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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The ideal of widespread political participation is a central theme of democratic theory and is deeply rooted in the American socio-political fabric. The proposition that just government must rest on the consent of the governed hardly needs defense or explanation beyond the simple recognition that this notion has been the cornerstone of American democracy from the writing of the Declaration of Independence to the present. Nevertheless, it is equally apparent that representative democracy is not limited to basic acts of political participation such as voting in periodic elections or discussing politics with friends. As government and society have grown more complex, the quality of representative democracy no longer rests simply on the opportunity to participate, but also on the "question of the effectiveness of established acts of participation."¹ Therefore, although participation represents a democratic goal per se, it must also be understood in terms of its effectiveness as a means to other ends. The most significant ones are those which contribute to the continued vitality of representative democracy.

Daniel and Virginia Bell link political participation to several goals involving the capacities and activities of individual citizens: First, democracy requires that the individual accept an obligation to perform the role of citizen which requires at least simple acts such as voting, keeping informed, and so forth. An important goal of participation is to provide an opportunity for the individual to acquire the skills needed for the successful performance of the role of democratic citizen. As the individual takes part in public decision-making, he acquires a sense of his own dignity and civic competence. He develops the capacity to influence his own fate, and he learns to use political action to cope with the pressures arising out of the social and physical environment. The effect of participation is cumulative—the more the individual participates, the more likely he is to acquire the skills which are necessary for effective participation; and the more his participation pays off, the more likely he will be to continue to participate. The key requirement for maintaining this cycle of learning is reinforcement, the participation must be effective—it must provide rewards which the individual considers valuable.

Second, democracy requires that most citizens have the political resources to compete in the political arena on reasonably equal terms. If there is little chance that participation will produce at least some minimal level of success for the individual in his attempts to acquire the tangible or intangible benefits distributed through the political

1Daniel Bell and Virginia Bell, "The Community Revolution" Public Interest, XVI (Summer, 1969), p. 142.
process, participation will produce little more than a heightened sense of frustration. For a participatory system to work requires that all individuals have approximately equal access to the political process, that goal inequalities in the political resources of different individuals and groups be eliminated and that the political rights of disadvantaged minorities be protected.

Third, as the scope and activity of government expands, the individual acquires a higher stake in political participation. As more and more aspects of life within our society come to be regulated by decisions in the public sector rather than the private sector, and as the details of these decisions come under the influence of specialized technical agencies rather than general representative bodies, new forms of participation recognizing the special interests of various clienteles and other target populations have to be developed.

The two Bells also link political participation to certain goals of democratic political systems: First, the entire society has a stake in the development of procedures which maximize the probability that the conflicting demands of competing groups and individuals will be resolved through peaceful means. Hence, pluralistic bargaining, decision-making based on mutual adjustment between competing interests and process values such as compromise, negotiation and peaceful accommodation, all require a political system which is open to widespread participation, thus increasing the likelihood that all legitimate interests will be heard. The stake of public authorities in this process relates to their desire to make decisions which may be effectively implemented with minimum coercion. Decision-making
based on widespread participation increases the probability that conflicts will be ironed out in the process of making decisions instead of being confronted after the decisions are made. In other words, participation provides decision-making information and support.

Second, the decision-makers' need for information and feedback is great. As the decision-making process grows more complex and as the decision-maker is separated from an automatic or instinctive sense of the needs of the general population, he becomes dependent on the process of participation for vital information. If citizens refuse to participate, or if the channels of communication function ineffectively, the decision-maker must formulate policies in ignorance of the ways in which the general population will be affected by those policies. Similarly, public decisions and governmental policies can hardly be improved unless the effects of past decisions are known.

Finally, since popular democracy rests on the central proposition that government must rest upon the consent of the governed, public officials must maintain the support of the general population. Support comes in many forms—the acceptance of the obligations of citizenship, adherence to the general rules of the political game, and the act of participation itself. System support requires the maintenance of a certain level of trust in the political process among the general populace and the avoidance of a situation in which disadvantages are systematically assigned to particular groups. Public decisions have a central impact on the level of system support. The political processes which produce decisions must be perceived as just and the need to impose unpopular decisions, which could alienate certain
groups, must be minimized. With regard to the latter, public authorities must at least guarantee that the costs of decisions are understood and accepted, if not enjoyed. Additionally, the cumulative impact of costs on any particular group should be minimized by an equitable distribution of the burden of public decisions across many groups and interests. It is generally felt that the widespread opportunity for meaningful participation will facilitate the process of building and maintaining system support in three ways: participation per se is likely to build trust by affirming the citizen's expectation that he should be permitted full membership in the system; participation increases the citizen's awareness of the complexities of administering public affairs; the widespread opportunity for participation should guarantee a certain level of protection for the individual and group self interest.

To summarize, the goals of citizen participation fall into two general categories—individual benefits and system benefits. At the level of individual goals, citizen participation is seen as a means to: (1) build civic competence; (2) guarantee equal access to the political process; (3) recognize and protect the special stakes which citizens have in certain public policies. In terms of system goals, widespread participation is viewed as a means to: (1) facilitate the peaceful resolution of conflict through a process of mutual adjustment; (2) provide information and feedback required for making sound public decisions; (3) maintain support for public authority.

It is worth noting that the six goals outlined above should not be assumed to be mutually supportive under all conditions. Indeed, they
are often contradictory. For example, when conflict is rooted in deep-seated socio-economic cleavages, increased participation may function to prevent the political system from avoiding a conflict which is temporarily unresolved and thereby intensify the mass awareness of the conflict and reduce the general level of trust in the political system. Or, increased participation may serve to raise citizen expectations beyond the present capacity of the system to respond and consequently serve to increase an individual's frustration and disillusionment rather than his sense of civic competence.

Whether, in fact, the goals of democratic participation are met in this society can only be determined by examining programs in which citizen participation is encouraged or required. The Model Cities Program, which is the main concern of this thesis, is such a program. Mention will also be made on a comparative basis throughout this research of other Federal programs which have attempted, with less success than Model Cities, to adopt the doctrine or concept of "citizen participation" embodied in legislation creating the programs.

The Model Cities Program

In recent years, citizens have expressed a growing desire to be involved in planning and implementing programs that affect their lives and communities. It has become evident to federal officials that citizen support of programs is necessary, and thus, one of the most important features of urban renewal, model cities and antipoverty programs is the requirement of citizen participation. However, the fact of citizen participation is somewhat of a novelty. Its role in decision
and policy-making has not been concretely established, and there is hardly widespread agreement that the programs which have incorporated citizen participation in their planning process have been improved by this experience.

In the Fall of 1966, Congress enacted legislation, Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, to launch the Model Cities Program. The program, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, is intended to increase the potentiality of cities to attack their social, economic and physical problems; to coordinate the activities of public and private agencies on the local, state and federal levels.

The purposes of this comprehensive program are: (1) to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas; (2) to expand housing; (3) to expand job and income opportunities; (4) to reduce dependency on welfare payments; (5) to improve educational facilities and programs; (6) to combat disease and ill health; (7) to enhance recreational and cultural opportunities; (8) to reduce the incidence of crime and delinquency; (9) to establish better access between homes and jobs; and (10) in general to improve living conditions for the people who live in these areas.

Selected cities are given grants which can be used for more purposes than other grants had afforded. The local office, City Demonstration Agency, in consultation with the citizens of the Model Cities

---

area and the local government develop the comprehensive plan for dealing with some of the problems over a five year period. The citizens set their own priorities without regard to the many restraints that usually accompany federal grants, and the City Demonstration Agency is encouraged to attempt innovative activities that could not be done under the existing grant-in-aid programs.

The comprehensive plan, called the action plan, consists of an analysis of the Model Cities area problems, their causes and the inter-relationship of the causes, definition of long-range goals, and specific program proposals that will reduce or eliminate the problems and the costs of the proposals. When the action plan is approved by the citizens, the City Demonstration Agency and the local government, the Model Cities Administration of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development review the plan. If approved, the City Demonstration Agency receives funds and technical support with which to establish the Model Cities Program.

It is conceived by the Model Cities Administration that such a comprehensive program should substantially improve the quality of life for persons living in the Model Cities area. It is also anticipated that with such dynamic potential in the Program, local chief executives will give more attention to the problems of the poorest neighborhoods, will organize the local governing structure with more effective planning and administration, and will eliminate obsolete programs. Lastly, it is anticipated that the Model Cities Program will strengthen the position of the local chief executive in coordinating state, local, and federal activities.
Section 103 (a) (2) of the 1966 Act requires that a Model Cities Program provide for widespread citizens participation in the programs. The implementation of this statutory provision requires (1) the constructive involvement of citizens in the model neighborhood area and city as a whole in planning and carrying out of the program; (2) the means of introducing the views of area residents in policy-making should be afforded area residents to participate actively in planning and carrying out the demonstration.¹

This requirement grows out of the conviction that improving the quality of life of the residents of the model neighborhood can be accomplished only by the affirmative action of the people themselves. This requires a means of building self-competence and a desire to participate effectively in the social and physical problems of their community.²

Statement of the Problem

My research concerns citizen participation in the Genesee County Model Cities Program. First, I will trace the history of the Program in Genesee County with particular emphasis on the degree to which the requirement of widespread citizen participation has been met. Second, through a questionnaire survey I shall try to answer the question: To what extent do the Genesee County Board of Commissioners and the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council differ in the degree to which they would permit citizens to participate in the decision and policy-making


²loc. cit., p. 2.
process? One of the major comparisons between the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council will concern a ladder of citizen participation as proposed by Sherry Arnstein in her article, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." As a typology of the degrees of citizen participation, the author proposes an eight rung ladder with each step corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in the decision-making process. My main concern here will be to ascertain whether the Board of Commissioners would permit citizens to participate in the decision-making process to the same degree that the Joint Council allows citizens to participate in the decision-making process.

Third, the study will deal with the relationship between the amount of participation each citizen had on the various planning committees of the Model Cities Program and the degree of satisfaction that citizens derived from each activity and with the Model Cities Program generally.

In order to deal with the questions posed in my research and the major concerns of this study, I have proposed four (4) hypotheses. They are as follows:

1. The rate of agreement among the Board of Commissioners' perception of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the top of the ladder to the bottom of the ladder of citizen participation.

2. The rate of agreement among members of the Model Cities Joint Council's perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the bottom of the ladder to the top of the ladder of citizen participation.

---

3. There should be no significant differences between the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council at the lower level of the ladder, but there should be significant differences between the Board and Council at the higher level of the ladder as to whether each regard citizen participation as appropriate.

4. Among Joint Council members there is a relationship between participation and satisfaction such that the higher the degree of participation experienced, the greater the degree of satisfaction both with their participation and with the Model Cities Program generally.

   (1) Participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity experienced in the Model Cities Program.

   (2) The greater the number of planning groups the citizens participated in, the greater the satisfaction with the overall Program and certain aspects of the Program.

   (3) The more activities experienced in the Model Cities Program, the greater the degree of overall satisfaction with the Program and with aspects of the Program.

In order to determine the impact of citizen participation in the decision and policy-making process of Genesee County Model Cities Program, I feel that my methodical approach should be both a qualitative and quantitative one to assure the most accurate defense of the hypotheses postulated. Therefore, various procedures of data collection will be utilized. These include the analysis of documents, charts, and newspaper clippings for the narrative history of citizen participation in the Model Cities Program. Then, to test the hypotheses listed above, a survey was undertaken. The subjects for the survey will be the elected citizens of the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council, since they are the individuals who represent the views, needs, and desires of the Model Neighborhood residents. Also, persons who are considered as "community influentials" were administered.
questionnaires to learn of their perception of appropriate citizen participation in the Program. These influentials are the members of the Genesee County Board of Commissioners.

My interest in the study commenced when I began working with the Model Cities Program in 1968. This was the first time that I had been involved with a program—local, state, or national—that gave area residents a chance to assert their views, prestige, and authority as to what programs would be allowed to direct the course of their everyday lives.

Hopefully, the outcome of this study will serve and be relevant to four audiences: (1) the citizens and staff of the Genesee County Model Cities Program, by bringing to light some of the problems that have caused a delay in the smooth operation of the program; (2) the local, state, and national governments in the overall administration of such programs; (3) the Department of Political Science of Western Michigan University; (4) and lastly, to myself. I hope this research will enhance my knowledge of citizens participation in federally funded programs, particularly, Model Cities.

Chapter 2 will consist of the "Review of Literature" which will give a brief history of citizen participation in the structure of urban government and also a brief history of the success of citizen participation in three Federal programs of the 1960's. Chapter 3 will concern itself with the methods of the research. Chapter 4 will give a narrative history of citizen participation in the Genesee County Model Cities Program from its implementation on up to the Third Action Year. Chapter 5 will give the analysis and discussion of the hypotheses. Chapter 6 will conclude the research with a summary and some recommendations for the Genesee County Model Cities Program.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Citizen Participation and the Structure of Urban Government

The full meaning of citizen participation cannot be understood apart from the peculiar historical forces which have shaped and molded this ideal in the arena of local government. At the outset, it is important to note that American democratic ideals and institutional forms were developed in a pre-industrial, pre-bureaucratic, pre-urban society. The Jeffersonian ideal of a democratic republic was based on a firm conviction that popular rule and self-government were possible only in small agrarian communities. In Jefferson's opinion, the New England town was one of:

the wisest inventions ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self government. Each ward would be a small republic and every man in the State would thus become an active member of the common government, transacting in person a great portion of its rights and duties, subordinate indeed, yet important and completely within his competence.

The Jeffersonian vision of grassroots democracy became institutionalized by virtue of its initial success and the basic agreements embodied in the U. S. Constitution. Federalism was probably the most significant structural feature because it guaranteed that most public programs would have to be administered on a decentralized basis.

Additionally, the powers of the national government, which was organized according to the republican principle of indirect representation rather than direct democracy, were severely limited by institutional checks and balances, the separation of powers, and the Bill of Rights. The subsequent actions of State governments further institutionalized this pattern by local governments.

The essence of the Jeffersonian ideal of grassroots democracy was captured nearly forty years later when Tocqueville observed that:

> the township, at the center of the ordinary relations of life, serves as a field for the desire of public esteem, the want of exciting interest, and the taste for authority and popularity; and the passions which commonly embroil society change their character, when they find a vent so near the domestic hearth and family circle.\(^1\)

In other words, citizen participation was a simple extension of the individual’s involvement in the life of his community. The skills of public citizenship were actually developed away from government in the more basic social interactions of family, church, and other communal institutions. By minimizing the distinction between government and society, Jefferson has unleashed an ideology of grassroots democracy, local autonomy, and decentralized administration which had endured to present times.

The Jacksonian era, subsequently added a faith in the common man, universal manhood suffrage, and by decentralizing the Presidential nominating process from Congress to the party convention, it replaced the republican principle of indirect election of the Chief

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 26.
Executive with radical procedure of direct democracy and popular control of the executive. According to Robert Wood, citizen participation was carried to its tolerable limit at the local level:

The broadening of the electorate, the proclamation that any man could serve effectively in public office, resulted in the long ballot and short term in municipal governments across the land. The office of mayor became elective and rapidly other administrative offices were made directly responsible to the people. Independent commissions multiplied, as a direct consequence of the desire for public supervision or what could not be done by the public itself. The power of the executive and a dispersion of responsibilities took place among innumerable boards, agencies, and ex-officio positions. Direct public participation might no longer be manageable, but the most radical concept of representation expressed itself forcibly in local government.

The collision of this "radical expression of representation" with the forces of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration produced the political machine. The boss was able to parlay the legal autonomy granted by the Jeffersonian ideal and the spoils and popular control produced by the Jacksonian reforms, into a formidable organization based on the control and manipulation of the vote of the immigrant masses. The substantial influence of the machine was soon allied with those portions of the business community which stood to gain substantial profit from the whimsical development needs of the burgeoning city. In the eyes of the "public-spirited" portions of the old establishment, the corruption, graft and vices of the vulgar machine constituted a straight forward perversion of the ideals of democratic rule. While it is undoubtedly true that the new political leader was motivated more by self-interest and greed than by "public-regardingness", he also

1Ibid., p. 31.
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offered a form of political participation in which the lower class immigrant masses could be involved. He forged out a politics which facilitated the development of strong ethnic institutions and offered protection to the ethnic community.

The New England towns of the Jefferson and Tocqueville ideal were not open to inclusion of alien cultures and religions or lower class peasant values. Catholics, for example, were a severely discriminated against and disadvantaged minority. Under these circumstances, the extra-legal techniques of the machine offered an avenue of social mobility to the immigrant. Similarly, the illegally amassed fortunes of ethnic leaders soon found their way into the creation of financial and social institutions serving the ethnic community. Schools, churches, hospitals, businesses which would not have been provided by a public sector irrevocably committed to unregulated capitalistic development and white Protestant superiority were created within the private sector of the immigrant community.

While it is probably true that the poor received the short end of the economic bargain--little favors went to little men and big favors went to big men--they did not get stuck with the short end of the bargain over the rules of citizen participation. Indeed, the ethnic neighborhood offered the pride of community and a secure form of communal life. The ward leader was something of an "ambassador to the outside world" who plundered the system and brought home at least some of

---

1 Herbert Gans uses this term to describe the politicians of Boston's West End in The Urban Villagers (New York: Free Press, 1962), Chapter 8.
the booty and conferred substantial symbolic benefits in the form of his own power, prestige and acceptance.

The public outcry over the "shame of the cities" was sufficient to produce a response from the State Legislatures. The States, still a bastion of rural and Jeffersonian rhetoric as well as their own brand of corruption, moved to limit the local autonomy of the cities. They used the right of the State to grant municipal charters, to virtually eliminate home rule. Special State Districts were created for many municipal functions, tax indebtedness limitations were set, and special acts were passed to regulate almost every detail of municipal administration. The States were hardly motivated exclusively by the altruistic values of reforms. Party differences rooted in the urban-rural cleavage played a role and many State Legislatures simply wanted a share of the graft being freely distributed by the Robber-Baron and Trusts.

A full blown reform movement did develop under the banner of the Progressives. Once again the ideology of reform centered on democratic participation. Democracy was to be revitalized by attacking the exclusive control over the political process which political parties had acquired. A bundle of electoral reforms, emphasizing the capacity of the individual citizen to exercise direct control without the intermediary of political parties, was introduced. The referendum, initiative, and recall were added to the litany of electoral devices. In order to insure that political parties would be internally democratic, the citizen was given the right to participate in the selection of party candidates, via the direct primary.
More significantly, the new breed of reforms began to propose a radically different view of the political system. First, they proposed that politics and administration be thought of as quite separate functions. The purpose of politics was to establish the collective goals and objectives of the political unit, while administration was the mechanism through which those policies would be executed. Municipal government, according to the reformers, should be reorganized to reflect these distinctions. First, the political process was expected to be free of partisan cleavage and parochial divisions. So that the general interest might be best promoted, non-partisan at-large elections were proposed. An assimilationist view of an entire city, sharing a common culture, in pursuit of a general interest which could be recognized by all was put forth. The old divisions based on race, class, ethnicity, and the like were to be eliminated by granting equal access to citywide institutions, such as public schools and all groups. The idea of a melting-pot resulting in a single widely shared civic culture because the dominant ideal of the reformer. Thus, the Jeffersonian ideal of the local government based on a shared conception of public virtue was transplanted from the New England town to the giant metropolis.

On the administrative side, the reformers proposed that city government be patterned after the business corporation in order to promote the values of efficiency and economy. Preferably, the city would be run by a professional manager, but even if a mayor was retained, all patronage was to be eliminated in favor of civil service reform based solely on merit recruitment and promotion. The city, it was felt, could be administrated only by politically neutral competent
bureaucrats. The public accountability of this politically neutral civil service was to be guaranteed by its ultimate responsibility to the politically sanctioned authority of a popularly elected council or mayor. Finally, the power of the chief executive would be strengthened by returning to home rule and through charter reforms aimed at reducing the fragmentation produced during the Jacksonian era. ¹

Although the adoption of reform, in all of its details, varied considerably from one city to another—many of the proposals of the municipal reform package are still being pursued—several of the basic tenets of the movement became part of the American governmental creed. First, the need for a professionally competent bureaucracy was recognized and civil service reform was widely accepted. Second, the notion that political accountability would have to be achieved primarily through an elected chief executive responsible to a consensus of the public interest became accepted dogma. The transformation to the contemporary system of city-wide bureaucratic complexity was sealed by the massive increase in the number and scale of public programs. Finally, the central position that political parties and representative councils, or legislatures previously occupied in the scheme of urban government was significantly diminished.

The Progressive reforms and subsequent growth of bureaucracy reduced the primary emphasis which had been placed on past representa-

¹The municipal reform movement included several variations, ranging from a Commission-Manager form to Strong Mayor-Weak Council form. For the most part, large cities retained the Mayor-Council form, and gradually increased the powers of the Mayor. Small and newer cities tended to prefer the Council-Manager form.
tive and participatory structures. Administration was "taken out of politics" and the value of politically neutral competence was fostered. However, the general importance placed on the ideal of democratic representativeness did not disappear as the old representative forms, such as legislatures and political parties, began to lose their significance. Hence, a demand for new forms emerged and bureaucracies began to create mechanisms for citizen representation in an obvious effort to rationalize, in terms of traditional democratic ideals, their own hierarchial structures. In effect, these "politically neutral" organs appreciated the fact that their own legitimacy required that they devise administrative mechanisms for political representation.

Bureaucracies were quick to realize the advantage which flowed from the creation of a politically powerful constituency. An early example of this process is provided by the Smith-Lever Act of 1915 which established a system of grants-in-aid to State Colleges of agriculture. Local groups were sought out by county agents for assistance in raising local monies for the required matching funds. These groups were organized into local farm bureaus and by 1919, the American Farm Bureau Federation was launched with the assistance of the Department of Agriculture. Thus, an effective lobby for agriculture programs was created in the form of a national federation of the county bureaus which had been organized by the county agents. The Department of Agriculture was careful to maintain the support of this group by giving it varying degrees of control over local farm programs.

Citizen participation was also devised as an administrative strategy to legitimate a potentially unpopular federal program. Perhaps, the
leading example of this device is provided by the Selective Service System which created local boards of community leaders in order to create the impression that conscription was an expression of grassroots democracy. Similarly, local boards were created by the Office of Price Administration during World War II.\(^1\)

Perhaps the most thoroughly studied example of democratic administration is the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) which was widely hailed as one of the New Deal's leading experiments with "grassroots democracy." TVA sought to minimize the traditional Jeffersonian fear of the federal and conservative fears of socialism by co-opting the local citizenry through representation on a variety of advisory bodies and substantive concessions were made to locally powerful elites.\(^2\) Other forms of representation, of a less visible and more informal nature, were also developed to maximize support for bureaucracies which had been "separated from politics." Significant interests were often given a de facto role in the process of appointing leading agency personnel. Thus, patronage was hardly eliminated--the rules governing its use were simply altered as the legitimate vehicle became the interest group rather than the political party.

The growth of relatively autonomous bureaucracies eventually led to still another problem of participation and representation. The fragmentation of the political structure produced by politically insulated


agencies threatened to eliminate the substantive impact of the popularly elected chief executive. Mayors, governors and presidents soon discovered that while they remained accountable to the general public, their actual ability to implement policies desired by the voters was severely limited by their lack of control over the agency structures beneath them. In the urban context, the years of Progressive reform and bureaucratic growth had succeeded in reducing drastically, if not totally destroying, the role of the urban party organization.

The power vacuum thus created was soon filled by a "new machine" comprised of public agencies and their organized clienteles. New York City probably represents the leading example of this process. Today, public employee unions, such as the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association or the United Federation of Teachers, are potent political organizations while political party organization is virtually non-existent. Additionally, the maze of government programs created since the New Deal had encouraged a kind of functional autocracy. Vast areas of public policy were controlled by clusters of agencies (at the Federal, State and local levels), their constituencies and public administrators specializing in functional areas. These clusters of administrative systems controlled decision-making over groups of programs which were at best aimed in an uncoordinated fashion toward some specific component of a larger problem and at worst, were pointed in contra-

---


dictory directions. There appeared to be no mechanism for producing a coherent urban policy; decisions were governed by the inertia of autonomous parts pursuing their own ends while the outcomes which were produced by this structure (or lack of one) were often intended by nobody.1

Predictably, the next wave of reform was aimed at strengthening the office of the popularly elected chief executive whose inability to coordinate and give meaningful direction to the vast administrative structures of the city had made a mockery of the Progressive assertion that the ideal of widespread political participation would be achieved through the political accountability of executive leadership. Despite a flurry of efforts to beef-up executive leadership with specialized staffs, planning agencies, bureaus of the budget, administrative reorganizations and charter reforms, the basic trend toward the separation of political-representational structures and administrative structure remained. No longer was the political power of the mayor of an average American city carefully built upon the power of grassroots organization. The effectiveness of executive leadership was now based on the ability of a mayor to forge out an "executive-centered coalition" comprised of city-wide business, labor, religious, ethnic, and public and private special interests.2 Whereas, the old mayor could rely primarily upon

1 The logic of this process has been given its classic statement by Norton Long, "Local Community as an Ecology of Games," in Urban Government, ed. by Edward Banfield (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 390-399.

his organization (the political party), the accomplishments of the new mayor were more dependent on his ability to serve as a broker and to bargain for a coalition comprised of organizations and interest groups which had their own stakes (often dissimilar to the mayor's) in the political game.

During the period of the "executive-centered coalition," citizen participation in administrative programs came to mean giving representation on city-wide boards and commissions to the city's recognized civic leadership. Citizen participation became a device for mayors and high level administrators to use in an attempt to mobilize general support for executive leadership. Planning Commissions, Urban Renewal Boards and a variety of blue ribbon committees made their appearance as the mayor attempted to convince the media and its middle-class audience that there was a demand among representatives of established city-wide interests for his leadership. The result of the drive for support for centralized and well coordinated executive endeavors was to carry the structures of political representation even further from the ideal of grassroots participation and involvement. The comprehensive nature of the new programs and management device (master plans, workable programs, city-wide administrative reorganizations, and the like) necessarily transformed the political task of the mayor from serving as a broker for the conflicting demands of neighborhoods to ratifying agreements worked out through bargaining among major city-wide interests.¹ This, in turn, carried forth the

¹Edward Banfield, Political Influence (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961.)
process of separating the mayor's political organization (if he had one left) from the structure of administrative influence and private sector interest groups. Hence, a division appeared between the mayor's audience, those who could help him assemble the elements of executive leadership and legitimize the centralization of administrative control in City Hall, and the mayor's voting constituency in the neighborhoods. Ultimately, the mayor's capacity to govern effectively was dependent upon his ability to walk a tightrope between the demands of established city-wide interests and the political forces which were beginning to emerge at the grassroots.

The fundamental principle that citizens have a right to participate in and influence the development of plans that will affect their lives is no longer debatable. The social revolution under way throughout much of the world has made this so.¹

Citizens participation has become the scholastic province of a number of professional disciplines, each seeking to place the phenomenon under its rubric.² Forays into this fecund area of research, some offering heuristic arguments, others asserting generalizations about human behavior that look better in print than they do in the context of ghetto reality, have been done by political scientists, sociologists, psychologists—


²Ibid.
gists, social workers, redevelopers, planners and lawyers. Most reflect the narrow approach of the author's own discipline; few attempt a rounded view of the subject matter.

**Proponents of Citizen Participation**

Among the advocates of citizen participation, Edgar S. and Jean Camper Cahn, in a penetrating analysis entitled "Citizens Participation" reassert the importance of participatory action as an essential component of the faith Americans profess in the dignity and worth of the individual, as a mobilizer of the energies and resources of the poor, as a source of insight, knowledge, and experience in social programming (the consumer perspective), and finally as the only guarantee that, frail as it may appear, people are willing to abide by the terms of America's social contract.1

James Wilson's thesis in his article, "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal,"2 is that the poor invariably succumb to the pressures of immediate need-satisfaction. He contends, rather, that the poor are capable and entitled to deliberate on the question of resource allocation to effect social change. This position has been refuted by the Cahns. Recognized as assailants of the "fallacy of Monolithic man," their criticism is directed at those professionals who manipulate the poor into a position responding as

---


passive consumers and dependents.

Positing citizen participation as a countervailing force necessary to protect social and welfare programs against the encroachment of institutional self-interest are Peter Marris and Martin Rein in the "Dilemma of Social Reform."¹ Their recitation of the experience of social action agencies in Boston, New Haven, and New York dramatizes the inherent conflict between these agencies' ideological commitment to the poor and their own vested interests, which make them institutional pawns in the great organizational chess game of urban politics. They also view citizen participation as a twin force capable of involving and accommodating target-area residents to the demands of urban society, while at the same time holding out the possibility of pressuring institutions to better adapt to the needs of constituencies.

Milton Kotler regards citizen participation as a countervailing power on an even grander scale. In "Two Essays on the Neighborhood Corporation," the combatants are pictured not simply as poverty programs and their institutional environment, as Marris and Rein perceive them, but the entire body of poor versus the community at large.² Kotler carries the implications of citizen participation to their logical extreme on the affirmative pole of the participation continuum—that of neighborhood control and self-rule. He advocates the transference of a portion of authority from the municipal government


to the new focal points of power in the poverty neighborhoods. With particular reference to the black community, Kotler states that neighborhood corporations should be set up as legal public entities, while at the same time enjoying a substantial measure of self-rule in what could be described as a reconstituted territorial community of the poor. Penetrating into the deeper realms of citizen participation, extending beyond involvement in decisions made by the power structure itself—to a redistribution of political power and authority are the Cahns, Marris and Rein, and Kotler. The Cahns view citizens participating in the original decisions to allocate community resources and frame institutions, on the choices necessary in any kind of capital formation and investments. For Marris and Rein, it is citizens participation when individuals organize their interests, defend their rights, and restore their self-confidence through a redistribution of power, presumably accomplished outside the confines of a governmentally sponsored social action organization. Kotler says citizens participation exists when there is a shared exercise of authority and the performance of certain municipal functions within a territorial structure based on neighborhood power and local self-rule.

Opponents of Citizen Participation

Those authors who emphasize the more negative and problematic features of citizen participation, or who underscore its inherent disabilities, come armed with theoretical brickbats and empirical thorns.¹

¹Ibid., p. 7
The deep rooting of citizen participation in politics is examined by James Wilson and Edward Banfield in "City Politics," where sharp distinctions are drawn between a "public regarding" and a "private regarding" political ethos.¹ The former is the province of high states, community-oriented middle-class elements, while the latter represents the immediate, need-satisfying predilections of the lower class. Wilson emphasizes the low efficacy of the poor in organizational situations in his provocative article, "Planning and Politics: Citizens Participation in Urban Renewal."

Frances Piven, whose article on "Resident Participation in Community Action Programs: An Overview," extends the characterization of the low income community to be one in which lower-class interpretations of the world reinforce an inability to cope with societal conditions. Political ineffectiveness results, which serves only to dampen participation and compounds a sense of community powerlessness. No inducements exist to stimulate citizen participation, either on the part of indigenous leadership whose rewards from their disadvantaged constituency are marginal, or on the part of the mass community whose paucity of organizational and influence resources deprive them of access to central sources of power and decision-making.²

Another adversary, Roger Starr, states that citizen participation can be a hindrance to attaining the goals of public programs. In his


publication, "An Attack on Poverty: Historical Perspective," he states that "it is a misunderstanding of the way in which the American form of government has worked to suggest that leadership depends on constant consultation with the governed."\(^1\)

Roberta Sigel views it as being very naive to think or even suggest that "inarticulate masses" can devise urban renewal schemes or other planning endeavors. In "Citizens Committees--Advice vs. Consent," she states that the bulk of members on citizen committees must have discernible skills, and that the poor might be capable of being mobilized for action and implementation, their role in the process of translating general goals into programmatic detail is perforce limited.\(^2\)

Phil Doyle, previous Executive Director of the Redevelopment Land Agency, says that "organization for participation means mobilizing the community to veto renewal plans. It is self-defeating for government to do this. You can't take a plebiscite about every official action or proposal and a plebiscite is what citizen participation is. The leisure time spent in participation in neighborhood discussion of local issues would be more effectively spent in a political club."\(^3\)

A second argument by Mr. Doyle regarding citizen participation in urban renewal is that it is a lobbying for locality-based vested interest

---


or special privilege. Participating citizens grind their axes on behalf of their own geographical locality and at the expense of the total community and of other localities. The outcome, if they are successful, is a disproportionate allotment of total community resources to the specific locality whose participating citizens have been influential with the professional planners and the government officials. ¹

It is obviously evident that a polarization exists in the literature on citizen participation between what are essentially theoretical, normatively oriented arguments, and empirical studies which proffer their own arguments on the basis of actual field experiences. Both have their advantages and disadvantages.

Keeping this in mind, it is indeed important that a student of this area be as objective as possible. He might ask himself these questions proposed by the Cahns: Can the low-income community make a rational allocation of resources within the decision-making process, i.e., do the poor lack the inherent capacity to make rational decisions by dint of their own conditions of deprivation? Are they capable of acting as a countervailing force to protect social and welfare programs from the encroachment of institutionalized self-interests as posited by Marris and Rein? Are they capable of sharing control of community resources and authority as advocated by Kotler?

On the other hand, we must also look at the more negative sides. Do the poor invariably succumb to the pressures of immediate need-satisfaction, as stated by Wilson? Are the poor incapable of dealing

¹Ibid., p. 38.
with societal conditions because of their socio-economic background, as suggested by Sigel and Doyle? Is Roger Starr correct in saying that citizen participation induces community instability?

Who is to say who’s right and who’s wrong? Each of these scholars feels that he or she is most competent to contribute his or her expertise to this most controversial field of literature. As for the panacea of "true wide-spread citizen participation" the problem still remains to be solved. The question is: Who will and how will it be solved? A review of how the concept of "citizen participation" has been defined and practiced in three types of Federal programs will come to grips in part with this question next in the study.

**Development of Citizen Participation In Federal Urban Programs**

The evolution of the current demand for administrative decentralization and new forms of representation may be traced through the development of citizen participation requirement in a series of Federal programs aimed at the physical and social renewal of urban areas. Beginning with the urban renewal efforts of the 1950's, the inner city became the target of massive physical redevelopment. This was followed by a series of attempts to achieve social renewal of slum areas through the programs spawned by the President's Council on Juvenile Delinquency, the Ford Foundation's Opportunity Act. The most recent attempt--the Model Cities Program--is a synthesis of the experiences generated by these earlier programs.

**Urban Renewal**

In urban renewal programs, for example, the concept of citizen
participation was originally interpreted to mean the involvement of
civic leaders in an advisory capacity to the local planning agency.
However, after the passing of time, the concept began to include the
activities of ordinary citizens in quite different roles. The variety
of meanings of citizen participation in urban renewal may be under-
stood by a typology that distinguishes between two aspects of partici-
pation: the range of citizenry involved and the focus of their partici-
pation.

In some programs participation by citizens was defined as involv-
ing civic leaders plus those citizens who were immediately affected by
the renewal. Most often, policy implementation by an "elite coalition"
was the original working concept of citizen participation in urban
renewal programs.

This definition met the requirements of the "workable program"
which demanded only the existence of a community-wide committee,
containing at least one representative of each civic group interested in
the program. This type of participation stresses the values of coopera-
tion, education, and consensus; it rather clearly implies that what is
crucial is the harmonious realization of the renewal plans as drawn up
by experts. ¹

Goal displacement in the program reflects the effect of the "elite
coalition." The legislation embodied two potentially conflicting goals;
the redevelopment of the center city and the provision of low cost

¹ Van Til, Jon and Van Til, Sally Bould, "Citizen Participation
in Social Policy: The End of the Cycle," The Society for the Study of
housing. It appears that the former goal has been given higher priority; the elite coalition has had its way. The latter has been given very little attention, since to date urban renewal has destroyed far more low-income housing than it has built.

This is due in part to the fact that the coalition often yielded to the "politics of renewal"; where competition for the scarce values of land use is concerned, the conflicting interest of political elites are often manifested. Citizen participation in the politics of renewal means little more than the struggle for control of renewal planners among competing political elites. The politics of renewal shows more than the inescapability of political conflict in renewal; it also reveals how far from the interests of those citizens whose lives are touched by renewal plans are concepts of citizen participation that make room for elites only.

The best studies of renewal politics (Rossi & Dentler, 1961:287; Meyerson and Banfield, 1964; Kaplan, 1963) demonstrate that the big decisions in renewal are made at supra-neighborhood levels and that non-elite participation in renewal conflict is often passive in nature. Gradually, renewal programs elicited the participation of citizens directly affected by the plans. Such "pluralist participation" say non-elites organizing to gain access to decisions formerly made by elites; it also took the form in most cases of opposing the renewal of their neighborhood. As citizens learned of renewal experiences in other areas of their city, they became more likely to organize to meet programs proposed for their community. The first encounter between citizens and the elite coalition tended to produce an easy win for the
latter—as in Lake Meadows in Chicago, The West End in Boston, and Kips Bay and Stuyvesant in New York. As the opposition became more organized, however, delays were won in implementation, and sometimes a veto was achieved.¹

The negative consequences of the involvement of non-elites as veto groups in the renewal process, coupled with the attractiveness of the idea of the participation of non-elites, have led to the development of citizen participation where non-elites serve as "citizen advisors." Such involvement may range from the merest leg-work of collecting an audience for a meeting to a rather full participation in the planning of the project itself.

Community Action Program

Most broadly, the Community Action Program, one of many programs developed as part of President Johnson's "War on Poverty", began on the same optimistic note as the renewal program did. This particular poverty program was seeking to develop a role called citizen advisors for the non-elite or poor. Community Action was designed to rehabilitate people rather than buildings. Its aim was to get the poor involved—somehow.

The primary intention of the program, which was generally interpreted as involving the poor in a largely administrative role, was short lived, if in fact it existed in large cities. The citizens who participated often became involved in ideological issues more quickly than they became involved in renewal issues. This defeated the pur-

¹Ibid., p. 375.
pose of the required citizen participation. In addition, the legislative intent was very vague and two new conceptions of non-elite participation emerged. One concept was that the poor should have an influential, if not controlling, voice in the administration of their program. The other was that the poor should be given a chance to deal with political as well as administrative questions. This was almost revolutionary since the poor had never been given credit of having the expertise regarding the area of their own experience.

This new concept of citizen participation dealt with non-elite only. Their administrative focus was labeled "client participation" and its political focus was "grassroot participation."

The overall intent of the poverty program being largely administrative implies that the innovative potential of such participation was originally seen in the form of "client participation," the structure of which was defined by Frank Riessmann. Here the emphasis was placed upon organizing and directing the demands of the poor toward the institutions more responsive to their poor clients. The clients become a "third force"; the model maintains the need for the direct involvement of the poor in helping themselves while also seeking to meet the O.E.O. directive of a "quiet revolution."¹

This type of participation was not accepted by the middle-class professionals who ran the service agencies, nor was it acceptable to city hall nor to the radical organizations nor their organizers, who had even more ambitious plans for the poor.

¹Ibid., p. 317.
Therefore, it is not surprising that the poverty programs became embroiled in political questions, at both the elite and the non-elite levels. Traditionally, political elites did not initiate poverty programs. However, there are a few exceptions such as Mayor Daley of Chicago and Mayor Shelley of San Francisco, who did in fact do so. Nevertheless, when the authority of the elites was challenged by grassroot participation or, as was more likely, by aspiring leaders of ethnic groups heretofore excluded from power in the pluralist polity, many more mayors and other local political elites quickly became involved.

The nature of the concerns of local elites was clarified at the Mayor's Conference in 1965. While their proposed resolution blamed the participation of the poor for "fostering class struggle," they were in fact aware that the real threat came not from the poor themselves, but from leaders who utilized the participation of the poor in their bid for power through ethnic politics. As Mayor Shelley of San Francisco astutely noted, "The poverty program has the political potential for setting up a great political organization."\(^1\)

Thus, the leadership of the black community, which had emerged in the civil rights struggle, was quick to demand a central role for the poor, and these black leaders were prepared to represent their interest. A large proportion of other ethnic groups found in the ranks of the poor also requested greater representation. As their new leaders came into power, they too recognized that the organization of the poor was very important. Their aim for this organization was directed toward boost-

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 318.
ing the mobility of individuals aspiring to be elites rather than the creation of powerful indigenous organizations among the poor themselves.

In the area of practical application, this new revolutionary concept of non-elite participation failed. Faced with these forces the poverty program retreated to modes involving more traditional participation of both elites and non-elites. "The Green Amendment," placing the final power in the hands of traditional political elites, as well as the new challenges to old leadership within the ethnic groups, have both contributed to this situation; the poor seeing little in the program to help them, lose interest. Generally, enough pressure remains in the program to provide some services. Thus, the program old and weary becomes depoliticized.¹

In the poverty programs, the involvement of the poor, once the subject of strong O.E.O. directives, is limited to individuals who are either hired by the program or "representatives" chosen by it. Again the power to propose is guarded by elites; non-elites may merely accept or reject what is offered them.

Model Cities Program

The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 was acclaimed as the capstone to all previous federal urban legislation. Spawned as the brainchild of a 1965 Presidential Task Force on Urban Problems, under the leadership of Robert C. Wood, the Act committed the Model Cities Program to a significant reduction of all urban pathologies and reiterated most of the unfulfilled promises of
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past legislation. However, the unique and most candid assertion of the Wood Task Force was that past programs themselves had been a significant factor contributing to the present "urban crisis." A chaotic grant-in-aid system, involving well over four hundred separate categorical grant programs, had resulted, according to the Task Force, in Federal urban programs which encouraged agency imperialism and fragmented local government. This situation was viewed as contributing to the failure to deal with the paramount need to achieve comprehensive well coordinated service delivery systems and to an agency structure which was highly resistant to changes demanded by both city hall and neighborhood residents.

The remedies offered by the Model Cities program placed primary emphasis on the general objectives of "institutional change" and the program was more oriented to the task of restructuring the way in which the Federal government, cities, and neighborhoods conducted their public business than to the specific content of any particular policy area. The key provisions of the Model Cities approach included: block grants to overcome the difficulties imposed by categorical funding and to offer city hall an opportunity to exert executive leadership; special funds for planning and other program devices aimed at improving the coordination of service deliver systems; and a target area approach, including widespread citizen participation, to insure the program's responsiveness to neighborhood needs. Thus, the three major objectives of past attempts at administrative reform--executive leadership, bureaucratic competence, and governmental responsiveness--which before had appeared as singular goals, were now combined into an overall strategy for institutional change.
The primary local mechanism for pursuing the Model Cities grand strategy of institutional change was a newly created City Demonstration Agency (CDA). Not a line agency, the major role of the CDA was defined as planning and coordinating the city's comprehensive program. In practice, it was positioned at the center of an incredibly complex decision-making system, which required that citizens, agencies, and city hall participate fully in the development of the plan. Through a system of successive approvals or "sign-offs", the rights and privileges of each major participant were to be protected and the comprehensive plan was to emerge from the complex process of bargaining and negotiation. The primary mission of the CDA became one of performing a brokerage function aimed at negotiating some form of cooperation between target area residents, city hall, and local agencies.¹

The "process view" which emerged had important implications for the Model Cities approach to citizen participation. Of foremost importance was the attempt of HUD to place citizen participation somewhere between the token role it played in early urban renewal and the rather exclusive attention it received in the Community Action Program. Hence, the term "maximum feasible participation" was diluted to "widespread involvement" and "maximum opportunities for employment" and final authority for the program was clearly vested

in city government. Yet, a number of citizen rights eventually were stated formally in terms of the following performance standards:

(1) . . . there must be some form of organizational structure, existing or newly established, which embodies neighborhood residents in the process of policy and program planning and program implementation and operation . . .

(2) . . . the leadership of that structure must consist of persons whom neighborhood residents accept as representing their interests.

(3) The structure must have sufficient information about any matter to be decided for a sufficient period of time . . .

(4) . . . the structure must have the technical capacity for making knowledgeable decisions . . . some form of professional technical assistance, in a manner agreed to by neighborhood residents.

(5) . . . financial assistance . . . should be extended to neighborhood residents to assure their opportunity to participate.

(6) Neighborhood residents will be employed in planning activities and in the execution of the program. . . 1

While many ambiguities are concealed in these "standards", HUD took great pains to begin the difficult process of clarifying the meaning of citizen participation. Yet, they managed to avoid the overkill strategy of using prescriptive citizen participation guidelines as a battering ram against city hall.

Despite the many efforts of HUD to reaffirm its position that final authority was vested in city hall, the neighborhoods read the guidelines differently. In nearly every city the issue of citizen participation

---

participation—the assertion that neighborhood residents should control the program—became the object of a vigorous struggle for power. The role HUD played in these struggles varied from city to city and substantial ambiguity surrounded its position during the program's formative period. At an early point, H. Ralph Taylor stated flatly that the right of citizens "to participate in and influence the development of plans that will affect their lives is no longer a debatable question." Later, in Technical Assistance Bulletin #3, HUD advised that demands from militant organizations for exclusive control could not be abided, but added that,

... The demand for control often can best be understood as a demand for guarantees that residents have particular rights and responsibilities in the policy determination, planning and execution of a Model Cities program. These guarantees will normally take the form of fixed rule and procedure, like a partnership agreement, which are fair and readily understandable, which provide that the residents have a voice in the determination of the rules, and which ensure that the rules remain unchanged unless the residents participate in the process of change.

The same Technical Assistance Bulletin also added to H. Ralph Taylor's acceptance of citizen rights per se two other objectives of

---


citizen participation:

... the best intentioned officials and technicians are often, by their training, experiences and styles, unfamiliar with or even insensitive to the problems and aspirations of model neighborhoods; therefore, resident ideas and priorities can result in more relevant, sensitive, and effective plans and programs.

... the process of participation makes it possible for those citizens formally outside the system to learn how it functions and how to make it function in their interests ...

Additionally, HUD explained its insistence on a "partnership" by stating that,

It is clear that citizen organizations cannot alone plan and carry out a broad program like Model Cities, that necessarily involves the authority and responsibility to govern. It is equally clear that local government must develop new relationships with and responsiveness to people in the neighborhoods if it is to meet effectively their needs, and if neighborhood residents are to benefit as people and grow in their capacity to function as citizens. 

Thus, HUD managed to incorporate nearly every version of citizen participation—even the Alinsky model has received at least one instance of de facto acceptance—into a package of administrative and institutional reform.

The Nixon administration has revised the previous administration's interpretation of citizen participation to place even heavier emphasis on the final authority of city hall; less stress has been

---

1 Ibid., p. 2.
2 Ibid.,
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placed on the partnership notion; no mention is made of any citizen role in policymaking, coordination or implementation; and cities are now being encouraged to provide representation to citywide interests. ¹ When one mayor sent his citizens home following Secretary Romney's early indication that change was in the air, HUD officials felt this was too drastic a move. However, HUD did attempt to alter significantly Philadelphia's First Year Action Plan without involving the citizen structure in the negotiation process. At this point, the citizens have won a temporary restraining order from Federal Appeals Court, preventing alterations in the plan, which were produced without their consent.²

While no empirical studies are available since the issuance of CDA #10, it is not known whether the recent policy changes will in fact alter the role of citizens in Model Cities programs. If we were to project from those experiences which have been reported, substantial change would appear doubtful. Although the studies completed thus far report a wide range of local patterns, they also report that the most significant variable appears to be the state of neighborhood organization which was achieved in past citizen participation efforts.³ In virtually every case, past experiences had a


²The Court's opinion, however, does not deal with CDA Letter #10 since these policy statements were issued after the case had been argued, North Area Council, Inc. et. al., vs Romney, et. al., U. S. Court of Appeals for the Third District, No. 18466.

³May, Morton, Sundquist, op cit.
cumulative impact on the sophistication, organization, and political
power of citizens and in every reported case, citizens played a some-
what stronger role in Model Cities than in its predecessor, Community
Action Program. It is also evident that HUD's process orientation and
concern for the needs of both public officials and citizens have pro-
duced a firm base of support for the program. Mayors, CDA direc-
tors, and others mobilized substantial support for the program when
its future under the Nixon administration appeared uncertain.¹ There-
fore, it seems plausible to conclude that citizen participation in public
programs has become firmly planted in contemporary administrative
doctrine. Finally, the accuracy of Roland Warren's observation
that most urban neighborhoods have within them "a powerful movement
for neighborhood control that already (has) a dynamic of its own that
(is) immeasurably more powerful than the spurt which could be given
by any governmental program and (can) not be contained by any such
program"² has not been challenged.

Degrees of Citizen Participation
Sherry Arnstein in her article, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation,"
states that citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen
power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not
citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes,

¹Judson James, "Federalism and the Model Cities Program"
(paper delivered to the Annual Meeting of the American Political
Science Association, Los Angeles, California, September 8-12, 1970),
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to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which
the have-nots have in determining how information is shared, goals
and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are
operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out. ¹

To help clarify the picture on this confused issue, I will at this
point attempt to present a typology of eight levels of participation
which was also taken from the same article by Sherry Arnstein. Also,
I used this typology as a guide for gathering data in defense of the
hypotheses postulated in this study. From this scale I was able to
solicit opinions, identify attitudes, priorities, and relationships
within and toward the program by the Model Cities representatives and
the Board of Commissioners. Sherry Arnstein describes her typology
as follows: "For purposes of illustration, the eight types of participa-
tion are arranged in the pattern of a ladder with each rung or step
corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in determining the end
product.²

1. **Manipulation** - This rung exemplifies the type of citizen participa-
tion wherein members of advisory committees or boards simply rubber
stamp proposals and/or other documents. Citizens are placed on these
committees for the express purpose of "educating" them or engineering
their support.

"Grassroot" involvement is required by federal guidelines, but
in actuality it is the officials who persuade and advise the citizens, not

²Ibid., p. 217.
the reverse. A typical example can be described as: a team of planners (physical, social, and economic) propose at a meeting the possibility of having a multi-service center which would be the "umbrella" agency for doctors from the health department, workers from the welfare department and specialists from the employment commission. The concept appears to be good and so the citizens sign the proposal which must be submitted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare within the following two days.

Although the concept appears to be good, the chicanery to the whole game is that the signators have been tricked into signing a $2 million proposal for a center that will only refer residents to the same waiting lines at the same old agencies. It has also been overlooked by the grassroots that the contractor for the new building is the mayor's brother-in-law.

2. Therapy - At this level citizens can be seen engaging in group sessions conducted by social workers or psychiatrists whose intentions are to cure the citizens of their pathologies instead of changing the racism and victimization that created and perpetuated the pathologies.

In public housing programs, 'tenant groups are used as vehicles for promoting control-your-child or cleanup campaigns. Tenants meet with residence advisors who use the meetings to urge the residents to adapt their attitudes and values to those of the larger society; pressing matters, such as arbitrary evictions, segregation of the housing project, and lengthy delays in having broken fixtures repaired somehow are never discussed.

\[1\] Ibid., p. 219.
3. **Informing** - Acquainting citizens with their rights, responsibilities, and alternatives can be advantageous to good citizen participation. If this is to be effective, the channel of communication must not be emphasized by a one-way flow of information—from officials to citizens—with no channel provided for feedback and no power of negotiation. It is under these conditions that people are given the necessary information at a late stage which causes them to have very little impact in the planning of programs designed for their benefit.

Meetings are also used as vehicles for one-way communication by providing superficial information, discouraging questions, or giving irrelevant answers.  

4. **Consultation** - This rung which is similar to informing is only beneficial if citizens' concerns and ideas are put into practice. Attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings are some of the most frequent methods used for consulting people. If these methods are not combined with other modes of participation, then this type of participation is still a sham because the citizens can not rest assured that their concerns will be taken into account.

When powerholders restrict the input of citizens' ideas solely to this level, participation remains just a window-dressing ritual. People are primarily perceived as statistical abstractions and participation is measured by how many come to meetings, take brochures home, or answer a questionnaire. What citizens achieve in all this activity is that they have "participated in participation." And what powerholders achieve is the evidence that they have gone through the

---

1Ibid., p. 219.
required motions of involving "those people."

5. **Placation** - At this level, participants begin to have some influence. An example of placation would be the selection and appointment of handpicked persons to decision-making bodies, such as the Board of Education, Police Commission, and Housing Commission. If the power elite constitute the majority of votes or if members do not relate to the needs of their constituency, the have-nots have no recourse.

In the Model Cities Program, planning committees continuously advise and plan, but the decision of legitimacy and practicality is determined by the decision-making board.

The extent to which participants are propitiated depends on the quality of expertise in verbalizing their priorities, and the extent to which the community is adamant in demanding that action be taken toward their priorities.

Some consider many of the Model Cities Programs to be at the placation level, and the manner in which the guidelines were established, citizen power is stifled. All Model Cities' grants must be channeled through the local governing body, thus giving the local executive final veto power over planning and programming.

6. **Partnership** - At this level power has been redistributed between citizens and powerholders through an agreement to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses.

---

1. Ibid.
Once by-laws are established, one factor does not attempt to usurp the other.

This type of participation is most effective when citizen leaders are responsive to a power base in the community; when participants are paid (either in money or recognition) for the time and effort expended; and when participants can hire their own technical assistants.

7. **Delegated Power** - At this level, citizens have achieved dominant control in the decision-making over the programs which makes the programs definitely accountable to them. "Model Cities policy boards delegate agencies on which citizens have a clear majority of seats and genuine specified powers are typical examples. At this level, the ladder has been scaled to the point where citizens hold the significant cards to assure accountability of the programs to them."

Another example of delegated power is separate and parallel groups of citizens and powerholders with provision for citizen veto if differences of opinion cannot be resolved through negotiations.

8. **Citizen Control** - At this level, citizens have full power over the management of a program or institution. No one in the nation has complete control, however, at this level "people are simply demanding that degree of power (or control) which guarantees that participants or residents can govern a program or an institution, be in full charge of policy and managerial aspects, and be able to negotiate the conditions under which "outsiders" may change them.

---

1. Ibid., p. 222.
2. Ibid.
As I stated earlier in the introduction, this ladder was used by the writer in designing a questionnaire to test hypotheses involving perceptions of citizen participation between the two groups. Since the review of literature has disclosed that there are significant differences between community influentials and grassroots in the degree to which they perceive citizens to participate in the decision and policy-making process, I have proposed three hypotheses in an attempt to deal with these matters effectively. The following are the hypotheses that will be tested for perceptions and significant differences.

1. The rate of agreement among the Board of Commissioners' perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the top of the ladder to the bottom of the ladder of citizen participation.

2. The rate of agreement among Model Cities Joint Council's perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the bottom of the ladder to the top of the ladder of citizen participation.

3. There should be no significant differences between the Board and Council at the higher level of the ladder, as to whether each regard citizen participation as appropriate.

There are various reasons why the members of the Joint Council decided to become involved in the Model Cities Program. Many of the members were motivated to become involved because of the financial gains they could achieve. Some were motivated because they had witnessed the success of the Model Cities Program and wanted to become a part of it. Others saw the Program as being an avenue for future political aspiration.

But one interesting thing is, after they became involved in the Program because of whatever incentive, they continued to participate...
beyond the time period for which there was an incentive to participate. As an example, the members were paid for attending only up to eight (8) meetings per month. If they attended more than eight, they were not compensated for them. This happened to many of the members on the Council because many times some of the members served on more than one planning committee. Surprisingly, this ruling did not hamper the participation of many of the members because most of them became so involved with their activities until they were willing to sacrifice pay for the extra meetings. To reinforce what I am attempting to test in hypothesis four (4) the writer would like to reinforce a passage in Chapter 1, paragraph 2—the effect of participation is cumulative—the more the individual participates, the more likely he is to acquire the skills which are necessary for effective participation; and the more his participation pays off the more likely he will be to continue to participate. The key requirement for maintaining this cycle of learning is reinforcement, the participation must be effective—it must provide rewards which the individual considers valuable.

My main concern here is in ascertaining an explanation for participation by council members in various aspects of the Program and continued participation beyond the time period for which there was an incentive to participate. Therefore, I have proposed the following hypothesis:

4. Among Joint Council members there is a relationship between participation and satisfaction such that the higher the degree of participation experienced, the greater the degree of satisfaction both with that participation and with the Model Cities Program generally.
1. Participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity experienced in the Model Cities Program.

2. The greater the number of planning groups the citizens participated on, the greater the satisfaction with the overall Program and certain aspects of the Program.

3. The more activities experienced in the Model Cities Program, the greater the degree of overall satisfaction with the Program and with aspects of the Program.

The analysis and discussion of the results from the questionnaire will be discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER III

METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

The research will consist of two parts. The first part will be a narrative history of citizen participation in the Genesee County Model Cities Program over a four year period. The second part will include the reporting of the empirical data and the testing of four hypotheses concerning citizen participation.

The documents used for the narrative history are numerous. The major sources were the documents of "Continuing Plans," submitted to the various levels of government annually. These documents give an account of the progress of the Program on a yearly basis. Other data were obtained from newspaper clippings, reports, surveys, and participant observation. The narrative history is essentially chronological. It commences with the planning stage of the Program and proceeds through the Third Action Year.

The two samples surveyed for the second part of the research consisted of elected officials and grassroot people from the City of Flint and the County of Genesee who were involved in the Model Cities Program.

The first sample for this research is composed of the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council. This group was selected because they are the "elected" neighborhood representatives who are charged with the responsibility of asserting the views and concerns of the total Model Neighborhood. (See Appendix I for Joint Council Organizational Structure.)
The questionnaire was initially passed out to council members at one of the regular Joint Council Meetings. Members who were not present at that meeting were later contacted by phone to solicit their cooperation in the completion of the form. To encourage the cooperation of the council members, the writer made home calls when requested.

Fifty-six (56) of the seventy-five (75) elected council members were contacted or administered a questionnaire. Thirty-seven (37) responded. It is felt by the writer that the reason for this seemingly low rate of participation is because approximately nine (9) to ten (10) people were no longer participating in the Program. A major factor for their leaving the Program was the moratorium which had been placed on lost-time pay employment for those members who had to attend to Model Cities business during working hours. The moratorium occurred at that time because the Program was in the process of going through budget analysis for the following year.

The second sample, the Genesee County Board of Commissioners, was selected because it is the local governing agency directly involved in the operation of the Program. Appointments with the Board members were made in order to interview them. The response from this group in filling out the questionnaire was 100%. (See Appendix 2 for Board structure. Also see Appendix 3 for Organizational Structure of the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council.)
Description of Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of items measuring three variables: perception of citizen participation, actual participation, and satisfaction. (See Appendix 4 for design of the questionnaire.) The first part—items ten (10) through thirty-nine (39)—was concerned with the ladder of citizen participation described in Chapter 2. This part of the questionnaire was administered to both the citizens and the commissioners. Its purpose was to record the perceptions of these two groups concerning the appropriate degree of citizen participation. The proposed ladder was based on an article, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", authored by Sherry Arnstein. The bottom rungs of the ladder are (1) Manipulation and (2) Therapy. These two rungs describe levels of "non-participation" that have been contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation. Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable powerholders to "educate" or "cure" the participants. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to levels of "tokenism" that allow the have-nots to hear and to have a voice: (3) Informing and (4) Consultation. When they are proffered by powerholders as the total extent of participation, citizens may indeed hear and be heard. But under these conditions they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. When participation is restricted to these levels, there is no follow-through, no "muscle," hence no assurance of changing the status quo. Rung (5) Placation, is simply a higher level of tokenism because the
ground rules allow have-nots to advise, but retain for the powerholders the continued right to decide. ¹

Further up the ladder are levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of decision-making clout. Citizens can enter into a (6) Partnership that enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional powerholders. At the topmost rungs, (7) Delegated Power and (8) Citizen Control, have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power. ²

The following items were used to operationalize each rung of the hierarchy:

**Manipulation**--This level, citizens are serving on advisory committees for purposes of rubber stamping proposals or documents.

10. Citizens should be allowed to serve on committees in an advisory capacity.

**Therapy**--This level, citizens are engaging in therapy sessions.

13. Citizen input in program planning of a project should include the opportunity to sign or approve the application.

**Informing**--This level, citizens are being informed of their rights, responsibilities, and options.

16. Citizens function best on committees when they are informed of their rights, responsibilities, and options.

19. The flow of communication between citizens and officials should be channeled in the same direction.


²Ibid.
Consultation--This level, citizens are attending neighborhood meetings and filling out questionnaires.

21. Citizens are most effective in the decision and policy-making process when they have the opportunity to attend hearings and neighborhood meetings.

Placation--This level, a few hand-picked persons are allowed to sit on decision-making bodies, such as the Board of Education.

23. Citizens should have clear and direct access to the decision-making process.

Partnership--This level, power has been redistributed between citizens and powerholders.

27. Citizens and officials should share in the planning and decision-making responsibilities on various boards.

28. Citizens should have the same degree of authority as the officials in the planning and decision-making process.

29. Citizen leaders and officials should have the same opportunity to represent their respective power bases in the community.

31. Citizens should have the opportunity to review plans before they are implemented by various governmental agencies.

32. Citizens should be allowed to hire their own technical assistants to help them in their planning of different projects.

Delegated Powers--This level, citizens have achieved dominant control over projects.

33. Citizens should have the power to veto officials' proposals if differences of opinions cannot be resolved through negotiations.

34. To assure the accountability of the programs to the citizens, the citizens should hold significant power over the powerholders.

35. Citizens should be allowed to contract with different agencies to plan and/or operate one or more decentralized neighborhood programs.

36. Citizens should have the power to help shape the rules and regulations for the administration, operation, and implementation of various programs in the community. Example - Health Center.
Citizen Control--This level, citizens have full power over the management of a program or institution.

37. Citizens should have the power to decide what programs will exist in their community. Example - Recreation Center.

38. Citizens should not have to account to public officials for various programs they initiate.

39. Citizens should have absolute control over programs or institutions in their community. Example - Headstart Program.

The second part of the questionnaire--items forty (40) through eighty (80)--was concerned with the measures of participation and satisfaction. This part of the questionnaire was administered only to the citizens. Its intent was to determine whether there was an association between the amount of participation engaged in by the citizens and amount of satisfaction received by the citizens from their participation on various planning committees and the program in general. Items forty-seven (47) through sixty-five (65) were testing the relationship between participation and satisfaction in certain activities. Items sixty-seven (67) through eighty (80) were testing the relationship between the overall participation and satisfaction in the program. Items testing the relationship between participation and satisfaction in certain activities were as follows:

47. How often did you participate on committees in an advisory capacity?

49. How often did you participate in the technical planning of projects before the signing and approval?

51. How often did you participate with officials in training sessions, designed to inform you of your rights, responsibilities and options in influencing program planning?
53. How often did you participate in the decision and policy-making process of program approval or acceptance?

55. How often did you participate in the hiring of your own technical assistants for program planning?

57. How often did you participate in the decision and policy-making process of rules and regulations governing project implementation, management, and operation?

59. How often did you participate in negotiation sessions with powerholders regarding the various projects?

61. How often did you participate in the decisions as to what programs would be allowed to operate in your community?

63. How often did you participate in decisions regarding salaries for project personnel?

65. How often did you participate in decisions regarding salaries for staff?

Items testing the relationship between the overall participation and satisfaction in the program were as follows:

67. How satisfied are you:
That the work which you did on the planning committee is in accord with the professional training and experience which you have had?

68. How satisfied are you with the progress you are making towards the goals which you set for yourself in your present position?

69. How satisfied are you with the financial incentives you received for attending meetings and etc.?

70. How satisfied are you with the professional interaction you had with your colleagues?

71. How satisfied are you with the opportunities you had for using your own skills and abilities in your work?

72. How satisfied are you with the relationship which exists between your office and other agencies?

73. How satisfied are you with the relationship which exists between you and public officials?
74. How satisfied are you with your participation in decisions affecting the course of development of the Model Cities Program?

75. How satisfied are you with your role in meeting the demands of your community?

76. How satisfied are you with your role in meeting the demands of the entire neighborhood?

77. How satisfied are you with your participation in the Model Cities Program?

78. Which of the Planning committees have you served on?

Analysis

The primary descriptive statistics used in the analysis of the data were the two sample t-test for differences in means, the Spearman Rank Order Correlation, and Yule's Q.¹ The t-test was used for testing the differences in means required by hypothesis 3. Spearman's Rank Order Correlation was used for the testing of hypotheses 1 and 2.² Yule's Q is the statistic used for testing hypothesis 4. This statistic is a nominal level measure of degree of association which is appropriate for 2 x 2 tables.³

The t-test of means for hypothesis 3 requires some explanation. For each item on the questionnaire, seven response categories were provided for the respondents. To perform the t-test on these items, means were computed for each of the items in the "ladder of citizen

---

³Blalock, Social Statistics, pp. 298-299.
participation" for both samples. The closer the mean came to one (1) for each group on the items, the stronger they were in agreement with that item. The higher the mean went over four (4) the stronger they were in disagreement. The means ranged from 1.556 to 6.077.

To provide a clearer understanding of this operation, the writer has plotted out a chart on item thirty-nine (39) explaining the operation.

The numbers on the y-axis represent the frequencies of people responding. The numbers (1-7) on the x-axis represent the number of response categories. The frequencies for both groups are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Agree strongly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree somewhat</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Disagree strongly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader will note that none of the Board members agreed that citizens should have absolute control over programs or institutions in their community, while twenty-four (24) of the citizens considered such an activity as appropriate. The mean score for the Joint Council was 3.243 and the mean score for the Board was 6.000. The t value of 5.261 is significant at the .001 level. This finding could have happened only one (1) time out of 1000 by chance. Stated another way, the difference of means between the Board and the citizens on this item is great (the actual mean difference is 2.757, which is almost 3 positions on the
seven category response scale) and is statistically different from chance. A similar analysis will be undertaken for all items in the "ladder of citizen participation."

Hypotheses 1 through 4 are described and tested in Chapter 5. The narrative history is in Chapter 4.

FIGURE 2

**t-TEST FOR MEANS FOR HYPOTHESIS 3**

--- Board Mean = 6.000  Citizen Mean = 3.243

\( t = 5.261 \quad p < .001 \)

Item: Citizens should have absolute control over programs or institutions in their community, i.e., Headstart Program

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE GENESEE COUNTY MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

The Comprehensive Demonstration Program

In April of 1967, a resolution was passed by the County Board of Supervisors (now the County Board of Commissioners) authorizing the Genesee County Planning Commission to prepare an application for a planning grant to finance the planning and developing of a Comprehensive Demonstration Program (C.D.P.). The application was prepared and submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The sum requested was $200,000.1

As fate would have it, in November of 1967 HUD dropped Flint from the list of First Round Cities because Flint/Genesee County's initial application was not successful in obtaining a planning grant. Shortly after being dropped from first round consideration, local officials refused to accept this rejection or denial by HUD. After requesting the Federal government to reconsider their application, the Genesee County Planning Commission began feverish activity and, as a result, they were approved for a planning grant in April of 1968.

Consequently, Flint's Comprehensive Demonstration Program became known as a "round and a half city" due to the delay in the approval of the application. Even though Flint started six months later than the other cities, the time constraints with which they had to comply were similar to those for cities presenting the first year action plan.

Before comprehensive planning could begin, a staff had to be recruited, a site office acquired, and area residents actively involved in the development of a work program. Placing things in their proper perspective, the new Comprehensive Demonstration Agency Director felt that the location of an office as close to the people that would be represented was number one on the list of priorities. In May of 1968, 5903 North Saginaw (the present site) was selected. The office opened its doors with little or no fanfare, equipped with only two pop cases for chairs and a borrowed table and typewriter stand as furniture.

The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 required that the Program provide for "Widespread Citizen Participation" in the planning and implementation process. So, although the government of Genesee County has the ultimate responsibility for carrying out the program, there was also a clear mandate from HUD to involve citizens in the program at all levels. This mandate, being a prerequisite to the program, began with a conviction that only through true citizen participation could there be a successful implementation of
goals as outlined in the 1966 Act. Unfortunately, HUD provided no suggestions as to appropriate organizational structures for accomplishing the goal of citizen participation. These had to be developed locally.

To develop the ideal organizational pattern designed to accomplish this objective, a direct channel for dialogue through numerous neighborhood and block club meetings was established. The meetings were designed to make it possible for everyone to be heard on the question of the organizational structure for citizen participation. Key individuals in various communities were found by the staff, with the assistance of community school directors, PTA’s, and the City of Flint’s Community Action Agency--COMPACT. Contacts of all kinds were made in the neighborhood centers of activity, such as pool rooms, card rooms, street corner hang-outs, and so-called black militant club rooms.

Numerous meetings were held in convenient locations for the residents of the Model Neighborhood to enhance their knowledge about the goals and purposes of the Program. For further clarification of the Program, the residents were provided visual aids such as maps, fact sheets and maps.

The citizens' opinions and suggestions were sought out and adopted

---


2Matlock and Roland, op. cit., p. 4.
by the CDA staff. In relation to the structure of the Citizen Council and the Policy Committee, the following methods were unanimously adopted at the three mass meetings:

1. That the election method would be used to implement "citizen participation."

2. That the Model Neighborhood would be broken down into precincts small enough to be truly representative.

3. That one resident from each precinct would be elected to represent each district.

4. That no precinct would be larger than 700 persons.

5. That youth representation would be elected at-large from the total area.

After the organization of the Council and the assignments of task forces, the next item on the list of priorities was to deal with the problems, causes, objectives, and broad goals for correcting the urban ills.

It was acknowledged at the inception of the Program that technical assistance would be necessary for the interpretation of the HUD guidelines and also to provide the citizens with the support needed to qualify them for future supplemental funding. (The First Action Year funds were being used at this time for the implementation of projects and administration.) Many things were done concurrently because of the need to move rapidly in the development of a C.D.P. A realistic target date of December, 1968 had been set for the submission of data.

---

1Ibid.  
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for Program Analysis of Part I of a three-part submission; January, 1969 for submission of Part II, the five-year plan containing projects and activities for achievement of long-range goals; and March, 1969 for the submission of Part III of the First Year Action Projects. The target dates were a little unrealistic and the matter was further confused because HUD changed its guidelines and there were changes in political leadership at both the local and the national levels. Because 1968 was an election year there was much concern about the possible attitude of the new administration towards social programs initiated under the administration of the Democrats. In spite of these complications, Genesee County was able to submit their Comprehensive Demonstration Plan in June, 1969. After being scrutinized through the channels of review, conferences, changes, misunderstandings, and confrontation, approval of the First Action Year supplemental funding in the amount of $3.5 million was received in November, roughly five months after submission. During this waiting period, staff and citizens were actively involved in tooling up for the implementation year which did not begin until March, 1970.

Aside from all the other "ups and downs" the program was incurring during this particular time, one thing occurred that they had not planned on---the withdrawal of one of the local units of government from the area. The Model Cities originally consisted of parts of Mt. Morris Township, Genesee Township, and the City of Flint.
Originally, the Model Cities population was surveyed as having 36,080 residents within its boundaries. According to the 1960 census, this figure constituted 11.4 percent of the total Genesee County population. Lost via the Mt. Morris withdrawal were 3,740 residents (1,000 families at 3.4 persons per family or 11 percent of the neighborhood area). See Appendix 5 for map of area).

Although Mt. Morris Township was included in the planning grant application, they refused vehemently to pass a resolution to remain as continuous participants in the Program after the first year. When I say "they," I am referring to the members of the Township Board. Let it be known that there were some members who saw the program as being very beneficial to their area. Unfortunately, these members did not constitute the majority. There were seven members on the Township Board, however, only six actually were present at the time of the vote on the issue. Had all members been present, the Chairman could have voted to break a tie, if a tie occurred. When it came time to vote, one of the members who was known to favor the Program left the meeting and went downstairs to engage in other activities. This left an uneven number of board members eligible to vote and automatically eliminated the chance of the Chairman having to break the tie. It was widely known that the Chairman's vote would have been "aye" had he had a chance to cast it. As the game of politics would have it, the final tally was 3-2 against continued participation in the Program.
and the forfeiture of $700,000 which had been allocated for them during the year.

There were several reasons why some board members did not want their township to participate and the effects that they had on the area. Some members felt that the resolution calling for participation was "loosely drawn." They feared the passage would delegate power to Model Cities which they were not ready to relinquish. The members also foresaw the decisions that would be rendered on code enforcement for the area included in the Program (their reason for voting against participating was their belief that property standards would increase and this would require a lot of home repairs).

Although their withdrawal was not emphasized as having racial overtone, this was the feeling of quite a few people. Some felt that they really did not want the influx of the ghetto residents, because they, in turn, would foster the construction of a considerable amount of "235 Housing."¹ A sizeable amount of "235 Housing" in that area would create an overcrowding of the schools, it was felt.

The ghetto residents ended up migrating to that area anyway because private industry moved into their area and bought them out. As a result, there is a tremendous number of "235 Housing" and these

¹This type of housing is a federal housing authority mechanism for low-income housing. The Federal government pays 4 percent interest rate and the buyer pays 3 percent interest rate.
added homes have tended to produce overcrowding in the schools. Plaguing the area are all kinds of increasingly apparent social problems. Some of the major ones are the need for credit counseling and for supportive services for welfare recipients. Many of the problems these neighborhoods in Mt. Morris Township now have could have been handled had they remained in the Model Neighborhood.

As Mt. Morris residents view the progress that has been made in the Model Neighborhoods in Genesee Township and the City of Flint and compare it to what has transpired in their own area, they have begun to cry for help. They may decide to pressure the Township Board to request another chance to be re-accepted to the Program. If re-accepted, HUD could make money available to them directly or they could apply to get some of the money which will be made available at the local level through revenue sharing. Nevertheless, at this point of time, the area of Mt. Morris Township that remained out of the Model Cities Program has been relatively disadvantaged by the Township Board's decision.

First Action Year

Returning to events of 1970, however, we find that losing part of the population of the Program did not interfere with the continued progress of the Program. A citizens' staff, which was hired in February, 1970, was in full service with their assigned task of
coordinating all of the residents of the elected citizen council and area residents.

Their responsibility included overseeing community organizations, i.e., block associations, service referrals, monitoring the progress of implemented projects, and data collection. These areas of staff responsibilities are stated here in broad terms and do not reflect completely the many activities that citizens and citizen staff were engaged in at that particular time period.¹

By May of 1971 the Program had developed into a well-oiled, highly sophisticated piece of machinery unsurpassed by any program in the nation and capable of delivering a Model Neighborhood.

During the Second Action Year the staff expected the level of citizen participation to increase, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Reflecting the knowledge and experience gained during the first action year, they established that citizen participation, in order to become a meaningful force in the community, had to become a way of life. They felt that if citizen participation was seen only as a mobilization of citizen response to crisis situations, its effect would easily be frustrated by organized opposition and its real potential remains unrealized, ² and they were determined that this would not happen.

¹Ibid., p. 6.

²Genesee County Model Cities Neighborhood Staff, Citizen Participation Annual Report of the First Year Activity and Second Year Projections, March, 1971.
Through direct and significant involvement in the planning process and the decision-making process of hiring personnel, budgeting, and expenditure of funds, contract development, monitoring, and evaluation of projects, members of the citizen council during the First Action Year had learned to understand institutional and organizational apparatus to a degree that gave them confidence as they looked forward to the challenges of the Second Action Year. They had learned that citizen input goes far beyond merely listening to complicated and technical discussions and discourses on the intricate operations of governmental or other institutions. They knew by then that citizen input meant much more than merely voting "aye" to give endorsement to plans which, although developed around their ideas, may well carry built-in "self-destruct" features which would make the plans unworkable. By that time they had already witnessed the implementation of their ideas and decisions and they intended no retreat from this level of citizen participation.

The Second Action Year Plan

Citizen participation in the Second Action Year plan was built upon a sound appreciation of the difference and the relationship between short-range and long-range goals, actions, possibilities, probabilities, and potentials in setting priorities and developing programs. Through trial

\[^1\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 1.\]
and error, citizens were developing a broad view of community needs and rising above sectional or factional considerations in a tremendous effort to overcome the natural human tendency towards self-preservation and self-interest at all costs.

They developed a commitment based on these principles:

1. The Model Cities Program is the first government approved and sponsored program which requires "citizen participation"--and because it does, elaborate machinery has been set up to meet that requirement. They are the nuts-and-bolts of that machinery.

2. In this program, citizens have been given a "monumental task--to learn how to participate, while at the same time, to produce results." For the most part, in Flint, that task has been performed admirably up to this point. Now, however, both the learning and the product on processes are ready to move into other levels--still simultaneously.

3. Each member of the Joint Council carries both authority and responsibility. This authority lies in the power to make decisions to determine the WHAT, HOW AND FOR WHOM MILLIONS OF DOLLARS SHALL BE SPENT.1

This responsibility is a formidable one--to make sure that their decisions result in concrete gains for the total community.

This commitment had been carried forward during the First Action Year in their efforts to assist other neighborhood organizations in the planning and implementation of programs. Close liaison with Martin-Jefferson Urban Renewal Council, which covers an area lying completely within the Model Cities area, has resulted in cooperative

---

1Ibid., p. 2.
and realistic planning which will continue in future years.\footnote{Ibid., p. 2.}

References to their interest and involvement in Model Cities programming by candidates for political office in the 1970 elections pointed up the importance of citizen participation in training candidates for public office as well as providing them with evidence that they were experienced in the planning and implementing of systems for delivery of valuable programs for their community. It was expected that closer cooperation between elected officials and Model Cities participants on all levels would reduce the feelings of isolation which had, at an early date in the Program, encumbered efforts to improve the quality of life of the Model Neighborhood residents.\footnote{Ibid.}

It was anticipated that a Model Cities election would be held early in the Second Action Year. There had been a delay in establishing election criteria and completing the election plan while the comprehensive community organization program was being developed.\footnote{Ibid.}

The original drawing of the neighborhood boundaries ignited many problems because the lines cut through some elementary school districts in the area. Many attempts were made to make the Model Cities boundaries co-terminal with the elementary school districts. The Joint Council spent many hours in an attempt to evaluate the value of
defining boundaries which would encompass the entire school district.
The members felt it would help the residents of the school districts
to participate in the Program if meetings could be held in the elementary schools. They finally settled on school district boundaries.

We have just had a brief look at the projections of the second year. Now we will take a brief look to see if the citizens were able to successfully fulfill these plans which would enable them to go on with the third year projections.

Second Action Year

During the second year, the Program clearly departed from the earlier urban planning practices of federal and local agencies in regard to citizen participation. The Genesee County Model Cities Program clearly demonstrated the value of, indeed the necessity for, citizen participation at all levels of planning and implementation processes. Having recognized the necessity of providing adequate technical assistance, i.e., staff, consultants, and resources from the community, they were able to demonstrate that "wide-spread citizen participation" was possible without hampering the process of "improving the quality of life" for Model Cities residents.¹

The citizen organization, having built in an effective monitoring
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process during the Second Action Year, was better able to assess project activity and its relation to strategy. Well defined strategy and good baseline data made evaluation a much more simple process.

Having recognized early in the Second Action Year that some of the projects were not meeting the goals, as outlined in the Contract Scope of Services, several decisions to terminate projects or to re-program resources were made by the citizens' organization.¹

Their major objective during the Second Action Year was a redefinition of the goals and objectives of the Genesee County Model Cities Program. This objective was accomplished.

**Resident Involvement**

The Education and Leisure Time Planning Group went into the broader community holding meetings in such places as neighborhood schools and project sites. This process enabled the members to better reflect the attitudes, concerns and priorities of the community for use in their planning process. The Health, Welfare and Aging Planning Group, through its Aging Sub-Committee was successful in organizing the elderly residents of the area and continued with plans for programs and projects designed to improve the quality of life for senior citizens. Pre-application for funds to develop a "Senior

¹Ibid.
Citizens Center" as a part of the Third Action Year was made to various State Departments.

A portion of each Joint Council meeting was set aside to allow area residents (non-elected) to address the Council on issues that they felt should have been given gross consideration and study. As a result, the Council was able to identify several problems of the community which could be resolved with limited resources and direct action. Attendance at meetings was consistently high. Usually there were always sixty to seventy-five members in attendance.

Community Organization and Training

During the First Action Year it was clear to all concerned that enough was not being done to effectively involve the total community in the planning process. As a consequence, this could possibly result in plans totally unacceptable to the community that was being represented. Based on the statement that "a depressed community--especially one in which the majority of residents are non-white--needs and deserves 'compensatory clout' in the established systems beyond the force of its members, if the gaps in quality of life of its residents are to be closed." Therefore, during the Second Action Year, thousands of

---

dollars were spent on community organization and training programs for the residents.

These sessions were geared toward providing training and technical assistance to working teams within the formal structure of the program which would lead to the planning and implementation of Community Organization strategies. They also held workshops and training sessions which would provide the background for developing Community Organization work teams by heightening awareness and skills related to positive self-concept, interpersonal communication, group processes, personal and group goal-setting, constructive conflict management and the need for trust, collaboration and win-win deals.  

Monitoring Teams

A new monitoring of projects system was implemented during the Second Action Year. To have an effective monitoring system, teams were set up which consisted of four to five members from each planning group. These teams were responsible for their respective projects on a monthly basis.

As a result of this project, citizens were better equipped to evaluate programs that were actually providing the intended services to the community and those that were not. Also, it was a major help

---
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to the operating agencies, since these teams provided them with information with which to measure their effectiveness and impact of their services to the community.

The most important impact this monitoring produced was that citizens were able to identify problems that developed in projects sooner than they would have normally, and this knowledge enabled them to develop sub-strategies to deal with those particular problems much earlier and more successfully. This technique, incidentally, caused citizen participation to progress to its highest level—citizens not only participated in the planning process, but they went a step further when they were allowed to evaluate the work they had done, and the consequence of the projects they had initiated.¹

Election

During the Spring of 1971, the election of council members to represent the 36,000 residents of the area was held. Fifty-six adults and nineteen youths were elected council members.

Residents aging from fifteen years of age and older were eligible to vote. Due to a very successful campaign strategy waged by the residents in publicizing the election, over 3,000 area residents voted. This reflected a 100 percent increase over the participation in the first election which was held in 1968. It is expected that the amount of

¹Ibid.
participation will be even higher in the next election which will be held during April of 1973.

Shortly after the Joint Council was reorganized, the members were quickly involved in training and organizational development activities. These activities focused on orientating newly elected members to the planning process and they also explained what their roles and responsibilities would be during their participation in the program.

The Third Action Year

Citizen participation during the Third Action Year was built upon a framework which successfully enabled citizens to participate in all areas of the Program. The structure of citizens participation focused on specific tasks such as planning, implementing, and monitoring.¹

It became clear during the Third Action Year that the task and responsibilities of citizens must be broadened to include evaluation and continuing planning. This resulted in the creation of a new component in the Program, identified as the Human Resources Planning Committee. This committee assumed the responsibility for updating and improving the internal structure of the Model Cities Program.²

¹Genesee County Model Cities Neighborhood Staff, Citizen Participation Annual Report on the Third Year Activity and Fourth Year Projections, April, 1973.

²Ibid., p. 2.
The recommended structure evolved into a four-level process for citizen participation in the Genesee County Model Cities Program. To forge an effective partnership between the C.D.A. and the citizens, it was established that the residents of the Model Neighborhood serving in their capacity as electors would be identified as the first level of citizens' participation. The second level of citizens' participation would be the elected Joint Council representatives who serve as the Martin Council, the Dewey Council, and the Beecher Council. The third level in the process continues to be the Model Cities Policy Board, which is responsible for providing the day-to-day coordination between the C.D.A. and Citizens Staff and the Citizens Council.¹

The Policy Board and the Joint Council created and appointed functional Planning Groups and Committees and assigned elected Council members and non-elected area residents to serve on these functional Planning Groups and Committees. The fourth level of participation thus became the Planning Groups and Committees which are:²

Planning Groups

1. The Education and Early Childhood Development Planning Group. This Planning Group was responsible for the development of strategies that would insure pre-school and school age children

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
quality education and supportive social and health services through such projects as the Pre-School Program, the Home Day Care Child Care Program, the Dental Program, and a planning component designed to bring about a comprehensive early childhood center.

2. Comprehensive Health Planning Group. This Planning Group was responsible for the continuation of the development and coordination of several health projects that were implemented during the First and Second Action Years. This group exemplified its capabilities by combining various health programs under a comprehensive community health project and it also assisted in the development and submission of applications for funds to construct and implement a comprehensive family health center during the Fourth Action Year.

3. Physical Development Planning Group. This Planning Group was responsible for the development of a comprehensive Land Use Plan. This plan would be responsive to the physical development needs as expressed by program components such as the Youth Activity Center, Senior Citizens Center, Comprehensive Health Center, and the Model Cities Development Corporation which is the program's housing arm.

4. Manpower and Economic Development Planning Group. This Planning Group was responsible for the creation of jobs and
career development of neighborhood residents. Responsive strategies used for this project were C.D.A. in-house Employment Center, Occupational Opportunity Scholarship Fund, Employment for Youth Project and O.I.C. Skills Training Project and others.

5. **Leisure Time Planning Group.** This Planning Group was responsible for the development and implementation of the Senior Citizens Activity Center. This enrichment project provided recreational, social, health, and nutritional programs for the elderly. This planning group also involved itself in other problem areas such as crime and juvenile delinquency.

6. **Human Resources Planning Group.** This Planning Group was responsible for the development and implementation of all strategies in the area of community organization and training. Training programs for council members and staff in conjunction with consultants and local community resources have been one of the major concerns for this group.

**Committees**

1. **Personnel Committee.** This Committee was responsible for the completion of the Citizens' Neighborhood Staff. Areas of responsibilities were reviewing and evaluating job performances, job openings and salary recommendations.

2. **Communications Committee.** This Committee was responsible for involving itself in all areas of public information and
the coordination of information on services available through Model Cities Projects. Some of its major concerns were the production of a monthly Model Cities newspaper and a weekly Model Cities news page with a local minority newspaper.

3. **Budget and Finance Committee.** This Committee was charged with the reviewing and approving of program expenditures for citizens' participation. Such participation consisted of compensation for meeting attendance by council members, travel to conferences and seminars and reimbursement of lost wages for council members participating in the planning activities of the program.

**Summary**

A brief history of the development of citizen participation in the Genesee County Model Cities Program from the implementation year up to the Third Action Year has just been presented. Without a doubt, citizen participation has proved to be very effective in the Program and has obviously had a great deal of impact on the decision and policy-making process.

To find out the effectiveness of citizen participation during the early years of the Program, the writer will test Hypothesis Four for the relationship between participation and satisfaction during the Fourth Action Year.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Analysis and discussion of the research hypotheses developed in Chapter 2 will now be presented.

First, Second, and Third Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are as follows:

1. The rate of agreement among the Board of Commissioners' perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the top of the ladder to the bottom of the ladder of citizen participation.

2. The rate of agreement among members of the Model Cities Joint Council's perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the bottom of the ladder to the top of the ladder of citizen participation.

3. There should be no significant differences between the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council at the lower level of the ladder, but there should be significant differences between the Board and Council at the higher level of the ladder, as to whether citizen participation is appropriate.

Hypotheses 1 and 2

In order to test hypotheses 1 and 2, means were computed for the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council for their responses to the items that compose the "Ladder of Citizen Participation." These items are listed in order, from the low rung of the ladder to the high rung of the ladder, in Table 1. There were seven responses to each item: (1) agree strongly, (2) agree, (3) agree somewhat, (4) neutral, (5) disagree somewhat, (6) disagree, and (7) disagree strongly. Means
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank Ladder</th>
<th>Rank Board</th>
<th>Rank Citizen</th>
<th>Mean Board</th>
<th>Mean Citizen</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Citizen should be allowed to serve on committees in an advisory capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Citizen input in program planning of a project should include the opportunity to sign or approve the application</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Citizens function best on committees when they are informed of their rights, responsibilities and options</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>The flow of communication between citizens and officials should be channeled in both directions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>-.560</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Citizens are most effective in the decision and policy-making process when they have the opportunity to attend hearings and neighborhood meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Value</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placation (Tokenism)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Citizens should have clear and direct access to the decision-making process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.231 2.000 0.481</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Citizens and officials should share in the planning and decision-making responsibilities on various boards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.154 1.838 3.27</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Citizens should have the same degree of authority as the officials in the planning and decision-making process</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.923 2.865 3.550</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Citizen leaders and officials should have the same opportunity to represent their respective power bases in the community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.308 2.108 2.477</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Citizens should have the opportunity to review program plans before they are implemented by various governmental agencies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.385 1.833 1.416</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Citizens should be allowed to hire their own technical assistants to help them in their planning of different projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.615 2.054 3.577</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Value</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Powers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Citizens should have the power to veto officials' proposals if difference of opinions cannot be resolved through negotiations</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.923 2.222</td>
<td>5.581 p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>To assure the accountability of programs to the citizens, the citizens should hold significant power over the powerholders</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.833 2.829</td>
<td>3.545 p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Citizens should be allowed to contract with different agencies to plan and/or operate one or more decentralized neighborhood programs</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.462 1.938</td>
<td>4.093 p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Citizens should have the power to help shape the rules and regulations for the administration, operation and implementation of various programs in the community</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.308 1.730</td>
<td>4.236 p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Citizens should have the power to decide what programs will exist in their community, i.e., Recreation Center</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.615 1.556</td>
<td>5.636 p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Value</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens should have to account to public officials for various programs they initiate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.077</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens should have absolute control over programs or institutions in their community, i.e., Headstart Program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>5.261</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were computed using the values 1 through 7. The lower the value of the mean, the higher the rate of agreement among the members of a group that the activity described in the questionnaire item was appropriate for citizen participants in the Model Cities Program. Means for the Board of Commissioner, referred to as "Board" and for members of the Joint Council, referred to as "Citizens", appear in Table 1. These means are ranked for the Board and the Citizens, as well as for the ladder itself in the same table.

The rank correlation between the Board and the ladder of citizen participation was very high, \( r_s = .715 \), and it is significant at the .01 level. The Board ordered the steps in the ladder roughly in the same manner as Sherry Arnstein, with the exception of item 13. The Board must have perceived the described activity in item 13 as being some form of citizen power while Arnstein considered it "therapy." In constructing the item, this researcher apparently did not successfully promote Arnstein's idea that allowing citizens to sign an application is pretty much a sham and does not imply input by the citizens. Other departures of the Board of Commissioners from the ranking for the ladder of citizen participation are minimal. We conclude that hypothesis 1 is, therefore, confirmed.

The rank correlation between the Citizens and the ladder was not as high as that computed for the Board. The Citizens responded in a much less hierarchial fashion. Obviously, they saw the lower rungs in the ladder as being true citizen participation with no chicanery being involved. The means indicate that they agree that these are activities they should be allowed to perform. With few exceptions, they responded the same way to items at the high end of the ladder. Their ordering of
the steps does not disprove the ladder, but it did not turn out as hypothesized. The correlation between the Citizens and the ladder of citizen participation was $r_s = +.409$. Since a negative association was predicted, we must conclude that hypothesis 2 is not confirmed.

In the rank correlation comparison between the Board and the Citizens, the writer proceeded to ascertain whether both groups ordered the items in the ladder of citizen participation roughly in the same manner.

The rank order correlation is $r_s = +.59$. This is a fairly strong association between the two groups in the way they order the items.

The Citizens didn't really perceive what Arnstein was trying to assert, i.e., that some of the lower levels (Manipulation, Therapy, Informing, Consultation, and Placation) were really nonparticipatory levels, but the Board apparently did, because these are the activities which they felt the Citizens should be allowed to do. This was their "place".

**Hypothesis 3**

To test the differences between the means for the Board and the means for the Citizens, two sample t-tests for differences in means were computed, as described in Chapter 3. These t-values are reported in Table 1. The writer can state with confidence that the mean differences between the Board and the Citizens were consistent with the hypothesis postulated. The mean differences are significant almost entirely high end of the ladder.

The t-tests show that twelve (12) out of the eighteen (18) items had significant differences. Of those twelve items, eleven were classified under some heading which corresponded to a form of citizen power:
only one (13) was a non-participation item. Ten items (27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 39) were significant at $p < 0.001$. These findings could have only happened one (1) time out of 1000 by chance. One item (29) was significant at $p < 0.01$ level. This finding could have only happened one (1) time out of every 100 by chance.

Now, I will discuss the specific items. It can be clearly seen that the Board of Commissioners and the Citizens Joint Council showed no significant differences between items 10, 16, 19, 23, and 31. However, both groups agreed that citizens should be allowed to participate in these activities, i.e., the means are all between 1 and 3. It was not expected that any significant differences would be obtained at this level since four out of five of the items -- 10, 16, 19, 23 -- are on a non-participatory rung of Arnstein's ladder. At this level, one would expect for the Board to agree strongly and the Citizens to agree or agree less strongly. I might say that it does surprise the writer that item thirty-one (31) showed no significant differences between the two groups since it is classified very high on the ladder as being a form of citizen power. There is a possibility that the connotation of the word "review" might have been misinterpreted by the Board to mean something other than citizen power.

Items 13, 27, 28, 29, and 32 presented a different picture. There are significant differences between the two groups as to whether the activities involved were appropriate for Citizen participants in the Model Cities Program. The Citizens tended to agree strongly that they do, while the Board agrees only weakly, and on items 13 and 38, the Board disagrees. All of the activities came under the top three
levels of the hierarchy which corresponded to some form or degree of citizen power with the exception of item 13. Chances are that item 13 received such a high mean from Board because of the connotation of the words "sign and approve". The reason the writer mentioned this is because Arnstein ranks this activity very low on the ladder.

Items 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 39 also showed a great deal of significant differences between the two groups. All of the items were significantly different at the .001 level. However, on these items, the mean responses for the Board are more than 3.0. They range from 3.308 to 6.077. These means indicate that the Board does not feel that these activities are appropriate for Citizen participants. These activities come under the heading of some form of citizen power. The means for the Citizens, on the other hand, continue to be primary within the range of "agree" responses: They range from 1.556 to 4.278. By and large, the Citizens would like to be able to perform activities which Arnstein refers to as forms of citizen power. The only item with which they disagree reads, "Citizens should not have to account to public officials for various programs they initiate." The Citizens disagree; they feel they should be accountable.

I can conclude by saying, as a result of the testing of these three hypotheses, the first and third were affirmed, but the second was not.

Fourth Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis 4 is as follows:

4. Among Joint Council members there is a relationship between participation and satisfaction such that the higher the degree of participation experienced, the
greater the degree of satisfaction both with that participation and with the Model Cities Program generally.

1. Participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity experienced in the Model Cities Program.

2. The greater the number of planning groups the citizens participated on, the greater the satisfaction with the overall Program and certain aspects of the Program.

3. The more activities experienced in the Model Cities Program, the greater the degree of overall satisfaction with the Program and with aspects of the Program.

The first sub-hypothesis to be tested here is concerned with the relationship between participation in specific activities and satisfaction with that participation. I have predicted that the more the Model Cities council members participated in various activities in the Program, the more satisfaction they would report receiving from these activities.

To acquire the information needed in ascertaining the degree of association between these two variables, the "Q" statistic was used. Originally, each variable had four response categories. Because of the small frequencies, each variable was dichotomized between low and high participation or between low and high satisfaction. This procedure resulted in 2 x 2 tables, for which Yule's Q is an appropriate measure of association.

The formula for "Q" is \( \frac{ad-bc}{ad+bc} \). If a plus value is obtained, then I can with some degree of confidence say that participation is positively related to satisfaction. I will use the Q values to test the following hypothesis:

1. Participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity experienced in the Model Cities Program.
Looking at Table 2, there were ten (10) items pertaining to specific types of participation. The percentage of those who participated in an activity and derived satisfaction from that activity, as well as the percentage of those who did not participate in that activity but who were nevertheless satisfied with it are reported in the table. In all cases, the comparisons yielded positive measures of degree of association. Out of these items, there were three (3) items, 47, 55, and 61, which showed a medium positive degree of association between participation and satisfaction. These items dealt with activities such as participation on committees in an advisory capacity; participation in the hiring of technical assistants; and participation in decisions as to what projects will exist in the neighborhood. Two (2) of the items, 55 and 61, were levels of citizen power (Partnership and Citizen Control) while 47 was on a nonparticipatory level (Manipulation).

There were seven (7) items, 49, 51, 53, 57, 59, 63, and 65, which showed a high positive degree of association between participation and satisfaction. These activities on the part of the council members were participation in the technical planning of projects; participation with officials in training sessions; participation in decisions on program approval; participation in decisions on rules and regulation governing projects; participation in negotiation sessions with power-holders; participation in decisions regarding salaries for project personnel and staff personnel. It can also be stated here that Arnstein would consider all of these activities to be types of citizen power.

Therefore, I can conclude that the "Q" test showed that all of the items were consistent with the hypothesis postulated, i.e.,
TABLE 2. --Yule's Q Values for Participation in Specific Activities of the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council and Satisfaction with that Participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
<th>Percent Deriving Satisfaction</th>
<th>Q Value</th>
<th>Level of Degree of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Participation on committees in an advisory capacity</td>
<td>High Participation: 77.8</td>
<td>Low Participation: 50.0</td>
<td>+.55 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Participation in the technical planning of projects before the signing and approval</td>
<td>High Participation: 71.4</td>
<td>Low Participation: 25.0</td>
<td>+.76 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Participation with officials in training sessions designed to inform citizens of their rights, responsibilities and options in influencing program planning</td>
<td>High Participation: 64.0</td>
<td>Low Participation: 33.3</td>
<td>+.63 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Participation in the decision and policy-making process of program approval or acceptance</td>
<td>High Participation: 80.0</td>
<td>Low Participation: 37.5</td>
<td>+.73 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Participation in the hiring of their own technical assistants for program planning</td>
<td>High Participation: 42.9</td>
<td>Low Participation: 23.1</td>
<td>+.42 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Participation in the decision and policy-making process of rules and regulations governing project implementation, management and operation</td>
<td>High Participation: 82.6</td>
<td>Low Participation: 37.5</td>
<td>+.77 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Participation in negotiation sessions with powerholders regarding the various projects</td>
<td>High Participation: 100.0</td>
<td>Low Participation: 16.7</td>
<td>+.66 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Participation in the decisions as to what programs would be allowed to operate in your community</td>
<td>High Participation: 61.9</td>
<td>Low Participation: 30.8</td>
<td>+.57 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type of Participation</td>
<td>Percent Deriving Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Participation</td>
<td>Low Participation</td>
<td>Q Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Participation in decisions regarding salaries for project personnel</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>+.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Participation in decisions regarding salaries for staff</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>+.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity in the Model Cities Program included in the questionnaire.

To test the second sub-hypothesis, ten items were involved—items 67 through 77. These concern the satisfaction derived from a citizen's overall participation in the planning committees of the Program. To determine whether there was a relationship between the number of planning groups which a person served on and the amount of overall satisfaction with the Program—using the Q test—we dichotomized the table into two groups—serving on one planning group to high and low satisfaction versus serving on multiple planning groups to high and low satisfaction. (See Table 3). The following is the results of the testing of this hypothesis:

2. The greater the number of planning groups the citizens participated on, the greater the satisfaction with the overall Program and certain aspects of the Program.

These persons participating on more than one (1) planning group in various aspects of the Program showed a low and medium positive degree of association between the two variables on the following items:

Of the ten (10) items there were two (69 and 75) for which a low positive degree of association was obtained. Those items were concerned with the financial incentives received from participation in the Program and satisfaction with meeting community demands.

There were four (4) items (67, 71, 72, and 76) which showed a medium positive degree of association between the two variables. These items were concerned with satisfaction with the opportunities acquired from using their own skills and abilities in their own work; satisfaction with the relationship that exists between their office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percent Deriving Satisfaction</th>
<th>Q Value</th>
<th>Level of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Satisfaction with work done on planning committees in accordance with the professional training and experience received.</td>
<td>Multiple 82.4</td>
<td>Single 61.1</td>
<td>+.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the progress made towards the goals set in present position</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the financial incentives received from attending meetings, etc.</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>+.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Satisfaction from the professional interaction with colleagues</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the opportunities acquired for using own skills and abilities in own work</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>+.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the relationship that exists between Model Cities and other agencies</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>+.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the relationship which exists between you and public officials</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type of Satisfaction</td>
<td>Percent Deriving Satisfaction</td>
<td>Q Value</td>
<td>Level of Degree of Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Satisfaction with participation in decisions affecting the course of the development of the Model Cities Program</td>
<td>61.1 70.0</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Satisfaction with meeting the demands of the community</td>
<td>50.0 36.8</td>
<td>+.26</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Satisfaction with meeting the demands of the entire neighborhood</td>
<td>50.0 21.1</td>
<td>+.30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Satisfaction with participation in the Program</td>
<td>66.7 73.7</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Model Cities) and other agencies; and satisfaction with meeting the
demands of the entire neighborhood.

On the other hand, those persons participating in a single plan-
ingen group in various aspects of the Program also showed a higher
degree of satisfaction received from certain other activities than did
those serving on multiple planning groups. They were items 68, 70,
74, and 77. These activities were concerned with satisfaction with
the progress made towards the goals set in their present position;
satisfaction from professional interaction with colleagues; satisfaction
with the relationship which exists between them and public officials;
satisfaction with participation in decisions affecting the course of the
development of the Program; and satisfaction with their participation
in the Program.

As a result of these findings, apparently people on a single
planning group received as much satisfaction out of the Program as
those who served on more than one, the difference being in the aspects
of the Program with which they were satisfied. This can be verified
by looking at the cells on Table 3 which show the proportion of Citizens
serving on one (1) planning group who expressed satisfaction versus
those serving on multiple planning groups who expressed satisfaction.
Most activities produced rates of satisfaction for more than 50% of the
two sub-groups. The biggest exception is item 73. There seemed to
be more dissatisfaction than satisfaction with the relationship existing
between the Citizens and public officials. The fact that the Board of
Commissioners were found to disagree as to how great a role citizens
should plan in decision-making may have something to do with the
Citizens' dissatisfaction on that item.
TABLE 4. -- Yule's Q Values for High and Low Participation in the Various Activities of the Model Cities Program and Satisfaction with the Model Cities Program Overall and with Aspects of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of Satisfaction</th>
<th>High Participation</th>
<th>Low Participation</th>
<th>Q Value</th>
<th>Level of Degree of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Satisfaction with work done on planning committees in accordance with the professional training and experience received</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>+.38</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the progress made towards the goals set in present position</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>+.26</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the financial incentives received from attending meetings, etc.</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the professional interaction with colleagues</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the opportunities acquired for using own skills and abilities in work</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>+.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the relationship that exists between Model Cities and other agencies</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>+.46</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the relationship which exists between you and public officials</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Type of Satisfaction</td>
<td>Percent Deriving Satisfaction</td>
<td>Q Value</td>
<td>Level of Degree of Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Satisfaction with participation in decisions affecting the course of the development of the Model Cities Program</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Satisfaction with meeting the demands of the community</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Satisfaction with meeting the demands of the entire neighborhood</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Satisfaction with participation in the Program</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the test of sub-hypothesis 2 are mixed. Six (6) items yield positive values; four (4) yield negative values; one (73) showed no relationship. This sub-hypothesis is, therefore, not confirmed. The number of planning committees one serves on is not an important variable for predicting satisfaction.

To test the third sub-hypothesis, the same ten (10) items—67 through 77—were used. However, in this case the writer was concerned with developing a measure of participation that took into account the variety of participation experiences a citizen might have had while serving on planning committees. Using the Q test, we dichotomized the table into two groups—low participation and high participation. Those persons who participated in from 1 to 4 activities of the Program were considered low participants. Those who participated in from 5 to 10 activities of the Program were considered high participants. It was predicted that those who were afforded a chance to participate in five or more activities of the Program would derive more satisfaction from their participation in the Program than would those who participated in less than five. (See Table 4) The following is the results of testing this hypothesis:

3. The more activities experienced in the Model Cities Program, the greater the degree of overall satisfaction with the Program and with aspects of the Program.

Of the ten (10) items, there was only one (1) item which showed a low positive degree of association. That item was number sixty-nine (69) which concerned itself with satisfaction with the financial incentives received from attending meetings and etc.
There were seven (7) items, 67, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, and 77, which showed a medium positive degree of association. These items were concerned with satisfaction with work done on planning committees in accordance with the professional training and experience received; satisfaction with the opportunities acquired for using one's own skills and abilities in work; satisfaction with the relationship that exists between their office (Model Cities) and other agencies; satisfaction with participation in decisions affecting the course of the development of the Model Cities Program; satisfaction with meeting the demands of the community; satisfaction with meeting the demands of the entire neighborhood; and satisfaction with participation in the Program. Participants in these activities were those who participated in five (5) or more.

On the other hand, those who participated in less than five activities did show some degree of satisfaction received from their participation. Those activities were items 69, 70, and 73. Those items were concerned with satisfaction with the financial incentives received from attending meetings; satisfaction with the relationship which exists between them and public officials; and satisfaction from the professional interaction with colleagues.

As a result of these findings, one can say with some degree of confidence that those persons who were allowed the chance to participate in a high number of overall activities of the Program did receive a higher degree of satisfaction with their participation in the Program than did those who participated in fewer activities. This can also be verified by looking at the cells on Table 4 which show the proportion.
deriving satisfaction among the high participants as compared with the low participants.

Therefore, I can conclude by saying that the results of the testing of this sub-hypothesis tended to go in the direction postulated. Clearly this variable, in which activities were counted yielded more positive associations than the one in which planning committees were counted.

The most consistent pattern of positive associations, however, was produced by the test of sub-hypothesis 1, which had to do with very specific types of participation and the satisfaction derived from that participation. The pattern of associations from the more general measures of participation are less clear. Nevertheless, we can conclude that Hypothesis 4 has considerable support.

Summary

Four hypotheses were tested in this chapter. Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 tended to be supported. Hypothesis 2 failed to be supported. The implications of these findings will be discussed in Chapter 6.
I have attempted to explore the concept of "citizen participation" as it has been interpreted by the organizers of and participants in the Genesee County Model Cities Program. The research consisted of two parts. The first part was to construct a narrative history of citizen participation in the Model Cities Program of Genesee County over a four year period: the planning year and the first three action years. This was accomplished through interviews, attendance at meetings, and the use of documents prepared by the staff of the Program. The importance of the narrative history to the reader was to show the different stages that the Program went through from its inception through the Third Action Year. From this narrative the reader can learn what the individuals who are being used as subjects in the second part of the research experienced as participants in the Program. While a few of the participants have been with the Program since its inception, most of the participants included in this research are those who started during the second and third years of action. The narrative history presents the setting as to how citizen participation developed during the first three years; the empirical research was undertaken during the Fourth Action Year. There is no need, I feel, to summarize the narrative history at this point except to point out that when the Model Cities Program in Genesee County was in its planning stage, there was no clear conception on the part of any of the planners as to what ultimately might constitute citizen participation. After three years of
meetings, task forces, elections, action programs, etc., citizen participation has come to mean every activity which Sherry Arnstein includes in her ladder of citizen participation.

The second part consisted of the testing of four hypotheses concerning citizen participation, using data collected by a survey of the Genesee County Board of Commissioners and the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council.

The first research problem investigated was: To what extent do the Genesee County Board of Commissioners and the Genesee County Model Cities Joint Council differ in the degree to which they would permit citizens to participate in the decision and policy-making process? Answers to this question were sought through a questionnaire survey of both groups and through the testing of the three hypotheses listed below.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are as follows:

1. The rate of agreement among the Board of Commissioners' perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the top of the ladder to the bottom of the ladder of citizen participation.

2. The rate of agreement among members of the Model Cities Joint Council's perceptions of the appropriate degree of citizen participation should increase as they proceed from the bottom of the ladder to the top of the ladder of citizen participation.

3. There should be no significant differences between the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council at the lower level of the ladder, but there should be significant differences between the Board and Council at the higher level of the ladder, as to whether citizen participation is appropriate.
The second research problem was to determine the degree of relationship between the amount of participation each citizen had on the various planning groups of the Model Cities Program and the degree of satisfaction that the citizens derived from each activity and with the Model Cities Program generally. Answers to this problem were sought by surveying the members of the Model Cities Joint Council and in the testing of the hypothesis and its three sub-hypotheses listed below:

1. Among Joint Council members there is a relationship between participation and satisfaction such that the higher the degree of participation experienced, the greater the degree of satisfaction both with that participation and with the Model Cities Program.

(1) Participation is associated with satisfaction for each type of activity experienced in the Model Cities Program.

(2) The greater the number of planning groups the citizens participated on, the greater the satisfaction with the overall Program and certain aspects of the Program.

(3) The more activities experienced in the Model Cities Program, the greater the degree of overall satisfaction with the Program and with aspects of the Program.

Following is a summary of the findings of the research.

The testing of hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 disclosed that there are significant differences between the Board of Commissioners and the Model Cities Joint Council in the degree to which each group would permit citizens to participate in the policy and decision-making process. The test results of hypothesis 1 showed that the Board viewed the ladder of citizen participation roughly in the same manner
as Sherry Arnstein did in her article, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." The rank-order correlation was high and positive. The Board was clearly able to distinguish between activities which they could see would constitute "true citizen participation" and those activities which were more likely a deceptive substitute for "true citizen participation." They indicated this by agreeing wholeheartedly that citizens should be allowed to participate in all activities Arnstein would describe as Manipulation, Therapy, Informing, Consultation, and Placation; the Board also agreed to some Partnership activities. On the other hand, the Board disagreed with most of the activities categorized as citizen power.

The testing of hypothesis 2 demonstrated that the Citizens did not perceive any of the steps on the ladder as being a deceptive substitute for "true citizen participation". They expressed this by agreeing that citizens should be allowed to perform every activity on this list. Had they viewed any of the activities as a sham, they could easily have disagreed with that activity. We must conclude that they considered all of the levels as being degrees of true citizen participation. A possible reason for this is that most of them had not had a chance to participate in any of these activities before the initiation of the Model Cities Program. Therefore, when the opportunity was afforded to them to participate, they accepted it with much gratification. With some degree of confidence, the writer feels justified in saying at this point that some unnecessary conflicts and delays which occurred during the operation of the Program can be attributed to the differences in their perceptions between the County Commissioners and the Citizens of what constitutes citizen participation.
The testing of hypothesis 3 revealed that the Board of Commissioners will allow citizens to participate at levels where they are not a threat to their power and authority. However, when citizens start demanding participation on levels which compete with powers the Board reserves for itself, then the Board assumes a different attitude. The Board obviously feels that to allow citizens to participate on very high levels of decision-making will dilute their power and will be a threat to their concept of what constitutes representative democracy. The t-test of means indicated this by showing that there were no significant differences in perceptions between the two groups which Arnstein places at the bottom of the ladder; for activities classified as Manipulation, Therapy, Informing, Consultation, and Placation. On the other hand, there were numerous significant differences in the perceptions of the two groups for the activities Arnstein places at the higher levels, for the activities designed as Delegated Powers and Citizen Control. These differences were significant at the .001 level.

The testing of hypothesis 4 yielded mixed results. While it is clear from the analysis that there is a strong relationship between participating in specific activities and deriving satisfaction from those specific activities, the pattern is less clear when overall measures of participation were used. The number of planning committees served on was positively related to satisfaction with certain aspects of the Program but negatively associated with others. On the other hand, an overall measure of participation based on a count of the number of activities yielded generally positive but low to medium associations.

Of all the comparisons made between participation and satisfaction in the test of the three sub-hypotheses of hypothesis 4, 24, or
75% were positive, and only 8, or 25%, were negative. This pattern suggests more support than nonsupport for hypothesis 4.

During the time that I have observed and done research on the Model Cities Program in Genesee County, it has become evident that citizen participation has to a great degree worked with much success in this Program. During the Fourth Action Year, the citizens' level of participation and rates of satisfaction with this participation and with the Program were very high. Many of the Citizens are now in a position to participate in the decision and policy-making process. Many have, in fact, done so on the Program's planning committees, while others are running for offices in the city or the county government. Many have moved up to administrative levels of employment in the Program or in other agencies in the County. I think that the time has arrived for the Board of Commissioners to recognize that since these people have had a chance to participate in the decision-making process, they will no longer accept invitations to participate in programs as "rubber stamps" or as "window dressing."

Based on the findings of the study, it is the general consensus of the majority of the members of the Model Cities Joint Council (the "Citizens") that citizen participation is a reality and is here to stay. As federal financing of Model Cities comes to an end, which is likely to happen in 1974, a closer relationship between the Citizens and the local powerholders will need to be worked out. The Board of Commissioners will have added power in this regard as the Board is the dispenser of revenue-sharing funds, the only likely funding source for the continuation of the Genesee County Model Cities Program. It is hoped
that the Citizens will be able to demonstrate to the Board the successes of the Program during its four to five years of operation and to convey to the Board that they are indeed experienced participants and decision-makers.

At this point I would like to make some recommendations that I would support if I were either a member of the Board of Commissioners or of the Joint Council:

1. The by-laws of the Model Cities Program should be amended to explain in more detail the powers of the Board of Commissioners vis-a-vis the Joint Council.

2. A structure should be designed which will create more frequent contacts between the Board and the Council in the planning process of the Program.

3. A structure should be designed so that the flow of communication between the Board of Commissioners and the Joint Council will enhance a better working relationship.

4. A structure should be designed whereas Council members and Board members will be allowed a chance to disseminate information to the broader community about the Program and also allow for feedback from them.

5. The Program should be designed to assure the continuation of citizen participation at all levels.

In concluding, citizen participation in public programs has emerged as a simple political necessity. Today, the cutting edge of social change lies somewhere between the ordinary citizen and a host of bureaucratic institutions which have come to have an impact on his life in a variety of vital areas. As the lives of citizens are increasingly "governed" by the rules, policies, and behaviors of public institutions, they are increasingly prone to demand that this "governance"
be buttressed by the traditional democratic claim that authority rests upon the consent of the governed. Thus, as public programs increasingly seek to intervene consciously into community processes, which were previously untouched by government, the consequent demand for representation and participation is simply politically unavoidable.
Appendix 1

Joint Council Organizational Structure
(Elected Members)

Manuel Jones - Chairman
Ronald Roland - Vice Chairman

Policy Board

James Blakely - Chairman
Deloris I. Knuckles - Beecher District Chairman
Frances Brandon
Solomon Chaney
Denise Copeland - Youth
Oliver Wren - Dewey District Chairman
Ozie Grady
Lawrence Brooks
Manuel Jones
Versie Clemons - Youth
Frank Hunter - Martin District Chairman
Precious Petross
Don Channels
Rufus Watts
Arlinda Hopkins - Youth

Planning Groups

Physical Development

Antionette Anderson          Clyde Bradshaw          Henry Harris
Estella Anderson             Arlandus Brady         Frank Hunter
Robert Anderson             Denise Copeland         Levester McKesson
Olivia Beck                  James Daniels           Willie Nolden
George Bemus                 Richard Dicks           Leona Oliver
Ella Bolden                  Ozie Grady             Michelle Singleton
Billy Bradshaw               Paul Haire             Gary Taylor

Education and Early Childhood Development

Wilma Bennett                Versie Clemons         Deloris Knuckles
Ophelia Bonner               Roxanne Copeland      Earline McFadden
Frances Brandon              Doris Gant            Marion Nicholson
Lawrence Brooks              Bessie Hudson         Rufus Watts
Reginda Clemons              Coleen Hudson         Charles Winfrey
### Comprehensive Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry Alexander</th>
<th>Wilma Bennett</th>
<th>Arlandus Brady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antionette Anderson</td>
<td>Annie Blakely</td>
<td>Doris Cant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estella Anderson</td>
<td>Rosie Blakely</td>
<td>Frank Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Anderson</td>
<td>Ella Bolden</td>
<td>Ozie Grady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Haire</td>
<td>Carole Sanford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Harris</td>
<td>Lloyd Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Hudson</td>
<td>Kenneth Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira Jones</td>
<td>Minnie Welch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunita Mosley</td>
<td>Emmett Willingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leisure Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry Alexander</th>
<th>Frank Gillespie</th>
<th>Earline McFadden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annie Blakely</td>
<td>Mary Harris</td>
<td>Isaiah Roland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Blakely</td>
<td>James Hill</td>
<td>Carole Sanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Bolden</td>
<td>Elmira Jones</td>
<td>Cynthia Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophelia Bonner</td>
<td>Dallas McDonald</td>
<td>Oliver Wren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manpower and Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Blakely</th>
<th>Frank Hunter</th>
<th>Gwendolyn Ruffin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy Bradshaw</td>
<td>Manuel Jones</td>
<td>Cynthia Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Chaney</td>
<td>Levester McKesson</td>
<td>Susan Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Channels</td>
<td>Alexis Murphy</td>
<td>Peggy Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Harris</td>
<td>Precious Petross</td>
<td>James Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Harris</td>
<td>Isaiah Roland</td>
<td>Oliver Wren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlinda Hopkins</td>
<td>Ronald Roland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2

Structure for Genesee County Board of Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Gerald R.</td>
<td>3746 Whittier Street Flint, Michigan 48506</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Michael J.</td>
<td>3314 Sherwood Flint, Michigan 48503</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin, Gary G.</td>
<td>11500 Colonial Woods Drive Clio, Michigan 48420</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadola, Thomas L.</td>
<td>1327 Mott Foundation Building Flint, Michigan 48502</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammel, Richard A.</td>
<td>G-5461 North Harvard Street Flint, Michigan 48505</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Willard P.</td>
<td>8253 West Grand Blanc Road Swartz Creek, Michigan 48473</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden, Harold R.</td>
<td>201 West McClellan Street Flint, Michigan 48505</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp, Joseph A.</td>
<td>5318 Butterfield Drive Flint, Michigan 48506</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice, Lawrence B.</td>
<td>1393 West Judd Road Flint, Michigan 48507</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruschman, Donald C.</td>
<td>522 Amesbury Drive Davison, Michigan 48423</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamos, Daniel</td>
<td>3505 Lawndale Avenue Flint, Michigan 48504</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Nathaniel</td>
<td>810 East Ruth Street Flint, Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Charlotte L.</td>
<td>2030 Barks Street Flint, Michigan 48503</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Richard L.</td>
<td>3225 Coin Street Flint, Michigan 48507</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3
Citizens Participation Organization

C.S.C.

Joint Council

Youth Council

District Councils

CDA Staff
Attorney

Policy Board

Communications Committee

Citizens Staff
(See Chart C)

Budget & Finance Committee

Human Resources Planning Committee

Personnel Committee

Leisure Time Planning Group

Comprehensive Health Planning Group

Phys. Development Planning Group

Manpower Planning Group

Early Childhood Dev. Planning Group

Task Forces

Task Forces

Task Forces

Task Forces

Task Forces

Monitoring Teams

Monitoring Teams

Monitoring Teams

Monitoring Teams

Monitoring Teams
Appendix 4

This questionnaire is designed to ascertain your perception of the role of citizen participation among the grassroots on the decision and policy-making process of the Genesee County Model Cities Program. Your answers will be combined with others to get an overall picture of the effects of citizen participation in the program. Your responses could also possibly serve as an indicator of what to expect of citizen participation in future programs of this nature.

For the above reasons, it is of the utmost importance that your responses be as accurate as possible. If there is any doubt in your mind about any of the items, feel free to ask the interviewer at any point and time for clarification while you are completing the forms.

Background Sheet for Board of Commissioners

Directions:

Please supply the following background information about yourself by checking ( ) the responses that are most nearly correct for you.

1. What is your sex?
   1. ____ (F)  2. ____ (M)

2. What is your marital status?
   1. ____ Single  2. ____ Married  3. ____ Separated
3. How old are you?
   1. _______15-24  2. _______25-34  3. _______35-44  4. _______45-54
   5. _______55-64  6. _______65 and over

4. What is your race?
   1. _______Black  2. _______White  3. _______Mexican American
   4. _______Other

5. What was the last grade you completed in school?
   1. _______0-8 years  2. _______1-2 years High School  3. _______3-4 years High School
   4. _______1-2 years College  5. _______3-4 years College  6. _______More than four years

6. What is your source of income?
   1. _______Wages  2. _______Self-Employed  3. _______Public Assistance
   4. _______Unemployed  5. _______Social Security  6. _______Other

7. What is your annual income?
   1. _______Less than 3,000  2. _______3,000 to 5,999  3. _______6,001 to 8,999
   4. _______9,000 to 11,999  5. _______12,000 to 14,999  6. _______Over 15,000

8. If you are not the head of your household, give the head of the household's annual income.
   1. _______Less than 3,000  2. _______3,000 to 5,999  3. _______6,001 to 8,999
   4. _______9,000 to 11,999  5. _______12,000 to 14,999  6. _______Over 15,000
9. How long have you lived in the Model Neighborhood area?

1. ______ Less than one (1) year  2. ______ 1-4 years  3. ______ 5-9 years  4. ______ 10 or more

Background Sheet for Joint Council

This questionnaire is designed to find out your opinions, attitudes, and ideas as to how satisfied you have been with your role in the decision and policy-making process of the Genesee County Model Cities Program. Your answers will be combined with others to get an overall picture of the effects of citizen participation in the program. Your answers could also possibly serve as an indicator of what to expect of citizen participation in future programs of this nature.

For the above reasons, it is of the utmost importance that your responses be as accurate as possible. If there is any doubt in your mind about any of the items, feel free to ask the interviewer at any point and time for clarification while you are completing the forms.

Directions:

Please supply the following background information about yourself by checking (✓) the responses that are most nearly correct for you.

1. What is your sex?
   1. ______ (F)  2. ______ (M)

2. What was the last grade you completed in school?
   1. ______ 0-8 years  2. ______ 1-2 years High School
3. _____ 3-4 years High School  4. _____ 1-2 years College
5. _____ 3-4 years College  6. _____ More than four years

3. What is your source of income?
1. _____ Wages  2. _____ Self-Employed  3. _____ Public Assistance
   4. _____ Unemployed  5. _____ Social Security
   6. _____ Other

4. What position do you hold if one (1) or two (2) is applicable to you?

5. What is your annual income?
1. _____ Less than 3,000  2. _____ 3,000 to 5,999  3. _____ 6,001 to 8,999
   4. _____ 9,000 to 11,999  5. _____ 12,000 to 14,999
   6. _____ Over 15,000

6. If you are not the head of your household, give the head of the household's annual income.
1. _____ Less than 3,000  2. _____ 3,000 to 5,999  3. _____ 6,001 to 8,999
   4. _____ 9,000 to 11,999  5. _____ 12,000 to 14,999
   6. _____ Over 15,000

7. Are you a resident or non-resident of the Model Neighborhood area?
1. _____ Resident  2. _____ Non-resident

8. What agency do you represent?
1. ___________________________________________
After reading each item thoroughly, check ( ) the answer that most nearly describes your opinion. You are to only check one (1) for each item.

QUESTIONNAIRE

COMMON CODE FOR COLUMNS
10 - 42

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Agree somewhat
4. Neutral
5. Disagree somewhat
6. Disagree
7. Disagree strongly
8. Not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Number</th>
<th>Citizens should be allowed to serve on committees in an advisory capacity.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Citizens should be placed on advisory committees for the expressed purpose of learning about matters before the committee.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Citizens should be placed on advisory committees for the purpose of obtaining their support for programs.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Citizen input in program planning of a project should include the opportunity to sign or approve the application.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The technical planning of projects for citizens should be left to the experts.

Citizens function best when they participate in group sessions, designed to adjust their values and attitudes to those of society.

Citizens function best on committees when they are informed of their rights, responsibilities and options.

Citizens should begin their participation on committees only after the initial planning stages of the project have been completed.

To expedite time and ensure citizen support for programs, citizens should be allowed to hear only what the officials feel is worthwhile information.

The flow of communication between citizens and officials should be channeled in both directions.

Citizens have more impact in the decision and policy-making process when they have been afforded the opportunity to fill out questionnaires in their neighborhood.

Citizens are most effective in the decision and policy-making process when they have the opportunity to attend hearings and neighborhood meetings.
22 Inviting citizens to public hearings and neighborhood meetings is just a waste of time.

23 Citizens should have clear and direct access to the decision-making process.

24 The actual planning of programs should be left to the technical planners while the citizens serve as "watchdogs."

25 Citizens should leave the decision and policy-making to the technicians, because citizens are very inarticulate in expressing their priorities.

26 Citizens are more capable of advising officials about certain programs than they are in making decisions about programs.

27 Citizens and officials should share in the planning and decision-making responsibilities on various boards.

28 Citizens should have the same degree of authority as the officials in the planning and decision-making process.

29 Citizen leaders and officials should have the same opportunity to represent their respective power bases in the community.

30 Citizens should have the same degree of authority as the officials in the planning and decision-making process.
31 Citizens should have the opportunity to review program plans before they are implemented by various governmental agencies.

32 Citizens should be allowed to hire their own technical assistants to help them in their planning of different projects.

33 Citizens should have the power to veto officials' proposals if differences of opinions cannot be resolved through negotiations.

34 To assure the accountability of the programs to the citizens, the citizens should hold significant power over the powerholders.

35 Citizens should be allowed to contract with different agencies to plan and/or operate one or more decentralized neighborhood programs.

36 Citizens should have the power to help shape the rules and regulations for the administration, operation, and implementation of various programs in the community. Example: Health Center.

37 Citizens should have the power to decide what programs will exist in their community. Example: Recreation Center.

38 Citizens should not have to account to public officials for various programs they initiate.
39  Citizens should have absolute 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ control over programs or institutions in their community. 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___ Example: Headstart Program.

40  Citizen participation through 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ the Model Cities Program has helped your agency or organization to improve its image and relationship with the community. 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___

41  Citizen participation through 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ the Model Cities Program has helped your agency or organization to improve its administrative, as well as, supportive services to the community. 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___

42  Citizen participation is a reality and is here to stay. 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___

COMMON CODE FOR COLUMNS 43 - 44

1. Very Successful
2. Successful
3. Somewhat successful
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat unsuccessful
6. Unsuccessful
7. Very unsuccessful

43  How would you rate the successfulness of the Model Cities Program? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___

44  How would you rate your successfulness in the Program? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___
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Please list below the individuals or groups you feel influence or control the major decisions taking place in the City of Flint and the County of Genesee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now go back and rank the individuals or groups in priority of their influentialness or control.

**COMMON CODE FOR COLUMNS**
47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65

1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometime
4. Never
8. Not applicable

**COMMON CODE FOR COLUMNS**
48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied
8. Not applicable

**47** How often did you participate on committees in an advisory capacity?

1. __ 2. __ 3. __ 4. __

8. __

**48** How satisfied were you?

1. __ 2. __ 3. __ 4. __

8. __

**49** How often did you participate in the technical planning of projects before the signing and approval?

1. __ 2. __ 3. __ 4. __

8. __
50 How satisfied were you? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

51 How often did you participate with officials in training sessions, designed to inform you of your rights, responsibilities and options in influencing program planning? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

52 How satisfied were you? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

53 How often did you participate in the decision and policy-making process of program approval or acceptance? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

54 How satisfied were you? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

55 How often did you participate in the hiring of your own technical assistants for program planning? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

56 How satisfied were you? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

57 How often did you participate in the decision and policy-making process of rules and regulations governing project implementation, management, and operation? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

58 How satisfied were you? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___

59 How often did you participate in negotiation sessions with powerholders regarding the various projects? 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 8. ___
60. How satisfied were you?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

61. How often did you participate in the decisions as to what programs would be allowed to operate in your community?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __

62. How satisfied were you?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

63. How often did you participate in decisions regarding salaries for project personnel?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

64. How satisfied were you?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

65. How often did you participate in decisions regarding salaries for Staff?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

66. How satisfied were you?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
8. ___

COMMON CODE FOR COLUMNS  
67 - 77

1. Very satisfied  
2. Satisfied  
3. Neutral  
4. Dissatisfied  
5. Very dissatisfied

67. How satisfied are you:  
That the work which you did on the planning committees is in accord with the professional training and experience which you have had?  
1. __  2. __  3. __  4. __  
5. ___
68 How satisfied are you with the progress you are making towards the goals which you set for yourself in your present position?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

69 How satisfied are you with the financial incentives you received for attending meetings and etc.?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

70 How satisfied are you with the professional interaction you had with your colleagues?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

71 How satisfied are you with the opportunities you had for using your own skills and abilities in your work?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

72 How satisfied are you with the relationship which exists between your office and other agencies?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

73 How satisfied are you with the relationship which exists between you and public officials?  
1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___
Appendix 5

Map of Genesee County Model Cities Neighborhood
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