CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS:
INCREASING CLIENT CONTROL OVER SERVICES

PREPARED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ROBERT K. YIN
WILLIAM A. LUCAS
PETER L. SZANTON
J. ANDREW SPINDLER

R-1196-HEW
APRIL 1973

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406
The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sponsored this study, under Contract No. HEW-OS-72-220. Views or conclusions contained in the study should not be interpreted as reflecting the official opinion of the sponsoring agency.

The cover photograph was provided courtesy of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Published by The Rand Corporation

The research reported in this publication was done in the Washington Office of The Rand Corporation, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037
The purpose of this study was to investigate policy options for citizen participation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Elliot Richardson, then Secretary of DHEW, commissioned the study in the late spring of 1972. In responding to an earlier analysis by DHEW staff, he had set the goals for citizen participation: to devolve power to citizens, to reduce alienation, and to improve program effectiveness. The objectives of the study were to review prior experience and research concerning various forms of citizen participation, and to derive from them information that would assist DHEW in drafting guidelines and model by-laws for citizen participation in specific DHEW programs. The major conclusions of the study were presented in a briefing to Secretary Richardson in December 1972, and a draft report submitted in January 1973.

The report, however, appears to have other potential audiences in addition to DHEW. These include citizen participants at state and local levels who are concerned with the effective management of their own organizations, and research specialists who may be making their own assessment of citizen participation. For these audiences, we have therefore prepared the following document, which is essentially the same as the earlier report to DHEW, but which has now benefited from subsequent comments and review by our colleagues.
SUMMARY

Participation in federal government activities by citizens—especially those whom government programs are intended to serve—has endured a fractured and controversial history. Different federal programs, primarily the recent antipoverty and Model Cities efforts, have attempted to develop different institutional structures for creating citizen participation. In each case, the hope was to improve programs. Yet the participatory mechanisms often produced unforeseen political and social conflicts, did not fulfill prior expectations, and suffered from eventual attrition. Against such a background, the present study examines the possibilities for developing a viable and permanent institutional structure for citizen participation in government decisionmaking, in the context of the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW).

The major goal of the study is to identify the forms and characteristics of citizen participation that facilitate the effective exertion of citizen power over program administration. Such a goal, defined at the outset by DHEW, may be viewed as part of an administrative reform, to combat the ills of overly centralized decisionmaking. The achievement of the goal requires that citizen participation be linked with the delivery of specific services and be given well-defined responsibilities. Above all, the goal differs from the more popularly ascribed role of citizen participation, which in the recent past had primarily served the needs of social reform. In other words, whereas the citizen participation of the 1960s may have been part of an attempt to create broad social change in this country's treatment of the poor, the less educated, and racial and ethnic minorities, the citizen participation studied here is aimed primarily at devolving power to specific groups of program beneficiaries, so that federal programs may more responsively meet local needs. Whether the need for the kinds of social reforms sought in the 1960s still persists into the 1970s is a question that is beyond the scope of this study.
Several factors at the outset later influenced the conduct of the study. Of great importance was the fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had already established the goals for citizen participation: to devolve power over DHEW programs to citizens, to reduce feelings of alienation from government, and to improve program effectiveness. Second, the study was to serve an immediate decision-making need, and therefore could not await the results of large-scale original research. Rather, the study necessarily had to rely on an analysis of prior research on citizen participation.

The findings of the study are thus based on an assessment of existing research, which is listed, with selected annotations, in an extensive bibliography (see Appendix A). This research includes published works, special evaluation studies carried out in relation to specific federal programs, and national survey data. Many of the key findings concerning citizen participation were based on the use of a specially designed checklist, which allowed the aggregation of results from 51 case studies of citizen participation collected from the available literature. The checklist methodology is described in full in a separate section (see Appendix B). In addition, some of the findings were based on heretofore unpublished research carried out by the Technical Assistance Research Programs (TARP), a nonprofit organization that served as a subcontractor throughout the present work.

The analysis begins by reviewing the full array of participatory modes or forms, primarily examining their ability, based on past experience, to meet two criteria: to devolve power (the most important of DHEW's goals), and to fall within the scope of expeditious and independent DHEW action. Several of the forms potentially devolve power to citizens, but are not within the full and immediate purview of DHEW action: neighborhood governments, community development corporations, and voucher plans. Other forms of participation are within that purview, but have not in the past devolved significant power by themselves: the use of volunteers, the use of paraprofessionals, grievance procedures, citizen polls, and citizen evaluations. Only a third group of participatory mechanisms—service-linked citizen organizations—serve to devolve power and fall within the scope of DHEW action.
The bulk of the analysis consequently focuses on the ability of such organizations to achieve simultaneously the DHEW goals of devolving power, reducing alienation, and improving program effectiveness. Here, the major conclusions are that certain organizational characteristics can serve to devolve power more effectively than others. In particular, characteristics such as the citizen organization having its own staff, having the power to investigate grievances and to influence substantially the formation and execution of service budgets, having an elected citizen membership, and having an umbrella-like organizational structure, all are associated with the ability of a citizen organization to exert its own influence and control.

At the same time, citizen organizations, and indeed any form of participation, do not appear able to reduce alienation toward government. Prior research consistently shows no relationship between participation and trust (one of the two dimensions of political alienation), and an ambivalent relationship between participation and sense of efficacy (the second dimension of political alienation). Finally, the evidence reviewed shows that citizen organizations may under some circumstances enhance program effectiveness, depending upon the type of service and the measures of effectiveness.

As a result of these findings, the study recommends a general model for citizen organizations to be formed within DHEW. If it desires to increase citizen influence over DHEW programs, DHEW should establish citizen-dominated boards having the following principal characteristics: citizen members are elected, other citizen and community organizations are represented, resources sufficient to support a staff reporting directly to the boards are provided, and each board's formal authority includes at least the power to influence substantially the service program's budget and to investigate citizen complaints. Such organizations could be developed at a geographically based service area, with separate boards serving the DHEW-supported health, education, and welfare programs for the area. The study also recommends that DHEW encourage the use of paraprofessionals and grievance procedures in conjunction with citizen boards. Finally, as part of the process of implementing citizen boards, DHEW should identify a fixed budget over which a citizen board would
have discretionary authority, and it should also institute an adequate evaluation program to assess the full impact of the boards.

The remainder of the study reviews the citizen participation experience in six illustrative DHEW programs, and shows how the general model can be tailored and implemented for each program. In particular, the study shows how the recommended organizations are compatible with and may enhance the effective administration of newer DHEW programs such as the education special revenue sharing proposal. Thus the study provides local citizens, researchers, and federal administrators with guidelines for developing a new brand of citizen participation to match the likely federal initiatives of the next few years.
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I. INTRODUCTION

CITIZENS AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: THE PARTICIPATORY RELATIONSHIP

Participatory democracy is one of the most distinctive features of American society. Citizens have not only long involved themselves in voting, political campaigns, and lobbying activities, but they have also formed a profusion of public organizations and associations to advance their self-interest. The proliferation of associations in American life was long ago noted by Alexis de Tocqueville, who also described their special importance to democracy:

The most natural privilege of man, next to the right of acting for himself, is that of combining his exertions with those of his fellow creatures and of acting in common with them. The right of association therefore appears to me almost inalienable in its nature as the right of personal liberty.

Although subsequent research has shown that the majority of Americans do not actually belong to any associations, participation has nevertheless become a well-established ideal and part of the American creed. According to a classic study of participatory attitudes in several countries, for instance, a majority of Americans think that the ordinary man should be active in his local community, an attitude held only by a minority of the respondents in the other countries (see Table 1).

As far as citizen participation in federal government affairs is concerned, the traditional form of participation—voting—has not necessarily provided a sufficient opportunity for meaningful participation. In the first place, a sizable minority of Americans do not vote.

---


Table 1
ATTITUDES ON HOW ACTIVE THE ORDINARY MAN SHOULD BE IN HIS LOCAL COMMUNITY, BY NATION (PERCENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses—the ordinary man should:</th>
<th>United States (N=970)</th>
<th>United Kingdom (N=963)</th>
<th>Germany (N=995)</th>
<th>Italy (N=995)</th>
<th>Mexico (N=1007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be active in his community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only participate passively</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only participate in church affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total who mention some outgoing activity</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only be upright in personal life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing in local community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Secondly, voting primarily affects the actions of elected officials, and has not proven very effective in dealing directly with program implementation and the day-to-day actions of civil servants. Thus several federal programs, notably the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Selective Service System, and the antipoverty programs, have attempted to develop alternative participatory structures.* In each case, the assumption has been that a citizen should have direct and continuing opportunities to influence the administration of a program, especially if he is an intended beneficiary of the program.

Yet such alternative structures have repeatedly encountered similar

problems and have ultimately failed to serve program beneficiaries. These problems include, first, unavoidable conflict in control between lay participants and the often technically-trained service providers. Second, existing local organizations do not appear to provide normally for participation by other than local elites, who themselves are not usually program beneficiaries. Third, the development of participation in new local organizations often leads to excessive community conflict and possible cooptation by the local elites. Fourth, where participation has been dominated by beneficiaries, it has usually featured the transmittal of information or other perfunctory activities, rather than actions enabling the beneficiaries to exert any real influence or control.*

These difficulties suggest that there may be a basic conflict between the ideal of participatory democracy and the administration of contemporary federal programs. Perhaps no viable institutional structure for citizen participation in government can be created, but the problem certainly continues to draw serious scholarly attention. ** Nevertheless, some have asserted that the need for effective citizen participation in government is as great as ever, especially as a result of two broad trends: the continued centralization of power within the federal government and the increased technical specialization required to administer public programs. *** It is claimed that both have helped to produce a widening gap between the decision-making process for public programs and the programs' beneficiaries. Furthermore, it remains to be seen whether current efforts to decentralize the federal role through revenue sharing programs will improve matters; the existing gap may simply be transposed to state or local levels. Rather, meaning-

---

* The history of the antipoverty programs reflects these problems and is traced in Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, Free Press, New York, 1970.


ful participation by beneficiaries in the decision-making process may still be the most likely mechanism for reducing this gap. A renewed investigation of the possibilities for developing viable institutional structures for citizen participation is thus worthwhile.

One possible reason for the failure to develop an adequate and stable relationship between citizens and the federal government in the past may be that the relationship has typically been treated as part of the problem of social reform. Citizen participation as it evolved in the federal programs of the 1960s especially had this characteristic. Participation was perceived as merely one aspect of the broader need for improving the livelihood of certain groups of people: the poor, the less educated, and racial and ethnic minorities. Such improvement required the redistribution of power and the rearrangement of social institutions; citizen participation was but one mechanism for achieving these ends. But the participatory structures that resulted were not viable. Community Action Agencies and Model Cities groups both suffered from the same problems: vague responsibilities and functions (for who dared to predict ahead of time the shape of social reform in any given locale?), uncertain definitions of membership and beneficiary groups, and a vague and hence threatening power posture, all resulting in continued conflict with existing institutions. The conflicts were frequently fatal to the fledgling participatory structures, the original power structure remained virtually unchanged, and participation in government failed to become institutionalized.

An alternative view is to treat the citizen-government relationship as a problem of administrative reform. If participation in government is necessary primarily because of the distance between the decision-making process and the intended beneficiaries of programs, then it is entirely reasonable on managerial grounds alone to establish mechanisms for greater control and influence over the decision-making process by the beneficiaries. The principle of citizen participation in the federal government, as well as the resulting participatory structures, could be applied wherever government programs provided specific services, without regard to any broader plan for social reform.

The major consequence of this latter point of view would be the establishment of participatory structures linked to specific government
programs. Participation would thus have clearly defined goals and functions, clear membership eligibility, and a permanent role in the administrative checks and balances within federal programs. Accordingly, the organizational model for participation, rather than being a Community Action Agency concerned with general and controversial goals such as community development, might be a powerful, parent-dominated PTA, linked to a specific facility or area. Analogous to but different from the existing network of PTAs, strong participant structures dominated by program beneficiaries might be institutionalized on a lasting basis. The present study of citizen organizations therefore attempts to explore this latter view of participation in government. The next section describes the genesis of the study and its general boundaries within the context of the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE QUEST FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN DHEW

Late in 1971, Secretary Elliot Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) asked his staff to explore the role citizens should have in the development and administration of DHEW programs. He wished particularly to learn what forms, structures, and mechanisms of citizen participation would be most practicable and effective.

In response to that request, the General Counsel of DHEW submitted a memorandum in March 1972. The memorandum provided a wealth of information about the history and statutory basis of citizen participation in DHEW, but also made clear that such forms and structures could not be designed until (a) the Department had decided which of many competing purposes it wished participation to serve, and (b) the extensive recent federal, state, and local experiences with various forms of participatory involvement had been reviewed, and the results analyzed.

The Secretary's response to the memorandum, together with subsequent discussion within the Office of the Secretary, made clear that, at least provisionally, the Department's principal objectives with respect to citizen participation were the following:
To devolve to citizens a greater measure of power over DHEW programs;

To reduce feelings of alienation and estrangement from government; and

To improve, if possible, the effectiveness of DHEW programs.

It was also decided that the review of prior experience with citizen participation as well as recommendations for subsequent DHEW action should be assigned to a research organization.

In June 1972, The Rand Corporation was asked to undertake this assignment, employing as a subcontractor the Technical Assistance Research Programs (TARP), of Cambridge, Massachusetts.* The work was to be undertaken quickly, with at least preliminary conclusions and recommendations presented by January 1973. The final report was to present not only research findings, but also specific conclusions and recommendations concerning the means by which, consistent with the Department's criteria, citizen participation in DHEW programs should be achieved.

The history has conditioned the form and method of this study. It determined, first, that by "citizen" we would not mean any member of the public who might wish to influence a DHEW program, but rather:

* A person whose membership in a population served by a DHEW program confers a special claim to participate in that program's design, operation, or oversight.

The second consequence was that our principal criteria were given. In analyzing the comparative effects of the various forms, degrees, and types of citizen participation, the characteristics of various programs, and the communities in which participation had been attempted, we would

---

*TARP produced several separate reports that served as supplementary materials to this study. Inquiries about these reports should be made to TARP, 54A G Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. The reports are as follows: Marc Grainer, "The DHEW Citizen Participation Experience;" John Goodman, "Monitoring of Citizen Participation in DHEW;" Patricia Lines, "Enforcement of Citizen Participation in DHEW;" and Patricia Lines, "The Title IX (ESEA) and AFDC Programs."
seek to measure success or failure principally in terms of the Department's three goals: to devolve power, reduce alienation, and improve program effectiveness.

Third, neither the development of new data nor the performance of original research would be possible to any substantial degree. Instead, we would attempt to extract the key information from the voluminous but largely informal and heterogeneous literature already in existence, supplementing these results with a limited number of specially commissioned case studies and interviews.
II. ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF PARTICIPATION

In theory, citizen participation in government can take a wide variety of forms. For the purposes of providing policy guidance to DHEW, however, two factors quickly narrow the field. First, the Secretary's priorities, as previously described, implied a focus on those forms that at a minimum are capable of devolving power to citizens. Second, DHEW was concerned with identifying citizen participation models that could be implemented in the near future. The aim of this chapter is thus to identify the generic types of participation that can both devolve power and be created by DHEW, in which DHEW could act, with lasting consequence, within a reasonable period of time.

This assessment of alternative forms has been based on the past experience with citizen participation. The major conclusions are that citizen organizations have been successful in devolving power and are readily implemented, but that most other forms of participation, as they have been approached in the past, either have not been successful or would be difficult to implement. This is not to say that new approaches to volunteers, neighborhood governments, or other forms of participation would not be valuable. Rather, it is to say that, in looking for positive evidence on the value of existing and tested forms, service-linked citizen organizations stand out as having the greatest promise.

Subsequent chapters will probe the reasons for the success of citizen organizations. This chapter briefly discusses the alternatives that were set aside either because there was no positive evidence that they successfully devolved power, or because they would be difficult for DHEW to implement.

EXCLUDED FORMS: FORMS THAT MAY DEVOLVE POWER BUT ARE BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DHEW ACTION

Three forms of participation may devolve power, and hence achieve the primary DHEW goal, but are beyond the scope of immediate DHEW action: neighborhood governments, community development corporations, and vouchers.
Neighborhood Governments and Community Development Corporations

The first two major alternatives which, after review, we chose not to consider further were neighborhood governments and community development corporations (CDCs). Both possess considerable potential to devolve real power to local communities. In their ideal form, both forms can involve broad-based organizations that: (a) are representative of the local community, (b) attempt to serve the local community's needs across an array of services, and (c) are self-sufficient enterprises. Under such ideal conditions, either type of institution could exercise genuine power within the community, and could afford local citizens a share of that power. While their effects on alienation and on program effectiveness are more speculative, both might be positive. In fact, however, the ideal conditions have been attained only rarely, and the broad-scale development of both neighborhood government and CDCs remains an aspiration for the distant future.

The main idea underlying neighborhood government is that the neighborhood is a political unit.* Neighborhood government is thus an effort to reinstate the authority and power that once existed in towns and villages but that have since been absorbed by higher levels of government. The establishment of a neighborhood government requires a formal charter by the state government, as well as a reliable source of funds. The services provided by the neighborhood government may include health, housing, employment, educational and library services, as well as criminal justice systems, including community police, community attorneys, and community courts.** Even regulatory functions, such as land-use planning and zoning, might be included.† These

---


functions compete quite directly with those of the municipal government, and it is thus no surprise to find neighborhood government considered primarily as a means for redistributing political power.*

As thus defined, neighborhood governments do not now exist. The only entities that have approached the neighborhood government concept are special-purpose governments, such as local school boards. In Detroit and New York, for instance, a citywide school system was decentralized into local school boards as a result of changes in the state constitution; the local boards actually serve as governing bodies over the local school district.** There is no known example, however, of a general-purpose neighborhood government existing within a municipal framework.***

At the same time, several experiments similar to neighborhood government in appearance have been conducted by municipal governments. In general, these efforts followed in the wake of the urban riots and the Kerner Commission Report's recommendations that municipal governments create more communication and service interaction at the neighborhood level.† Thus, cities like Norfolk, Boston, Baltimore, and Houston opened local facilities called multipurpose centers, little city halls, mayor's stations, and neighborhood city halls, respectively.‡‡


***Kotler's East Central Citizens Organization (ECCO), in Columbus, Ohio, has often been cited as an example of neighborhood government. Although free-standing, this organization is not a unit of government.


These facilities, while located in a neighborhood and providing informational and other services, are not genuine neighborhood governments. The municipal facilities all stem from an "outreach" motivation on the part of municipal government to extend its services or to decentralize municipal administration.* The facilities, however, remain under the full control of the mayor, and not of the neighborhood; a study of such facilities in twelve cities found only a few cases with any organized citizen participation, much less citizen power. ** And in fact, the potential use of such facilities as political clubhouses of the mayor has been one reason that the mayor's political competitors have sought to limit the development of the municipal version of neighborhood government.

The main idea underlying community development corporations, on the other hand, is that the neighborhood is an economic unit. The goal of the CDC is to develop the neighborhood economy by creating jobs and improving the balance-of-payments status of the neighborhood. CDCs first became popular as components of local antipoverty programs, and as a result have been associated mostly with the economic development of the ghetto. † Perhaps the best-known of the CDCs is the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, founded with national political fanfare in 1966 and now an important neighborhood institution. But CDCs remain rare, and the few in existence have not created representative structures; neighborhood residents do not usually act in any governing capacity. ‡‡

** Washnis, op. cit.
‡‡ For a brief review of the development of CDCs across the country, see the Twentieth Century Fund, CDCs: New Hope for the Inner City, Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1971.
The economic frailty of neighborhood governments and CDCs has led to the introduction of a series of bills in Congress. These include the Neighborhood Development Corporation Assistance Act (1967); the Community Self-Determination Act (1968, and reintroduced in 1969); the Community Corporation Act (1970); and the Neighborhood Corporation Assistance Act (1971). All of these bills were aimed at providing financial assistance of one sort or another to neighborhood organizations dealing with the improvement of some aspect of physical, economic, or social conditions; but none has become law.

The argument against DHEW implementing CDCs as a form of citizen participation seems obvious and strong: The primary mission of the CDC is to operate in the private market, and not to provide public services. This role is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of DHEW's programs. Neighborhood government does not suffer from that defect, but two other considerations appear to preclude any major DHEW action there. The first is that, while there may be widespread interest in the idea of neighborhood government, any specific plan for its development is likely to encounter both severe local political opposition and formidable legal obstacles.* In virtually every state, constitutional change would be required, and change in any neighborhood would probably require several years. Second, unless residential patterns are extremely homogeneous, the establishment of true participatory democracy at the neighborhood level, e.g., through local elections, is likely to work against the disadvantaged groups that DHEW programs attempt primarily to serve. As one analyst reminds us,

The poor have typically lost out in the one-man-one-vote sweepstakes that determine who gets what in American political and economic life. Indeed, this is one meaning of powerlessness . . . . If in a racially mixed decentralized district, conservative whites win control of the neighborhood government, the poor and the blacks have no recourse.

The effect of decentralization then is to establish the legitimate authority of those very forces that were viewed as the source of oppression.

A recent analysis of decentralized school board elections has reaffirmed this view.

Vouchers

Another form of participation that may devolve power but is also beyond the scope of immediate DHEW action is the use of vouchers. Here, sums equivalent to the user's share of the cost of a DHEW service might be paid directly to the user. At least in theory, the citizen is thus provided with the means to seek alternative providers of service, and the citizen gains the same leverage with respect to them that his power to bestow or withhold patronage gives him in the marketplace. It could be argued that each of the Department's power, alienation, and effectiveness criteria might, in some degree, be met by this ultimate form of governmental decentralization.

The voucher form of participation, however, has only recently been considered as a real alternative to the direct provision of services. As a result, the actual impact of a voucher policy is still unknown. If government does not provide certain services, for instance, there is no guarantee that the private marketplace will either, even if vouchers are available. More broadly, the full effects of vouchers on a marketplace are not clear, and for this reason several critical experiments with vouchers in educational and housing services, among others, are just beginning. Since the relevant results will not be available for

---


† Rand, for instance, is currently conducting three large-scale social experiments related to the use of vouchers. These experiments deal with low-income housing, education, and health insurance.
some time, the fact that there is no positive evidence now available on the voucher form of participation must be underscored as being an interim judgment subject to change. For the present study, vouchers are excluded because implementation in absence of greater experience would be difficult and too much is still unknown. However, depending upon the outcome of the experiments, vouchers may eventually become an alternative form of participation that would be highly attractive for beneficiaries and government alike. The experiments therefore require close monitoring from both the economic and participatory vantage points.

EXCLUDED FORMS: FORMS THAT HAVE NOT DEVOLVED POWER BY THEMSELVES

Five forms of participation were identified as being within the immediate scope of DHEW action, but that did not by themselves, in their traditional use, fulfill the primary criterion of devolving power to citizens: volunteering, the employment of paraprofessionals, grievance procedures, citizen surveys, and citizen evaluations. Although none of these forms serves well as a major policy alternative, however, each is compatible with other participatory forms that do devolve power. Thus, these five forms are not to be discarded entirely; rather, as we will see, they can become secondary features of the citizen organizations that DHEW should develop.

Volunteering

In one sense, most forms of citizen participation rely on volunteers. Those who participate on advisory committees are often unpaid, and they give freely of their time and energy. In this subsection, however, we are concerned with the use of volunteers in the actual delivery of services.*

The use of volunteers in program service delivery is particularly common in education and health. The parent who helps in the classroom one day per week or prepares for occasional social events in the school is familiar in most communities; volunteers play a useful role in

auxiliary functions in many hospitals. However, it is extremely rare for any of these volunteers to make any decisions of consequence. Volunteers are usually not asked for and do not offer opinions about how programs should be organized, and they have at most little authority in the administration of routine activities. The use of volunteers from the community therefore does not necessarily devolve power to the citizens.

In addition, most experiences with volunteer activities have shown that volunteering tends to be limited to those of higher income and educational levels. Thus, not only does volunteering generally confer little real power to the volunteer, but the citizens of concern in the present study—the beneficiaries of DHEW program who tend to be poor or otherwise disadvantaged—are not likely to be the ones to volunteer in the first place. Thus, the use of volunteers is especially unlikely to devolve power to the clients of DHEW services.

These limits, however, do not mean the complete abandonment of the use of volunteers. The main point is that the use of volunteers alone does not devolve power. Volunteers may nevertheless be used in conjunction with forms of participation that do devolve power, and in such circumstances, may help to produce marginal, but desirable, changes in relation to DHEW's remaining two goals, the reduction of alienation and improvement in program effectiveness. Specific individuals, for instance, may derive some satisfaction from having the opportunity to volunteer their services; this may result in the reduction of whatever feelings of alienation they may have. As for program effectiveness, where the only costs associated with volunteers are the burdens of recruiting, training, and supervising the volunteers, and where these operations can be conducted smoothly with low turnover rates among the volunteers, the total effort may result in a program benefit without any significant additional costs.

Employment of Paraprofessionals

A second form of participation that has failed by itself to devolve significant power is the use of paraprofessionals. This form of participation may devolve a limited amount of power to the citizens
employed, depending largely on the type of service and the number of paraprofessionals. Service centers and programs, in fact, have frequently sought to achieve citizen participation by employing individuals from the community served. The greater their number and responsibility, the more paraprofessionals and other indigenous staff can influence the application of policy, but that influence generally is small. A dental assistant is unlikely, for example, to have a role in shaping health clinic policy. The hiring and training of members of the target population for management positions might bring about a greater devolution of power, but there are two potential problems here. First, one must consider whether such people are still members of the beneficiary community if their socioeconomic status has been greatly improved. Second, even when paraprofessionals are in positions of some influence, they have usually succeeded as individuals and not as a group, and their influence has been determined by previously acquired skills brought to the job.*

Another drawback in the use of paraprofessionals has been that, in terms of actual implementation, paraprofessional positions supposedly giving preference to members of a specific community have frequently fallen into the hands of persons outside that community. One recent study of Model Cities programs, for instance, found that less than half of the salaried employees were residents of model neighborhoods, even though those residents should have received preferred treatment.**

Moreover, this proportion applied to clerical and unskilled as well as professional employees. The study also found that model neighborhood residents earned less than nonresidents for roughly equivalent work. The study thus raises doubts about the effectiveness of paraprofessional programs in creating participatory opportunities for beneficiary groups.

*David M. Austin, "Resident Participation: Political Mobilization or Organizational Co-optation?" Public Administration Review, September 1972, 32:409-420.

As with the use of volunteers, these limitations again, however,
do not imply the complete curtailment of the use of paraprofessionals.
Rather, paraprofessionals may be viewed as a complementary form of par-
ticipation; citizen organizations that, as we will see, do devolve
power may be strengthened by the use of paraprofessionals, especially
in striving for the two other goals of reducing alienation and increasing
program effectiveness.

Grievance Procedures

A grievance procedure involves the receipt, investigation, and
disposal of a complaint made by an individual citizen. The complaint
may be submitted against any public or private institution. From the
complainant's point of view, the most desired outcome is a satisfactory
response to his complaint, possibly including the reversal of a prior
decision by the public or private institution; from the managerial
point of view, an investigation of the grievance is necessary to deal
satisfactorily with the individual complaint and to determine general
grievance patterns in order to suggest future policy changes.*

For grievances related to the delivery of public services, a
citizen has three major recourses: (a) he may complain to the agency
managing the service in question; (b) he may complain to his legisla-
tive representative; and (c) he may bring legal action in the courts.**

As for the first course of action, each service program usually has
some type of complaint unit, hearing process, or other informal gri-
vance procedure. Many grievances may involve an easily resolved ad-
ministrative problem, e.g., the retrieval of a lost social security
check or questions of eligibility for programs such as public assis-
tance, and the law may even require that a program establish grievance

---

* For a general discussion, see Walter Gellhorn, When Americans
Complain: Governmental Grievance Procedures, Harvard University Press,

** A citizen may also complain, of course, to his local radio sta-
tion or newspaper or to a community or political party organization.
But this discussion is limited to the avenues of recourse provided by
government.
procedures just for these purposes. Since in these cases the program itself is most likely to resolve the grievances through direct action, the placement of a complaint unit within the program has some justification. However, such a procedure is definitely not effective where a specific grievance challenges the program's policies, personnel, or services in a more fundamental way. In such a case, the requirement that the citizen bring his complaint to the same agency against which the complaint is lodged is likely to work against him.* He may get no response, or worse, the agency may appear to be punitive and thus make citizens reluctant to complain in the first place. For these reasons, an intra-agency grievance procedure is likely to be of extremely limited use in serving as a general grievance procedure.

The second avenue of recourse is for a citizen to complain to his legislative representative. Typically, he writes his Congressman. The legislator may then bring the prestige of his office to bear in examining the complaint on behalf of the citizen, and can thus obtain prompt response and frequently substantial success in disposing of a legitimate complaint. The legislative procedure has several shortcomings, however. First, it is unable to investigate a large number of complaints. Second, the degree of investigation and subsequent action varies from one legislator to another, especially at state and local levels, where legislators may be part-time, and staff resources may be limited or nonexistent.** Third, clients of DHEW programs in particular may not be well informed on obtaining help from their legislators.

The third recourse involves the use of the courts. The courts can also serve a citizen well in disposing of a legitimate complaint.


** There has been little analysis of the types of complaints received through the legislative procedure. For a sampling of the cases handled by a state legislator, see John E. Moore, "State Government and the Ombudsman," in Stanley V. Anderson (ed.), *Ombudsmen for American Government*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, pp. 70-100.
However, the litigation process is generally slow and expensive, and is not likely to prevail unless a clear violation of law has occurred and administrative remedies have been exhausted. Moreover, poor, transient, and minority citizens are far less oriented than are middle- and upper-class citizens toward courts, the law, or any formal procedure requiring their own protracted involvement. Court proceedings are therefore an unrealistic alternative for redressing ordinary grievances.

The three existing grievance procedures thus all have limitations, and previous studies have suggested that effective grievance mechanisms have not in the past been accessible to large numbers of citizens. The Kerner Commission report, for instance, cited the absence of adequate procedures to bring complaints against local and state agencies as one source of frustration associated with the urban disorders of the 1960s; the report recommended the development of new agencies, such as a neighborhood action task force, among whose functions would be the capacity to secure the redress of grievances.

To provide an improved grievance procedure, many recent proposals by public officials and private individuals have called for some type of ombudsman function. The idea of an ombudsman is not new. Other countries have established ombudsmen at the national level, while several bills to establish a national ombudsman for the United States have been introduced into Congress.** One bill called for an experiment with a national ombudsman whose functions would be limited to grievances against four agencies: the Social Security Administration, the Veterans Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, and the

---


Bureau of Prisons (S. 1195, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967, introduced by then Senator Edward Long of Missouri). In addition, several localities have established local ombudsmen at the municipal, county, or state levels.*

Any official operating in a federal agency, however, could not be an ombudsman in the strict sense, since ombudsmen are independent of the executive branch and external to it, generally being attached to the legislature. Moreover, even if the use of grievance procedures were expanded in some other manner, the procedure still would not devolve power to citizens, because grievance investigations rarely change policy-making responsibilities. By providing an outlet for those citizens most dissatisfied with a service, and by successfully resolving a complaint, the grievance procedure may reduce dissatisfaction and a certain amount of alienation for the individual complainant; for noncomplainants, no attitudinal change is likely. As for program effectiveness, the grievance procedure may save trouble for other citizens with similar problems, and it may thus produce slight improvements in program effectiveness. Any new DHEW action taken solely with regard to grievance procedures, however, is not likely to achieve the primary goal of devolving power to citizens.

Citizen Polls

At the present time very few federal programs, including those of DHEW, conduct systematic citizen polls. Occasionally, federal programs conduct citizen polls at the beginning of a new project to determine citizen needs and desires. These planning polls are really "once-only" surveys, and the information may be introduced into the design of the project or disregarded. Information gained directly from citizens comes more often from existing grievance procedures. However, while even a good grievance procedure may settle individual citizen problems and also determine desirable policy changes based on patterns of grievances, the grievance procedure cannot provide an overall assessment of citizen preferences or satisfaction.

*For instance, see Moore, op. cit.; and also Jesse M. Unruh, "The Ombudsman in the States," The Annals, May 1968, 377:111-121.
Thus, the main virtue of citizen polls is that they aggregate individual opinions and attitudes and can provide a broader assessment and produce more pressure on programs than can usually be applied by isolated individual action. In private industry, automobile manufacturers have recently begun citizen polls of a kind that may be applicable to federal programs. One manufacturer (American Motors) sends a letter to the recent purchasers of its cars, enclosing a form to be returned by the purchaser. The form inquires about the condition of the car at the time of purchase, the service received from the sales department, and the customer's satisfaction. Another manufacturer (Ford Motor Co.) gives each customer a short checklist after he has had his car serviced by a dealer. The checklist identifies the mechanic who attended to the car and asks the customer to indicate his satisfaction with the service he has received.

The results of these automobile polls were not available for analysis in the present study. Even though such polls may be instituted merely for public relations reasons, they inherently contain incentives, whether used or not, for dealers to provide better service. Some evidence to suggest that the incentives are being used is that the manufacturer using the checklist has also instituted a reward scheme for its mechanics, whereby highly rated mechanics can win special vacations and awards. Such incentives have previously been limited to sales employees. Moreover, this same manufacturer has introduced guarantees of the service work of its dealers, with an offer of free subsequent repair for any faulty service work.

The parallels between automobile customers and consumers of public services are intriguing. That differences exist between automobile repair and, say, health services, is obvious, but the similarities may be more important. In both cases the consumer may perceive the symptoms of malfunction, but have difficulty in identifying their cause. A second similarity is that subjective criteria for assessing the quality of service may be as important as objective tests. And third, the central organization is judged, at least in part, on the basis of services
that can be provided only through a large and dispersed network of semi-autonomous local providers of service (i.e., dealers or local health personnel). Thus, incentive award schemes for the local providers of services can play an important role in both cases.

Depending upon how the results are used, the polls can devolve very limited power to citizens. If the poll, as in most current cases, is only a nominal attempt to determine citizen attitudes and is not put to further use, then no power is devolved. However, if the poll is made a part of a formal review procedure, as in budget or personnel reviews, then citizens can exert a small influence by participating in the poll. In general, however, polls are unlikely to lead to any significant devolution of power to citizens.

Similarly, polls can have differential but minor effects on citizen alienation. The act of filling out a questionnaire may vent frustrations or dissatisfactions, but it is not likely to have more than a momentary effect on the individual. Moreover, superficial use of polls has led some citizens and researchers to regard user polls rather cynically, as a device whose purpose is to assuage citizens without making any changes either in their control over the services or in the way those services are delivered.*

Program effectiveness can be improved by the use of polls, especially in service areas where citizen satisfaction and cooperation are important. User polls may serve to strengthen the arguments of local staff who want program changes, and help them win increased support for effective programs. Polls can have some impact on the decision process within the service organization, particularly when there are no other evident measures of output available. On the other hand, if the service staff regards citizen views as a secondary or illegitimate criterion by which to judge effectiveness, the impact will be insignificant.

Citizen Evaluations

Citizen evaluations are special program reviews conducted by citizen-dominated teams.* These evaluations can be intensive investigations of service projects, or can be brief reviews of program performance. In either event, the key factors are that an organized review, not under the control of the services staff, results in the expression of citizens' views.

In the few cases that citizen evaluations have been used, they have not led to any devolution of power to citizens. This is primarily because the idea of evaluations by lay persons is frequently objectionable to service staff and professional groups, and the evaluations tend to be ignored or have impact only on a relatively few projects. The evaluations rarely serve as the basis for broader policy changes. At the same time, the citizen evaluation teams are difficult to train, and there are few standards for judging the qualifications of any individual member of the team. More often than not, the citizen evaluation team may be dominated by a professional who serves the citizens' interest, but in such case, meaningful participation by citizens is obviously minimized.

Citizen evaluations also provide little potential for reducing alienation. Unlike citizen polls, which can be conducted frequently and produce visible outputs in a relatively short time (survey results, if not service changes, can be produced quickly), citizen evaluations must undergo a round of review and interpretation that often clouds results. Thus, the effect on the participants' sense of efficacy is minimal.

Evaluations are similar to citizen polls, however, in that they seem to have some potential for impact on program effectiveness. The independence of the citizen forum and either threatened or actual public debate over citizen views put considerable pressure on the service staff to be more responsive. If elements within the service organization already favor citizen proposed changes, the effectiveness of the evaluations will be enhanced.

* A relevant example is provided by DHEW's Program Evaluations by Summer Interns (PEBSI).
FORMS CONSIDERED FOR SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS: CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS

In summary, the existing research provides little evidence that the alternative forms just discussed can both devolve power and satisfy the immediate implementation needs of DHEW. The forms may, in some innovative version, be adapted to DHEW needs, but our discussion has not considered such innovations. Instead, we turn attention now to an existing form of citizen participation that on the surface does satisfy the two major criteria of power devolution and falling within the purview of DHEW action. This form involves the use of citizen organizations, operating in association with specific federal programs (and hence service-linked).

Such organizations appear to provide the necessary scale, visibility, stability, and participatory opportunities that can afford some measure of power to program beneficiaries. The organizations can also incorporate other participatory forms, such as the use of volunteers and paraprofessionals, and develop them as complementary functions. Finally, DHEW can act with relative independence in establishing the organizations, as long as the organizations are limited to specific DHEW programs or arrays of such programs.

But it is also clear that some citizen organizations thrive while others fail. Specific organizational characteristics may represent critical factors in determining the ultimate performance of the organization. The bulk of our analysis, as presented in the next two chapters, therefore attempts to draw conclusions concerning the general efficacy of citizen organizations in meeting DHEW's three goals, as well as to identify those characteristics associated with successful performance. The conclusions form the basis for our recommendations for DHEW action.
III. ASSESSING THE ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS: BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

As a group, the organizational forms of citizen participation appear to have considerable potential for achieving the three goals of devolving power, reducing alienation, and improving program effectiveness. At the local level, citizen boards and committees allow a large number of individuals both the opportunity and the means to influence service programs. There are distinct types of organizations, however, each different in its potential for achieving the three DHEW goals. Here, we will consider how the various organizational types relate to those goals.

Organizational forms of participation can be categorized according to their level of authority. At one extreme, citizens may serve on a citizen-dominated governing board that determines the policies of a project. Board members can hire and fire the management or staff of the project, approve the budget, set policies to guide programmatic operations, and make judgments about the quality of the service delivery. These governing boards often take the form of nonprofit corporations and have considerable legal authority. At the other extreme, citizens may participate as part of an advisory committee. Citizens serving on these committees or attending open meetings express opinions that need not be given much weight by those delivering the services. In some instances, the advisory bodies are not even empowered to represent the citizens served and act only as forums for the project staff to inform the public about plans and programs.

Many citizen organizations fall between these extremes and might be called committees of limited authority. The citizens on these committees have been granted one or two significant but limited responsibilities. For example, they might be able to hire the project director and sign the application for federal funds, but might not have any legal control over the services, staff, or budget revisions once the funds are awarded. For the most part, however, the primary distinction made in the citizen participation literature is between boards and committees with the latter including both committees with limited
authority and those of a strictly advisory nature. This chapter reviews the past experience with organizational participation and how it relates to the three DHEW goals. The next chapter examines further the organizational characteristics that are most often associated with the primary goal of devolving power.

DATA AND METHOD

The choices of methods and data used in this study were constrained by time and the stipulation by DHEW that no new field research be initiated. As a consequence, the study relied on the existing research on citizen participation and on the knowledge and experience of persons involved in attempts to increase citizen participation in government activities. We found a variety of sources relevant to the task of assessing citizen participation, including:

- The existing citizen participation literature;
- Special case studies made available just for this analysis;
- Large-scale evaluation studies not necessarily available in published form;
- Surveys of political participation and citizen attitudes;
- Statutes, regulations, and guidelines relevant to citizen participation; and
- Informal reports from DHEW staff, citizen representatives, and research experts.

A review of the existing literature on citizen participation showed it to be voluminous and of widely varying quality. Appendix A of this report describes the literature and presents an extensive bibliography.

The objectives to be used in assessing the various forms of citizen participation dictated that the literature be synthesized in a systematic way. To that end, our research concentrated on studies that included detailed case histories of the events surrounding one or more examples of attempts at citizen participation. A checklist method, described further in Appendix B, was designed specifically for this task.
The checklist poses a series of close-ended questions, to be answered by a reader-analyst. It is divided into five major sections. One is designed to elicit a description of both the immediate community and the larger environment in which the citizen participation took place. The second deals with the characteristics of the service program to which the citizen participation activity is linked. The third and fourth cover the history and organization of the citizen participation activities. The fifth section of the checklist contains questions about the consequences of the citizen participation effort.

One checklist was filled out for each case of citizen participation. In most instances, a single report was available that provided enough information to complete most of the checklist. In some instances, more than one report concerning the case was available, and the analyst had to make his judgments based on the information in all the reports. In a few instances, only a single report was available but it lacked sufficient information to complete a significant portion of the checklist; here, the analyst sought to fill the gaps by contacting directly a person involved with the case. If extensive gaps were found in a case, it was not used. In essence, then, the checklist was used to reduce different case studies in the available literature to a common analytic format.

Our analysis considered 51 specific cases of citizen participation drawn from rural and urban areas in 17 states.* Eleven of the cases were largely DHEW funded, and eight were Model Cities cases. OEO projects were well represented, and other projects were supported with private funds. Because the Technical Assistance Research Programs (TARP) had detailed data on participation activities in Massachusetts, we drew heavily on cases from that area, posing a potential bias in our conclusions. In addition, our analysis may be biased in that it is based largely on cases of participation of the socially disadvantaged: in 45 of the community populations under study, at least one-third of the populations being served were poor or working poor; and in 25, at least

*The cases used in the analysis are listed in Appendix B.
one-third were black. The results therefore may not be generalizable to participation by other socioeconomic groups. However, for the purpose of discussing citizen participation in DHEW programs, which tend to serve the socially disadvantaged, the cases are directly relevant.

Different data sources, including the checklist, were used to assess the relative merits of citizen organizations in achieving the three goals stipulated by DHEW. The object of this chapter is to seek general conclusions regarding each of the goals; the bulk of the checklist data bear on the discussion in the next chapter, where attention turns to the organizational correlates of power devolution.

ASSESSING BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

With these data sources, each of the three DHEW goals will be considered in turn. First, boards and committees will be reviewed to determine if they in fact devolve power to citizens. Second, the consequences of the participation for the citizens themselves will be examined to determine whether citizen alienation is decreased. Third, the impact of that influence on program effectiveness will be assessed.

Devolution of Power

Much of the debate regarding citizen participation can be characterized as circular: Citizen participants are given greater authority, citizens therefore have greater authority, and participation therefore is successful because authority has been devolved. Devolution of legal authority, however, is not necessarily the devolution of actual power; one must go beyond the granting of legal authority and study the actual impact of citizen participation on the administration and planning of programs. In other words, one needs to ask whether citizen participation has led to actual citizen influence on government programs.

One answer is provided in the context of welfare boards and committees. Edward J. O'Donnell and Otto Reid used mail questionnaires sent in 1970 to a national probability sample of local welfare agencies. The questionnaires were completed and returned by 458 local welfare administrators. O'Donnell and Reid distinguished between those agencies
with boards, which were "defined in the main as a group of people who set policy . . . and a committee as a group of people who give advice to the agency."* Some local agencies had both a committee and a board, and O'Donnell and Reid note that some committees and boards were quite similar. Nevertheless, the basic distinction is similar to our own.

The administrators responded to the question as to whether boards and committees had a "noticeable effect" on the day-to-day services provided by the agency, and the pattern of their answers suggests that the stronger boards indeed had more influence than committees. Of the boards, 68 percent had a noticeable effect as compared to 46 percent of the committees. But while this finding would suggest that boards devolve power more effectively than committees, it is also important to recognize that almost one-half of the committees were judged to be effective.

The checklist data on the 51 cases we examined in depth closely parallel the O'Donnell and Reid findings. Our cases include some welfare committees, but also include local citizen participation organizations trying to influence a wide variety of other government activities. The results are thus not peculiar to welfare services. The governing boards with the greatest legal authority do have greater actual influence over services than the advisory committees, but the relationship between legal authority and actual impact on service programs is again not as direct as one might expect. For each of the 51 cases in our sample of citizen participation projects, the following question was asked:

** Has the organization been successful in obtaining implementation of ideas or approaches the participants favor that would not have otherwise been put into effect? **

---


** The total cases may vary from question to question because of incomplete information in some of the case studies.
The following was the breakdown for the different types of citizen organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of Citizen Ideas</th>
<th>Percentage of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committees (N=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all, to a small degree</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a significant or high degree</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that although there was a higher percentage of governing boards where the organizational efforts had some impact, success as judged by this criterion was still absent in almost one-third of the governing boards. Evidently, legal authority is far from a perfect predictor of relative power, and subsequent analysis will show that other organizational characteristics are at least as important. Nonetheless, the governing boards appear to be the superior means of devolving power over services.

Further evidence about the impact of citizen organizations is found in the Office of Economic Opportunity's evaluation of the effect of Community Action Agencies (CAAs) in 100 cities.* The focus of that study was the impact of the CAAs on local service agencies, such as schools and welfare agencies, and employment practices. Here, the CAAs are not formally linked to the services and have no legal authority over the services in question. They try to influence private and public programs from the outside, giving advice whether or not it had been requested. In each area of impact, the officials and key private citizens making decisions that the CAAs were attempting to influence were asked whether there had been change and, if so whether it could be attributed to the CAAs. An illustrative finding was that the change in the type of services delivered by local social service agencies was reported by the directors of those agencies in almost one-half (48 percent) of the 100 communities. In 23 percent of the communities (or about one-half of those reporting

---

change), the directors attributed change in that aspect of service delivery to CAA action. The amount of CAA-related impact varied from area to area, with education showing the greatest change attributed to CAAs and employment the least, but in each area there had been some CAA impact. Citizen organizations, even when not formally tied to specific services, can have some impact.

The results of these studies all support the conclusion that the organizational forms of citizen participation can and do have an impact on the conduct of local public activities and services. The stronger boards have more impact, but the advisory committees can also be quite effective. Indeed, the simple statement that the way to give more power to citizens over local services is to give them more legal power is only partially true. Many powerful boards do not have significant influence despite their formal authority; many advisory committees are quite successful despite the weakness of their formal charter. Chapter IV of this report will identify those organizational characteristics that are associated with successful citizen influence. However, having established that citizen organizations do devolve power, it is first appropriate to ask about the nature of their impact on alienation reduction and program effectiveness.

Reduction of Alienation

The second criterion for assessing the success of citizen participation is the reduction of citizen alienation. The reduction of alienation has been the goal of many social welfare programs for over a decade. As early as 1962, the Mobilization for Youth Project in New York City and the ensuing antipoverty program were seen not only as economic programs; they were also designed to attack the problem of powerlessness and the ensuing feelings of alienation.*

In spite of the continued interest in reducing alienation, the term "alienation" has resisted precise definition. An extensive academic literature has debated the conceptual content and appropriate means of measuring alienation. Articles such as "On the Meaning of

Alienation,* "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement,"** and "What Is Alienation: The Career of a Concept,"*** have tried to identify different types of alienation that are rooted in the personality of the individual and in the nature of society. The result has been "a virtually limitless number of varieties of alienation."†

The definitional problem is less difficult, however, if the range is narrowed to those types of alienation involving the relationship between the citizen and his government. Here, one finds that there are basically two types: sense of powerlessness/efficacy, and sense of cynicism/trust. Ada Finifter, who conducted an empirical examination of the concept through studying the responses in a 1961 national survey found that there were two independent dimensions of political alienation. The first, sense of political powerlessness, she defines as "an individual's feeling that he cannot affect the actions of the government;" this dimension "is closely related (inversely) to the concept of 'political efficacy,' which has achieved such prominence in studies of voting behavior." The second dimension, called "perceived political normlessness," means that the citizen "believes that frequent deviations from accepted norms occur in the political process."‡ Joel Aberbach, using a different national survey data set, also distinguished between trust and efficacy as forms of alienation, and found the two to be unrelated.+++ Assessment of the success of different forms of citizen participation in reducing alienation therefore requires analysis of social-psychological data on both the citizen's feeling of power or powerlessness and his trust (or lack of it) in the political process. But few studies of citizen participation on boards and committees have made any attempt to include systematic evidence on the changing attitude

---

** Dwight Dean, American Sociological Review, 1961, 26:753-758.
*** Lewis S. Feuer, New Politics, Spring 1962, 116-134.
and values of the participants. In addition to using the limited data that are available, our analysis therefore drew heavily both upon secondary analysis of (a) national survey data initially gathered on political participation in general, (b) data on attitudes toward services in ten cities across the country, and (c) TARP data, which, although restricted to two cities, were specifically designed to study the impact of local citizen participation in service programs on citizen attitudes. The specific sources used were, respectively:

- University of Michigan national probability sample, 1,600 respondents, 1970;
- Urban Observatory samples in ten major cities, 3,600 respondents, 1970; * and
- TARP surveys of health clinic users and parents of school children in Greater Boston and Detroit, 1,500 respondents, 1968-1972.

Since the two dimensions of political alienation are not related, each can be considered in turn.

**Trust.** A review of the available evidence quickly shows that no type of citizen participation is related to citizen trust. In a 1960 national study, membership in voluntary organizations and political participation bore virtually no relationship to citizen trust; a subsequent causal model developed from those data to explain the variation in trust in government also showed that neither participation nor organizational membership was a significant determinant of trust.** In 1970, a similar national survey was conducted on political participation, and included the following question:**

---

* For a general description of the Urban Observatory program, see Lawrence A. Williams, "The Urban Observatory Approach," Urban Affairs Quarterly, September 1972, 8:5-20.
** Ada Finifter, op. cit., p. 403.
*** Survey data are from the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. "Don't Know" and "No Answer" responses are not reported, hence the number of respondents varies from question to question.
How much time do you think you can trust the government in Washington?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Nonvoters (N=487)</th>
<th>Voters Only (N=930)</th>
<th>Active Participants (N=126)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonvoters, voters, and active participants who did more than vote all felt the same degree of trust, showing again that participation is not related to trust in government.

Organizational membership at the local level is also unrelated to trust. In a survey sponsored by the Urban Observatory, the responses of citizens in ten major cities were divided among those citizens who belonged to local organizations and those who did not. The two groups were compared along an index of political trust, which aggregated several questions on trust.** The results were as follows:

Do you belong to any clubs, neighborhood groups, or other organizations that are working on city problems in any way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Political Trust</th>
<th>Yes (N=508)</th>
<th>No (N=3081)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents who participate in addition to voting by attending political rallies, meetings, etc.

** Frank X. Steggeort and the Secretariat of the National League of Cities' Urban Observatory Program kindly made the basic data analyses available to us. Other results of the survey are reported in "City Taxes and Services: Citizens Speak Out," Nation's Cities, August 1971, pp. 1-32.
There remains the logical possibility that the trust of nonparticipants might be increased merely by their awareness of participatory opportunities. In other words, even though individuals are not active participants, they may be influenced by their perceptions that people "like themselves" are involved in program decisions. The evidence on this subject is limited, but one quite relevant study has been conducted on attitudes toward draft boards. The findings suggest that participation may not be widely perceived by those not directly involved, and even if perceived it is unlikely to enhance trust. In a 1966 study of Selective Service Boards in Wisconsin, James W. Davis and Kenneth M. Dolbeare surveyed a statewide probability sample of Wisconsin citizens.* Despite the fact that these boards had considerable local autonomy, less than one-third of a sample survey of Wisconsin citizens were aware that boards did not just follow instructions from the federal governments. And those who recognized that the boards had discretionary authority were less likely to trust the draft. The results were as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward Draft</th>
<th>Local board decides for itself (N=67)</th>
<th>Local board just follows instructions from Washington (N=148)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The draft is fair</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft is not fair</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, regardless of the organizational form, participation is unlikely to increase generalized trust in government. Similarly, bystanders are not likely to have their trust in government increased by the fact that other citizens have an involvement in government programs.

Sense of Political Efficacy. In contrast, our analysis showed that participation is related, under some circumstances, to the second

---

** Ibid., p. 188.
dimension of alienation, a lack of sense of efficacy. In fact, the literature is quite unequivocal about the relationship between political participation in general and a sense of political efficacy. The Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan has studied citizen sense of efficacy for over a decade,* and in survey after survey has frequently sought responses to the question:

People like me don't have any say about what the government does. Do you agree or disagree?

Our analysis of the responses to this question, dividing respondents into three categories based on their reported level of participation, reveals the following results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Nonvoter (N=495)</th>
<th>Voter Only (N=941)</th>
<th>Active Participant (N=128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, a higher level of political participation is consistently associated with an increased sense of efficacy.

While general political participation is thus related to a general sense of political efficacy, specific types of local participation are not so clearly linked to a general sense of efficacy. The OEO 100-City study identified leaders of the poor by briefly interviewing people on the street in CAA neighborhoods, asking people to identify leaders they thought were doing something about local problems. A list of leaders was prepared for each city, and a total of 630 leaders identified in

---

*The surveys are in a series available for analysis, and have served as the basis for many studies in political science and related areas. The first is the classic, Angus Campbell, et al., The American Voter, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964.

**The data reported are from the same 1970 survey reported on p. 34.

***Respondents who participated in addition to voting by attending political rallies, meetings, etc.
this manner were interviewed. They were better educated than the typical neighborhood resident (41 percent had gone to college), and 71 percent reported belonging to neighborhood groups and organizations. They also responded to the above question about whether people like themselves had any say about what the government does, and 46 percent said they did not.* While there are problems in identifying the best group these leaders should be compared with, one generous test would be those in the 1970 University of Michigan survey who earn $10,000 a year or less. Only 41 percent of that group felt they had no say. Given the education level of the leaders, any more precise matching by income level would (since higher income groups have a higher sense of efficacy) only strengthen the conclusion that these local leaders have a lower sense of efficacy than others like themselves in education and income.

Studies conducted by the Technical Assistance Research Programs (TARP) differentiate between a sense of efficacy in regard to national government and efficacy relative to local authorities. A survey of the participation and attitudes of parents of school children in Boston was conducted at four different schools. Two were parochial schools, and the citizen participation unit was a Mothers Club with little influence. The third was located in a white, low-income, Italian area of Boston; the citizen participation unit was Home and School Association (a PTA). The fourth school had a student body that was largely black, and an advisory group of its own that was established after an active local group was successful in having the Home and School Association disbanded.

The TARP studies showed no consistent evidence that these forms of citizen participation are related to a diminished sense of powerlessness at either the national or local level. A sense of powerlessness at the local level was ascertained in one study by asking:

Supposed the Boston School Committee adopted a policy which you strongly disapproved of. Could you do anything to change the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Parochial Schools</th>
<th>Third School</th>
<th>Fourth School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant (N=18)</td>
<td>Nonparticipant (N=95)</td>
<td>Participant (N=33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants in the school associations did not respond much differently from the nonparticipants at any of the four schools. Participation at the third school was weakly related to greater efficacy, but at the fourth school the reverse was true. A similar pattern emerged when participation was related to the respondent's sense that he could have an effect on a national government policy that he disapproved.

There is no consistent evidence here that participation in these local school associations is related to a citizen's sense of efficacy at the city level. Similarly, there is no consistent relationship between local participation and citizen sense of efficacy relative to national government. What is found, however, is a weak but positive relationship between participation in each of these schools and a sense of efficacy related to the affairs of that specific school.

Finally, citizen participation in local organizations has also been said to contribute to the reduction of the sense of powerlessness by conveying to nonparticipants that their interests are being pursued and their point of view is being represented. The underlying argument is that seeing people "like you" involved in programs may decrease a citizen's sense of powerlessness regarding his government and its programs. The research question then is whether or not a nonparticipant's awareness of some citizen participation activity is associated with his sense of efficacy. At present, there is mixed evidence to support such a relationship. In a TARP survey of users of a Boston neighborhood health clinic, for example, patients were asked whether they were aware of the citizen participation activity at the health center. They were also asked, first, whether they personally had some say in what the center did, and second:
How much say do other people like yourself have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Awareness of Citizen Participation Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aware (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot, some, or very little say</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No say at all</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here awareness of the citizen activity is weakly related to a sense of efficacy.

Other TARP surveys, however, have not produced the same result. In a survey of the attitudes of Detroit parents in two very similar schools, TARP found that different types of participation have different outcomes. In one school, PTA members knowledgeable about PTA affairs felt a higher sense of efficacy relative to that school than did those who were not aware of or involved in the PTA. In the second school, an aggressive citizen advisory committee of parents was seeking a more vigorous voice in school affairs (and having some success). In that second school, parents who were aware of its activities (similar in most social and demographic respects to the PTA) felt they had less say about their school's affairs than parents unfamiliar with the committee's work.*

In summary, political participation generally is related to a general sense of political efficacy, but participation in local organizations may be related only to a sense of efficacy in regard to the specific program or activity. In addition, there is doubt that this local efficacy necessarily has any consistent implications for a sense of efficacy relative to government in general. The evidence is also unclear as to whether awareness of citizen participation is related to the sense of efficacy of nonparticipants. However, even if one were to conclude that there is a participation-efficacy relationship, it
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would not necessarily mean participation causes a heightened sense of efficacy.

The problem is that the nature of the cause and effect relationship is quite ambiguous. It is not clear whether those who are already efficacious join organizations and participate in community life, whether those who are induced to participate become efficacious, or some combination of the two. Similarly, we must know whether efficacious non-participants are simply better informed and hence are aware of citizen committees, or whether becoming more aware of such activities heightens one's sense of efficacy. The critical question requires the assessment of citizen participation and a focus on the marginal change in the sense of powerlessness of the participants brought about by their involvement. To study incremental effects, however, testing must be done before and after some form of participation has taken place. Since almost all the research in this area involves a single survey and only one interview of the individual at one point in time, it is logically impossible to draw a definitive conclusion about the direction of causality from the data.

Trust and Sense of Efficacy: Longitudinal Data. We have found only two longitudinal studies, both providing relatively weak evidence, that cast light on whether participation or awareness of participation causes increased trust or sense of efficacy. The first is a 1966 study of an OEO poverty board in Texas. Louis A. Zurcher conducted tests in which he administered an array of standard psychological scales to the participants.* Seven months later he repeated the same tests to determine the effects of participation on the board. Unfortunately, only 18 board representatives from the target neighborhoods responded both times, which greatly limits the statistical reliability of the data. The results did not show a significant change in the sense of powerlessness or anomie (containing a trust-of-officials factor) of the participants. Thus, this longitudinal study suggests that there is no incremental effect of participation on alienation reduction, but the study is an isolated case with a very small number of respondents.

The second longitudinal study relates more to nonparticipants than participants. Citizens using Community Action Program services in San Diego, California, and other area residents with matched characteristics were surveyed to determine their personal efficacy, civic responsibility, self-concept, ethnic group relations, and other attitudes. Although there was considerable attrition, 58 respondents were reinterviewed after a year. The study concluded:

The findings generally do not support the contention that the type of CAP participation assessed modifies attitudes and perceptions in desired directions. Rather, the results are fairly uniform in revealing little differential benefit from CAP participation.*

Improving Program Effectiveness

The impact of citizen participation on program effectiveness is perhaps the most difficult relationship to assess. Effectiveness measures for most social programs are poor. Typical is the comment of an Urban Institute report** referring to the evaluation of social programs generally and specifically to Model Cities and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: "Relatively little is known about the effectiveness of such programs in meeting their objectives."

The report states that the problems of measuring effectiveness include the difficulties of defining program objectives and output measures; methodological, bureaucratic, and practical constraints; shortages of trained personnel, lack of funds, and the absence of clearly defined evaluation policies. If one cannot specify the effectiveness of those programs that involve citizen participation, it is impossible to identify the increment of effectiveness due to participation. For this reason, we relied heavily on those studies that focus separately on the impact


of citizen participation and the few studies that do provide some objective measure of effectiveness.

One of the better reports on the effects of citizen participation is a study conducted by Community Change, Inc.* This study does not purport to measure program effectiveness objectively, but it does provide a large number of subjective assessments of the consequences of citizen participation that bear directly on the effectiveness issue. Project personnel were surveyed about the effects of citizen participation in selected DHEW programs at 18 sites that varied considerably in their forms of citizen participation. Three sites had participant control over at least some functions; five shared control; and the remainder had either an evaluative function or no influence at all. When 443 program officials at those sites were asked about the consequences of participation, 80 percent reported that there had been no negative consequences. On the affirmative side, 27 percent of the respondents felt that the scope and type of services had improved and 14 percent felt that community awareness had increased due to citizen participation. Some of the local project people identified negative effects, but the frequency of adverse comments was much lower. Of the 443 local administrators at the project sites who were asked about the impact of citizen participation:

- 7 percent felt that there were delays in decisionmaking;
- 4 percent felt that it had led to friction with staff; and
- 2 percent felt it had led to community conflict.

This view of the effects of citizen participation in social programs is supported by the O'Donnell and Reid survey of local welfare administrators. Of some 458 administrators, each in a different

*Community Change, Inc., and Public Sector, Inc., "A Study of Consumer Participation in the Administrative Process in Various Levels of HSMHA's Service Projects," Sausalito, California, June 20, 1972 (Mimeo- graphed). Administrative personnel at the state, regional, and national level were less positive than project site personnel in their assessments, pp. 64-65.
community in a nationwide sample of local agencies, only 5 percent reported that there had been any adverse effects. The authors distinguish between the effects of boards and committees, however, and find that when the local administrators reported any adverse effects, they were attributable to boards. But the same strength of the boards that produces occasional negative effects seems to lead much more often to greater effectiveness:

- 43 percent of the boards helped to increase community support for the agency, compared to 33 percent of committees;
- 39 percent of the boards helped to bring in outside resources to meet recognized needs, compared to 28 percent of the committees; and
- 34 percent of the boards innovated agency operations to improve services, compared to 18 percent of the committees. *

The data suggest that both committees and boards increase program effectiveness, but that boards do so more successfully.

Objective data on program effectiveness in the educational field support the conclusion that advisory forms of citizen participation may also be linked to program effectiveness. Christopher Jencks conducted a reanalysis of the Equal Educational Opportunity data, relating the activity of a weak organizational form of participation, the PTA, to the average performance of school children on math and reading tests. ** The principal's evaluation of the proportion of families attending a typical meeting of the PTA or similar parent group was related to the average test scores at his school for 684 urban elementary schools. In schools whose principals indicated that almost all the parents attended PTA

---

* O'Donnell and Reid, op. cit.
meetings, children performed two to four months ahead of children in schools without PTAs, and those in schools with moderate PTA attendance fell between the two extremes. Even after the effects of race, social class, and other factors are held constant, Jencks reports that a significant relationship remains. This finding, like the entire Coleman Report, is subject to methodological controversy, but it is generally agreed that PTAs have no negative effects. There will be argument over the magnitude and meaning of the positive association between PTAs and the performance of children, but at present there is good reason to believe that parent participation and school achievement are meaningfully related.

If one moves beyond these few broad-gauged studies, two types of literature on program effectiveness remain. The first set is composed of short-term evaluations of a handful of projects. One illustration is an OEO-supported study of six Upward Bound projects.* This study is suggestive in that it found that effectiveness as measured by college admissions was greatest in the two programs with high parent involvement. It is typical in that the authors were not prepared to argue that there was a causal effect, and they recommended more research. The second set is made up of articles such as the one in The Washington Monthly** describing the disastrous consequences of citizen participation as implemented in Bakersfield, California, in a migrant health center. Articles such as this one pick out extreme cases of success and failure, give them widespread publicity, and worry more about attributing blame than seeking generalizations. We have chosen to rely on the available systematic studies rather than being concerned with the doubtful generalizability of these scattered and isolated articles. We should note, however, that this journalistic literature seems to have contributed to widespread expectations that citizen participation has pervasively negative effects on program effectiveness, an impression

---


that is not supported by the more systematic studies we have cited.

Together, the studies of DHEW-supported health service programs, Community Action Agencies, local welfare agencies, and educational achievement lead us to the conclusion that citizen participation increases citizen influence, and increases it in such a way that does not adversely affect program effectiveness. Advisory committees have less impact, and may improve effectiveness less than boards, but they have a significant and beneficial impact nonetheless. There are more adverse effects with boards, but these tend to take the form of delay and friction. This seems to be a natural and unavoidable consequence of introducing another actor in a decision-making process, particularly in the formative period when citizens are less familiar with the services and how decisions are made. In summary, boards in the aggregate give citizens more influence, and they may have a more positive impact on program effectiveness than do committees.

SUMMARY: BOARDS, COMMITTEES, AND DHEW GOALS

The evidence suggests that one of the DHEW goals cannot be directly affected by citizen organizations, and two goals can be achieved. As far as the DHEW goal of reducing alienation is concerned, there appears to be little evidence that increasing citizen participation will reduce the political alienation of either those who actually participate or those who merely look on. Trust is not positively related to participation, and sense of political efficacy is in some cases and not in others. The limited longitudinal evidence suggests that citizen participation will not have a marginal impact on citizen attitudes. While it may influence citizen views toward specific local institutions, citizen participation does not promise to change the general level of political alienation in our society, regardless of the organizational form of that participation.

At the same time, it seems equally clear that citizen participation on boards and committees effectively meets the DHEW goals of devolving power and enhancing program effectiveness. Boards with their greater authority have more impact and thus devolve more power.
With that power comes greater program effectiveness and, if not reduced alienation, at least an increase in the knowledge and skills of the participants. But the differences in boards and committees are not so great that the greater legal authority of the boards is the only determinant of devolving power. In fact, there are important features of organizations that vary from board to board which are also found in some committees, and the features are differentially correlated with the devolution of citizen power. The next chapter describes and analyzes these features.
IV. CORRELATES OF POWER IN CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS

The discussion of advisory committees and governing boards has led to the conclusion that some of these bodies, while unlikely to reduce alienation, substantially devolve power to citizens and may have a favorable influence on program effectiveness. Here, we will move beyond the basic distinction between boards and committees and examine the more specific assertions about the correlates of successful citizen participation organizations (CPOs). The literature contains an array of assertions about the determinants of successful citizen participation, but they can be grouped into three general areas expressed in the questions:

- In what kinds of communities is a citizen participation organization most likely to be successful in influencing services? The presence of a strong community identity, the homogeneity of the community, the proportion who are poor, and the nature of the region or city are said to be related to the success of citizen participation.
- In what kinds of programs is an organization most likely to be successful in influencing services? Attention will be given to how services are to be funded, the inherent nature of the services, and the organization of the agency delivering services.
- What organizational features, authority, and functions does a citizen organization need in order to be successful in influencing services? The success of citizen participation could be related to the type of organizational form chosen, the existence of a committee structure, the procedure used in selecting the participants, the specific duties they are given, and the skills and experience of the participants.
Success has been operationally redefined somewhat from the original DHEW goals set out above. Since no organizational form of participation seems likely to decrease political alienation, that concern is not pursued here. To the degree evidence is available, we will try to relate program effectiveness to the different characteristics that might affect citizen participation; but if the citizens have no influence, there is less reason to search for a further impact on program performance. Thus, the central question is whether or not the citizens have the power to influence programs. The primary definition of that power used here will be whether citizens are successful in getting their views implemented. An ancillary concern, however, is whether the nature of the context and organization have a positive or negative impact on the community being served. If participation unnecessarily fragments the constituency of the participants, their long-term credibility and effectiveness is likely to be undermined. By successful citizen influence, then, we mean that the citizens can: (1) implement their views (program impact), (2) bring more effective cooperation among the groups in the community being served (community impact), and (3) develop new organization and management skills for the participants (skill development).*

Because much of the citizen participation literature does not treat organizational, community or program characteristics in the detail required for our analysis, this section relies heavily on the checklist methodology. Few existing studies consider, for example, whether the investigation of grievances or the use of specialized subcommittees enhances the performance of citizen organizations. Those

* These three consequences will be used frequently below and refer to specific checklist questions, which are: program impact, "Has the Citizen Participation Organization (CPO) been successful in obtaining implementation of ideas or approaches the participants favor that would not have otherwise been put into effect?"; skill development, "Has the CPO developed significant political and/or organizational skills for more than five participants who did not have those skills a year before the analysis?"; and community impact, "Has citizen participation had a unifying effect, no effect, or a fragmenting effect on the target population?" Success on the first two questions is defined as those cases where the impact was to "a significant but limited" or to "a high degree." There was no successful impact when the effect was "none" or to "a trivial degree." For the third question, a "unifying effect" is evidence of successful community impact, and "no effect" or "a fragmenting effect" were answers indicating an absence of success. See the checklist in Appendix B for these questions in context.
that mention these specific details are usually case studies that refer to only one or two instances of citizen participation. The checklist methodology, which draws on 51 cases that offer such a level of detail, is for that reason central to the analysis here. The checklist, it should be emphasized, is an aggregation of case studies done by reader-analysts, and the findings are no better and no worse than the quality of the original studies.

First, we shall explore what community and program characteristics are related to citizen participation. Then, we shall focus on the organisational features related to successful citizen participation.

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

The first concern is whether community characteristics limit or improve the effectiveness of citizen participation. We examined the relationships between citizen influence in service programs and, in turn, community homogeneity, sense of identity, and size and type of city. The purpose of this investigation is not simply to identify in what type of community citizen participation is most likely to succeed, although such information would be useful in planning demonstration projects. DHEW requirements apply to all parts of the nation, and the fact that the probability of success is higher or lower in different areas has little significant meaning in and of itself. It would be valuable to know, however, whether different types of requirements work more effectively in different types of communities, and hence useful to identify community characteristics that are themselves directly related to successful citizen participation.

Demographic Homogeneity

The analysis of the checklist data showed that racial or social class homogeneity in the target community were not strongly correlated either positively or negatively with successful program impact. However, it should be pointed out that there were few cases where a substantial middle-class population was present, and extreme heterogeneity—where the middle-class existed side by side with a large poor population—existed in only six communities. The results are thus based on limited numbers and are only suggestive.
Sense of Community Identity

In contrast, it does appear to matter whether or not the individuals in the target community share a common sense of community identity. When we compared those cases which involved communities shown by a checklist question as having such a sense of identity with those that did not, we found that the citizen participation organizations (CPOs) in communities with clearly ascribed identities were considerably more likely to be successful in implementing citizen views: 62 percent have a program impact compared to a 40 percent success rate among those cases without a shared identity to build upon. But this does not necessarily mean that a CPO in an area with a common sense of identity is likely to contribute further to the unity of that area, for there is no evidence that there is a greater impact on the unity of those communities with shared identities. It may well be that the effects of citizen participation are attenuated and are less likely to increase the cohesion of a community when the level of identity is already quite high.

Size of Community and City

A Brandeis study of Community Action Agencies (CAAs) found that CAAs were more likely to be successful in major cities. "Limited participation" (as opposed to the more successful "active participation") was found in six of the eight CAAs studies in small cities and in only two of the nine CAAs in areas with central cities of over 150,000.* Our checklist data, however, yielded contrary results: CPOs in cities of over 250,000 population were less successful than CPOs in smaller urban and rural areas. Perhaps because of the greater complexity of large cities, only 46 percent of the metropolitan CPOs were successful in implementing approaches the citizen participants favored. On the other hand, 70 percent of the nonmetropolitan CPOs had this type of program impact; in small cities, there were 80 percent with a program impact, and the limited number of rural cases appeared to be about as successful as the metropolitan cases. The checklist finding may result

from a bias inherent in the cases available for study, since failures in major cities are more likely to attract attention than unsuccessful attempts at citizen participation in small towns. The pattern is supported, however, by the finding that program impact is negatively related to the size of the target population. Of the CPOs involving activities serving less than 20,000 citizens, 68 percent were successful in implementing their ideas, compared to less than one-half of those involving over 20,000 citizens. The greatest success for all criteria, program impact, community impact, and skill development, was found for target populations between 5,000 and 20,000 citizens.

In summary, some community characteristics are related to the likelihood that a CPO will be successful. Moderate size of the target population and the prior existence of a shared identity are correlates of devolution of power to CPOs.

PROGRAM AND SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS

Efforts to establish citizen participation appear to be consistently related to a set of program preconditions. We have no evidence that CPOs in one type of service program are much more successful than those in another, but CPOs have been created far more frequently in one type of program than another. We found CPOs most frequently associated with new, direct, and continuous services, largely in free-standing projects with direct federal funding.

New Services

Almost all of our checklist cases involved services that were less than five years old at the time they were studied. In fact, other than in education where there has long been a tradition of parent participation, the cases are generally associated with service programs that were new at the time the citizen participation effort was initiated. But while citizen participation may not be as well known in conjunction with well-established service activities, CPOs nevertheless still have a successful program impact as often in the context of old services as in new ones.
Direct and Continuous Services

Only a handful of the checklist cases of citizen participation were found that did not involve multiple or continuous services. Thus, while the nature of the individual user's relationship to the service may be an extremely important consideration, the data do not permit the necessary comparisons. For instance, if the user or user family has continuing and direct contact with a service, as is the case with education, the motivation for participation may be stronger. By the same token, centers that have highly intermittent services may be more successful when they aggregate the delivery of many services at one location. At this point, however, no conclusions can be drawn, but the absence of citizen participation in intermittent services does suggest that it is harder to initiate a successful CPO when citizen contact with the services is highly intermittent.

Direct Federal Funding

A common question in the literature is whether the nature of the service program financing (e.g., by state governments as opposed to federal governments) makes any difference in the likely success of the affiliated CPO. Roughly one-half of our cases were financed by federal funds going directly to the local performer, and did not involve the state as an agent or pass-through. When those cases were compared with cases in which the state is involved in the funding process, there were no differences found in terms of the success rate of the CPOs in terms of program impact, community impact, or skill development.

Services under Own Control

What does matter, instead, is whether the services are under the control of the local performer, or whether they are under the CPO's direct control. Consumers trying to influence one or more public agencies which are legally responsible for the services are one step removed from operational activities and are correspondingly less likely to be successful in effecting changes they favor. Moreover, in the absence of direct responsibility for the services, there is
opportunity to develop new organizational and management skills among the participants: In those cases where legal control was vested in the CPO (including cases where the consumers both did and did not have majority control of the CPO), 72 percent were successful in developing new leadership skills, whereas only 33 percent of those exerting indirect influence were successful in this manner.

In summary, citizen participation has been more often tried in new, federal, and continuous programs. However, no particular service and program characteristics are found to be major correlates of program impact, community impact, or skill development. Funding mechanisms and other program characteristics are not related to success except insofar as they inherently involve projects which provide for CPO control over the services.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The pattern of relationships suggests that neither community nor program characteristics are major correlates of the measures of successful citizen participation. One can therefore examine the consequences of organizational characteristics across a variety of communities and a variety of programs to identify one general model of successful participation.* Thus, the purpose is to isolate the features of citizen participation organizations that are most strongly correlated with our measures of successful participation.

Organizational Authority and the Proportion of Citizen Participants

As discussed in Chapter III, the legal authority of a CPO is a factor in predicting the success of citizen participation. Governing boards in general are more successful than advisory committees in having

*This does not necessarily mean that there are no interaction effects, with some organization features having differential consequences under different programs or in different communities. The number of cases did not permit systematic analysis of this question, and the only evidence of interaction was idiosyncratic and not susceptible to generalization.
program impact and they had a more beneficial impact on program effectiveness. A serious problem of interpretation remains, however, because the greater the legal authority of the organization, the fewer are the number of actual consumers of services found on the committee or board. For example, the surveys of welfare boards revealed few welfare recipients or even low-income people as board members. In fact, while one-third of the committees (32%) had two or more welfare recipients, none of the boards had even two recipients. Three-fourths of the boards had no low-income participants of any kind.* Is the greater program impact and effectiveness of boards due to their greater power, or is it due to the absence of consumer members?

At stake is one of the critical questions about citizen organizations, the proportion of board members that should come from the community being served. Citizens from the target group have rarely been allowed to dominate service-linked citizen organizations that have considerable authority. One possible inference is that there are negative consequences with having a strong, citizen-dominated board. As best we can tell, this assumption is incorrect. While the distribution of the checklist cases makes inference difficult for this question, it did not appear that holding a majority of a board affects the program impact of the participants from the community being served by the program activity.**

This view is supported by the fact that a separate study of health centers also found that the proportion of participants from the consumer population was not related to program effectiveness.*** Geomet, Inc., under an OEO contract to evaluate neighborhood health centers, surveyed approximately 9,500 families, including users of health centers, nonusers in the health-center areas, and comparable respondents in a

---

* O'Donnell and Reid, op. cit. This discussion excludes the confounded cases where boards and committees exist side by side.

** Only 12 percent of our 51 cases were either governing boards or advisory committees with less than one-half of their membership from the target community.

matched area for each of 21 centers. Objective information was gathered about the services the center provided, the management structure, the integration of funding, outreach activities, and many other features of the center. Program effectiveness was measured by 28 subjective factors from interviews and 15 objective characteristics of the centers, including:

- 13 measures of appropriate utilization of the center, e.g., are fewer appointments broken; is there home care; are there fewer untreated needs?
- 5 convenience measures, e.g., how long is the waiting time; how crowded is the center?
- 3 satisfaction measures, e.g., do users like the doctors; is the doctor's treatment respectful and dignified?
- 15 comprehensiveness measures, e.g., how many tests are administered; is there pre- and post-natal care?

These were all aggregated by Geomet into one performance score. The score thus reflects objective and specific definitions of program effectiveness for comparable services in addition to the report of on-site evaluations made subjectively by local administrators.

Citizen participation was measured simply by the proportion of service beneficiaries on the boards of these neighborhood centers, which varied from under 25 percent to 100 percent. In all cases, the proportion of beneficiaries was substantial. When the degree of participation was correlated with the Geomet program effectiveness measure, it was found that there was no relationship of any kind between the two.

The conclusion appears to be that, after a certain proportion of beneficiary representation is achieved, other factors determine the success or failure of the citizen organizations. All-citizen boards may represent a neighborhood point of view better than boards with only one-third or one-half of its members drawn from the target community population,*

but there is nevertheless a case to be made for having substantial numbers of service managers and providers present to supply another perspective and to explain some of the complexities of service delivery. For these reasons, an optimum strategy would be a "citizen-dominated" board (50 to 60 percent citizen representation), but with the condition that both providers and citizens each comprise at least one-third of the board.

**Budgetary Control**

As noted above, the borderline between governing boards and advisory committees is not at all distinct, for there are both relatively weak boards as well as committees with some significant legal powers. This fact accounts in part for the modest differences in the success of boards and committees, but also suggests that some legal powers are much more critical than others in identifying which organizations are most successful.

Analysis of the checklist cases suggests that budget control is a key to citizen participation success. Budgetary control is, of course, an ultimate power in any organization, for it is the concrete instrument through which policy changes are most often put into effect. The success of the CPOs in implementing citizen views was determined as it related to the following question:

*Does the CPO have substantial influence over the service(s) budget?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or trivial implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant or high implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four out of five CPOs with budgetary influence also had program impact. Moreover, control over the budget also provides opportunity for managerial responsibility, and 83 percent of the CPOs with substantial budgetary influence also indicated development of new leadership skills among the citizen participants.

"Substantial influence" over the budget means much more than merely reviewing or approving the local application for funds. While mere approval of a grant application, including its budget, at first glance seems to be a powerful authority, participants are frequently confronted with a prepared application and given a simple choice: They can approve an unfamiliar or disagreeable application package and obtain the money for the locality, or they can fail to approve it, miss the deadline, and not have a project at all. Assurances that the CPO will be able to exercise future influence are frequently made but that opportunity rarely occurs. We found that the success of the participants in implementing their views when the sign-off of the CPO is required is not very different from when it is not required:

*Is the sign-off of the CPO required on funding requests by the service(s) organization?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (N=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or trivial implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant or high implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, mere sign-off requirements, by contrast to deeper citizen involvement in formulating and debating the budget and approving changes, do not by themselves contribute to significant program impact.

**Grievance Investigation**

Circumstances may not always permit giving sweeping authority to the CPO. When we consider the other functions that citizens have
fulfilled, we note in particular that CPOs have frequently been involved in the investigation of individual complaints about the staff and administration of the services. Citizens can easily deal with the concrete issues involved in grievances. The specific information regarding a complaint can often be grasped quickly, and a complaint may lead to focused decisions that are made in a relatively short period of time, permitting even new participants to take part in discussions in a meaningful way. Such discussions also increase participant contact with both staff and users, and may have a variety of positive consequences for the CPO that go well beyond the narrow grievance investigation function itself.

In the cases where the CPO had substantial influence in the investigation of complaints, we found that the participants also were successful in other respects. Participants were able to implement their views in 74 percent of those cases where they had influence in grievance investigation, and they were successful in only 23 percent of the cases where they did not:

*Does the CPO have substantial influence in the investigation of complaints that individual citizens have about staff and program?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or trivial implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant or high implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we looked more closely at the 13 cases in which the CPO had no influence in the complaint process, we found only one case of a CPO that had increased *skill development* and only one CPO that had a significant *community impact*.
Staff and Participant Expertise

Another important organizational characteristic for a CPO is whether it should have staff under its own control. As the following pattern of responses to the checklist indicates, the simple presence of staff is associated with a 75 percent success rate in having program impact.

Does the CPO have its own staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or trivial implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant or high implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This feature appears to be of central importance to success in affecting services, and the reasons for this are not difficult to infer. The availability of staff makes continuity and expertise available to the CPO that it cannot otherwise attain. Participants who put in several hours a week cannot keep up with the details of service programs in sufficient depth to exercise meaningful influence unless they start with considerable expertise in the area. The participants in what became an embittering experience with the Philadelphia Model Cities stated that one lesson they learned was:

Community organizations must have the dollars to hire their own staff technicians, and must be able to direct that staff and hold it accountable.


When the citizens in a CPO are economically disadvantaged, typically without the time, education, and other resources available to the
middle class, the absence of staff may be a crippling weakness. Moreover, the fact that staff can serve as a vehicle for providing training and experience to members of the target population may also account for the strong correlation between the CPO having staff resources and skill development: In cases where the CPO had its own staff, 76 percent were judged to have developed significant new organizational skills among members of the target community.

Indigenous Service Staff. There may also be additional support for effective participation if the service staff is drawn from the target population. Whether or not they are hired by the CPO, service staff from the local community often provide useful information and support for the CPO participants. In addition, the employment of indigenous staff in the delivery of services appears to improve program effectiveness. The previously cited Geomet study of neighborhood health clinics collected data on the proportion of the staff indigenous to the clinic service areas, as well as on the extensive measures of program effectiveness. The relationship between their aggregate performance measures and the proportion of indigenous staff is weak but positive.* In seeking a possible explanation, we turned to the Geomet data on the frequency of professional staff-citizen problems in the center: A low frequency of such problems was strongly related to a high proportion of indigenous service staff.

Another study notes that strong forms of citizen participation are more likely to be associated with a more frequent employment of indigenous paraprofessionals.** It thus seems that when strong organizations are set up and have their own resources for staff, the result is both a higher likelihood of their having a program impact and as a matter of course, a higher probability of improved staff-client relations.

* The data were drawn from Volume II of the Geomet study, op. cit.; the rank order correlation between the proportion of indigenous staff and program effectiveness was + .412, which is significant at the .05 level.

Training, Reimbursement, and Prior Expertise. As an alternative to staff, one might consider increasing the expertise of the participants. This could be done by training, by attracting more knowledgeable individuals with pay or at least reimbursement for expenses, and/or by recruiting participants with prior experience in citizen participation. We found that training was provided only in 10 of our 51 cases, and pay and reimbursement only in 8. The small number of cases limits the reliability of the results, but in two-thirds of the cases where training was provided, the participants developed new skills and were successful in getting their views translated into policy. Reimbursement and pay were unrelated to our measures of success, but that may be the result of how the money was allocated. Frequently, individuals have been reimbursed only after a delay of many months, and observers have complained that such a reimbursement schedule is not a meaningful incentive.

Indications that the presence of knowledgeable participants does make a difference was brought out by a different question. We asked of each case whether at least a substantial minority of participants from the target population had prior experience in citizen participation or community organization. We found a consistently higher rate of success for program impact among those CPOs with experienced participants. Of 22 cases with experienced participants, 68 percent implemented their views compared to a 42 percent success rate among the cases without participants with prior experience.

Tenure and Specialization. Whether or not prior experience is available, another way of strengthening citizen participation may be to assure that participants remain active and thus develop expertise. The effects of longevity of participation could not be closely examined, however, since in 86 percent of our cases where a judgment was possible, one-half or more of the participants had been involved for two years, or for the life of the organization if it was less than two years old. As for functionally specialized committees, their effect may be to permit the participants to choose those topics where their interests and knowledge are greatest, and to keep track of a narrower range of
problems and activities. Consistent with that view, 67 percent of those cases where functional committees operated were associated with successful program impact, compared to 47 percent success among cases without such committees.

In comparing the availability of CPO staff with the impact of any type of training for participants, however, the superior knowledge held by the professionals responsible for service delivery make it extremely difficult for the part-time participant to have any influence, even when he has the legal right to do so, and even if he is well-trained. In other words, the most important way of giving participants the capacity to exercise power is to provide them staff over which they have control. Training, remuneration, and the use of specialized committees are additional factors that will further support the participant and increase his expertise.

Organizational Structure, Level, and Membership Selection

With remarkable consistency, the checklist data have suggested that none of the previously considered characteristics are related to community impact. For the most part, it appears that the effects of a citizen organization on the community it represents is more a function of the structure of the organization and not its powers and duties. Considered here are the basic structure of the organization, the level at which it is organized, and the means used in selecting citizens from the target community.

Constituent Organizations. The growing number and diversity of organizations in many communities, all purporting to represent or serve similar target populations, make it important to consider what organization form citizen participation should take. Some organizations are simple in structure; others are complex in that they are "umbrellas" bringing together a variety of other active organizations. These umbrella organizations occasionally have their own constituent organizations organized at a lower level of aggregation (such as neighborhood councils in a citywide CPO); or the constituents can be well-established, independent organizations that participate in the CPO (an example of the latter would be the selection of delegates by and from welfare rights
organizations, churches, and other organizations on a community action agency board). In either event, there are costs and benefits. Simple organizations are easy to join, as a new board member simply learns the politics of one, unitary organization; delegates to umbrella organizations must deal with the politics of constituent organizations as they influence the behavior of their colleagues. But the umbrella organization can often tap the significant resources of its constituent organizations, where a unitary organization often stands alone in trying to influence a service agency.

A more complex structure does make it less likely that the participants will hold common views and more difficult for them to hold common positions. In 60 percent of our cases where citizen participants represented constituent organizations in umbrella organizations, the CPO was not able to implement participant views beyond a trivial degree. On the other hand, organizations with such a structure provided a forum for different points of views within the target community, and appeared to lead to greater interorganizational coordination. We find that the umbrella organizations are much more likely (77 percent) to have a unifying effect on their communities than are unitary organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Impact</th>
<th>Type of Organizational Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umbrella (N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying effect on community</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effect or fragmenting effect on community</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we appear to have potential conflict between two desirable consequences. The structure associated with success in bringing the community together is associated with decreased participant influence over the services.

*This finding may be due to the fact that umbrella organizations correspond to and effectively channel the multiple membership in various groups held by many leaders of the socially disadvantaged. See Melvin B. Mogulof, Citizen Participation: The Local Perspective, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., March 1970, pp. 35-41.
A resolution to this problem is found, however, when we consider the effects of organizational structure and the key factor of staff as they operate together. Although the number of cases is limited, the pattern is suggestive. Umbrella organizations with staff have a successful program impact, as do unitary organizations with staff. Unitary forms without staff do not do well, but umbrella organizations without staff do worst of all. It appears that staff, perhaps by providing continuity and cohesion, are equally effective in umbrella organizations in enabling the CPO to implement citizen views. The results suggest that CPOs structured with component organizations maximize control over services as well as beneficial consequences for the community if they have their own staff. Without staff, umbrella organizations appear to be self-defeating as a means of increasing participant influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>Organizational Structure and Staff Resources (Number of Cases)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umbrella with Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or trivial implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant or high implementation of citizen views</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Organization. In discussing community characteristics, we found that the size of the target population makes some difference, but that the nature of the community was not a large factor. A separate but consistent finding is that whether the CPO is organized at the county, metropolitan, city, or neighborhood level makes little or no difference. The only evidence that suggested the desirability of one level over another is that city and county CPOs seem to have a greater likelihood (59 percent) of playing a unifying role than do the CPOs based on smaller areas. Those in smaller, more homogeneous neighborhoods, villages, and suburbs probably have less diversity in the first place, so
the fact that they have a unifying effect less often (37 percent) may
not have much importance.

Membership Selection Procedures. Boards and executive committees
of CPOs can be selected in three basic ways. They can be appointed,
whether by state or local officials, by the administrator of the ser-
vices performer, or by some professional or community group. They can
be elected, either by the community or by some organization or group
within the community. They can be self-selected, in that those who
come to open meetings are presumed to be those both interested and
able to speak for others, or in the sense of a self-constituted group
setting up a nonprofit organization. Quite commonly, a board's mem-
ers will be chosen by a mix of these selection procedures, but our
concern is with how the citizens from the target population are chosen.

The data suggest that appointment of citizens is the weakest method.
The reasons are probably varied. Because those appointing tend to choose
citizens already known as prominent or outspoken figures, this process
seems less likely to help develop skills for participants not previously
involved in community activities. The dangers of cooptation are quite
great, as individuals friendly to the wishes of management of the ser-
vices are frequently chosen. In either event, less than one-half of
the cases using appointment procedures were successful in influencing
the program, compared to 60 percent of those relying on election and
self-selection.

Both self-selection and appointment have limited impact on the
broader community, probably because the process of selection goes on
with little fanfare. Where only 30 percent of the cases relying on
appointment or self-selection had a unifying effect on the community,
81 percent of those using elections had a similar positive effect.
Self-selection is somewhat better than appointment, however, in that
individuals with widely differing views can express them and take
active roles in the organization's activities. But just as appoint-
ment leads to citizens that are too passive, self-selection opens the
door to ephemeral and/or rancorous participation. Even when it is
structured so that the citizens are informed and cooperative in atti-
tude, the potential abuses are evident to the professionals and managers
of the services, making implementation difficult.

The data therefore suggest that election mechanisms appear to be the most desirable. One reasons may be that elections are almost the only way to establish the fact that a few citizens represent and speak for a larger number of citizens. General elections are not always successful, however, because the turnout is frequently quite small, raising questions about the legitimacy of the elected representatives. A comparison of Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York efforts at participation by Paul Peterson * reinforces the conclusion that elections are the better form, but suggests that elections within constituent organizations, or among delegates or organizations may well be the best form among the many election procedures available.

THE SUCCESSFUL ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL

In summary, the experience from our 51 cases of citizen participation suggests that some organizational features are not related to the likelihood of success of citizen participation. These are: sign-off authority, the geographic level of the organization, and whether the service program is funded directly by the federal government or through state and local agencies. Other organizational features do appear to be consistently correlated with a substantial devolution of power to citizen participation. Three of these features are of first importance and are all critical in devolving power:

- Meaningful influence over the budget;
- Investigation of complaints; and
- Staff responsible to the citizen participant organization.

The ancillary benefit of positive community impact is maximized if the structure of the organization is umbrella-like, and elections for CPO membership are held by constituent organizations. Once chosen, we

found, the participants should be given as many opportunities to gain expertise as possible. At the early stages of the CPO, this process is enhanced if the selection process brings in participants with prior experience. Training and pay, if promptly delivered, might be useful, but expertise is also fostered by the organization of the participants into functional committees.
V. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN DHEW: CURRENT STATUS

The previous chapter has indicated the most desired features of citizen organizations. Our discussion now turns to the problem of relating these findings to the current situation in DHEW, and of making recommendations for new DHEW actions. A necessary prelude to such recommendations is an examination of the current status of citizen participation in DHEW. It is especially important to understand whether DHEW is already following a policy course that will produce adequate citizen organizations, or whether new initiatives by the Secretary are required to create the necessary changes.

FORMAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN DHEW

At the present time, many DHEW programs have some formal requirement for citizen participation. These formal requirements vary both in the type of citizen participation required (e.g., local boards, state advisory committees, or the employment of paraprofessionals) and in the source of that requirement (e.g., law, federal regulation, or program guideline). Moreover, the requirements are often vaguely stated, thus allowing for considerable variation even among different projects within the same DHEW program.

Table 2 summarizes the citizen participation requirements in existing DHEW programs. The information in the table is derived from official documents and numerous interviews of DHEW officials and client groups carried out by the Technical Assistance Research Programs.* Excluded from this review are training and research programs (e.g., the National Institutes of Health), programs for institutions of higher education, and other programs whose nature made citizen participation a less important activity. The review shows that, in general, health programs are most frequently marked by requirements for local advisory committees; education programs usually call for a mixture of local and

* A more extensive discussion of this topic appears in the related TARP paper entitled "The DHEW Citizen Participation Experience." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB Number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Usual Grantee</th>
<th>Approx. 1973 Budget</th>
<th>Citizen Participation Requirements</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.206</td>
<td>Areawide Health Planning-314(b)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Areawide Health Council</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.224</td>
<td>Health Services Centers-314(e)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Local Gov. and Adv. Bds.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.003</td>
<td>OEO Health Centers</td>
<td>CAAs and others Special</td>
<td>40(?)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Local Gov. and Adv. Bds.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.228</td>
<td>Indian Health Services</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Local Adv. Councils Paraprofs.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.229</td>
<td>Indian Sanitation</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.246</td>
<td>Migrant Health Grants</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Local Adv. Bd.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.249</td>
<td>Regional Medical Services</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.251</td>
<td>Alcoholism Services</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SHA=State Health Agency; CAA=Community Action Agency.

*Level: L=Law; R=Regulations; G=Guidelines.

*Compliance: P=Poor; S=Sporadic; G=General; N=New program (no experience); U=Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB Number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Usual Grantee</th>
<th>Approx. 1973 Budget</th>
<th>Citizen Participation Requirements</th>
<th>Apparent Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amount ($ million)</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.400</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>SEAs</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Adv. Com.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Adv. Com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.401</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>LEAs and Non-prof.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>State Adv. Com.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Adv. Com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.420</td>
<td>Drug Abuse Prevention</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>General Citizen Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.520</td>
<td>Handicapped-Special Children</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local Adv. Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs./Volun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.408</td>
<td>Public Library Const.</td>
<td>SLAs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>State Adv. Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.464</td>
<td>Public Library Services</td>
<td>SLAs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Adv. Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.465</td>
<td>Interlibrary Services</td>
<td>SLAs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>State Adv. Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.421</td>
<td>Career Opportunities</td>
<td>SEAs and LEAs</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Local Adv. Bds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.427</td>
<td>Title I-Handicapped</td>
<td>SEAs</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.428</td>
<td>Title I-Grants</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>Parent Adv. Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(majority membership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.429</td>
<td>Title I-Migrants</td>
<td>SEAs and LEAs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Local Adv. Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.431</td>
<td>Title I-Neglected and Delinq. Children</td>
<td>SEAs and LEAs</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Local Adv. Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.433</td>
<td>Follow Through</td>
<td>LEAs and CAAs</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Strong Local Adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>like OEO; Paraprofs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a SEA=State Education Agency; SLA=State Library Agency; LEA=Local Education Agency; CAA=Community Action Agency.

b L=Law; R=Regulations; G=Guidelines.

c P=Poor; S=Sporadic; G=General; N=New program (no experience); U=Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB Number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Usual Grantee</th>
<th>Approx. 1973 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.444</td>
<td>Handicapped Early Childhood Assist.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.445</td>
<td>Deaf-Blind Centers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.448</td>
<td>Handicapped Teacher Training</td>
<td>SEAs and Non-profs</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.449</td>
<td>Handicapped Pre-school Services</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.482</td>
<td>Disadv. Students in Higher Education Talent Search</td>
<td>Higher Ed.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.488</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Ed.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.492</td>
<td>Upward Bound</td>
<td>Higher Ed.</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.493</td>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>SEAs and LEAs</td>
<td>500 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.505</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.516</td>
<td>Education Special Projects</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.521</td>
<td>Experimental Schools</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.523</td>
<td>School Health and Nutrition</td>
<td>LEAs and Non-profs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.524</td>
<td>Emergency School Assistance</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Participation Requirements Type</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Apparent Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Adv. Council Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Adv. Boards</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Adv. Boards Paraprofs.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Adv. Boards Paraprofs.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Council Paraprofs.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Council Paraprofs.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Title I Parent Adv. Committee</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Adv. Board</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

aSEA=State Education Agency; LEA=Local Education Agency.
bL=Law; R=Regulations; G=Guidelines.
cP=Poor; S=Sporadic; G=General; N=New program (no experience); U=Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB Number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Usual Granteea</th>
<th>Approx. 1973 Budget (No. of Projects, $ million)</th>
<th>Citizen Participation Requirements Type</th>
<th>Level b</th>
<th>Apparent Compliance c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Adv. Com.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.714</td>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>SWAs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>State Adv. Com</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.748</td>
<td>Work Incentives</td>
<td>SWAs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>State Adv. Com</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Adv. Com.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.753</td>
<td>Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>SWAs and Non-profs.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>State Adv. Board</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.754</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>SWAs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>State Adv. Board</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(same as Local Adv. Board AFDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.756</td>
<td>Aging-Special Projects</td>
<td>Non-profs.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>State Adv. Board</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.761</td>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>SWAs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6,628</td>
<td>State Adv. Board</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(includes AFDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofs.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.600</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary</td>
<td>CAAs and LEAs</td>
<td>500(?)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>Local Gov. Councils</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a SWA=State Welfare Agency; CAA=Community Action Agency; LEA=Local Education Agency.

b L=Law; R=Regulations; G=Guidelines.

c P=Poor; S=Sporadic; G=General; N=New program (no experience); U=Unknown.
state advisory committees; and welfare programs only call for the weaker forms of citizen participation, i.e., state advisory committees and the employment of paraprofessionals.

The review also shows that there are a variety of citizen participation requirements within each area of health, education, and welfare. Although some of this variation is due to the different programs in these three major areas, the variation also reflects the lack of an overall citizen participation policy at either the department or the agency level. DHEW imposes no overall citizen participation policy. The major DHEW constituent agencies, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration (HSMHA), the Office of Education (OE), and the Social and Rehabilitative Service (SRS), have not developed consistent citizen participation policies either. (Both HSMHA and SRS, however, have made preliminary attempts to review citizen participation in their programs, with a view toward considering some agencywide action.) Thus, the first major characteristic of citizen participation in DHEW is that: There is no broad citizen participation policy; the existing citizen participation requirements and activities stem from the unique history of specific DHEW programs, and consequently do not follow any general pattern.

A second characteristic is that: The formal requirements are not usually explicit about the precise form citizen participation should take. Where state advisory committees are required, for instance, neither the membership of the committees nor the powers of the committees is made clear. The requirements do in many cases call for some minimum number of citizen members, but the citizens may be "consumer representatives," who are usually not elected representatives but are appointed by program officials. The result is that citizens may be unaware of the fact that they are being represented. Similarly, the ambiguity in committee powers hampers the work of the committees and can also create unnecessary frustrations in situations where different people have different expectations about the role of the committees. For instance, citizens may expect a committee to provide an opportunity to exert real influence over program administration, but program officials may expect a committee merely to endorse those program decisions
that the program officials choose to bring before the committee.

One frequent outcome of the vague requirements is that they result in only nominal types of citizen participation. Another outcome, however, can also result and is quite different. The language calling for citizen participation in 314(e) health projects, for instance, occurs only in program guidelines (which are viewed as less binding than statutory or regulatory provisions) and is no more explicit than in other programs. Despite these conditions, citizen participation in 314(e) health projects has frequently involved strong local governing boards, dominated by consumers. This is because of the apparently strong commitment of program officials to citizen participation. The presence of vague requirements and the absence of clear departmental or agency policies, then, means an increased dependence on the attitudes of program staff in determining the ultimate form and content of citizen participation.

**ACTUAL PARTICIPATION IN DHEW PROGRAMS**

The actual amount and quality of citizen participation in DHEW programs are unknown because there is no systematic monitoring or enforcement procedure. No DHEW office, for instance, keeps track of the degree of compliance, even to the limited formal requirements that exist.

The lack of such a monitoring or enforcement procedure precludes any adequate analysis of citizen participation in DHEW. However, some information is available as a result of special surveys of specific DHEW programs.* These surveys suggest that, while compliance is usually more frequent than noncompliance, there are nevertheless significant cases of noncompliance. For instance:

- In migrant health, the formation of local boards is required, yet only 69 percent of the projects had

---

such a board;

- In family planning, regulations only require that some type of citizen participation be developed (boards, the use of paraprofessionals, or any other means), yet 13 percent of the projects have no citizen participation of any type;

- In Medicaid, regulations call for state advisory committees with some citizen membership, yet 32 states failed to have a single Medicaid recipient on their committees, and several states had neither recipients nor "consumer representatives."

In other programs, such as Title I grants to local education agencies, the citizen participation requirements are relatively new, and thus full compliance by all Title I projects may not occur immediately.

Because of the lack of systematic monitoring, the general impact of citizen participation activities is also unknown. In partial recognition of this weakness, DHEW initiated a series of program evaluations by special teams supervised by the Office of the Secretary, known as Program Evaluations by Summer Interns (PEBSI). These evaluations were intended as experiments to see whether nonprofessionals from communities could evaluate programs, and citizen participation was not the only subject of study. Nevertheless, the PEBSI experience provides some relevant lessons for any subsequent effort by DHEW to monitor citizen participation:

- The monitoring must cover a systematic sample of DHEW projects;

- The monitoring should be a year-round activity, and not be limited to summer field activities;

- Field evaluators and monitors require a sufficient amount of training, both to perform their duties and to be accepted by project officials; and

- DHEW needs to link the monitoring results to overall program reviews in a timely and systematic manner.
FUTURE COURSE, ABSENT NEW INITIATIVES

In spite of the incomplete information on the current status of citizen participation in DH-EW, it is possible to forecast the future course of events if DH-EW takes no new initiatives regarding citizen participation: Although individual DH-EW programs may continue to require citizen participation, the general level of citizen participation will be no greater than it has been, and in fact citizen participation is likely to decline if DH-EW makes a major reorganization of its programs.

With no new initiative by the Secretary, professional groups and program administrators are likely to continue dominating DH-EW program design, and are not likely to act independently to expand participatory opportunities. Moreover, recent Secretarial initiatives in the drafting of new program legislation have ironically had the side effect of de-emphasizing the citizen participation that already exists. The Education Special Revenue Sharing bill of 1971, for instance, would have abolished several categorical programs, including Title I. It must be assumed that Title I Parents' Advisory Committees, one of the newer forms of citizen participation, would also have been abolished. In place of the parents' committees (and the other participatory structures related to the other categorical programs abolished by the bill), the special revenue sharing bill only called for the establishment of weak state advisory committees. (An early draft of the 1973 version of the bill, however, did call for the retention of the Parents' Advisory Committees.)

Similar evidence can be found with regard to two other new legis- lative proposals, the Allied Services bill of 1972, and the Social Security Amendments of 1972. The Allied Services bill establishes a series of programs that might have been compatible with citizen participation; yet the proposed legislation called only for public hearings at the local level, and for no participatory opportunities at the state level, where important program decisions would be made. The draft legislation for the Social Security Amendments of 1972 (H.R. 1) actually contained a provision that precluded DH-EW from requiring states to establish any welfare-related advisory bodies. The provision
Sec. 505. Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after Section 1127 the following section:
"Sec. 1128. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize or permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe any rule or regulation requiring any State, in the operation of a State plan approved under Titles I, IV, X, XIV, XV, or XVI of this Act, to establish or pay the expenses of any advisory council to advise the State with respect to such plan, its operation, or any program or programs conducted thereunder."

The provision was dropped before final passage of the bill, but the point is that such an important step had even been considered. Moreover, the Social Security Amendments Act did abolish one quasi-participatory body, the National Advisory Council on Medicaid.

In summary, without explicit and new Secretarial initiatives, citizen participation in its traditional form will diminish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Certainly there is no current movement toward the preferred type of citizen organization as described in the last chapter. However, the major premise of this study has been that the Department is willing to consider new initiatives. The following chapter therefore describes the appropriate areas for departmental action, based on all the study findings reported up to this point. The recommendations for new actions especially focus on policies that can promote effective citizen participation in the context of future DHEW programs.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS: THE PREFERABLE FORMS OF PARTICIPATION

This chapter presents the recommendations which follow from our findings concerning the forms of citizen participation that best meet the DHEW criteria of devolving power, reducing alienation, and increasing program effectiveness. The chapter first presents our general recommendations, discusses the costs associated with these recommendations, and then, in order to illustrate how the general recommendations might be applied throughout most of DHEW, specifies their application to six representative DHEW programs. These programs include a selection of traditional as well as proposed DHEW programs; it should be noted that the development of a participating structure is therefore entirely compatible with the current evolution and reorganization of DHEW programs.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Citizen Organizations

Our general recommendations on citizen participation organizations (CPOs) must be qualified by the local political context and the nature of specific programs. Strong citizen boards sometimes involve serious political problems, and they may require program changes that are not always feasible alternatives. They are, nonetheless, the optimum general solution for giving effective influence to citizens. We therefore recommend that, wherever possible:

DHEW require the establishment of citizen-dominated boards having the following principal characteristics:

- Citizen-members are elected;
- Other citizen and community organizations are represented;
- Resources sufficient to support a staff reporting directly to the board are provided; and
The formal authority possessed by such boards includes at least the powers to influence substantially their program's budget and to investigate the complaints of citizens.

To provide these resources for every CPO, and to work toward the permanent establishment of citizen participation in DHEW, we recommend that:

DHEW create separate boards for health, education, and welfare at the local service area level.

For education, the local service area would be the 17,000 local school districts; for health and for welfare, the local service area would be the 3,000 or so U.S. counties. Establishment of CPOs at the local service area level would mean the creation of citizen boards with a wider range of responsibilities than project-oriented boards. The area-level boards might thus serve as an integrating force to accompany other DHEW initiatives with similar objectives (e.g., services integration and special revenue sharing); the broader boards would also be less vulnerable to the continual reorganization of project-oriented programs that occurs in DHEW.

Finally, establishment of local service area boards would enable DHEW to provide the essential minimum staff to CPOs without expending very large sums. Our estimate is that such an effort would cost approximately $180 million per year, but it is important to emphasize that all of this cost is not new. Funds are being expended now for many citizen participation functions, but budgets are not usually organized so that the costs are separately identifiable. (For a further discussion, see the subsequent section on costs.)

Other Forms of Participation

None of the other forms of citizen participation substantially devolve power to citizens, and hence we recommend that
DHEW take no new initiative solely with regard to volunteering, the use of paraprofessionals, grievance procedures, citizen polls, and citizen evaluations.

However, two of these forms complement the development of CPOs well. One form, grievance procedures, has already been mentioned as a desirable function for CPOs. The other, the use of paraprofessionals, can potentially increase program effectiveness and increase the sense of efficacy of those citizens working as paraprofessionals. We therefore recommend that:

DHEW promote the use of grievance procedures and paraprofessionals in conjunction with the development of citizen participation organizations.

ESTIMATING THE COSTS OF CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS

Our recommendations call for the establishment of separate citizen boards for health, education, and welfare at the local service area level, and for minimal staff support for each board.

There are 23,000 local service areas (17,000 school districts, 3,000 U.S. counties for health, and the same 3,000 counties for welfare), but our estimate is that only about one-half of such areas, or 12,000, would actually have operating citizen organizations. The estimate of one-half, though crude, is supported by two observations. The first is that the 90,000 schools across the country have produced some 45,000 PTAs; the second is that only two-thirds of all school districts have more than 300 students, with less than one-half having more than 1,000 students. There are also several school districts that are extremely large and will be able to justify having more than one citizen board; however, these cases will increase the number of required boards by only a small fraction.

The amount of money required to support a minimal staff is estimated to be $15,000 per board. This estimate is derived in part from the recent experiences with the Selective Service System, in which
approximately 4,000 local draft boards used over $75 million in FY 1972, or under $20,000 per board. The citizen organizations would be staffed somewhat more modestly, and thus would require $15,000. This figure of $15,000 per board multiplied by the estimated 12,000 boards yields a total estimated cost for citizen organizations of $180 million, although the total cost will increase if a larger majority of the potential organizations is activated.

Only some portion of this $180 million would represent a new outlay in funds. Although no inventory of current DHEW expenditures for citizen participation exists, there is some evidence that the annual expenditures are already in the tens of millions of dollars. For instance, several large programs, including Medicaid, Title I, and Vocational Education, require that state and local advisory bodies be given staff assistance and technical assistance, and be reimbursed for expenses. In Vocational Education, $2.7 million was obligated in FY 1972 for grants to state advisory councils for these activities. In Title I, monies have been expended for full-time staff such as "parent coordinators" to work with the parent advisory committees; though the extent of the use of such personnel is unknown, if only 20 percent of the 14,000 Title I projects had such staff, and the staff drew a full-time professional salary plus part-time clerical assistance, this activity alone could involve over $50 million per year.

No estimates are possible for other DHEW programs. However, it is clear that many programs currently support a variety of citizen participation activities. To avoid ambiguity in the future in relation to the citizen organizations recommended by this study, we also recommend that:

DHEW identify a fixed budget over which a citizen board would have discretionary authority. This budget would provide minimal support for staff to serve the board.
Whatever the total costs of sustaining these citizen organizations, the costs may ultimately be offset by savings in program effectiveness. In fact, citizen participation should not necessarily be considered a managerial luxury (i.e., hard on the budget but providing a social return); it may also serve as a managerial device to promote cost savings through improved programs. To determine the precise savings, we recommend that

DHEW institute an adequate evaluation program along with the creation of the new citizen boards, to assess the full impact of the boards.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

To illustrate how these general recommendations can be applied to specific DHEW programs, we turn now to descriptions of (a) the past participation experience and (b) the potential methods of implementing the general model of local participation in six programs: Section 314(e) health projects, Title I grants to local education agencies, Medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Allied Services, and Education Special Revenue Sharing. Each of these programs is intended to represent a certain type of category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Category Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 314(e) health projects</td>
<td>Service programs with direct federal support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I grants to local education agencies</td>
<td>Service programs with financial support primarily through state and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>Payments programs with cash going to vendors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</td>
<td>Payments programs with cash going to program beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Services</td>
<td>Services integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education special revenue sharing</td>
<td>Revenue sharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last two programs were also selected as prototypes of the potential programs that will dominate DHEW in the future, and thus to show how the establishment of citizen organizations might be compatible with the operation of these programs.

Not all types of DHEW programs have been covered. Excluded for reasons of less direct relevance to the issue of devolving power to citizens were programs devoted principally to research, training, grants to institutions of higher learning, construction, and regulatory activity.

1. Health Projects Funded under Section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act

Support for health projects under Section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act began with the passage of P.L. 89-749, The Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966. The legislation called for a new series of grant programs, of which the most pertinent for the 314(e) projects were: 314(a) grants to states for statewide planning and for health services; 314(b) grants to local groups for area wide health planning; and the 314(e) projects themselves, which are grants to local agencies and nonprofit organizations to provide "services (including related training) to meet health needs of limited geographic scope or of specialized regional or national significance," or to develop and support "for an initial period new programs of health services (including related training)."

The 314(e) projects are intended to provide health services to local target populations, especially low-income groups with large health care needs but with inadequate access to health services. The services are provided through such facilities as family health centers and neighborhood health centers, with possible future emphasis on health maintenance organizations. The projects involve relatively large grants, as more than one-half of the grants amount to $500,000 or more.

The recommendations for citizen participation in projects under 314(e) illustrate the steps to be taken for any service that is directly supported by the federal government.
a. **The Citizen Participation Experience**

The 314(e) projects operate within a citizen participation environment not usually found in DHEW: The formal requirements for citizen participation are diverse, but there appears to be an informal commitment to citizen participation.

At the project level, neither statutes nor regulations state any citizen participation requirements. However, the program guidelines clearly establish a strong role for citizen participation, with respect to both the governance of the project and the employment of local residents. Concerning governance, a 314(e) project is expected to:

- Ensure that residents of the target area will have decisionmaking roles in the planning, development, and operation of the project, including site and personnel selection; and
- Make provision for the active participation and advice of residents and practitioners from the project area in defining changing needs, special problems, and major gaps in services.

On the employment of local residents, the project should:

- Develop job opportunities for residents in the service area. These jobs should be structured to provide the employee a necessary and significant function; and
- Indicate clearly what effect the project will have on unemployment in the target area.

There is also a provision for citizen participation beyond the project level. All 314(e) projects must be reviewed by the areawide

---

*Health Services and Mental Health Administration, "Guidelines for development of comprehensive health services projects to be supported in full or in part by Section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act," Washington, D.C., February 1969.*
health planning council established under Section 314(a).* According to law, a majority of the membership of both of these councils must consist of representatives of consumers of health services.

These formal requirements and the general commitment to citizen participation on the part of grantee staff have resulted in considerable participation. At the project level, one special study found that all projects have participation of some sort, whether through employment of paraprofessionals or through citizen representation on advisory boards or governing boards; one-half of the projects have governing boards with citizen membership, and citizen representatives form a majority in about one-fifth of all projects.** At the statewide level, a second study found that twelve states out of a 15-state sample had advisory councils with majority citizen representation; in two of the remaining three states, citizen representation fell just under 50 percent.***

While compliance has not been complete, the results of these studies suggest substantial citizen participation in 314(e) projects. For instance, local governing boards dominated by citizen representatives have emerged in many projects even though no such structure was required by statute, regulation, or guideline. The quality and impact of participation on service delivery and on the participants, however, are unknown.

b. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

The 314(e) projects provide a good example of how extensive citizen participation opportunities can be created in service programs directly supported by DHEW. In the future, however, DHEW may attempt
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to consolidate or reorganize its directly supported service programs. Therefore, we recommend that:

DHEW delegate increasing responsibility to local areawide councils, each council serving as a permanent citizen participation organization for health in a local area.

Local project boards may still govern activities at the project level, and the areawide council need only play a coordinating role at first. However, if individual projects are reorganized, the areawide council should become more active to ensure consistent implementation of participatory requirements. The local project boards could even choose representatives for the council to increase project coordination.

In addition, the general lack of information about the actual extent of citizen participation points to the need for developing better monitoring procedures, even in programs where participation appears to be extensive. For service programs directly supported by DHEW, we also recommend that:

DHEW establish systematic monitoring efforts.*

The major responsibility for monitoring could rest with the regional DHEW staff, since it already plays an important role in administering 314(e) projects. The monitoring mechanism could be any efficient combination of the mechanisms discussed in the related TARP papers, e.g., reports by project officers or site visits by headquarters staff. One mechanism that deserves to be explored is the requirement that each project routinely administer to all citizens a brief questionnaire in which questions about citizen participation are posed, and that the questionnaires be returned to the regional staff for analysis. The 314(e) projects might thus present a good opportunity to test the cost feasibility of this type of citizen survey.

* A discussion of monitoring requirements generally appears in the related TARP paper, "Monitoring of Citizen Participation in DHEW." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)
No matter what the mechanism, an effective monitoring process offers the opportunity for examining the following issues:

- The degree of compliance, and the major reasons for noncompliance;
- The number of citizens who are aware of the board structure, and whether or not they are represented on the board;
- The procedures for selecting citizen representatives;
- The desire among citizens for more (or less) citizen participation; and
- The apparent impact of citizen governance on program services, in comparison to those projects that have had little or no citizen governance.

2. **Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies**

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes grants to improve educational opportunities for children who are disadvantaged (because of low family income, physical handicap, or for other reasons) in relation to traditional educational opportunities. Under the Title I program, DHEW gives financial assistance to state and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) for compensatory services to the disadvantaged children. The basic LEA grant, which is channeled through the SEA, is set by a statutory requirement that takes into account the number of children from low-income families in a geographic area.

The appropriations for FY 1972 were about $1.5 billion, making the Title I program both the most significant federal aid to education program for the disadvantaged and also the largest grant program among education programs. Typically, the LEAs use the Title I funds to purchase goods and services for local schools. These goods and services

*A more extensive discussion of this topic appears in the related TARP paper, "The Title I (ESEA) and AFDC Programs." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)*
may include paraprofessionals, special educational personnel, clothing for poor children, and equipment and supplies for the school.

The recommendations for citizen participation in Title I illustrate the steps that might be taken for any service program that is supported through state and local government.

a. The Citizen Participation Experience at the Local Level

Regulations issued in October 1971 require LEAs to establish a parent advisory committee (PAC), in which parents of educationally deprived children must be "more than a simple majority." The regulations further specify that the PACs are to receive copies of the Title I law, federal regulations, guidelines, and related material; related state regulations and guidelines; the LEA's application for funds and future plans; and evaluations of the program. The PACs are entitled to review evaluations, to be informed and consulted on services, and to provide comments on SEA and LEA applications for funds.

Prior to the issuance of these regulations, some LEAs had voluntarily established advisory committees. A DHEW survey conducted in early 1972, after promulgation of the new regulations, found that 85 percent of the 14,000 LEAs had established PACs.* It was estimated that in 90 percent of the PACs, the school board or superintendents had chosen the PAC members. DHEW staff believe that, on the average, about 60 percent of the PAC members are parents.

The critical characteristics of the current participatory requirements are the following. First, the regulations allow LEA officials to select PAC members. This procedure is unlikely to produce a PAC that equitably represents Title I parents, especially those with low-incomes. Second, the PACs have very little power because their rights are limited to access to certain documents. Third, there is little systematic monitoring or enforcement of the participatory requirements, so that neither the precise number of noncompliant LEAs nor the consequences of noncompliance are clear.

*See the related TARP paper, "Title I (ESEA) and AFDC Programs." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)
b. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

There are two ways of improving meaningful influence in Title I programs by Title I beneficiaries and their parents. First, we recommend that:

*DHEW expand both the responsibilities of the PACs and the citizen role within them, so that the PACs ultimately serve as a permanent citizen participation organization for education in a local school district.*

The initial step would be to require PAC members to be chosen through an elective process with parents as voters. Then, the PACs should be given increased functions, including:

- A veto over the selection of the local Title I director and other personnel supported by Title I funds;
- More control over funds already designated for use by the PACs (the LEA often requires the PAC to go through an unnecessarily lengthy process to obtain its funds);
- Approval of the final budget and program application;
- Formal status as a monitor of local programs and investigator of citizen complaints; and
- Provision of support for permanent staff to work for each PAC.

Another function that would strengthen the PACs even further would be to make them, or some other nonprofit, community-based organization, eligible as an alternative grantee for Title I funds where the LEA has not complied with federal requirements. However, such a drastic change would require a statutory mandate and is not likely to suit the current political situation.

Second, we recommend that:

*DHEW experiment in the use of more comprehensive community organizations as the umbrella organization for a PAC.*
Many communities now have citizen organizations such as the Community Action Agency that cover a wide variety of services. Giving such broad-based organizations an umbrella role would attempt to approach citizen participation from the client's point of view. Program beneficiaries and staff of supporting organizations rarely express interest, for instance, in only a single program. Those concerned with Title I are also likely to be concerned with the administration of AFDC, the Public Assistance Social Services Programs, the Work Incentives Program, Medicaid, and Head Start, among others. Presently, however, each of the programs has a different and independently structured participatory component. Reliance instead on a broad-based organization would also closely approach the attributes that our research suggests as having the greatest potential for devolving power, namely that: (1) there is a viable organization of participants; (2) it is a general-purpose organization with specialized subcommittees; (3) it has staff under its own control; and (4) it plays a significant part in investigating complaints.

The recognition of broad-based organizations as an umbrella for the PAC involves serious implementation problems, however. First, in some communities no such organization may exist. In addition, it may be difficult to designate such an organization in the face of opposition from program professionals who appear to prefer single-purpose structures, and from existing client organizations which have developed their own constituencies and will be reluctant to transfer their small status to a larger group. Thus, we believe that limited experimentation in a selected number of sites is the appropriate course of action in relation to the formation of umbrella organizations.

c. Participation at State and National Levels

Participatory opportunities should also be expanded at the state and national levels of administration for Title I. The state education agencies (SEAs), for instance, have a major policy impact on the program, since they are responsible for monitoring LEA grants and dealing with citizen complaints; the SEAs also promulgate regulations
affecting program policies. Yet, there is no formal requirement for any citizen participation at the state level.

Some states have spontaneously responded to the situation, with seven of them having established all-parent advisory councils, and five or six others making parents members of state compensatory education committees. This experience suggests that DHEW should require all states to provide a formal structure that would give Title I parents a regular opportunity to meet with, advise, and influence the administration of the Title I program at the state level. We recommend that DHEW require that:

SEAs establish state advisory committees that include
Title I beneficiaries and their families;

At least one-half of the membership of such committees be
selected by local PACs; and

The state advisory committee be given specific functions,
including: (a) the right to review and comment on all
state applications, evaluations, and monitoring reports,
and (b) the investigation of complaints.

At the national level, the National Advisory Council on the Edu-
cation of Disadvantaged Children, comprised of 15 members, is the only
existing participatory mechanism. We recommend that:

DHEW broaden participatory opportunities at the national
level by requiring that at least one-third of the Council
be composed of parents of disadvantaged children.

3. Medicaid

The Medicaid program provides grants to states in order to give
medical assistance to people with low incomes. The states reimburse
the vendors of medical services to cover the cost of treatments pro-
vided to people who are either beneficiaries of federally assisted
welfare programs or "medically needy."
The states share in the costs to varying degrees. In FY 1971, for instance, the amount of sharing ranged from states paying 50 percent of the total costs (New York, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, and several smaller states) to states paying less than 25 percent of the total costs (Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, and South Carolina). Moreover, the states vary in the number of medical services offered and in the administrative organization of the program. Current estimates are that the Medicaid program serves 23 million people. For FY 1973, the administration's budget request to the House was for $4.0 billion.

The following discussion of methods for providing effective citizen participation in Medicaid can be taken as representative of the dominant considerations in other programs of its type, i.e., where payments are made through and with the states, to providers of services to citizens.

a. The Citizen Participation Experience

The original legislation for Medicaid (Title XIX of the Social Security Act) mandated the creation of a national advisory council, a majority of whose members were to consist of representatives of consumers of health services. However, the new Social Security Amendments Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-603) terminated the council.

At the state level, federal regulations (45 C.F.R. 246.10) require the establishment of state medical care advisory committees. According to the regulations, the membership of these committees must include:

(i) Board certified physicians and other representatives of the health professions who are familiar with the medical needs of low-income population groups and with the resources available and required for their care;

(ii) Members of consumers' groups including Title XIX recipients, and consumer organizations such as labor unions, cooperatives, consumer-sponsored prepaid group-practice plans, and others; and
(iii) The director of the public welfare department or of the public health department, whichever does not head the single state agency for the Title XIX plan.

These regulations do not specify the proportional distribution of these three groups on the committees. However, subsequent program guidelines urge that at least 51 percent of the membership be consumers or consumer representatives.

The regulations also stipulate that the state advisory committee shall:

- Have adequate opportunity for meaningful participation in policy development and program administration; and
- Be provided such staff assistance from within the agency and such independent technical assistance as are needed to enable it to make effective recommendations, and be provided with financial arrangements, where necessary, to make possible the participation of recipients in the work of the committee.

The formal requirements for citizen participation in the Medicaid programs thus at first glance appear to be quite considerable, given that the program is a payment program and does not have local service sites. Although the state committees do not have formal governing powers, they can play a strong advisory role. Citizen participation is required by regulation and amplified in the program guidelines.

The actual citizen participation experience, in contrast, has been quite minimal. First, the committees have played a largely perfunctory role, and have not influenced policymaking. In many areas this is because the state itself may not have as much real control over the program as a smaller district, e.g., a county. Since no citizen participation structure exists at the county level, the influence of citizens is minimal. Second, providers of medical services have overwhelmingly dominated the work of the advisory committees and the administration of the Medicaid program. This is evident simply
from the actual membership composition of the state advisory committees. A survey in late 1970 found that:

- Representatives of providers of medical services accounted for about 70 percent of all members;
- Only 15 percent of the members represented citizens; and
- Actual Medicaid beneficiaries constituted only 4 percent of the total membership: 32 states did not have a single Title XIX recipient on their committees, and several states had no citizen membership of any kind.*

b. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

There are several options for increasing citizen participation in the Medicaid program:

- DHEW could issue new regulations stipulating a minimum membership requirement, e.g., 51 percent of the state advisory committees should be service beneficiaries;
- DHEW could establish a new beneficiary-dominated advisory board structure at the county level in those areas where counties play the dominant role in administering the program; and
- DHEW could leave the state advisory committees unchanged, but establish new beneficiary-dominated structures, e.g., a citizen evaluation unit; such new structures could be used for Medicaid programs alone, or could be combined with other programs, e.g., AFDC.

Because the medical provider community has so dominated the administration of the Medicaid program up to this time, any new citizen participation requirement that merely modifies existing structures is not likely to produce a substantial change. The provider community is
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likely to bypass any new requirements, so that the existing structures simply play the same role as in the past. Therefore, we recommend that DHEW pursue the last two of the above options. In particular, we recommend that:

DHEW establish citizen-dominated welfare review boards at the county level. These boards would coordinate as many federal welfare programs as possible, beginning with the Medicaid program.

The boards should have well-specified powers and responsibilities. These would include:

- The dissemination of information about these programs to all potentially eligible consumers;
- The power to investigate grievances and to conduct annual reviews of each program; and
- The obligation to inform the governor and state advisory committee of the board's activities, and to report their work to appropriate regional or national program officials who deal with the enforcement process.

4. Aid to Families with Dependent Children*

The federal maintenance assistance program provides matching funds to states in support of the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program. AFDC payments are made directly to eligible beneficiaries to cover the costs of daily living, including food, clothing, shelter, and other needs. Until now, the states have administered AFDC together with three other maintenance assistance programs (Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled). As of 1973, however, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-603) mandated that these latter three programs be ad-

* A more extensive discussion of this topic appears in the related TARP paper, "The Title I, ESEA, and AFDC Programs." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)
ministered directly by the federal government (through the Social Security Administration) so that AFDC will stand alone as a program with state-administered welfare payments. The federal share of the AFDC program in FY 1972 was about $3.7 billion.

The recommendations for citizen participation in AFDC illustrate the steps that might be taken in any DHEW program with payments to individual beneficiaries.

a. The Citizen Participation Experience

There are several formal requirements for citizen participation in the AFDC program. The only statutory requirement calls for the training and employment of persons of low-income as paid subprofessional staff in the administration of the state plan, and for the use of volunteers to assist program applicants and recipients. In addition, DHEW has established regulations mandating national and state advisory committees for the limited purpose of reviewing DHEW's simplified payments method, a method whereby eligibility is determined solely on the basis of the applicant's statement. For all the maintenance assistance programs except AFDC, this method was first tested and then put into practice on July 1, 1970; for AFDC, the method was to be used on a test basis for an indefinite period of time. The national and state advisory committees thus have very limited authority; moreover, the membership requirements for both merely call for the inclusion of some program beneficiaries, but do not specify a minimum number. Little is known about either the work of these committees or their ultimate membership composition.

In addition to these formal requirements, informal meetings have been taking place over the past two years, at roughly monthly intervals, between the Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitative Service Administration (SRS) and representatives of the National Welfare Rights Organization. The purpose of these meetings is to convey program information to the National Welfare Rights Organization and to review questions and complaints about the program.

In general, citizen participation requirements are extremely weak in the AFDC program. There are no strong advisory committees, and there is no systematic interaction with program beneficiaries.
b. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

To expand citizen participation in policy decisions affecting the AFDC program, we recommend that:

DHEW establish citizen-dominated welfare review boards at the county level, and that it increase participatory opportunities at state and national levels.

At the county level, the same boards should serve the Medicaid and AFDC programs. Prototypes of such organizations are the Client Advisory Committees in New York City, where each committee plays an advisory role to a district-level welfare center. These committees advise local welfare agencies regarding the overall administration of the program, and also focus on the disposition of individual complaints. On an experimental basis, DHEW should test the use of existing, broad-based community organizations as umbrella organizations for these welfare review boards.

At the state level, DHEW should broaden the role of the state advisory committees, so that the committees would be composed of a majority of program beneficiaries and would advise on all state-related program policies. For example, the committees could give advice regarding the development of procedures for dealing with such issues as family planning for parents and for "problem" dependent children, registration for employment, and the establishment of legal paternity relations. In addition, DHEW should require that one-third of the members of grievance hearing panels at the state level should be program beneficiaries. This requirement would be an extension of the statutory mandate to use beneficiaries as paid subprofessional staff.

At the national level, DHEW should organize informal "client education" committees, both to inform program beneficiaries of AFDC requirements and to inform federal administrators of the beneficiaries' view of the program. One possible prototype for such a committee already has been formed in Region Ten of the DHEW Regional Offices. In addition, DHEW should formalize its relationship with client organizations such as the National Welfare Rights Organization by holding
regular meetings with these organizations at specified times and places.

5. Allied Services

During the last three years, DHEW has experimented with a variety of services integration projects. All projects share the goal of integrating the administration of categorical programs at state and local levels. In theory, such integration can have two major benefits: (a) citizens can deal with a single service point that attends comprehensively to their problems rather than having to deal independently with a series of highly specialized programs; and (b) greater efficiency can be achieved by having the single service point integrate the management of otherwise separate programs.

To carry out services integration projects more effectively, a bill was introduced during the 92nd Congress, "The Allied Services Act of 1972" (S. 3643 and H.R. 15838 and H.R. 15857). The bill authorized the states to transfer funds from one categorical program to another at the state level (up to 25 percent of the funds of one program could be transferred to another program, with some programs excepted). No action was taken on the bill, and the current plan is to reintroduce it into the next session of Congress.

The services integration approach does not call for the establishment of new programs; it seeks instead to help states and localities make more effective use of their existing programs. State participation in services integration is entirely voluntary, and the Allied Services bill called for a minimum amount of new funds ($20 million for planning and initial implementation). In addition, the legislation listed a wide variety of DHEW categorical programs, with the minimum requirement that states coordinate public assistance programs (Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled) with each other and with any three of the following:

- Comprehensive health grants to states;
- Maternal child health, and crippled children's services;
Vocational Rehabilitation;
- Programs on aging;
- Juvenile delinquency programs;
- Medicaid;
- Community mental health centers;
- Alcoholism programs;
- Drug abuse programs;
- Developmental disabilities services;
- Adult education;

or

"Any other human services programs (regardless of whether they are supported with any federal assistance) which the local agencies may wish to include."

Since most of the listed programs are administered directly by the states, DHEW encouragement to integrate these programs can facilitate a state's own efforts at reorganizing its social services. In particular, states can use the services integration approach to develop new superagencies at the state level, as many may wish to do given the current tendency at city, state, and federal levels toward administrative consolidation. It should be noted, however, that a serious defect in the current legislation is that the basic requirement to coordinate public assistance programs clashes with provisions of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1972, which "federalizes" all the programs except AFDC by requiring that they be administered by the Social Security Administration, and not by the states. Future services integration legislation will undoubtedly have to take this change into account.

At the local level, the state carries out services integration by dividing the state into local service districts, and by designating a local agency to administer the integrated programs. The legislation prefers that the local agency be an arm of local government, wherever possible.
a. Provisions for Citizen Participation

The Allied Services bill called for an extremely weak form of citizen participation. Moreover, the citizen participation was to occur only at the local and not at the state level, even though major decisions would be made at the state level. The relevant passage from this bill reads as follows:

The local allied services plan must be accompanied by assurances that, in the process of developing the plan, a reasonable opportunity was afforded interested agencies, organizations, and individuals to present their views and to comment upon the proposed plan prior to its submission to the state agency and that a procedure has been established under which such agencies, organizations, and individuals have their views taken into consideration with respect to the administration of the plan.

This requirement for participation is weak in several fundamental respects:

- an official, not citizens or their representatives, provides
- "assurances," not evidence, that a
- "reasonable opportunity" (reasonable presumably in the official's view, no standards are supplied) to
- "comment," but not otherwise to influence the plan, and that
- "a procedure," however casual (again no minimum standards are suggested), has been established under which those interested have their views
- "taken into consideration" with respect to administration.

Even though the legislation could be clarified by subsequent federal regulations, the existing passage nevertheless suggests a very weak commitment to citizen participation. At a minimum, the prospective consumers of the integrated programs might have been given better defined and more assured rights to participate. In addition, the legislation might have required some participatory mechanism at the state
level, where key decisions will also be made.

The lack of requirements for broader or more powerful citizen participation is unfortunate in two respects. First, services integration projects are unlikely to include any devolution of power to citizens. Second, and of special importance to services integration, stronger citizen activity would facilitate the services integration process. This conclusion was reached in an early evaluation of services integration projects, which showed that only a few projects had accomplished any significant integration, and suggested that citizen participation could act as an integrating force because of the citizen's broader perspective.* What has generally occurred in the services integration projects to date, according to the evaluation report, is that the state creates some new umbrella organization like a superagency, using services integration resources to staff the new organization. The categorical programs within the umbrella organization, however, continue to carry on business as usual. In fact, a strong possibility for the future is that the services integration approach will produce a new managerial layer (i.e., the umbrella organization) rather than real integration. One can readily imagine the states' superagencies playing the role of mini-DHEWs where, at least for an extended initial period, programs are simply administered in categorical fashion in spite of the umbrella organization.

A similar experience has been found at the local level, with little genuine integration occurring.**

b. Problems for Expanding Citizen Participation

As presently designed, services integration poses two major problems in any attempt to expand citizen participation.

First, although services integration is a useful concept, the selection of the categorical programs to be integrated is not really broad enough. From the citizen's point of view, true services inte-
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gration would include all social services programs that have an impact on the same target population. Even if all DHEW programs were included in the services integration approach, they would represent a small percentage of the total federal activity in any local area. Only with the addition of antipoverty programs (OEO), housing and urban redevelopment programs (HUD), and employment and training programs (Department of Labor), for instance, would a reorganization begin to approach full integration. At a minimum, closely related services like the food stamp program administered by the Department of Agriculture would have to be consolidated with DHEW programs in order for services integration to be meaningful for citizens.

The present selection of programs, incidentally, may not be well suited to administrative needs, either. For instance, a more logical consolidation at the local level would involve all health programs rather than some health programs and some welfare programs. Ironically, HSMHA is currently conducting an experiment in integrating health services at the local level. The program, Experimental Health Services Delivery Systems, is unrelated to the DHEW services integration effort, yet it calls for the establishment of a local nonprofit corporation to serve as an umbrella agency for as many public and private health services as possible. A consolidation in this direction might ultimately include health facilities operated by other federal agencies as well, such as the Veterans Administration. The program, however, does not give great emphasis to citizen participation; citizen representatives form a small minority of the corporate board that governs the nonprofit corporation.

Second, any increased citizen participation activity must begin with the fact that most of the programs to be integrated already have some form of citizen participation. Most of the programs require citizen participation on program-specific advisory boards. Although most of these boards do not offer either broad-based or powerful forms of participation, any new effort should certainly not result in a decrease of the existing level of citizen participation. Moreover, the development of new participatory structures must provide for a transition from these existing structures to the new ones.
c. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

Although the consolidation of a more meaningful array of programs may not take place in the near future, DHEW should act now to establish citizen participation as one of the major objectives of services integration projects. In other words, DHEW can require specific citizen participation opportunities to be developed, even though these opportunities may not be fully used until some later date.

The diverse types of programs to be integrated would best be served by the establishment of citizen boards at the state and at the local levels. We recommend that:

*DHEW establish a citizen-dominated board at the county level in conjunction with the local services integration agencies in the area.*

Such a board may have governing powers over the management of the local services integration agency, or carry out annual citizen evaluations of the programs, or both. Depending on the ultimate array of programs integrated, there may even be three local boards, one for health, another for education, and the third for welfare. In addition, we recommend that:

*DHEW establish state citizen-dominated boards to advise in the management of the state services integration agencies.*

Such a board would be chosen by the local citizen boards, by statewide organizations representing the consumers of the programs being integrated, and by representatives of the providers of the services.

Among their other functions, the local citizen boards would establish formal grievance procedures. They would also have staffs available to investigate complaints, recommend to the state citizen board those individual cases that require court action, and support complainants in the legal process. The state citizen boards would, among their other functions, have the power to direct the attorney general to bring suit against a county or local government or agency.
Finally, citizens served by the programs should have the choice of either establishing these totally new structures, or of raising the already existing program-specific DHEW citizen participation structures to equivalent standards, but not both. Where citizens decide to establish the totally new structures, provision should be made for the transition process whereby the existing structures are phased out and the new structures are phased in.

Because the services integration effort is still in its early stages of development, DHEW should consider at least three further aspects in the design of the program: changing statutory and regulatory provisions, developing incentives for state participation, and providing consumer education.

First, any new services integration legislation should call for the establishment of local and state boards, with a brief description of their role in reviewing the decisions of the local services integration agency and the state. The federal regulations would then describe more fully the local and state board structures, the membership requirements, the method of selecting members, and the specific powers of the boards. Although these requirements could be promulgated through program guidelines rather than regulations, regulatory changes are preferable to indicate to DHEW administrators the strength of the Department's commitment to citizen participation.

Second, either state participation in services integration must be made mandatory, or additional incentives must be offered; otherwise, participation by the states is likely to be low. This conjecture follows the early evaluation report, which noted that the ability to transfer up to 25 percent of a categorical program's funds was simply not a strong enough incentive for a state to participate under the present conditions.* With a more stringent citizen participation requirement added, states may be even less anxious to participate. For the time being, additional incentives should be explored by the Office of the Secretary, but since services integration requires only that states integrate a few categorical programs of the states' own choosing, it

* Research Group, op. cit.
does not seem unreasonable to make state participation mandatory.

Third, systematic consumer education efforts will be required to inform consumers of the new services integration projects and the new participatory structures. The state and local agencies should show that they have attempted to inform every citizen individually of the changes put into effect, and to advise them of their participatory opportunities as well as their service eligibility.

6. Education Special Revenue Sharing

The education special revenue sharing bill of 1971 (S. 1669) was introduced into the last session of Congress as part of the President's special revenue sharing package. This bill was not acted upon during the session, but has been reintroduced in the 93rd Congress. Moreover, other special revenue sharing bills (e.g., for health or for social services) may also be considered. Thus, it is worth examining the design of special revenue sharing programs and citizen participation activities.

The purpose of special revenue sharing programs is to give state and local governments greater discretion in the administration of federally funded programs. In education, the 1971 bill called for the abolition of several major categorical programs:

- Titles I, II, III, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (about $1,800 million);
- School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (about $350 million);
- Vocational Education (about $200 million);
- Education of the Handicapped (about $40 million); and
- Several smaller programs.

In their place, the funds for these programs would be given to the states, to be divided according to a fixed formula to serve the same target populations, but the states would also have the option of transferring up to 30 percent from one part of the formula to another. The
new transfer authority enables state educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to design programs that are more responsive to local needs.

There is some uncertainty about the ultimate design of the revenue sharing provisions. This is because some of the categorical programs, like Title I, are basically administered by LEAs, with the SEAs acting mainly as a "pass-through." Other programs, like vocational education, are totally administered by the state. The final design of the revenue sharing provisions will, of course, have a great impact on the nature of any citizen participation.

a. **Provisions for Citizen Participation**

The 1971 education revenue sharing bill only called for one form of citizen participation: a state advisory council. The membership requirements of the council were as follows:

- At least one representative of the public elementary or secondary schools of the state;
- At least one representative of the nonprofit private elementary or secondary schools of the state;
- At least one representative of each of the target populations (residents on federal property, low-income families, migratory families, families of neglected and delinquent children, families of handicapped children, families of vocational education recipients);
- At least one person competent in planning and evaluating educational programs; and
- At least one person competent in each of three educational areas (education for low-income families, for the handicapped, and for vocational purposes).

The state advisory council was to advise the SEA in developing and administering its annual plan; the council was also to evaluate all activities carried out under the special revenue sharing program.
Interestingly, the 1971 bill makes no mention of citizen participation requirements at the local level. Since the categorical programs such as Title I were to be abolished by the bill, it must be assumed that the recently formed Parents' Advisory Committees (PACs) would also have been abolished. Thus, the revenue sharing legislation appears to reduce current levels of citizen participation. (An early version of the 1973 special revenue sharing bill, however, did specifically call for the retention of the PACs. In this case, it is not clear whether the PACs would only supervise the use of the Title I component of the revenue sharing program, or whether they would supervise the use of all the education revenue sharing funds in the local area.)

b. Implementing the Local Citizen Participation Model

The special revenue sharing program actually provides an excellent opportunity to develop strong citizen participation organizations at both state and local levels. This is because all participatory activities related to education could be combined; this would reduce the current proliferation of state and local advisory committees that are found for each separate education program and focus citizen interest on a single participatory structure.

To establish formal citizen participation bonds, we recommend that:

DHEW require local parent advisory councils (LPACs) to operate with the local education agencies that administer revenue sharing funds, and state parent advisory councils (SPACs) to operate with the state education agencies that administer revenue sharing funds.

The membership requirements for the local PAC would be similar to Title I PACs (i.e., more than a simple majority of citizen representatives), except that the citizens would also represent, in some proportion, the other target populations that the revenue sharing programs may serve in that local area. (To reduce the possibility of allowing the interests of the larger target populations to dominate those of
the smaller ones, the local PAC might be required to create separate
subcommittees for programs aimed at each of the specified target popu-
lations.) Thus, the local PAC would act in the interest of all educa-
tion revenue sharing programs in the area. The state PAC would have a
similar scope of responsibility, and would be similarly composed with
a majority of citizen representatives.

The powers of the local PAC could be advisory only, or could also
include some governing responsibilities. Advisory functions would be:

- Educating citizens as to the nature of the revenue
  sharing programs;
- Commenting on the LEA plan to administer the revenue
  sharing programs;
- Reviewing and evaluating the programs;
- Investigating citizen grievances; and
- Making an annual report to the state PAC.

Governing functions would include:

- Approving the local budget for federal funds;
- Approving the expenditure of such funds; and
- Approving the appointment of any employee supported
  by more than 75 percent federal funds.

The powers of the state PAC would be advisory only, with the
following responsibilities:

- Approving the state plan and reviewing its administra-
tion;
- Approving the transferral of any funds in deviation
  from the original federal formula;
- Evaluating the state's revenue sharing programs;
- Analyzing all grievances reported to the local PACs
  and recommending new policy changes where appropriate; and
- Making an annual report to the federal government.
c. Enforcement Provisions

The revenue sharing program also provides an excellent opportunity to develop improved enforcement procedures for insuring that program services, including citizen participation activities, are carried out properly.*

In most federal programs, the only sanction that can be used for enforcing federal regulations is the withholding of funds. In other words, federal funds may be withdrawn (even retroactively) from any grantee not in compliance with a specific regulation. This procedure, however, leaves much to be desired from the citizen's point of view. If local officials are unable or unwilling to comply with participatory requirements, the citizen's only recourse is to ask the federal government to terminate the program, an outcome citizens may well regard as more threatening to themselves than to program officials.

The special revenue sharing program offers an opportunity to broaden the enforcement options, and to avoid this dilemma. We recommend that:

*DHEW carry out limited experiments to test alternative forms of payment as potential provisions of new revenue sharing programs.

For instance, if programs were noncompliant, the federal funds could still be used in the local area, through:

- Payments to alternative nonprofit grantees, in an attempt to provide services in lieu of a noncompliant LEA (the local PAC might be an eligible grantee); or if all else fails,
- Payments to individuals in the designated target populations, representing the per capita proportion of the local funds (these payments would be admission that government could not provide the necessary service,

*For a general treatment of the enforcement issue, see the related TARP paper, "Enforcement of Citizen Participation in DHEW." (See footnote on p. 6 of this report.)
but would be recognition that the needy individuals should still have their share of the resources to try to purchase the services on the open market).

The addition of these provisions would give federal administrators three options for enforcement: withholding of funds from the LEA, payments to an alternative grantee to provide substitute services, and direct payment to individual recipients. These expanded enforcement options could be applied whenever a federal regulation had been consistently violated, whether related to citizen participation requirements or other requirements.
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INTRODUCTION

The following citations are intended neither as an exhaustive tabulation of literature on citizen participation nor as a complete list of works consulted by the authors of this report. The citations are simply a large and representative sampling of both published and unpublished writing on the subject. As such, they should convey a sense of the volume, the vague boundaries, and the variety (in subject matter, format, and quality) of the literature. The citations may also serve as a guide to further study of this complex subject.

The bibliography is divided into two major parts. The first consists of an annotated list of twenty works that the authors consider of unusual quality or influence in the field. The second part, which is not annotated, contains a much larger and categorized but less selective sampling of the literature. The reader should be aware of several rules that governed the bibliography's compilation:

- The second part is divided into ten categories. The first nine deal with specific subjects, and the tenth contains a list of selected other bibliographies on citizen participation. Within each category, works are listed alphabetically—according to author whenever that information is appropriate or available, and otherwise according to title.
- Within the second part, the four most clearly defined subject categories appear first. These cover citizen participation in health, in education, in social services, and in planning. The fifth subject group, entitled "Citizen Participation in Relation to Poverty and Urban Development," covers literature on Model Cities, Community Action Programs, housing, urban renewal, ghetto corporations, and related topics. The sixth category contains literature devoted specifically to volunteers or voluntary organizations, and the seventh includes works on community
or neighborhood participation whose appearance in earlier categories would have been inappropriate. The last two subject categories are still broader. The eighth covers theoretical and general discussions of citizen participation as well as analyses of forms of participation not previously covered. The ninth category surveys selected works from topics that, while not directly related to citizen participation, are closely associated with it.

- The citation of an unpublished doctoral dissertation usually includes a reference to an abstract. Such a reference appears on the citation's last line in the following form:

  (D.A.: Vol. _____, No. _____; Subject Category).

  D.A. stands for Dissertation Abstracts—A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, a monthly publication containing abstracts of dissertations available on microfilm or as photo reproductions from University Microfilms, a Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The volume and number locate the specific issue, and the "Subject Category" gives the abstract's location within that issue.

- Although all works annotated in the first part are cited again in the second, no work is cited more than once within the second part itself. Thus, the reader should take care to check all appropriate subject categories to locate a particular title or body of material. For example, health planning literature might appear under either "Citizen Participation and Health" or "Citizen Participation and Planning," depending on the primary focus of a given work.
Part One

TWENTY PROMINENT WORKS

The following twenty works are considered by the authors of this report to be of unusual quality or influence in the field of citizen participation.


This controversial early work by a prominent expert and activist in community organization influenced a number of post-war American social movements. Alinsky argues that the most important need of the poor is to acquire power and that their only available route to power is through the indigenous leadership of a "People's Organization." In fighting for their rights as citizens, the poor should use such a mass organization to induce conflict by "rubbing raw the sores of resentment."


Alinsky turns his organizing attention in this work, published twenty-five years after Reveille for Radicals and shortly before his death, to the middle class. In trying to define the book's purpose, Alinsky wrote,

There are people who say that it is not revolution, but evolution, that brings about change—but evolution is simply the term used by non-participants to denote a particular sequence of revolutions as they synthesize into a specific major social change [italics in original]. In this book I propose certain general observations, propositions, and concepts of the mechanics of mass movements and the various stages of the cycle of action and reaction in revolution. This is not an ideological book except insofar as argument for change, rather than for the status quo, can be called an ideology . . . .
Reveille for Radicals and Rules for Radicals together illustrate the adaptability of Alinsky's thinking to different social movements, classes, and times.


This article develops a useful typology of citizen participation, drawing examples from three federal programs: urban renewal, antipoverty, and Model Cities. Arnstein defines eight levels of participation, corresponding to different degrees of influence permitted citizens. The bottom two rungs or levels, which the author groups together as "nonparticipation," are manipulation and therapy. The next three rungs, which Arnstein labels "degrees of tokenism," are informing, consultation, and placation. Arnstein argues that only the top three rungs permit degrees of citizen power," and they are partnership, delegated power, and citizen control. Each rung is illustrated; for example, Arnstein cites most Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs) as cases of manipulation, and the Harlem Commonwealth Council as an instance of citizen control.


The report, as stated in its preface,

presents a summary of a study of citizen participation contracted for by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and carried out by the consulting firm of Booz, Allen Public Administration Services, Inc. The study entailed a survey of the Model Cities programs in 15 selected cities and was directed at the following purposes: to develop an objective snapshot of citizen participation in the Model Cities program; to assess the effect of existing HUD citizen participation policy and practice; to analyze the impact of citizen participation on individuals, projects and programs, and institutions; and to provide operational guidance to HUD on citizen participation in the Model Cities and Community Development programs.
The report, which is divided into six sections, focuses primarily on the nature of citizen participation in the Model Cities Program; a brief section also examines the possible role of citizen participation in special revenue sharing for urban community development (the Community Development Program). The report recommends continuation of existing citizen participation policy in the Model Cities Program but modification of specific implementation requirements.


This 90-page special issue of *Public Administration Review* begins with three competing analyses of the Philadelphia Model Cities Program. Opposing points of view are presented by Sherry Arnstein, writing on behalf of the North City Area Wide Council, Inc., and City Hall staff. These articles are followed by a less partisan discussion by Erasmus H. Kloman.


This study was designed to provide DHEW's Health Services and Mental Health Administration with a description and evaluation of consumer participation in eight health service programs and recommendations for the future development of such participation. The study covers participation at the local project as well as at regional and
administrative levels in the following programs:
  - Indian Health (Service Units);
  - 314(e) Comprehensive Health Centers;
  - OEO-transferred Neighborhood Health Centers;
  - Migrant Health;
  - Maternal and Infant Care;
  - Children and Youth;
  - Community Mental Health Centers; and
  - Family Planning.

In conducting the study, Community Change surveyed over 1,000 projects in these eight programs by mail. In addition, the organization interviewed approximately 100 administrative personnel in headquarters, regional and state offices as well as 350 staff members, consumers, and board members at 18 project sites. The study:
  - Profiles consumer participation in HSMHA programs at the local, regional, program director, and administrative levels.
  - Compares the profile to legislative and executive policy requirements.
  - Identifies the issues that participants are addressing.
  - Describes attitudes of program directors, administrative officials, and consumers.
  - Traces the history of significant participatory issues in selected projects.
  - Describes the dynamics of local project development.
  - Reviews consumer participation literature.
  - Develops models and guidelines for consumer participation in HSMHA programs.

The study provides a unique, comprehensive review of projects in the eight HSMHA programs listed above as well as a remarkable compilation of both providers' and users' attitudes. The final product includes an 85-page report, a large appendix devoted to findings, and a volume of case studies.

Kaufman writes that the unfulfilled promises of federal programs, the pluralistic nature of the American political system, and the large scale of our society's organization all contribute to the common impression among minority groups that only the powerful get attention. He adds that one perceived solution to the problem of achieving representativeness is decentralization, and he anticipates two types to occur: "Concessions will be made to the demands for greater local influence on public programs, and there will be some headway toward establishing territorial officers with at least limited authority over field personnel of the functional bureaus."

However, "the administrative history of our governmental machinery can be construed as a succession of shifts of this kind, each brought about by a change in emphasis among three values: representativeness, politically neutral competence, and executive leadership" [italics in original]. Kaufman predicts such shifts to continue and reasons that the present call for decentralization reflects one phase of a cycle.


The author argues that an understanding of the origins and nature of the neighborhood will validate "its present drive for local control as a political movement for liberty." After tracing historically the cities' annexation of surrounding towns, the author attempts to show how the resulting neighborhoods have become "imperial dominions," in both a political and economic sense, of the central business districts. The neighborhood, whether self-ruling or dominated, is an integral political unit in origin as well as continuity, according to Kotler. Other topics dealt with in the book include various theories of community control, the neighborhood corporation, and the concept of a federated city achieved through local control, as opposed to complete separation of localities from the state.

Kramer focuses on the evolution of the Community Action Program in the San Francisco Bay Area. The result of a three-year effort, the book is divided into two sections, the first consisting of four community case studies and the second presenting comparative analyses and conclusions. Kramer's primary data sources are direct observation and interviewing, undertaken while teaching community organization in the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley. The study's central questions are: How did the Community Action Program become organized? How did it respond to the demands for greater participation of the poor? How did the poor participate?


Marris and Rein offer the following comments on their work in the Introduction:

In this book we set out to examine, in the light of one experiment, some of the principles, dilemmas and frustrations with which social reform in America must grapple. The particular projects with which we shall be concerned . . . represent the most imaginative and ambitious attempt to manipulate deliberate social change in the years 1960-1964. These projects were promoted, and largely financed, by the Ford Foundation and the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961: absorbed into the poverty program, and diffused as a national strategy, they are now known as community action projects . . . . [This study is concerned] with strategies of reform, as they appeared to a group of dedicated professionals working within the limits of community action . . . .

The first chapter summarizes the community action projects established by 1964 and their origins in the Ford Foundation and the federal government. Chapter two examines
the underlying assumptions of community action as a reform movement, and Chapter three reviews the initial success of some of the programs. After these first three chapters establish the social and political context of community action, Chapters four through eight examine the actual strategies of reform—"the dilemmas of each, their relationship to each other, and the constraints under which the reformers acted." Chapters nine and ten conclude the book with a discussion of community action's evolution under the Economic Opportunity Act.


In the Introduction to this first of a two-part series, Mogulof writes that the issue of citizen participation has changed considerably since the perception by social scientists and administrators that

... lack of involvement in the planning and delivery of social services for the poor and disadvantaged was associated with alienation and seemed to decrease the effectiveness of these programs ... However the problem was perceived at the outset—to increase program effectiveness, to redistribute power, to build an effective political constituency for new programs—the problem has gradually shifted over the past five years from an issue involving individual involvement and participation to a matter of group rights and power vis-à-vis the larger community ... Thus citizen participation has become the problem of community control and decentralization of decision-making power from traditional federal, state and local government levels to the neighborhood level.

The work is divided into three sections. The first provides definitional discussions of *citizen, participation, neighborhood,* and *representation.* The second section reviews citizen participation within specific federal programs
(agencies focused on by the author include DHEW, Department of Labor, HUD, and The Office of Economic Opportunity). Much of the analysis here addresses the questions: (1) Was the participatory body a coalition of various community forces but not dominated by any of these forces or was it controlled by citizen representatives? (2) Was the citizen participation body advisory or did policy control over a program rest with it? The third section presents conclusions and policy recommendations.

The study reviews the salient policy issues for citizen participation in federal programs. However, the conclusions are based solely on interviews of federal officials in the San Francisco area and are not directed to the real policy constraints of any single federal agency.


In reference to his work of several months earlier just discussed, Mogulof writes that "... it lacked a 'feel' for what citizen involvement in decision making was 'really' like at the local level." This later report is an attempt to analyze the policies of the same four federal agencies, now from the perspective of their locally supported constituents.

The report is based on observations of seven city- or county-based agencies, all located in the Far West: (1) a neighborhood health services center, (2) a community action agency, (3) an OEO-supported legal services center, (4) a Model City agency, (5) a tenants' council in a public housing project, (6) an urban renewal project area committee, and (7) a community mental health center. These seven local efforts represent programs sponsored by HUD,
OEO, DHEW, and Department of Labor (one of the seven local agencies, Model Cities, also directed a Labor Department-supported Concentrated Employment Program).

Mogulof summarizes that "citizen participation is there to be observed, it works, it seems to have secured important commitment by federal and local staff, and it appears to have something very useful to contribute to the amelioration of tensions in our society." Furthermore, "Citizen participation policy at the federal level is erratic, piecemeal, misunderstood, and possibly not really cared about."

The study is one of the best to date, looking across several federal programs in a fixed geographical area, San Francisco Bay. However, the limited geographical scope of the research restricts the degree to which Mogulof's conclusions can be generalized.


This short but comprehensive article traces the development of citizen participation from the Kennedy Administration's Juvenile Delinquency Demonstration Program through OEO's Community Action Program, and then to HUD's Model Cities effort. Mogulof notes both the participatory elements common to these programs and those features that evolved. The author also discusses how "the developments in these programs have been influenced by—and have influenced—a parallel black community movement away from integration toward a focus on independent black community development."

Moynihan describes the origins of the community action element of the War on Poverty, and argues that many of the problems that developed were the result of a basic confusion at the outset as to what the program was designed to accomplish. According to Moynihan, "the essential problem with community action was that the one term concealed at least four distinct meanings: organizing the power structure, as in the Ford Foundation programs of Paul Ylvisaker; expanding the power structure, as in the delinquency program of Cloward and Ohlin; confronting the power structure, as in the Industrial Areas Foundation program of Saul Alinsky; and finally, assisting the power structure, as in the Peace Corps of Sargent Shriver."

The thesis of *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding* is that "[a] program was launched that was not understood, and not explained, and this brought about social losses that need not have occurred." Moynihan also argues that Washington directly undermined OEO's efforts by establishing a "competing" program, Model Cities, to operate toward the same goals, in the same cities, and among the same people.


Professor Shalala's monograph, issued by the American Jewish Committee's National Project on Ethnic America, developed from a paper prepared for the National Consultation on Neighborhood Government held in March 1971. A review of various proposals for neighborhood government, the monograph addresses issues such as assignment of power and responsibility, size of neighborhood units,
governmental framework, political representation, and staffing.

The author calls for a change in the present structure of local government in response to both the need for a wider tax base and area-wide controls. She also urges simultaneous creation of smaller governmental units to permit wider participation in the decision-making process. But the author notes that neighborhood government proposals alone will not solve the "urban crisis"; increased resources are essential, and neighborhood government without them may pose greater problems for the redistributive function of urban political systems by creating a greater number of competing interest groups.


This Reader "focuses primarily on the efforts of urban residents, especially in low-income neighborhoods, to improve their own community and individual conditions through group actions." The volume stresses the more theoretical aspects of citizen participation: "How is the problem defined by various authors?" is the lead question. Following a bibliographic overview by Spiegel and Stephen D. Mittenthal, the volume is divided into four sections devoted to housing and urban renewal, the anti-poverty program, the work of Saul Alinsky, and the implications of citizen participation for community decision-making. Contributing authors include Edgar S. Cahn, Robert L. Crain, Ferne K. Kolodner, Peter Marris, Frances F. Piven, Martin Rein, Stephen C. Rose, Donald B. Rosenthal, Thomas D. Sherrard, James Q. Wilson, and Louis A. Zurcher.

Professor Spiegel writes of Volume II, "Here concrete situations will be discussed and solution-oriented endeavors examined." The question dominating the second volume is "What can be done about the problem?" Twenty-six authors contributed selections to the book, whose main themes are suggested by the titles of the chapters following the overview:

II. Generating Citizen Power: The Neighborhood Organization;
III. Generating Minority Power: The Black Caucus;
IV. Generating Citizen Government Partnership: Urban Renewal;
V. Decentralization: Urban Schools;
VI. Reactions to Specific Crisis Situations;
VII. The Urban Planning Advocate;
VIII. The Community Development Catalyst;
IX. Training for Participation.


Professor Spiegel offers the following abstract of his work:

This monograph attempts to review what we know about citizen participation in federal programs, based both on available published literature and information gathered in special interviews with officials in selected federal programs. The paper begins by considering some problems of definition, passing then to a brief history of citizen participation in the United States over the past 40 years. The present regulations and actual administrative enforcement of citizen participation is reviewed for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (Workable Program for Community Improvement, Public Housing, Urban Renewal, Metropolitan Development Planning
Program, Model Cities); the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start, Comprehensive Health Planning); the Department of Transportation; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the Office of Voluntary Action. A series of propositions are stated that attempt to summarize what we know from examining these programs. The nature of citizen participation at the local level is discussed, with special attention to the roles of program manager and of neighborhood spokesman. Citizen participation as a political process is captured in a set of several propositions, and some alternative models of types of citizen participation are reviewed. Finally, some key unanswered questions are raised and predictions are made about possible future trends of citizen participation in federal programs.


This 120-page advocate statement investigates "the pitfalls and prospects for economic self-help in the United States." Based on analysis of the effectiveness of community development corporations in operation as of 1971, the Task Force evaluated the potential of the CDC approach for the economic development of inner-city poverty areas. The Task Force found about seventy-five CDCs in urban areas which "are controlled by a broad base of community residents, are planning and/or operating development projects and have some full-time staff." Upon examination of those CDCs, the Task Force concluded, among other things, that

- Their local conception and design make them more flexible and responsive to local needs and conditions than organizations which have been designed in Washington.
- Obstacles to expansion and success of community development programs include the scarcity of management skills in inner city
ghettos; the inevitable time lag between initial business and housing investment and visible benefits; and the unwillingness or inability of many federal agencies to support independent local organizations.

One of the Task Force's recommendations is that the federal government take immediate steps to create a national system of support for CDCs.
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1. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND HEALTH
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Peterson, Malcolm L. "What Is Needed Is Care as They See It, Not as We Do," Modern Hospital, August 1969, Vol. 113, No. 2, pp. 84-87.


(D.A.: Vol. 31, No. 6; Sociology, General)


(D.A.: Vol. 31, No. 9; Sociology, General)


2. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATION
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4. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND PLANNING
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Barss, Reitzel and Associates, Inc. of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and The National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. Reports from the 100-City CAP Evaluation: The Effect of the Community Action Program in Stimulating Responsiveness to the Poor by Other Organizations, June 1970.


------. *City Reports. Attachments to the Study of Citizen Participation in the Model Cities Program* (Model Cities Programs covered are those of New Orleans, Louisiana; Kansas City, Missouri; Toledo, Ohio; Texarkana, Arkansas; and Cambridge, Massachusetts). Prepared for Model Cities Administration, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., January 22, 1971.
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Appendix B

CHECKLIST METHODOLOGY
THE STRATEGY OF AGGREGATION

The analytic problem posed by this study was to review the voluminous and heterogeneous body of research on citizen participation and integrate this research into meaningful common categories. Two strategies were considered: the propositional approach and the analytical approach.

The propositional approach is the usual style of integrating existing research, i.e., a scholar reports that one study found a relationship, and compares that with the findings of other researchers. If conceptual refinement can reconcile apparent contradictions or achieve greater parsimony, the refinement is put forward. If the contradictions are real and inescapable, the quality of the research on each side is weighed and, where possible, one perspective judged to be the stronger.

When the literature is voluminous, and particularly when different studies do not correspond systematically to the earlier research, the task of integration is much more difficult, and greater demands are placed on the propositional approach. Differences in operational definitions and widely varying methodologies make synthesis difficult and provide considerable room for the values and training of the individuals doing the integration to bias the outcome. The greatest problem in integrating research is not reaching a conclusion; it is reaching a conclusion in a systematic way. There must be sufficient objective evidence that another individual with different values would come to the same conclusion.

There have been successful applications of the propositional approach to various types of literature. Three studies are particularly noteworthy. The first, a study of the literature on scientific research in the American Behavioral Scientist, collected the available studies that advanced propositions about what produced scientific accomplishment. The authors differentiated among hard, empirical and more intuitive studies, and noted the number of research efforts that had found positive, negative, or no relationships between scientific accomplishment and factors such as organizational setting and management
In a study for the President's Commission on School Finance, Rand analysts examined the major research efforts on educational effectiveness in terms of their methodology, the variables they employed, and their central findings. **An Annotated Bibliography on Rural Medical Care**, another Rand effort, † included a specification of independent and dependent variables, the nature of the relationship between them, and the articles supporting the proposition. In the first two studies, the authors reached their own conclusions about the literature; no conclusions were drawn in the third. What is important in all three cases, however, is that the evidence was presented in a form that helped the reader reach his own conclusion.

Another point of interest is that in a propositional approach, the unit of analysis is the research report. For example, two studies on the same set of schools which came to different conclusions would be counted as one for and one against the proposition at issue. Although the study of scientific accomplishment made judgments about research quality, and the survey of school effectiveness research provided evidence on the strength of studies, each separately mounted research effort was counted. The choice of articles, books, and reports is in one sense a "sample" of the literature, but this "sampling" can introduce bias.

Our initial intention was to do a propositional integration, but this was not possible because of the nature of the citizen participation literature. First, there was a remarkable paucity of specific, operational propositions about why specific cases of citizen participation succeeded or failed. The limited number of studies that were rich in causal assertions would have dominated the inventory, and many studies would have been omitted. Second, the propositions would not

---


integrate because of the diversity of the concerns. No criterion such as "scientific accomplishment" was available except "successful participation," and that was defined inconsistently. A program delayed or even blocked entirely by one citizen group would be called successful; a comparable delay in another case would be cited as an example of the dangers of citizen participation. Evidence of citizen militancy and overt conflict was seen as an advantage in one study; such conflict might have been judged as a disadvantage in another. The citizen participation literature involves so many concepts with strong normative overtones that a propositional integration requires controversial value judgments that would almost certainly undercut its objectivity.

The decision was made therefore to use an analytical approach for integrating the previous studies. In this approach, the case-study literature is a source of data, rather than a source of propositions. The citizen participation organization or activity, not the research report, is the unit of analysis. If two or more articles had been written on the same case, for instance, they are considered to be two observations of the same phenomenon. We chose to integrate the known and available experience with citizen participation, not the literature on that experience. Once this approach was chosen, it was necessary to design an instrument to collect the case data and to choose the cases that would be used. Each step is associated with possible bias in the data base.

THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH

An analytic integration requires specification both of variables that are conceptually broad, and of clear operational definitions.

For each of the 51 case studies drawn from the literature or from available special studies, we developed a checklist of direct and simply structured questions about such factors as the source of funds for the services, the size of the citizen board, and the demographic characteristics of the community. The checklist for each case was completed by an analyst who was thoroughly familiar with the available case materials. For each question, the recording analyst was asked to indicate whether he was confident or doubtful about each answer. This
approach clearly does not obtain purely objective data, but we tried to put most of our questions in a form that would minimize subjectivity. Some questions, particularly the final assessments of the impact of citizen participation in a specific case, were necessarily much more subjective in nature. Calling for conclusions, the questions solicited judgments that were potentially much more biased by the values of the observer. We relied on the judgments of the cases in print, and where possible, we checked with those knowledgeable about the cases. These judgments were the weakest point of the integration but they were essential to it.

The result was the "CPO Checklist," a set of 72 questions. Seventeen were designed to investigate the characteristics of the target population and the nature and organization services that the CPO was trying to influence. Ten questions were about the history of the establishment of the CPO, and thirty-two were about the characteristics of the CPO, the functions it performed, its organizational structure, and the participants that served in it. Eight questions (see questions 65-72 in the following checklist) were about the consequences of citizen participation in each case under study. This checklist was our main research instrument in reducing a quite disparate literature into a common format, susceptible to limited quantitative analysis.

THE SAMPLE OF CASES

In relying on the case studies of citizen participation in the literature, there was the distinct possibility that there would be strong overrepresentation of atypical cases. Outstanding examples of successes and failures are more likely to be researched than are those attempts at citizen participation that had little effect. Cases in university areas and in major cities have also received disproportionate attention. Our choice of cases was not made on the basis of a systematic count of past efforts at citizen participation. We had no way of determining what universe of cases our selections represented. We therefore cannot claim that our results are an unbiased sample of citizen participation, and they should not be used as an evaluation of that experience. We also suspect that there is bias in relating
type of city to other characteristics of participation because city type is strongly tied to the choice of cases. Other characteristics of the cases do not appear to be related to the choice of cases, and we feel that interrelationships among variables other than city type are fairly reliable. (The list of the 51 cases precedes the checklist.)

To maximize the reliability of our study, we chose our cases according to three criteria: completeness, reliability of the data, and variety. Completeness and reliability in each case were essential because incompleteness was not randomly distributed. When only partial information was available, it tended to be the same questions in similar types of cases. That could distort the relationships, and it would mean the findings would be based on essentially different data bases from one part of the study to another. Reliability is straightforward -- we had to have some confidence in the analyst treating a case and the validity of his findings. A variety of types of citizen participation was sought to avoid conclusions that would not be valid for citizen participation in general. The inclusion of too many Model Cities or Community Action Agency cases would lead to results more applicable to those programs than to other types of citizen participation. Various types of cases of organizational structures were examined in different service organization contexts in order to maximize variation on as many characteristics as possible. One-third of our cases were taken from the Greater Boston area because of the detailed data available through TARP, including survey data for some cases.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

One of the first concerns in analysis was the problem of "halo" effects. Observers, seeing one clearly successful activity, might be too positive in their evaluations of other citizen activities. Analysis would then be of generic success without knowing which component of success was the most important, or whether it varied from case to case. A second problem was that multiple criteria for success were used. The cases we analyzed were not consistently successful according to all the criteria; furthermore, not all cases were judged according to each criterion, so the cell sizes varied. Therefore, three criteria were
used as the most useful indices of citizen participation success: the ability of the participants to implement their views, the number of new leadership skills developed, and the consequences of the citizen participation activity in unifying the community (checklist items 62, 64, and 70). Given the limited time available, and since these three criteria covered the major issues of the devolution of power in terms of both the services and the broader community, these were the principal dependent variables used in our analysis.

As is often the case, the research uncovered a variety of intriguing questions, and at the same time it answered many, but not all, of the questions we set out to investigate. We have developed a revised checklist and improved our understanding of how it ought to be applied. Time did not permit its use for this report, but steps are being taken that will lead to updated analysis. (Attached is a list of the 51 cases and the checklist used.)
CASE HISTORIES BY STATE, LOCALE, AND PROGRAM

Arizona
Tucson—Model Cities

Arkansas
Pulaski County—Follow Through

California
Kern County (Migrant) Health Committee
Los Angeles—Community Action Program
Oakland—Economic Development Council
San Diego—Follow Through
San Francisco—Economic Opportunity Council
Santa Clara County—Economic Opportunity Commission
Tulare County—Community Action Program

District of Columbia
Washington—Model Schools Division Citizens' Advisory Committee

Georgia
Savannah State College Upward Bound

Iowa
Linn County—Community Action Program

Louisiana
St. Martin Parish—Follow Through

Maine
Portland—Model Cities

Massachusetts (Boston)
Agassiz District Home and School Association
Allston-Brighton—Area Planning Action Council
Assumption-Fitton Mothers' Club
Columbia Point Area Planning Action Council
Columbia Point Health Association
East Boston Neighborhood Health Center
Franklin Park Community College Advisory Board
Kennedy-Sheridan Home and School Association
Martin Luther King School
Neighborhood Information Referral Office
New School
North Suffolk Legal Assistance Assoc.
Roxbury Multi-Service Center
Solomon-Lowenberg School
Massachusetts (Cambridge and Boston suburbs)
---
Central School
Community Service Center Board
Fall River—Community Service Center Board
Somerville—Mystic Tenants Housing Association

Michigan
---
Detroit—Community Action Program

Minnesota
---
White Earth—Community Action Program

Montana
---
Upward Bound (eastern part of state)

New Hampshire
---
Manchester—Model Cities

New Mexico
---
Santa Fe—Organización de Barrios (Model Cities)

New York
---
New York City—Metro North Citizens' Committee
New York City—Rockaways Chamber of Commerce
New York City—Washington Heights
St. Lawrence University—Upward Bound

North Carolina
---
Winston-Salem—Model Cities

Ohio
---
Dayton—Model Cities
Cleveland—Poverty Board

Pennsylvania
---
North City Area Wide Council (Model Cities)

Tennessee
---
Elk River Basin—Community Action Program

Texas
---
Upward Bound (small urban, semi-rural part of state)

Washington
---
Seattle—Tuition Voucher Advisory Committee

West Virginia
---
McDowell County—Follow Through

Location not identified
---
"Metro-Uptown Clinic"
Upward Bound (rural Texas or Montana)
INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer all questions as they apply at one single point in time, whether it be now or at some point in the past when a report or analysis was done. The approximate date your answers apply to is ____________.

Responses:

When answering "Yes," "No," or checking one of several choices, the analyst should have some confidence in his answer. Final "proof" is not necessary, but there must be good basis for the judgment. If you doubt whether you should use these categories, you should not.

When answering "na" or "not applicable," the analyst is stating that for some reason the structure of the question is not appropriate to the case in hand.

When answering "NW" or "No Way," the analyst is stating that the research in hand does not permit any kind of judgment. If one has a consistent impression or can make a reasonable inference, do not use this category. If you are in doubt whether you should answer "No Way," then you should answer "y"" or "n" to signify weak yes and no estimates. They are regarded as good guesses and care will be used in compiling them.

Please give only one response. If you have doubts about the best response, give the response which you feel is best and make marginal notes about the problem.

On some of the multiple response questions, you need to give only one answer. In some cases, however, more than one choice could apply. If there is only one answer of Yes or "y," we will assume the rest of the choices have negative responses at the same level of confidence.
Definitions:

Service(s) .................. Activities that provide funds, goods, information, or services to individuals.

Service(s) Staff ............. Paid individuals who engage in service(s) at the operating level: teachers, doctors, employment agents, etc. Paraprofessionals are included.

Management .................. Paid individuals who direct service(s) staff and service(s).

CPO .......................... The organization of "citizen participation," giving individuals who are neither staff nor managers an opportunity to influence service(s).

Target Population ............ That body of individuals who potentially or actually benefit from the service(s).

Participants .................. Individuals who spend time in the CPO.

Users .......................... Those taking active advantage of the service(s).
TARGET POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

1. Is the target population being served (check one):
   (a) In a large metropolitan area?
   (b) In a city of under 250,000 population?
   (c) In a small city under 50,000 population?
   (d) In a predominantly rural area, or a town under 5,000 population?

2. Does the target population have a large (33% or more) black population?

3. Does the target population have a large (33% or more) poor or working poor population?

4. Is the target population homogeneous (70% or more) in terms of race?

5. Is the target population homogeneous (70% or more) either WC, MC or poor in terms of socio-economic status?

6. Does the target population contain a substantial (over 33%) middle-class population?

7. Is the target population (check one):
   (a) Less than 5,000 people?
   (b) Between 5,000 and 20,000?
   (c) More than 20,000?

SERVICE(S) CHARACTERISTICS

8. Do the service(s) include:
   (a) Health activities?
   (b) Education activities?
   (c) Welfare activities?
   (d) Transportation activities?
   (e) Legal aid activities?
   (f) Other activities _______?

9. Does DH EW provide (check one):
   (a) Over half the funds for the service(s)?
   (b) Between half and 5% of the funds for service(s)?
   (c) Less than 5% of the funds for the service(s)?
10. Do state agencies and officials either provide state funds to a local or neighborhood performer directly, or does the state serve as an agent, allocating federal funds to local and neighborhood deliverer(s) or services?

11. Does the federal government provide funds to service(s) performer directly?

12. Does the service organization receive half or more of its support from service fees?

13. Are the service(s) directed toward a target population with high mobility into and out of the area of service(s)?

14. Are the service(s) the CPO is trying to influence largely under its own legal control?

15. Are the service(s) the CPO is trying to influence being operated by more than one public agency at the city and local level?

16. Are the service(s) the CPO is trying to influence under the direction of two or more levels of government?

17. Is the CPO attempting to influence only the planning rather than the operation of service(s)?

HISTORY

18. The demand for citizen participation arose from:
   (a) Pre-existing CP-type activities?
   (b) Traditional community groups organization (e.g., churches, civic associations, etc.)?
   (c) Federal requirement or initiative?
   (d) State requirement or initiative?
   (e) County, metropolitan, or city requirement or initiative?
   (f) Community professionals?
   (g) Citizens acting as individuals?

19. Was substantial organizational support or personnel for the CPO drawn from other, pre-existing CP-type activities?
20. Was the CPO initiated in conjunction with a new service activity? 

21. Was there active political support for the CPO effort among city or county officials at the time the CPO effort started? 

22. Was there active political support for the CPO effort among city or county officials at the time of the analysis? 

23. Was the existence or role of CPO a subject of active political controversy at the time the CPO effort started? 

24. Was the existence or role of CPO a subject of active political controversy at the time of the analysis? 

25. Do the individuals in the target community share a common sense of community or group identity? 

26. Did the definition of the target population shift from a heterogeneous population to a homogeneous area of group? 

27. What is the age of the CPO in years at the time of analysis? 

28. The CPO is organized at the level of the: 
(a) Block or small neighborhood (under 5,000 population)? 
(b) Large district or neighborhood? 
(c) Town or village, major suburb? 
(d) City? 
(e) Metropolis or county? 
(f) Region within a state? 
(g) State? 

29. Does the CPO have constituent organizations? If yes, at what level are they organized? 
(a) Block or small neighborhood (under 5,000 population)? 
(b) Large district or neighborhood? 
(c) Town or village, major suburb? 
(d) City? 
(e) Metropolis or county? 
(f) Region within a state? 
(g) State?
30. Does the CPO have a formal board? What is its size? __________.

31. Are over one-half of the participants drawn from the target population?

32. Is representation controlled by quotas?

33. The members of the governing unit or group of the CPO from the target population are:
   (a) Appointed? (a) ___
   (b) Elected by the target population? (b) ___
   (c) Self-selected through open participation? (c) ___

34. Is the CPO organized in a series of functionally specialized committees?

35. Is the sign-off of the CPO required on funding requests by the service(s) organization?

36. With respect to the service(s), the CPO (excluding sign-off powers):
   (a) Serves only as a source of communication and discussion? (a) ___
   (b) Makes decisions which are advisory only? (b) ___
   (c) Makes decisions which are not binding but accorded substantial weight? (c) ___
   (d) Makes binding decisions? (d) ___

37. Does the CPO have substantial influence in the investigation of complaints individual consumers have about staff and program?

38. Does the CPO have substantial influence over staff recruitment, promotion, or retention?

39. Does the CPO have substantial influence over the service(s) budget?

40. Does the CPO have its own staff?

41. Is there a component in the service organization(s) with primary responsibility to help the CPO effort, or is the CPO being provided staff by some other organization?

42. Is the relationship of the service(s) management with the participants characterized by:
   (a) Active management cooperation? (a) ___
   (b) Passive management cooperation (responsive only to direct requests)? (b) ___
   (c) Management resistance? (c) ___
43. Is the relationship of the service(s) staff with the participants characterized mainly by:
   (a) Active staff cooperation? (a)  
   (b) Passive staff cooperation (responsive only to direct requests)? (b)  
   (c) Staff resistance? (c)  

44. Does the management and staff exercise strong leadership over the CPO, obtaining CPO support for service plans and activities?  

45. Do at least a substantial minority of participants from the target population have prior experience in citizen participation or community organizations?  

46. Have more than one-half the participants been participating for at least two years (or, if the CPO is less than two years old, for the age of the CPO)?  

47. Are one-half of the participants from the target population also local community and group leaders with established constituencies?  

48. Are the participants from the target population given training or some form of preparation for participation?  

49. Do the participants receive:
   (a) Reimbursement for expenses incurred?  
   (b) Pay or material privileges for participating?  

50. Are any of the participants using the CPO to build a political base?  

51. Are the participants from the target population generally representing or speaking for the interests of the entire target population?  

52. Does CPO lobby federal, state, or local officials in support of program?  

53. Do the participants reflect the racial composition of the target population?  

54. Do the participants reflect the social class composition of the target population?
55. Are the participants relatively cohesive, reconciling their own differences, and maintaining common positions?

56. Is the service staff largely volunteers and/or paraprofessionals drawn from the target population?

57. Does the management come from the target population?

58. Is there any systematic mechanism for assessing user attitudes toward service(s)?

59. Does the CP effort have a regular newsletter or bulletin, or does it receive regular coverage in one?

60. Has the unit cost of the service(s) been increased as a result of the CPO activities?

61. Has there been an increase in the target population's interest or use of the service(s)?

62. Has citizen participation had:
   (a) a unifying effect on the target population? (a)
   (b) no effect on the target population? (b)
   (c) a fragmenting effect on the target population? (c)

63. Has citizen participation led to substantially greater turnover or difficulties in recruiting staff or management?

64. Has CPO developed significant political and/or organizational skills for more than five participants who did not have those skills one year before the analysis?
Note the following questions have four levels of answers. Please continue to answer "No Way" or "Not Applicable" under the same criteria discussed above by writing it in. If you are confident in your judgment, check the appropriate column. If you have some question but have some basis for making a decision, put a question mark in the appropriate column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>To a Trivial Degree</th>
<th>To a Significant but Limited Degree</th>
<th>To a High Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. Has citizen participation led to a strengthening of the influence of new neighborhood and/or local leaders relative to the local government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Has citizen participation led to a strengthening of the federal government influence relative to state or local governments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Has citizen participation brought pre-existing local political divisions and rivalries into the planning and operation of service(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Do the participants feel that their contributions have made a difference in the operation of the service(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Do the service users or the members of the target population feel that CPO has made a difference in the operation of the service(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Has the CPO been successful in obtaining implementation of ideas or approaches the participants favor that would not have otherwise been put into effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>To a Trivial Degree</td>
<td>To a Significant but Limited Degree</td>
<td>To a High Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Has the CFO blocked or seriously delayed changes or plans that the participants opposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Has citizen participation increased staff responsiveness to the problems of individuals or groups of users?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source(s) of data: Author(s), Title(s), and Complete Citation(s)

Propositional Inventory:

(What statements of cause and effect are included in the analysis, and what strong inferences are offered? Rank them "h" for high; "M" for modest; and "L" for low confidence, according to your judgment as to the degree of which they seem supported by the analysis or description.)

Omitted Propositions:

Statements of cause and effect, not offered by the author, which you feel are warranted from the study.