, the data presented here is exploratory at best. Davis and Dolbeare (1968) found that low income jurisdictions had low proportions of I-Y's, but due to the nature of the classification, it was suspected that the variables which had high loadings on the SES factor, the urban factor, and the centrality factor would be highly correlated with the preponderance of I-Y's.

Two variables which had high loadings on the SES factor correlated significantly with the dependent variable and they were suggesting essentially the same thing. Median income correlated highly (.35, $p < .01$), in the same direction as the dependent variable, and poverty income correlated negatively (-.26, $p < .02$) with the dependent variable. This suggests that local board jurisdictions with high average incomes had a higher proportion of registrants in the I-Y medical, mental and physical deferment category. The expected relationship was confirmed by both variables.

The table also reflects that two variables which loaded on the rural-urban factor correlated highly with the dependent variable. First, percent of rural population correlated highest (-.47, $p < .01$) with the I-Y classification. The inverse relationship suggests that the urban jurisdictions had

higher proportions of registrants classified I-Y. The second urban variable that correlated highly (.29, $p < .01$) was percent of the civilian labor force unemployed in the local board jurisdiction. Again, the implication is that urban jurisdictions had higher proportions of I-Y registrants. It is suspected that registrants in urban jurisdictions tend to have access to draft deferment information and to physicians and lawyers who would be useful in obtaining an I-Y.

Table 12. Zero Order Correlations between I-Y Deferments and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	I-Y Deferments
(Rural-Urban Factor)	
Percent rural population in jurisdiction	-.47*
Percent civilian labor force unemployed in jurisdiction	.29*
(SES Factor)	
Median income of jurisdiction	.35*
Percent of jurisdiction population with less than poverty level income	-.23**
(Centrality Factor)	
Percent nonwhite population in jurisdiction	.34*

* $P < .01$

** $P < .02$

The last factor containing a variable which correlated significantly with the I-Y category was the centrality factor. Table 12 indicates that percent of nonwhite population in local board jurisdictions correlated .34 ($p < .01$) with the dependent variable. Because the centrality measure itself was not significantly related to the dependent variable, the nonwhite relationship

is not assumed to be measuring centrality. The implication is that constituencies characterized by comparatively large nonwhite populations in Kansas had high proportions of registrants classified I-Y. Indirectly, the nonwhite variable also indicates that the I-Y deferments predominated in the urban areas. The zero order correlation matrix in the Appendix shows that the nonwhite variable correlated $-.58$ with the percent rural variable.

The IV-F Exemption

Davis and Dolbeare (1968) found that low income and rural jurisdictions were high in proportions of IV-F classifications. Klassen's research (1966) indicated that unfitness rates were related to low levels of education and the nonwhite races. These variables were probably indicators of ascribed IV-F's and constituted the bulk of the IV-F category. Based on this prior research, it was suspected that the IV-F classifications in Kansas would be inversely related to the independent variables which loaded on the SES factor and positively related to rurality.

It was hypothesized that another facet of the IV-F category favored registrants of high SES. Unless an individual had an obvious defect, it was unlikely that military physicians would declare him unfit during an induction physical. There were over four hundred defects which were legitimate grounds for unfitness. In order to obtain a IV-F with a less than obvious defect, one first had to know if he had a defect which might result in disqualification. Second, he needed a medical file containing a medical history of the ailment. In many urban areas, documentation of defects could be obtained from organizations of physicians and psychiatrists who were sympathetic to problems of draft-age men.

"Documentation of unfitness is essential--perhaps more important than

the defect itself. One is more likely to win an exemption with a doctor's letter describing a disqualifying defect that does not exist, than with the condition and no report." (Suttler, 1970: 5).

Following Suttler's argument, it was also predicted that the IV-F category would be directly related to the independent variables which loaded on the centrality factor. Table 13 shows that two variables included in the centrality factor were significantly related to the dependent variable. Centrality itself correlated .37 ($p < .01$) and percent nonwhites correlated .30 ($p < .01$). Since the zero order correlation matrix in the Appendix shows that the two independent variables correlated .61 with each other, it was assumed that they were both measuring centrality. The relationships supported the prediction and suggested that the more central local board jurisdictions had higher proportions of their registrants classified IV-F. The implication was that the more central constituencies had closer ties with a larger communication network which provided the registrants with the information which allowed them to obtain IV-F classifications.

It is relevant to ask which types of local board jurisdictions were characterized by high centrality. Looking at the Appendix, it can be seen that centrality correlated $-.36$ ($p < .01$) with the percent rural variable. This means that the urban constituencies were related to high centrality and that in Kansas, IV-F exemptions appeared to predominate in the urban areas.

The final independent variable that correlated significantly (.23, $p < .05$) with the IV-F category was the manufacturing variable. The positive relationship indicated that jurisdictions with high proportions of the civilian labor force employed in manufacturing industries had higher

proportions of their registrants in the IV-F category.

Table 13. Zero Order Correlations between IV-F Exemptions and the Independent Variables for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

Variable	IV-F Exemptions
(Centrality Factor)	
Centrality	.37
Percent nonwhite population in jurisdiction	.30*
(Rural-Urban Factor)	
Percent of civilian labor force of jurisdiction employed in manufacturing industries	.23**

*P < .01

**P < .05

By itself, the finding has little meaning. It must be asked which types of jurisdictions were characterized by workers in manufacturing industries. Inspection of the Appendix clearly shows that manufacturing workers resided primarily in the urban areas, because the manufacturing variable was correlated -.48 with percent rural. This was further support for the inference that IV-F deferments were predominantly an urban phenomenon in Kansas.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

The general conclusion of this research is that certain socioeconomic characteristics of a particular environment, the local draft board jurisdiction, influence differential classification of Selective Service registrants. People interact with and are affected by their respective social milieus. In other words, people are controlled to a certain extent by the social environment in which they live (Berger, 1963; Lynd, 1967). To a large degree the results of the study supported the preceding assumptions.

The selected socioeconomic characteristics of the local board jurisdictions were separated into four different social dimensions through factor analysis (See Chapter III). A composite picture of the results of the study are shown in Table 14.

The reader will notice that the deferment and exemption categories were separated into two groups. The occupational, hardship and conscientious objector deferments comprised Group I because they had something in common. They were classifications which were the most ambiguously defined, and as a result, the local boards had almost complete control in deciding whether to grant these deferments. The conscientious objector classification was a special case which occurred infrequently (see Table 3, Chapter II) and correlated significantly only with the peace church factor.

The four deferments shown in Group II also had something in common. The qualifications for each one were explicitly defined, and consequently, the local boards had little or no control over their conference. Student

Table 14. Summary of the Results Showing the Relationships between Four Factors and the Deferment and Exemption Classifications for 82 Local Draft Boards in Kansas, 1970.

	Dependent Variables	Rural-Urban	Factors		
			SES	Centrality	Peace Church
Group I	Occupational deferments	R	-	-	
	Hardship deferments	R	-	-	
	Conscientious objector deferments				+
Group II	Student deferments		+		
	Reserve deferments		+		
	I-Y deferments	U	+	+	
	IV-F Exemptions	U		+	

Notes: "R" indicates a significant positive correlation with independent variables which loaded high on the rural part of the rural-urban factor.
 "U" indicates a significant positive correlation with independent variables which loaded high on the urban part of the rural-urban factor.
 "+" indicates a significant positive correlation with independent variables which loaded high on the respective factors.
 "-" indicates a significant negative correlation with independent variables which loaded high on the respective factors.

deferments were more or less automatic if one could prove that he was a student. Reserve deferments were obtained immediately upon enlistment into the military reserves. The acquisition of a I-Y or IV-F deferment was determined by the physicians and psychiatrists who conducted pre-induction and induction physicals.

Often situations occurred in which the draft quota for local boards was low and draft registrants were bountiful. In these instances, local boards may have been directed by National Headquarters to hide large numbers of the I-A pool in deferment categories in order to convince the public that conscription was still necessary (Carper, 1967: 39). In the rural areas, there were only two classifications in which local board members could hide registrants--the occupational and hardship deferments.

In the areas where SES was high, registrants appeared to be obtaining a high percentage of the automatic deferments through their own initiative. In these constituencies it was evidently not necessary for the local board members to take the initiative in protecting registrants from the draft or to hide registrants when low draft quota situations existed.

Table 12 indicates that the Group I deferments predominated in rural areas which were characterized by high proportions of people of low socioeconomic status and by low centrality. In Group II, it is shown that two deferments (I-Y and IV-F) occurred in the urban areas which are characterized by high centrality. Also in Group II, three of the four deferments (student, reserve, and I-Y) were related to high average socioeconomic status.

It appears that a significant social process was taking place with regard to Selective Service deferment and exemption classifications in

in Kansas. Because the rural populations were characterized by low SES, it is unlikely that their registrants could qualify for one of the high SES related deferments. Since rural constituencies were negatively related to centrality, they were likely to be isolated and much more cut off from the flow of information from a containing system. In these situations social solidarity is likely to increase (Young, 1970). If social solidarity was strong in rural jurisdictions and local board members wished to protect some of their registrants from the draft, there were two alternatives--an occupational or a hardship deferment.

The conscientious objector deferments were largely determined by the existence of traditional peace churches in the constituency. This suggests that most conscientious objectors in Kansas were of the traditional religious variety and that boards in areas with a high proportion of members of peace churches were more likely to view conscientious objector applications favorably even if the registrant was not religious in the traditional sense.

Discussion of the Independent Variables

All of the selected independent variables seemed to measure the constructs that they were intended to indicate except the crude differentiation measure which consisted of the largest city in local board jurisdictions. Differentiation was assumed to be a measure of information existent within the boundaries of the local board constituencies which would be useful in acquiring a draft deferment. The differentiation variable did not correlate significantly with any of the dependent variables. Before any conclusions can be drawn with respect to differentiation and draft deferments, a more sophisticated measure of the concept will have to be devised. One can

conclude, however, that population, often thought to be an important sociological variable, has no predictive value with respect to draft deferments.

The centrality measure, on the other hand, appeared to be a fairly good indicator of the flow of draft deferment information from central places outside jurisdiction boundaries or the larger containing system. Centrality was significantly correlated with four of the seven dependent variables.

The correlations among the independent and dependent variables were not extremely high, but many were nonetheless significant, because of the large number of observations (eighty-two). It is strongly believed that much higher correlations would be found if the study were driven down to the level of individual behavior.

Suggestions for Further Research

The study was conducted on a level several steps removed from individual people. It was a study of the socioeconomic characteristics of local draft board jurisdictions as they related to the differential proportions of deferment and exemption classifications in the Selective Service in 1970. The study was conducted on the jurisdiction level because of readily available inexpensive data. The problem with research done with precollected aggregated data is that nothing definitive can really be said with regard to behavior of particular individuals. Herein lies the potential ecological fallacy. From jurisdiction level research, speculations can be made about individuals, but legitimate generalizations should be made only with regard to similar levels and similar environments.

One way to validate the findings of this study would be to drive the analysis down to the level of the behavior of individuals. If similar

findings resulted from a survey research project on individual draft registrants or on individual local board members, the findings of the jurisdiction level study would be supported. The major implication would be that jurisdiction level studies using aggregated data would be preferable because of less cost, time, and work.

If individual level studies of draft registrants revealed different findings from the jurisdiction level studies, several things could be happening. It could mean that one or the other sets of data was not measuring what it was intended to measure. A more probable explanation would be that the two levels of analysis were tapping different dimensions of a social environment which could be interacting in the determination of Selective Service classifications.

The possibilities and strategies for future research on Selective Service classifications are numerous. As noted previously, the II-A, II-C, and I-Y deferments have been eliminated. Who was affected by these changes in deferment and exemption categories? Are those who were protected under the old system still being protected under the new, more limited system? Future research will require imagination and initiative on the part of the researchers.

REFERENCES

- Berger, Peter L.
1963 *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bradford, David F.
1969 *Deferment Policy in Selective Service*. Princeton, New Jersey: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University.
- Carper, Jean
1967 *Bitter Greetings*. New York: Grossman Publishers.
- Christaller, Walter
1966 *Central Places in Southern Germany*. Translated by Carlisle (1935) W. Baskin. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Davis, James W., Jr., and Kenneth Dolbeare.
1968 *Little Groups of Neighbors: The Selective Service System*. Chicago: Markham.
- Davis, James W., Jr., and Kenneth Dolbeare
1969 "A Social Profile of Local Draft Board Members: The Case of Wisconsin." In Roger W. Little (ed.), *Selective Service in American Society*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Flora, Cornelia B.
1971 *Reference Tables; Population Change of Counties and Incorporated Places in Kansas, 1950-1970*. Manhattan, Kansas: Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Flora, Jan Leighton
1967 *A Communications Approach to Development: An Intervillage System in Southwestern Puerto Rico*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- Gerth, Hans, and C. W. Mills.
1953 *Character and Social Structure*. Chicago: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Janowitz, Morris.
1966 "The case for a national service." *The Public Interest* (Fall): 90-110.
- Johnston, Jerome, and Jerald G. Bachman.
1970 *Young Men Look at Military Service*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.

Kansas Council of Churches.

- 1964 Handbook of Kansas Churches. Topeka, Kansas: Division of Planning of the Kansas Council of Churches.

Kansas State Selective Service Headquarters.

- 1970 Report of Classification by Counties. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Selective Service Headquarters (typewritten).

Klassen, Albert D.

- 1966 Military Service in American Life Since World War II: An Overview. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Leinwand, Gerald.

- 1970 The Draft. New York: Pocket Books.

Lynd, Robert S.

- 1967 Knowledge for What? Princeton: Princeton University Press.

MacCloskey, Monro.

- 1965 You and the Draft. New York: Richards Rosen Press.

Marmion, Harry A.

- 1968 Selective Service: Conflict and Compromise. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

- 1967 In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Council of Churches.

- 1957 Churches and Church Membership in the United States: An Enumeration and Analysis by Counties, States, and Regions. Series C, Numbers 29 and 30, Kansas. New York: National Council of Churches.

National Selective Service Headquarters.

- 1965 Annual Report of the Director of Selective Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1966 Annual Report of the Director of Selective Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1970 Semiannual Report of the Director of Selective Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Office of the Federal Registrar

- 1972 32 Code of Federal Regulations. National Defense. Part 1600 to end. Office of the Federal Registrar. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Roach, Jack L., Llewellyn Gross, and Orville R. Gursslin.

- 1969 Social Stratification in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Suttler, David.

1970 IV-F: A Guide to Draft Exemption. New York: Grove Press.

U. S. Bureau of the Census.

1963 U. S. Census of the Population: 1960. Vol. I, Characteristics of the Population. Part 17, Kansas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census.

1971 U. S. Census of the Population: 1970. General Population Characteristics, Kansas. Final Report Pc(1)-B18. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census

1971 U. S. Census of the Population: 1970--General Social and Economic Characteristics, Kansas. Final Report (PC(1)-C18. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Congress. House of Representatives.

1966 Review of the Administration of the Selective Service System. Committee on the Armed Services. Hearings. 89th Congress, 2nd session.

Wamsley, Gary L.

1969a Selective Service and a Changing America. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

1969b "Decision-making in Local Boards: A Case Study." In Roger W. Little (ed.), Selective Service in American Society. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wilson, Charles H., Jr.

1966 "The Selective Service System: An Administrative Obstacle Course." California Law Review 50: 2123-2179.

Yale Law Journal.

1966 "The Selective Service." Yale Law Journal 76: 160-199.

Young, Frank W., Berkeley A. Spencer, and Jan L. Flora.

1968 "Differentiation and solidarity in agricultural communities." Human Organization 27: 344-351.

Young, Frank W.

1970 "Reactive subsystems." American Sociological Review 35: 297-307.

APPENDIX

Identification of Variables in the Appendix

1. Percent of population in the local draft board jurisdiction with peace church membership.
2. Percent rural nonfarm population in the local draft board jurisdiction.
3. Percent rural farm population in the local draft board jurisdiction.
4. Median school years of the local draft board jurisdiction.
5. Percent of the civilian labor force unemployed in the local board jurisdiction.
6. Percent of the civilian labor force of the local board jurisdiction employed in manufacturing industries.
7. Percent of the civilian labor force employed in white collar occupations.
8. Median income of the local draft board jurisdiction.
9. Percent of families in the local draft board jurisdiction with less than poverty level incomes.
10. Percent of families in the local draft board jurisdiction with an income of \$15,000 or higher.
11. Percent of nonwhite population in the local draft board jurisdiction.
12. Centrality measure.
13. Population of the largest city in the local draft board jurisdiction (crude differentiation measure).
14. Percent rural population in the local draft board jurisdiction.

SELECTIVE SERVICE DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTION CLASSIFICATIONS:
A STUDY OF LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS IN KANSAS

by

WILLIAM PRATT CURTIS

B. A., Washington State University, 1968

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

This thesis is a local board jurisdiction level study of Selective Service deferment and exemption classifications in the state of Kansas. Past studies on Selective Service deferment and exemption classifications indicated that these classifications were not equitably distributed and that the socioeconomic characteristics of the local draft board jurisdictions were related to this inequity.

The present research was primarily descriptive and attempted to show the effect of local board jurisdiction level socioeconomic variables on deferment and exemption categories in Kansas.

The results of the study indicated that student deferments, the reserve deferments, and the I-Y deferments were found to be significantly related to high average socioeconomic status. The IV-F and I-Y categories were significantly related to high centrality. Occupational and hardship deferments predominated in rural areas which were characterized by high proportions of people of low socioeconomic status and by low centrality. This is probably due to a greater amount of solidarity in rural areas which allows draft boards to be more protective of registrants in these jurisdictions. It is only in the case of occupational and hardship categories (in addition to conscientious objector deferments) that local boards have complete autonomy in decision-making. Conscientious objector deferments were largely determined by the existence of traditional peace churches in the constituency, suggesting that most conscientious objectors in Kansas are of the traditional religious variety.