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The relationship between the satisfaction members of locally initiated citizen advisory committees have with their committees and the following types of independent variables were examined: (a) shortcomings of the committees; (b) external influences on the committees; (c) information available to the committees; (d) specific actions performed by the committees; and (e) personal characteristics of the members. The membership of eight citizen advisory committees in Kalamazoo, Michigan comprise the sample. A questionnaire was distributed to the members to collect information on the five groups of independent variables, member satisfaction with the committees, and socio-economic characteristics of the members. A satisfaction scale was created and was correlated with the independent variables. The following were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction: (a) committee shortcomings—lack of participation and one person domination of the committees; (b) external influences—external influences which make the job difficult to do, and consulting with the agency to veto and suggest alternatives to staff proposals; (c) information available to the committees—whether the committees had sufficient information, and receiving information from the staff in the form of written reports prior to and at the meetings, and verbal reports at the meetings; (d) specific actions of the committees—soliciting support by talking to individual friends and meeting with affected groups, and providing information to the public through formal press releases and holding public hearings.
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CHAPTER I

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES: AN OVERVIEW

Introduction

The concept of "citizen participation" occupies a prominent position in American political thought. Strange (1972), in an article entitled "The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration," indicates that citizen participation in government has been an objective of our government since its inception. Jeffersonian democracy stressed "grassroots democracy," and Jacksonian democracy invited the common citizen to share in governmental functions (Bollens & Schmandt, 1970). Millbrath (1965) states that participation is not only espoused as a value by political scientists, but has also been taught to most citizens.

Most Americans have been told, and have come to believe by the time they reach adulthood, that in order for democracy to flourish, it is essential for citizens to be interested in, informed about, and active in politics (p. 142).

Verba and Nie (1972) in Participation in America, have divided citizen participation into four broad categories: (a) voting; (b) campaign activity; (c) citizen initiated contacts with government officials; and (d) cooperative participation. The form of participation most frequently discussed in the literature is voting. American voting behavior has been discussed at length by such political scientists as Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes (1964),
Pomper (1975), and Nie, Verba and Petrocik (1976). However, voting has been criticized as not being a meaningful form of participation.

The result of the act of voting is the election of a person who will represent the citizen. Luck (1976) feels that by voting, the citizen delegates all policy-making powers to another person. A further criticism of voting as a method of citizen participation has been indicated by Kaufman (1969). In an article entitled "Administrative Decentralization and Political Power," Kaufman states that citizens are more directly affected by administrative agencies and their agents than by elected officials such as legislators and chief executives. Citizen participation through voting has no effect on the bureaucrats most citizens must deal with. It has been suggested that for citizens to meaningfully participate in government, they must find a method other than voting. Decentralization of government has been suggested as a means to provide citizens with more input into the government.

Decentralization has been offered by some political scientists and sociologists as a means to enable citizens to have cooperative participation with the government. Schmandt (1972), in "Municipal Decentralization: An Overview," cites four supportive arguments for decentralization. The first is administrative. Decentralization, according to Schmandt, is a means to improve the delivery of services. Second he cites the psychological arguments. Clients, or consumers, may benefit psychologically from decentralization. Third, Schmandt believes, there are sociological arguments for decentralization.
Government policies and practices may be adapted to locality differences in life styles. Finally, the political arguments are presented by Schmandt. Decentralization can be a mechanism for mobilizing power, a means of giving more citizens a voice in the government. In this way, citizens may have cooperative participation. The present research will concentrate on a form of cooperative participation.

Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) have divided citizen participation groups into three types: (a) those required by the federal government; (b) those established by the local government to be advisory to the mayor and/or governing body; and (c) citizen created groups recognized by the political process. Locally initiated citizen advisory committees will be studied in this paper.

The literature concerning locally initiated citizen advisory boards is quite sparse and limited. The existing literature concentrates primarily on such aspects of the committees as topical areas considered by the committees, size of the committees, characteristics of committee members, and the relative effectiveness of the committees. This researcher will attempt to expand the present knowledge available regarding locally initiated citizen advisory committees.

Membership on a citizen advisory committee involves three major decisions by the individual. First, a citizen must decide if he or she will join a committee. A study by Steggert (1975) found that long-term residents of an area, over 34 years of age, and in the
upper socio-economic class, will tend to join citizen advisory committees more frequently than other residents. Second, the citizen must decide how active he or she will be on the committee. The level of activity one has on a committee may be seen as being related to the individual's basic personality. Is the individual an active or a passive person? Barber (1972 & 1965) has discussed the active-passive aspects of personality as they relate to presidents in *The Presidential Character*, and to state legislators in *The Lawmakers*. Finally, the citizen must decide whether or not to remain on the committee. The decision to remain on a committee is believed by this researcher to be related to the member's satisfaction with his committee membership. The relationship of member satisfaction to different committee and personal variables will be examined in this paper.

The effects of several variables on locally initiated citizen advisory board members' satisfaction with their committees have been hypothesized by the present researcher. Hypotheses have been made concerning the effects of five different categories of variables on member satisfaction. The five categories of variables considered are: (a) shortcomings of the committee; (b) external influences on the committee; (c) information available to the committee; (d) specific actions taken by the committee; and (e) personal characteristics of the members. Five specific hypotheses have been proposed regarding committee shortcomings. These hypotheses are listed below.
1. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is adequate attendance.

2. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is active participation by the members.

3. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which too much time is not spent on unimportant issues.

4. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which one person does not dominate the meetings.

Three hypotheses are listed below concerning the level of satisfaction and external influences on the committee.

6. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have external influences which make the job difficult to do.

7. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have duplication with other committees.

8. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with their agency.

Following are two hypotheses that have been proposed concerning the relationship between information available to the committee and the level of member satisfaction.

9. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which the members are sufficiently informed.

10. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees which receive information from the staff.

The proposed relationship between specific actions performed by the committees and satisfaction are listed in the following hypotheses.

11. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy.
12. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support.

13. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public.

Finally, two hypotheses are proposed concerning personal factors of the members and their level of satisfaction with the committees.

14. The longer a member of a citizen advisory committee has served on the committee, the more satisfied he or she is with the committee.

15. Members of citizen advisory committees with high political efficacy ratings are more satisfied with the committees than are members with low political efficacy ratings.

The members of eight locally initiated citizen advisory committees in Kalamazoo, Michigan, comprise the sample to be examined. The local newspaper, the Kalamazoo Gazette, was examined for information regarding the eight committees' recent accomplishments. A questionnaire was distributed to all members of the committees. The members were asked in the questionnaires to provide socio-economic information about themselves. Five questions were asked to determine each member's level of satisfaction with their committee. Questions were also included in the survey regarding specific aspects of the committees such as tasks performed by the committees, the committees' relationships to different governmental units, organizational aspects of the committees, and perceived shortcomings of the committees. Items were included in the questionnaires to determine the members' political efficacy rating. The members' satisfaction with their membership on the committees was then examined in light of the above variables in order to explore possible explanations for the level of satisfaction members have with their committees.
If the concept of citizen participation is considered important to the American political system, then it also becomes important to discover not only why citizens chose to participate, but why they remain or do not remain participating members of the political system. It is hoped that the present research will offer some insight into why citizens remain participants on locally initiated citizen advisory committees.
Citizen Advisory Committees:  
A Review of the Literature

Citizen advisory committees as a form of citizen participation have been discussed in the literature of Political Science, Sociology, and Public Administration. The scope of these discussions focuses primarily on the following areas: (a) types of committees; (b) structure of the committees; (c) specific tasks performed by the committees; (d) the relative power of the committees; (e) the effectiveness of the committees; and (f) characteristics of members of the committees. These aspects of citizen advisory committees will be discussed in this section of the paper.

Types of Committees

Citizen advisory groups may be either single-purpose or multi-purpose. They may be created to discuss a short-term issue, or to serve as a long-term body. Studies have revealed that groups cover many different topical areas. Meyers, Grisell, Gollin, Papernow, Hutcheson, and Serlin (1972) have discussed multi-purpose mental health citizen boards in Massachusetts. Bradley and Levett (1973) studied the Wellington Citizen's Committee on Accommodations (WCCA), a citizen initiated committee created to discuss housing problems in Wellington, that later grew to work closely with the City Council. Sigel (1966) conducted an intensive case study of the Community Planning for Community Schools (CPCS) citizen's advisory committee.
in Detroit. This committee was created by the School Superintendent
Brownell, to plan for a new community school. Brownell used citizen
advisory committees throughout his tenure as superintendent. Sigel
(1966) states that "the pattern of citizen advisory committees be­
came the preferred method used by Brownell's administration for
handling major problems of school-community relations" (p. 4).
Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) conducted a study of citizen advisory
groups in Cleveland, Ohio. They examined four groups, all of which
were charged in general with combatting deterioration in the area.
The School Improvement Program was created to deal with school
related activities. The Community Development Foundation is con­
cerned with housing in the area. The remaining two were formed to
protect the general social welfare of the community (e.g., health
and safety). Clavel (1968) conducted a study of three citizen advi­
sory committees: the county planning board; a board of college
trustees; and an industrial relations committee concerned with the
location of poultry farms near resort and residential areas.

Steinbacher and Solomon (1971), in a study of Cleveland citizen
advisory groups, have discovered single-purpose and multi-purpose
groups. Gordon and Babchuk have classified groups according to the
function they serve. They have found the following groups: expres­
sive associations, which provide immediate gratification to the mem­
bbers; instrumental associations, which maintain or change a condition
in the environment; and expressive-instrumental groups, which combine
the features listed above (Hutcheson & Steggert, 1971, p. 7).
Hutcheson and Stegert (1971) have also found that "organizations initiated by governmental institutions often are structured in a manner consistent with the role which the political institution envisions for the organization" (p. 8).

**Structure of the Committees**

Structural aspects of citizen advisory committees will be examined here. Factors of primary concern are the size of the committees, how the members are selected, the nature of the leadership of the committees, and who the committees report to.

Sigel (1966) states that the Detroit School System, under the leadership of Superintendent Brownell, was characterized by large citizen advisory committees. The Community Planning for Community Schools (CPCS) citizen advisory committee, the object of Sigel's study, was composed of 183 members. The 183 members were divided into 10 subcommittees, where the actual work of the committee was to be accomplished. The subcommittee chairmen and 26 other members of the committee were selected to belong to the Steering Committee. These members were responsible for "making policy recommendations for the overall program" (Sigel, 1966, p. 13). Brownell appointed a Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator for the entire project, and the Chairman of the Steering Committee. These three appointees, in addition to the Director of Planning and Building Studies, recommended the 10 topical areas of the subcommittees to the Steering Committee. The Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator selected the
membership of the CPCS, the Steering Committee, and subcommittees, within guidelines set by Brownell, and subject to Brownell's final approval. Brownell wanted the CPCS to be representative of the entire community. The final committee was made up of the following: 42 representatives of social agencies and churches; 40 representatives of the public schools; 47 local community members (such as housewives, party leaders); 28 government representatives; eight business, industry and labor members; six representatives of Colleges and Universities; and 12 youth. The subcommittees prepared reports that were submitted to the Steering Committee for approval. The Coordinators then prepared a final report from the reports accepted by the Steering Committee. This final report was then submitted to the Steering Committee for approval. Once approved, the report was sent to Superintendent Brownell, who approved it and sent it to the Board of Education for their approval.

Meyers et al. (1972) and Meyers, Dorwart, Hutcheson, and Decker (1974) studied 37 Mental Health and Area Retardation Boards in Massachusetts. These Boards were established by the Comprehensive Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services Act of 1966 in Massachusetts. "Each board is composed of 21 citizens who work or live in the area and have assumed roles of community leadership" (Meyers et al., 1972, p. 313). From the studies conducted by Meyers et al., it can be determined that all of the boards had a President and Vice President, and that some of the boards had an established office with secretarial help.
Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) studied four citizen groups in Cleveland, the Community Services Center of Mt. Pleasant, the Mt. Pleasant Community Council, the Mt. Pleasant Community Development Foundation, and the School Improvement Program. The authors state that one way the success of the organizations was determined, was by the size of their membership. The committees all had open memberships, which fluctuated in size from 100 to 900. The Mt. Pleasant Community Development Foundation has four general meetings per year. At one of the meetings a 15 member Board of Trustees is elected. The majority of its committees are ad hoc. However, there are two permanent committees, the personnel and policy committees. The Mt. Pleasant Community Development Foundation also has a part-time secretary. The Mt. Pleasant Community Council is open for membership to any employer, employee, landlord, tenant, or homeowner in the area, and to any civic organization with a majority of its members living in the area. The only other membership requirement is that the person must be over 14 years of age. Most of the Council's work is conducted by committees. The Council has a President; First, Second, and Third Vice-Presidents; a Recording- and Assistant Recording-Secretary; a Financial Secretary; and a Treasurer. These officers, along with the chairmen of all standing committees, the presidents of all member organizations, and 30 members elected at-large, compose the Executive Committee. The city councilman from the area is an honorary member of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee meets once per month. It assists the President,
advise on programs, reviews applications for membership, hears committee reports, and conducts the business of the organization.

Steinbacher and Solomon provide minimal information on the School Improvement Program, other than to note that its membership is made up of parents and other area residents interested in improving the quality of the local schools. The fourth group studied by Steinbacher and Solomon, the Community Services Center, has a paid staff and a Board of Trustees. The Board members are primarily professionals or business executives from within or outside the area. The Board has a requirement that a certain percentage of its members be area residents. However, there have been problems keeping the lower class residents of the area interested in Board membership.

**Specific Tasks Performed by the Committees**

Citizen advisory committees vary in the types and amount of activities that they perform. Steggert (1975) states that the Atlanta study, sponsored by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, found some differences between active and less active groups.

1. More active groups put more emphasis on communication.

2. Less active groups "asked" or "requested" things from city government rather than demanding.

3. More active groups had a "doing" orientation and dealt with all levels of government and made more contacts with elected officials.

4. More active groups tended to be found in upper class neighborhoods. (Steggert, 1975, pp. 40-41)
Meyers et al. (1972) have found four basic activities in which the Mental Health and Area Retardation Boards are involved. The tasks performed by the Boards are: (a) service creation or improvement; (b) outside resource mobilization; (c) reviewing budgets of health care institutions; and (d) coordination of services.

Different tasks are performed by each of the four groups in Steinbacher and Solomon's (1971) study in Cleveland. The goals of the Mt. Pleasant Community Development Foundation are to sponsor economic development and rehabilitation and the construction of housing in the Mt. Pleasant area. Within these goals the Community Development Foundation: (a) established a cooperative of apartment building owners; (b) created a loan guarantee program; (c) bought a deteriorated house, remodeled and tried to sell it; and (d) applied for loans for housing renewal. The Mt. Pleasant Community Council has: (a) written letters to city officials concerning problems; (b) invited city department staff members to meetings; and (c) prints a newsletter. The School Improvement Program's (SIP) goals are to: (a) make the residents aware of and involved in what is happening in the schools; (b) aid groups in improving the schools; (c) establish lines of communication for parents to express their feelings; and (d) develop Mt. Pleasant representation on city-wide projects and groups dealing with school issues. Steinbacher and Solomon found SIP's one visible activity to have been the creation of an advisory council to the
principal of a school that was having problems with violence.

Power of the Committees

Several typologies have been developed to determine the relative power of citizen groups. Two of these will be discussed in this section. Then, the literature will be examined to determine how powerful specific citizen committees have been perceived to be.

Arnstein (1969) has developed an eight-rung "ladder of citizen participation," ranging from total manipulation to complete citizen control. At the first level, manipulation, "people are placed on rubber-stamp advisory committees or advisory boards for the express purpose of 'educating' them or engineering their support" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 218). Therapy groups are the second level. It is assumed "that powerlessness is synonymous with mental illness. On this assumption, under a masquerade of involving citizens in planning, the experts subject the citizens to clinical group therapy" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 218). Third are Informing groups, which permit a one-way flow of information from the government to citizens. Consultation groups are fourth, and are created to solicit citizens' opinions, but do not guarantee that they will be used. Fifth are Placation groups. These groups "allow citizens to advise or plan ad infinitum but retain for powerholders the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 220). In the sixth level, Partnership, planning and decision-making are shared. The seventh level, Delegated Power, gives citizens dominant
decision-making authority. The final level, Citizen Control, is characterized by "a neighborhood corporation with no intermediaries between it and the source of funds" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 223).

Riedel (1972) has classified citizen advisory groups according to the function they serve for the governing body. He has developed the following four classifications: (a) Advisory, (b) Supportive, (c) Put-Off, and (d) Put-On. If an Advisory group is created, the agency will be willing to listen to alternatives or recommendations proposed by the committee. Supportive groups are created to reach the same conclusions as the agency, to give alternatives to the agency (when the agency knows what it does not want), or to evaluate existing programs. Put-Off committees are created to give the impression that something is being done about a problem. However, the membership is selected so that nothing will be accomplished. Put-On groups are created to reach the same decision as the agency, to quiet dissident groups, or to let a report take the place of action.

When analyzed according to Arnstein's typology, the Community Planning for Community Schools (CPCS) citizen advisory committee appears to fit best at Level 5, the Placation group. The committee approved the final report written by the Coordinators, but final approval for implementation of the plan lay with Superintendent Brownell, and then with the Board of Education. Furthermore, Sigel (1966) found that "the crucial decisions—on budget and site—were not made by the CPCS citizens advisory committee. Those decisions,
which might have provoked deep conflict, were made by the Board of Education and its officials" (p. 55). Arnstein (1969) states that at the Placation level, "the ground rules allow have-nots to advise, but retain for the powerholders the continued right to decide" (p. 217). In the case of the CPCS, the citizens were allowed to plan, but the final power to accept and implement the plan was held by the Board of Education. The CPCS members were not able "to negotiate and engage in trade-offs" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 217) with the Board of Education— an ability that would have placed them at the sixth-rung of power, that of Partnership. However, the CPCS also does not fit the fourth level of power, that of Consultation. Typical methods of Consultation are "attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 219). Public officials list "citizen needs" or "citizen opinions" in reports prepared by or decisions made by public officials. The citizens involved in the CPCS had more power than this. Through their sub-committees they prepared individual parts of the plan. Furthermore, the members of the Steering Committee were able to approve the final plan prepared by the Coordinators. Following Riedel's typology, the CPCS would appear to be an Advisory group. Superintendent Brownell did consider the recommendations made by the Committee.

Effectiveness of the Committees

A perusal of the literature will reveal that citizen advisory committees are viewed as ineffective by many Political Scientists
and Sociologists. Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) state two major problems of advisory committees. "One is the difficulty of spelling out meaningful activities which would be advisory as distinct from administrative: the other is the problem of keeping board members interested when they are confined to giving advice only" (p. 193). Clearly defined role and purpose are essential for an effective committee. Meyers et al. (1974), in their study of Massachusetts mental health boards, found that "uncertainty about the boards' proper role is negatively related to all four accomplishment factors" (p. 195). Meyers et al. (1974) further state that "role ambiguity may have a paralyzing effect on board activity" (p. 195).

Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) found groups were ineffective if they inadequately defined their goals, or if they had too many goals.

Steggert's (1975) summary of the findings of 10 Urban Observatories on citizen participation discusses the effectiveness of committees at length. The Albuquerque group found effective groups were those that:

2. Had already assembled some economic and political resources.
3. Had engaged in prior successful negotiations.
4. Used their information in simple and forthright ways.
5. Made demands that could be politically acceded to. (Steggert, 1975, p. 61)

The Atlanta study showed that "the variable that seemed to determine success was the ability of the group's leadership to gather community
support while damping down intergroup conflict to the degree that it did not become publicly visible" (Steggert, 1975, pp. 61-62). The Cleveland groups were found to be ineffective overall, because they "had no real capacities to affect the community—decay and community-improvement concerns that were manifest goals" (Steggert, 1975, p. 63). They were also ineffective because they were "cut off from any significant contacts with the local political system" (Steggert, 1975, p. 63). The Kansas City, Kansas study dealt only with groups that could be considered successful. The groups had in common:

1. A significant proportion of each group's activities was initiated by a small dedicated leadership cadre within the larger, more general membership structure.

2. This leadership cadre studied the structure and operations of the target agency to learn how the system worked.

3. The organization made direct contacts—letters, calls, or visits—to those officials who had the authority to act. (Steggert, 1975, p. 64)

Clavel (1968) has connected committee ineffectiveness with inadequacies on the part of the board members. Clavel states that "the administrative and technical potential of the boards is extremely limited: much more so than the professional practices of the experts and the politics of state and federal programs seem to assume" (p. 136). Clavel found three sources of conflict between the professional planners and the county planning board which led to an ineffective performance by the board. First, there were conflicts of interest within the board membership itself. Second,
there were social differences between the professionals and the board members, and among the board members. Finally, Clavel found there were status inequalities present. At the beginning of the board-planner relationship, the board members had higher status. However, as the relationship continued, the board members found themselves inferior in technical knowledge. A situation such as this, Clavel states, results in the board refusing to act, or acting in opposition to the experts.

The concept of citizen advisory committees is also viewed as an ineffective method of citizen participation. The committees are frequently viewed as being used by the city, rather than having an independent function. Steggert states that

The citizen advisory group approach tends to see citizen involvement at the output end—as providing advice to agencies on policy implementation and program administration matters. In this sense, the citizens involved are somewhat locked into the agency's overall organizational structure. They may, moreover, be located at or near the bottom of the influence chain. (Steggert, 1975, pp. 77-78)

Benz (1975) studied citizen participation under the Community Development program in Des Moines, Iowa. In speaking of citizen groups in this program, Benz states that they were not "participatory as the term has been defined....The community was 'acted on' but was not allowed to 'act' or encouraged to find alternatives to existing social institutions" (pp. 115-119).
Characteristics of the Members

If citizen participation is believed to be important to the political system, then it becomes essential to explore what types of people do participate, in this case, on citizen advisory committees. Political efficacy has been found to be related to participation. Individuals with a high sense of political efficacy are more likely to participate than are those with a low sense of efficacy (Steggert, 1975). Length of residency has been found to be another relevant factor. They found that home-owners participate more than do renters. Steggert (1975) finds that upper-class citizens are more likely to participate than lower-class citizens. Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) state that the individual variables of occupation and education are not significant, but that geographical area is. They conclude that the geographical area combines several socio-economic variables, as well as peer pressure, to participate.

Psychological motivations for individuals to participate on citizen advisory groups have also been discussed. Shaw (1971), discussing general group participation, states that

Sources of need satisfaction residing in the group include at least (1) attraction to the members of the group (inter-personal attraction), (2) attraction to the activities of the group (i.e., the goals of the group are valued by the individual), and (3) group membership per se. (p. 87)

Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) state that "participation is based very much on what the client hopes to gain from his involvement
in the organization. For instance, the client may acquire psychological benefits or rewards as well as power and/or prestige" (p. 6). The above motivations help explain the initial decision to join a group. The maintenance of participation in the group has also been discussed by Steinbacher and Solomon (1971). They state that

If a client receives increasing rewards from more active participation, this study assumes that his degree of activity will also increase. This increase will be manifested by greater attendance at meetings or by defending the organization physically or verbally; or perhaps by taking greater initiative and leadership in the organization. When the rewards decrease the client will either drop membership or join another organization. (pp. 5-6)

If the climate of the advisory group rewards the member, the member will continue to participate, and may even increase his level of participation. If the committee fails to reward the member, he will decrease his level of participation, or withdraw from the group.

Steinbacher and Solomon hypothesize that there is a direct relationship between the degree of decision-making power given the advisory committee, and the level of participation present on the committee.

Membership on a citizen advisory committee is a form of cooperative participation, according to Verba and Nie's (1972) classification scheme. They generalize that people involved in cooperative participation

Are interested in collective outcomes (which may be narrower than those of elections); take high initiative to become involved in this form of participation; have a high sense of community contribution, involvement in
politics, skills, and competence; are nonpartisan and avoid conflict; upper socioeconomic levels are very overrepresented, blacks are underrepresented, Protestant rather than Catholic; overrepresented in rural areas and small town, underrepresented in big cities. (Verba and Nie, 1972, pp. 118-119)

Satisfaction: A Review of the Literature

The effects of different committee variables on members' satisfaction with their committees are to be examined in the present research. In this portion of the paper, satisfaction will be studied. First will be a general discussion of satisfaction as it relates to work. Second, will be an examination of the findings of different studies of satisfaction that relate directly to the hypotheses presently under consideration.

The literature of Industrial Psychology is quite extensive concerning the relationship of satisfaction and work. While it is conceded that one's occupation does differ from one's participation on a citizen advisory committee (particularly with regards to monetary remuneration), it is believed that there are enough similarities between the two to warrant an examination of the literature. First, many studies conducted in Industrial Psychology discuss "group performance" and "group member satisfaction" with regards to work, both clearly relevant to the present study. Second, many variables that have been discussed as affecting one's job performance, such as status, inter-personal relations, responsibility, achievement, work itself, recognition, and self-expression, also have relevance to one's performance on a citizen advisory committee.
Many of the preceding variables are of interest to the present research. It is thus of importance to explore how they have been found to affect job performance.

An extended debate has been conducted in the field of Industrial Psychology over the classification of variables affecting job satisfaction. Psychologists have argued whether one set of variables affects satisfaction and another set affects dissatisfaction for the entire working population. They have also wrangled with whether one set of variables is important to white-collar workers, and another set to blue-collar workers. This debate will be briefly presented on the following pages.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman developed a classification of variables affecting job satisfaction that has been much debated and re-examined. Herzberg et al. divided variables into two categories, satisfiers and dissatisfiers. They found that one group of variables cause job satisfaction, and another group cause job dissatisfaction. The five satisfiers are related to the job itself. They are: (a) recognition, (b) achievement, (c) work itself, (d) advancement, and (e) responsibility (Wernimont, 1966). The five dissatisfiers are related to the environment of the job and are: (a) salary, (b) company policies and practices, (c) technical aspects of supervision, (d) interpersonal relations in supervision, and (e) working conditions (Wernimont, 1966).

Wernimont (1966) tested the findings of Herzberg et al. He used a sample of 50 accountants and 82 engineers. The respondents
were asked to describe some job situation that had made them feel happy, and some situation that had made them feel unhappy. They were further instructed to select aspects of their job with which they were satisfied, and items with which they were dissatisfied. Wernimont terms the job related items "intrinsic factors" and environmental items "extrinsic factors." In contrast to Herzberg et al. Wernimont found that intrinsic factors proved to be the most important, both as satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

Centers and Bugental (1966) also tested Herzberg et al.'s findings. However, unlike Wernimont's white-collar only sample, Centers and Bugental wanted to study the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic variables on all occupational levels. They attempted to match in their sample the proportions of age, sex, and socio-economic level that were existent in the working population of the city from which the sample was taken (Los Angeles). The respondents were asked to choose from the following the item most important for staying at their present job: (a) the pay, (b) good co-workers, (c) the work is interesting, (d) the work allows you to use your skill or talent, (e) you can be sure of always having the job, (f) the work gives you a feeling of satisfaction (Centers and Bugental, 1966, p. 194). Items c, d, and f were classified as intrinsic factors by Centers and Bugental, while items a, b, and e were classified as extrinsic factors. Centers and Bugental found that white-collar workers rated the intrinsic factors as being most important, while blue-collar workers considered extrinsic factors to be the
most important. In discussing their findings, the authors state that

Interpreting our results in terms of Maslow's (1943) need-hierarchy, it could be said that individuals in lower-level occupations are more likely to be motivated by lower-order needs (pay, security, etc.) because these are not sufficiently gratified to allow higher-order needs (the self-fulfillment possible in the job itself) to become prepotent. (Centers and Bugental, 1966, p. 197)

Armstrong (1971) has criticized both the Wernimont and Centers and Bugental studies. He criticizes Wernimont specifically for using a white-collar only sample. Furthermore, Armstrong states that in neither study did the respondents rate variables both in terms of their satisfaction value and their importance. Centers and Bugental asked the respondents to rate variables in terms of their importance, whereas Wernimont asked for the level of satisfaction. Armstrong divided variables into content factors (intrinsic) and context factors (extrinsic). The content factors considered were recognition, responsibility, achievement, advancement, and the work itself. Salary, job security, status, supervision-technical, supervision-interpersonal relations, interpersonal relations-peers, company policy and administration, and working conditions were the job context factors. Armstrong utilized an all-male sample consisting of engineers and assemblers. The questionnaire used consisted of four parts: (a) a section to determine over-all job satisfaction, (b) a section to measure satisfaction with specific job content and job context variables, (c) a scale to rank the importance of various job factors, and (d) items to
obtain demographic characteristics of the respondents. Armstrong found that job content (intrinsic) factors proved to be most important to both the engineers and the assemblers in terms of satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

Starcevich (1972) studied three levels of management in a corporation. The sample was asked to rank order 18 factors first in terms of satisfaction sources, and next in terms of dissatisfaction. It was found that job content factors were more important for both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at all three levels than were job context factors. For all three levels of management, "feeling of achievement" was the most important satisfier and dissatisfier.

Locke (1973) has criticized the classification schemes previously discussed. He finds fault with the intrinsic-extrinsic or content-context dichotomies. Locke proposes instead a system based on agents and events. Locke utilized this system in a study of blue- and white-collar workers obtained by accidental sample. The subjects were asked to describe a good and a bad time in their job. The answers given were then classified according to agent and event. Agents included self, supervisor, co-workers, subordinate, organization, customer, non-human agent, or no agent. Events included task activity, amount of work, smoothness, success, promotion, responsibility, verbal recognition of work, money, interpersonal atmosphere, physical working conditions, and uncodable or others. Locke found no evidence that satisfying events were caused by different factors than were dissatisfying events. He found that employees
were more likely to take credit for good events, and to blame others for bad events. Locke divided the events into three categories:

1. Task events—task activity, amount of work, smoothness, and success.
2. Reward events—promotion, responsibility, verbal recognition of work, and money.
3. Context events—interpersonal atmosphere and physical working conditions.

Locke found that task events were more important to white collar workers than either reward or context events.

Studies have been conducted in Industrial Psychology to investigate many of the variables of concern in the hypotheses of this paper. Each of the five groups of hypotheses have some basis in the literature of Industrial Psychology. Additionally, some of the relevant variables have been discussed in studies of citizen participation groups. A brief discussion of some relevant findings will be presented here for each of the following hypotheses groups: (a) committee shortcomings (b) external influences on the committees; (c) information available to the committees; (d) tasks conducted by the committees; and (e) characteristics of committee members.

**Shortcomings of Committees**

It has been hypothesized that

1. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is adequate attendance.

Landy and Trumbo (1976) have found a correlation between satisfaction with work and the rate of absenteeism. They have found that workers
who are dissatisfied with their work tend to be absent more frequently. The following has been offered as an explanation for this factor.

Since people avoid punishing situations and seek out rewarding situations, significant correlations between measure of work approach or avoidance (such as absenteeism or tardiness) are to be expected. (Landy & Trumbo, 1976)

Following from this, one could hypothesize that people would tend to be dissatisfied with a situation in which one found high rates of absenteeism.

The effect that the level of participation of members has on member satisfaction is another variable to be investigated. It has been hypothesized that

2. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is active participation by the members.

Levine (1973) conducted a study, with a sample of 192 students, to determine the effects of a balanced versus an unbalanced level of participation by group members on the time needed to complete a task, the score achieved on the task, and the members' satisfaction with their groups. The sample was divided into four types of groups, numbering three members each. Each participant was instructed by the experimenters to be either "high control" or "low control."

High control members were to have a high rate of interaction, a high amount of giving suggestions, and a low amount of asking others for information or their opinions. Low control members were to have a low rate of interaction, offer few suggestions, and have a high rate of asking for information or opinions from other members.
The four types of groups formed were: (a) High Control/Balanced—all three members high control; (b) Low Control/Balanced—all three members low control; (c) High Control/Unbalanced—two members high control, one low control; and (d) Low Control/Unbalanced—two members low control, one high control. The groups were given a matrix game to complete, and were measured in terms of the time needed to complete the task and the total score achieved. A post-experimental questionnaire was distributed to measure members' satisfaction with their groups. It was found that time to completion, total score, and member satisfaction were all higher under the high control groups than under the low control groups. Levine (1973) concludes that

A high amount of control and a balanced distribution of control should lead to increased striving for goals, better communications, and decreased conflict—the result being better performance and satisfaction on the part of the group or organization. (p. 193)

Hypothesis 2 is consistent with Levine's findings that members are more satisfied with high than low control groups.

Hypothesis three states that

3. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which too much time is not spent on unimportant issues.

Locke (1973) classified unimportant or insignificant work as a task event. Task events, reward, and job context were examined for their relative effect on white- and blue-collar workers' satisfaction with their jobs. It was found that task events such as the perceived importance of work were significantly more important for a white-collar worker's job satisfaction, than were reward or context events.
The fourth hypothesis about committee shortcomings is concerned with dissension.

4. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have a high level of dissension.

Steggert (1975), in speaking of a study conducted in Baltimore, states that

Contrary to one major school of thought, internal rivalries within groups did not produce many projects, proposals, or demands—i.e., a full organizational agenda. Such conflict and competition within groups were associated with the absence of a full agenda. (p. 64)

In essence, Steggert found that dissension results in an unproductive committee. Crenson (1974) studied the relationships of the internal characteristics of seven neighborhood-based groups in Baltimore. He found that high levels of conflict within a group result in the inability of the group to define its tasks. Low levels of conflict were related to the high production of demands by a group (their prime output).

The fifth hypothesis concerning committee shortcomings states that

5. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which one person does not dominate the meetings.

Levine's (1973) study, in addition to examining high and low control groups, also examined the satisfaction participants had with balanced and unbalanced groups. Levine found that member satisfaction was higher on balanced groups than on unbalanced groups. Members participated equally on balanced groups, with no one person
dominating the group. Levine (1973) found that "the superiority of balanced over unbalanced groups on payoff and satisfaction holds up equally well regardless of the ease or difficulty of the task" (p. 193).

**External Influences on the Committees**

Three hypotheses have been made regarding external influences on the committees, and member satisfaction. They are:

6. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have external influences which make the job difficult to do.

7. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have duplication with other committees.

8. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with their agency.

These external influences could also be termed extrinsic, or context factors.

Centers and Bugental (1966), in interviews with 692 employed adults, found that extrinsic factors were more important to blue-collar workers with regards to job satisfaction, whereas intrinsic factors were rated by white-collar workers as being most important. Wernimont (1966) studied only white-collar workers, and found intrinsic factors were rated by white-collar workers as being most important. Wernimont (1966) studied only white-collar workers, and found intrinsic factors to be more important than extrinsic factors, both as satisfiers and dissatisfiers.
Two studies were found to relate directly to hypothesis 8. Steggert (1975) found that in Kansas City, Kansas, the successful groups were those that studied the structure and operations of their agency, and then made direct contacts with the officials involved. Cole (1974) studied the members of 26 neighborhood programs in four states and six metropolitan areas. The programs were ranked on a two-dimensional array of participation intensity and program scope. Programs rated lowest were those whose function was solely advisory. Cole found that participants in programs at both ends of the scale were the most dissatisfied. Members of the mid-level programs had the highest level of satisfaction. One reason given by Cole for this, is that the mid-level programs had a considerable amount of coordination and direction from city hall. Hypothesis 8 is consistent with this finding.

Information

The next two hypotheses are concerned with the relationship of member satisfaction and the amount of information available to the committee members. Hypotheses 9 and 10 state that

9. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which the members are sufficiently informed.

10. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees which receive information from the staff.

The relationship of lack of information, or role ambiguity, and job satisfaction, has been compared to the correlation of role conflict and job satisfaction in the literature of Industrial
Psychology. Two studies will be presented here.

Hamner and Tosi (1974) have studied the relationship of role ambiguity and job satisfaction. One factor helping to create role ambiguity is a lack of information. Sixty-one high-level managers were surveyed by Hamner and Tosi, to determine the relative effects of role ambiguity and role conflict on job satisfaction. It was found that role ambiguity was negatively correlated with job satisfaction, whereas the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction was not found to be significant. The authors postulated that

Since it has been argued by many that the managerial job is one of solving unstructured problems, or introducing more certainty into lower organization levels, it could be reasonably argued that the effects of higher ambiguity levels are more important determinants of satisfaction than are conflicting role pressures. (Hamner & Tosi, 1974, p. 499)

The relationship of role ambiguity and role conflict on job ambiguity and role conflict on job satisfaction were compared by Schuler (1975) for high-, mid-, and entry-level employees of a manufacturing firm. Schuler (1975) defines role ambiguity as

A situation in which there is inadequate role sending, that is, when lack of agreement among role senders produces sent expectations that contain logical incompatibilities or that take inadequate account of the needs and abilities of the focal person. Essentially it is a condition in which information is lacking or not communicated. (p. 683)

Questionnaires were distributed to 391 employees to measure role ambiguity, role conflict, and job satisfaction. Schuler found, in concurrence with Hamner and Tosi, that at the high-level, role ambiguity and job satisfaction are more negatively related than
role conflict and job satisfaction. At the entry-level, role conflict had a stronger negative relationship with job satisfaction than role ambiguity. Schuler speculates that the disparate findings for the high- and entry-level employees can be explained by the different natures of tasks performed. At the entry-level, tasks are generally well structured and defined; additional information is usually easy to obtain. However, entry-level employees cannot easily change rules or procedures, or increase resources in order to reduce role conflict. Higher-level employees, in contrast, have the power to more easily handle sources of role conflict. However, at the higher-level, one must deal frequently with vague and unstructured tasks, therefore creating the opportunity for more role ambiguity.

Participation on a citizen advisory board would seem to more closely resemble a high-level position than an entry-level position. Advisory board members do perform vague and unstructured tasks. Therefore, the findings of Schuler and Hammer and Tosi are congruent with hypotheses 9 and 10.

Tasks

Specific tasks performed by the committees are the focus of the next group of hypotheses. Of interest here is whether or not a committee performs a specific action. The hypotheses are

11. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy.
12. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support.

13. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public.

Tasks performed by a committee can be considered the work of the committee. Two dichotomies exist in Industrial Psychology to classify variables that may affect job satisfaction. The nature of work itself, has been classified under the general category of intrinsic factors (vs. extrinsic factors) or motivator aspects (vs. hygiene aspects). The two dichotomies appear to be identical, with only the labels being different.

Starcevich (1972) studied management level employees in a corporation. He had the subjects rank order 18 factors first in terms of satisfaction sources, and then in terms of dissatisfaction sources. He found that job content factors were, in general, more important than job context factors. The work itself (tasks) was the second most important factor affecting job satisfaction; feeling of achievement was first. Wernimont (1966) compared the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic factors as satisfiers and dissatisfiers on 50 accountants and 82 engineers. It was found that intrinsic factors (work itself, recognition, achievement, advancement, and responsibility) were more important as satisfiers and dissatisfiers than were extrinsic factors (salary, company policies, technical competence, interpersonal relations, working conditions). These results are consistent with Halpern's (1966) study, in which motivator factors were found to be more important to job satisfaction than
hygiene factors. Halpern's sample consisted of 101 men, whose names were taken from a phone book.

It has thus been found that intrinsic, or motivator factors, are more important to job satisfaction than extrinsic or hygiene factors. One would thus expect that members would tend to be more satisfied with committees that do take specific actions, than with committees that do not, for these actions can be seen as the work of the committee, and can thus be classified as intrinsic or motivator factors.

With regard to hypothesis 12, Steggert (1975) found that in Atlanta,

The variable that seemed to determine success was the ability of the group's leadership to gather community support while damping down intergroup conflict to the degree that it did not become publicly visible. (pp. 61-62)

One could hypothesize from this that members would tend to be more satisfied with successful committees. As committees that solicit public support will tend to be successful, one would then expect members to be more satisfied with these active committees.

**Personal Factors**

The final two hypotheses are concerned with the relationship of member satisfaction and different personal factors of the members. The first hypothesis is concerned with a member's length of service on the committee. It states that

14. The longer a member of a citizen advisory committee has served on the committee, the more satisfied he is with the committee.
It has been seen that citizen advisory boards are viewed in the literature as being, in general, ineffective (Steggert, 1975; Pfiffner & Presthus, 1967; Benz, 1975). One would thus expect members who first encounter this ineffectiveness, to become dissatisfied with their membership. Some members, however, do retain their committee memberships for long periods. One would expect that these members would be more satisfied with their membership, for one of two possible reasons. First, they may have been satisfied from the start, or two, they believe they need to stay on the committee for some personal reason (such as career advancement), and thus, through cognitive dissonance, come to be satisfied with their membership.

Festinger (1957) developed a theory of cognitive dissonance. If two beliefs are dissonant, they are diametrically opposed to one another, in conflict with one another (Smith, 1973). Thus, a member's belief that a citizen advisory committee is ineffective and useless, would be in opposition to his need, for personal reasons, to remain on the committee. This dissonance must be resolved. Smith (1973), in a brief review of Festinger's theory, states that dissonance can be reduced in three ways, "by changing one or more of the elements involved in dissonant relations, by adding new cognitive elements that are consonant with already existing cognitions, and by decreasing the importance of the dissonant elements" (p. 70). If an individual states that the committee is effective, he or she would be changing an element of his or her belief.
The final personal hypothesis is concerned with a personality variable of the members, and its relationship to the member's satisfaction with their committee. Personality has been used to explain a wide variety of political behaviors. Personality has been used by some researchers to explain the behavior of individual political actors. Woodrow Wilson (George & George, 1956; Freud & Bullit, 1967), Richard Nixon (Wills, 1969; Mazlish, 1972) and Lyndon Johnson (Kearns, 1976) are only a few of the political leaders to have been studied, based on their personalities, on an individual basis. Other researchers have concentrated on specific types of personalities. Perhaps the most well known political typology is that of Barber (1965 & 1972). Barber's typology results in four separate personality types, based on a political actor's level of activity (high or low) and his attitude towards his position (positive or negative). Barber has applied this typology to legislators and presidents.

Political efficacy is the subject of the next hypothesis. The hypothesis here states that

15. Members of citizen advisory committees with high political efficacy ratings are more satisfied with the committees than are members with low political efficacy ratings.

Knutson (1973) equates efficacy with competence, or "inner feelings of potency." She has found efficacy to be one of the most frequently studied personality traits in the literature of political science. Millbrath (1965) found that "persons who are psychologically involved in politics are more likely to feel efficacious about
political action. Millbrath further believes that participation tends to increase one's feelings of political efficacy, which then increases one's level of participation, thus creating a circular pattern. Millbrath's postulate on the circular pattern of participation and political efficacy helped serve as the foundation for Hypothesis 15.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present research is to examine the level of satisfaction members of locally initiated citizen advisory committees have with their committee membership. Five types of variables will be examined as potential influences on the level of members' satisfaction. They are: (a) shortcomings of the committee--lack of attendance, lack of active member participation, too much time devoted to unimportant issues, a high level of dissension, and one person dominates the meetings; (b) external influences on the committees--duplication with other committees, consultation with the agency, and external influences in general that make the committee member's work difficult; (c) information--are the members sufficiently informed? and do the committees receive information from the agency staff? (d) specific actions performed by the committees--policy formation, solicitation of support, and providing of information to the public; and (e) personal characteristics of the members--the length of service on the committee, and a member's feelings of political efficacy.
Research Methods

A brief review of the research methods used will be presented here. The research methods will be discussed in fuller detail in Chapter III.

The Sample

The membership of eight citizen advisory committees in Kalamazoo, Michigan were chosen to comprise the sample. The committees are: (a) Airport Advisory Board, (b) Environmental Concerns Committee, (c) Kalamazoo Historic District Commission, (d) Kalamazoo Historical Commission, (e) Parks and Recreation Board, (f) Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board, (g) Tenant Landlord Council, and (h) Transportation Advisory Board. The eight committees chosen are all locally-initiated advisory committees, with limited membership.

The Design

A questionnaire (see Appendix) was distributed to all members of the eight citizen advisory committees. The responses to the questions provide information on the members' satisfaction with their committees, their feelings of political efficacy, and about features of the committees. Newspaper clippings of the Kalamazoo Gazette were examined to obtain descriptive and historical information about the eight committees.
Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaires were distributed at meetings of the eight citizen advisory committees by graduate Political Science students from Western Michigan University. Questionnaires were mailed to members absent from the meetings, with a stamped, pre-addressed envelope enclosed. The questionnaire responses were recorded on code sheets by this researcher, with the process validated by an independent recorder. The information was then placed on computer tape, to be used for data analysis.

Outline of Remaining Chapters

Following is a brief description of the topics to be covered in the remaining chapters of this paper.

In Chapter II will be presented descriptive information about the eight citizen advisory committees under study. Information will be provided about each committee's charges, its accomplishments, and characteristics of the members of the committee.

In Chapter III will be a discussion of the research methods used in the study. Detailed information will be provided about the sample, the design, data collection procedures utilized, and the statistical methods to be used to analyze the data.

Present in Chapter IV will be the statistical tests of the hypotheses. Finally, the conclusions to be made from this study will be presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

LOCALLY INITIATED CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN KALAMAZOO

Introduction

The focus of the present study is the membership of eight citizen advisory committees in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Kalamazoo is a city with a population of 85,555 people (according to the 1970 census). It is located in Kalamazoo County, which has a total population of 201,550. The City of Kalamazoo has a commission-manager form of government. The mayor is the member of the City Commission who receives the most votes in the non-partisan election.

The eight citizen advisory committees under study are all locally initiated bodies; they were created by the City Commission of Kalamazoo. The committees all have limited memberships. It is the City's policy that no member on an advisory committee shall serve more than two consecutive terms. To obtain more information about the eight committees, the local paper, the Kalamazoo Gazette, was surveyed from 1972-1978 to obtain information about these committees. Additionally, city publications about the committee were also examined.

Presented in this chapter will be, first, a description of each of the committee's charges, activities, and accomplishments. Second, will be a presentation of the characteristics of the members
of the committees, based on the descriptive information obtained in the present study.

Description of Committees

Airport Advisory Board

The Airport Advisory Board "consults with and makes recommendations to the City Manager at any time as to any activities at the airport" (Summary of Duties and Responsibilities of City's Boards and Committees). The Board was originally composed of seven members, but in 1977 the City Commission expanded the membership to eleven. The City Commission also decided at that time to allow up to four members of the Airport Advisory Board to be residents of Kalamazoo County who do not reside in the City of Kalamazoo. Furthermore, the City Commission changed the length of Airport Advisory Board members' terms from two to three years.

Several activities of the Airport Advisory Board have been highlighted by the local media. In late 1977, the Airport Advisory Board formed a subcommittee "responsible for monitoring and recommending procedures and practices to minimize noise from aircraft at Kalamazoo Municipal Airport" (Kalamazoo Gazette, Oct. 16, 1977, p. A-10). In 1978, the Airport Advisory Board sent a recommendation to the City Commission that the airport curfew be amended to allow small jets to land after 11:00 p.m., and for all jets to land after 11:00 p.m., if weather emergencies delayed them.
Environmental Concerns Committee

The Environmental Concerns Committee is charged with identifying local trends and activities affecting the environment, with studying environmental impact statements prepared for and by City departments, and with serving as a citizen's forum on environmental concerns. The Committee is composed of nine members who serve three year terms, and meet once a month.

The Environmental Concerns Committee has been involved in a wide range of projects. In 1972 the Committee held a public hearing on the proposed widening of a local road from two to four lanes. At that time, the Kalamazoo Gazette said of the Committee that it "has ranged widely in its recommendations, from support of business design standards to the proposed and scuttled U.S. version of a supersonic transport plane, to state billboard legislation" (Kalamazoo Gazette, March 23, 1972, p. C-14). In 1978 the Committee examined the issue of throw-away versus returnable bottles. (This was prior to the passage of a state-wide election that banned throw-away bottles in the State of Michigan.) The Environmental Concerns Committee urged the City of Kalamazoo to pass an ordinance requiring that stores have an equal number of throw-away and returnable bottles. Members of the Environmental Concerns Committee made an effort to publicize their existence in 1978. An article was printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette informing the community of where and when the Committee meets, and encouraging citizen input. The article said that this effort was made because "board members feel citizens may
have forgotten that such a committee exists" (February 12, 1978, p. A-5). The Committee also began to survey community leaders and neighborhood groups regarding their environmental concerns. It was noted by the *Kalamazoo Gazette* that "in the past, the group has been involved in noise ordinance discussion, the Hull Estate preservation fight, and other matters of public policy which came before the City Commission" (February 12, 1978, p. A-5).

**Kalamazoo Historic District Commission**

The Historic District Commission was created by the City Commission in 1973. Prior to this, in 1971, a study committee was formed by the City Commission. The purpose of this study committee was to:

1. Safeguard the heritage of the city by preserving a district or districts inside the city which reflect elements of its cultural, social, economic, political, or architectural history.

2. Stabilize and improve property values in such a district.

3. Foster civic beauty.

4. Strengthen the local economy.


This study committee recommended that an historic district be created in the South Street area of Kalamazoo.

In 1973, the City Commission created the South Street Historic District, and concomitant with this, formed the Historic District Commission (initially called the South Street Historic District Commission...
Michigan's Historic Districts Act of 1970 requires that "anyone who wants to change the exterior appearance of a building, or demolish it, in a historic district has to have permission from the historic district commission" (Todd, October 6, 1972, p. B-1). Thus, the formation of an historic district in the City of Kalamazoo necessitated the creation of a historic district commission. The law further states that the commission must have seven members, one of whom is an architect, and two of whom are chosen from nominees submitted by an existing historical society. (In Kalamazoo, the existing historical society was the Historical Commission.) The reasons given for creating the South Street Historic District were that:

1. It would illustrate a variety of architectural styles which were popular in the 19th century.

2. It would include buildings with a wide range of construction dates.

3. Many prominent citizens of Kalamazoo lived in the older buildings on the street. (Todd, October 6, 1972, p. B-1)

The Historic District Commission can only deal with the exteriors of buildings. It has legal authority to rule on alterations to buildings. It cannot require homeowners to paint their houses, though, or prescribe colors. Landscaping is not covered by historical protection laws, either. In general, only those alterations which permanently change a building—and cannot easily be undone by future owners—are covered. (Donia, June 6, 1975, p. B-4)

In 1974, the State of Michigan gave formal approval to the South Street Historic District. To celebrate this approval, the
Historic District Commission "issued guidelines to owners of the houses on landscaping, neighborhood design, repairs and maintenance" (Kalamazoo Gazette, May 12, 1974, p. D-4). The Historic District Commission in late 1974 had the modern street signs removed from the neighborhood and replaced with street signs more congruent with the era of the district.

The Historic District Commission has been involved in a variety of activities promoting historic districts in the City of Kalamazoo. In early 1974 the Commission proposed to the City Commission that a second Historic district be formed, this time in the Stuart Street area. This proposal was approved in July of 1976. To promote the South Street Historic District, a tour of homes in the area was sponsored in 1976. Antique cars were also paced on display for the event. In 1978 a concert of Christmas music was held in one of the historic homes in the South Street District.

Kalamazoo Historical Commission

The Kalamazoo Historical Commission is responsible for the total community's historical perspective. As part of its general charge, the Commission is accountable for maintaining an "Inventory of Historic Sites." This inventory is composed of historical sites and buildings which the members believe "have such historical value as to warrant preservation or development" (Summary of Duties and Responsibilities of City's Boards and Committees) Originally, only professionals and members of the Historical Commission could
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propose sites and buildings to be added to the Inventory. However, in 1976, the Historical Commission decided to allow the public to make nominations for the Inventory. An article was published in the Kalamazoo Gazette describing the Inventory, and explaining how nominations were to be made. A recommendation for the Inventory must be submitted in writing to an Historical Commission member, or through the City's Planning Divisions of the Community Development Department. The recommendation must include information to document the age, style, and original owners of the building or site. Appearance on the Inventory, however, does not protect a building for alteration or demolition. The Historical Commission is also charged with assisting City officials "in classifying, arranging, indexing, and preserving official records and documents so that they may be available for public use" (Summary of Duties and Responsibilities of City's Boards and Committees). If the City Commission approves, the Historical Commission may, for historical purposes, also accept donations of money, personal property, or real estate. The Historical Commission is composed of seven members who meet once a month, and serve three year terms.

The Historical Commission has been involved in a variety of projects. In 1974, the Historical Commission publicized its intent to publish pamphlets containing items of interest about Kalamazoo for the Bicentennial, and solicited suggestions from citizens for the pamphlets. Later in 1974, the Historical Commission saw the completion of a project it had sponsored. Historic boundaries of
the city of Kalamazoo were marked with signs. The Historical Commission failed in 1975 to convince the City Commission to use the profits from the sale of a house donated to the City, for historical purposes. *Kalamazoo: Nineteenth-Century Homes in a Midwestern Village* is a book published by the Historical Commission in 1976. The book "features old and new pictures of many of Kalamazoo's historic homes" and provides "a general lesson in architecture into the history of Kalamazoo as it related to the people who built the homes" (*Kalamazoo Gazette*, October 17, 1976, p. B-4). The Historical Commission also prepared a booklet in 1976 to assist people who were interested in recommending sites for the "Inventory of Historic Sites." The booklet described styles of architecture in old homes and provided information about research styles.

**Parks And Recreation Board**

The Parks and Recreation Board was created in 1974. The Board is charged with making recommendations to the City Commission regarding parks and recreation planning and programming. In this capacity, it is involved with such activities as (1) setting fees for program participants, (2) scheduling the use of facilities, (3) setting and enforcing rules and regulations for facility use, and (4) recommending budgets for the recreation programs. The Board has nine members who serve three year terms and meet once a month.
Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board

In 1957, a pedestrian mall was created in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The street on which the major downtown stores were located was closed to automobile traffic. The Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board was created to make recommendations to the City Commission regarding the Pedestrian Mall. Subjects their recommendations may include are: building permit applications, mall traffic (bikes and motorcycles), street selling, maintenance, lighting, decoration, and architecture. The Board is charged with coordinating a "park-like and pleasant effect, but not necessarily uniform" (Summary of Duties and Responsibilities of City's Boards and Committees) appearance for the pedestrian mall area. The Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board is made up of six members, who serve two year terms and meet once a month.

Tenant-Landlord Council

The Tenant-Landlord Council was created in 1972 over the opposition of the Kalamazoo Board of Realtors. Its purpose is to negotiate settlements in disputes between tenants and landlords in the City of Kalamazoo. The Council has the power to submit reports to the City Commission, with or without recommendations. The Council is composed of six members, three tenants and three landlords, all of whom serve two year terms.

The Director of the City Community Relations Department was appointed to provide staff assistance to the members of the Council.
Citizen complaints are to be put in writing, and sent to the Community Relations Department. A staff member of the Community Relations Department then attempts to resolve the problem. Problems that cannot be resolved by staff members are then sent to the Council for a hearing. After the Council had been in existence for nine months, only one hearing was held by the Council. All others had been heard.

It was the hope of the Council to solve problems such as rent, damage, and eviction. The rent, damage, and eviction were off of the agenda of the Council's first meeting. The creation of the Council was to clarify laws between the landlord and tenant. (Thinnes,

Several meetings of the Council had been publicly reported. The Council had a single open meeting of the Council. The purpose of the meeting was to acquaint the community with the functions of the Council. The Council printed a booklet entitled "Tenant Landlord Information." It was hoped that this booklet would inform the public about the relationship between tenants and landlords. The booklet was distributed to neighborhood groups, at the Off-Campus Housing Office of Western Michigan University, at City Hall, at the Kalamazoo County Legal
Aid Bureau, and at the Kalamazoo Public Library. In 1976 the Council sponsored a workshop on tenancy for landlords and tenants. The workshop focused on rental agreements, security deposits, code enforcements, escrow accounts and evictions. The workshop was designed "to give people a proper understanding of how a model tenancy should be according to law" (Kalamazoo Gazette, August 1, 1976, p. C-17).

Transportation Advisory Board

The Transportation Advisory Board is charged with advising the City Manager and City Commission on the Metro Transit System. It is concerned with such aspects of the Metro Transit System as rates, routes, service, and equipment. The Transportation Advisory Board has eight members who serve three year terms and meet once a month.

Membership Characteristics

The committee membership as a whole is composed of slightly more males than females, with a total composition of 51.67% male and 46.67% female (1.67 no response) members. The membership is overwhelmingly married, with 86.7% married, 8.33% single, and 5% divorced.

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the age of the members of all the committees combined.
Table 1

Age Distribution of Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The age data does not include the Pedestrian Mall Authority. Of the six members responding to this question, four indicated they were 12, one that they were 19, and one that they were 92.

The above chart reveals that 73% of the members who responded to this item are over 30 years of age, and that 26% are under 30 years of age. This is compatible with Steggert's (1975) finding that individuals over 34 are more likely to participate than those under 34. The members' age ranged from 22 to 67, with a mean age of 40.44.

Of the members responding to a question regarding their level of education, 4.35% stated that they had completed high school, 2.17% had completed junior college, 39.13% had completed college, and 54.35 had completed post-graduate work. The members thus have a high level of education. This would appear to be in contrast to the findings of Steinpacher and Solomon (1971), which indicated
that education was not a significant factor in member participation on citizen advisory committees.

Table 2 indicates the distribution of members according to income level. The majority of the members earn more than $15,000 per year. Only 11% of the members indicated that they earned less than $6,000 per year. This is congruent with Stegert's (1975) findings that upper-class citizens tend to participate more frequently than lower-class citizens on citizen advisory boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Income</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000+</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$30,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000-$15,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) found that home-owners participate more frequently than renters. The membership of the eight committees under study conforms to this finding. Of the members responding, 80% owned their own home, 15.56% rented an apartment, and 4.44% rented a home.
The distribution of members' occupations is presented in Table 3. No members indicated that they were clerical, salesmen, factory workers, or retired. Steinbacher and Solomon (1971) did not find occupation to be a significant variable in determining participation on citizen advisory committees. The present study would appear to be in contrast to this. Of the members responding to this item, 52.17% were professionals, and 26.09% were managers, officials, or proprietors.

Table 3

Occupational Distribution of Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Official, Proprietor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Sample

Eight citizen advisory boards in Kalamazoo, Michigan were chosen to comprise the sample of the current study. The eight committees are: (1) Airport Advisory Board; (2) Environmental Concerns Committee; (3) Kalamazoo Historic District Commission; (4) Kalamazoo Historical Commission; (5) Parks and Recreation Board; (6) Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board; (7) Tenant-Landlord Council; and (8) Transportation Advisory Board. The committees are all locally-initiated boards, created by the City Commission of Kalamazoo.

Questionnaires were distributed to all members of each of the eight committees; completed questionnaires were returned by 52 committee members. Following is a summation of the number of members from each committee who returned questionnaires, and thus comprise the sample for the present study.

(1) Airport Advisory Board--has seven regular members plus two city commissioners as ex officio members; eight members responded.

(2) Environmental Concerns Committee--has nine regular members, plus a biologist as a consultant, and one ex officio member from the City Commission; nine members responded.

(3) Kalamazoo Historic District Commission--has seven regular members; seven members responded.
(4) **Kalamazoo Historical Commission**—has seven regular members; five members responded.

(5) **Parks and Recreation Board**—has nine regular members plus two city commissioners as ex officio members; five members responded.

(6) **Pedestrian Mall Advisory Board**—has six regular members plus one city commissioner and the Parks and Recreation Director as ex officio members; six members responded.

(7) **Tenant-Landlord Council**—has eight regular members; five members responded.

(8) **Transportation Advisory Board**—has eight regular members plus the City Manager and one city commissioner as ex officio members; seven members responded.

**Design**

To examine the effects of different advisory committee variables on member satisfaction with their committee, it was decided to conduct a descriptive survey study. A questionnaire was developed to include items regarding: (1) personal characteristics of the members; (2) length of service on the committees; (3) tasks performed by the committees; (4) member satisfaction with the committees; (5) shortcomings of the committees; and (6) member feelings of political efficacy.

Portions of the questionnaire were administered to members of a graduate course in Political Science Research Methods at Western Michigan University, to test for vague and ambiguous items.

The questionnaire was distributed by graduate students in a Political Science Research Methods course at Western Michigan University during meetings of the individual advisory committees.
Self-addressed stamped envelopes were included with each questionnaire, so that the members could complete the questionnaires in their homes. Questionnaires were mailed to members absent from the meetings. The members' answers were coded on "mark sense sheets" by this researcher. This coding was verified by an independent Political Science graduate student. The data was then stored on magnetic type, to be available for data analysis by computer.

Data Collection Procedures

Member satisfaction with their committee is the dependent variable in each of the hypotheses of the present study. Therefore, this section will first present the method by which a measurement of satisfaction was derived. Second, will be a description of the means by which data was collected on the independent variables of each of the hypotheses.

Satisfaction Scale

Five items were included on the questionnaire to determine the level of satisfaction members had with their committees. First, members were asked to rate three separate items.

1. Please rate the following:

   1--satisfied; 2--fairly satisfied; 3--somewhat satisfied;
   4--minimally satisfied; 5--dissatisfied.

   a. Are you satisfied with your committee's meetings?  
      1 2 3 4 5

   b. Are you satisfied with your committee's recommendations?  
      1 2 3 4 5
c. Are you satisfied with what happens to these recommendations?  1  2  3  4  5

In addition to these three items, two additional items were included on the questionnaire to determine members' satisfaction with their committees. These items are:

4. Does it make a difference to you whether this advisory committee exists or not? Yes____ No____

5. Do you intend to seek reappointment? Yes____ No____

One point was given for an answer of "1" or "2" on items a, b, and c, and 1 point for an answer of "Yes" on items 4 and 5, to create a satisfaction scale ranging from 0-5. As a member could receive a score of 0 by failing to answer any of the items, only scores between 1 and 5 were considered in the data analysis. Of the 52 members responding to the survey, 11% had a satisfaction score of 0, 7% a score of 1, 5% a score of 2, 23% a score of 3, 25% a score of 4, and 26% a score of 5.

Shortcomings of the Committee

Hypothesis 1 states that

1. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is adequate attendance.

Item 4 on section VI of the questionnaire asked members

4. What are some of the shortcomings of the advisory committee on which you are seated?

Under this item were listed five specific problems for members to check, plus one item labeled "Other" and one item labeled "None."
The item concerned with lack of attendance on the committee appeared simply as

a. _____ Lack of attendance

Lack of attendance was cited as a problem by 31% of the respondents.

Hypothesis 2 states that

2. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which there is active participation by the members.

To measure whether or not there was a lack of active participation by members on a committee, the following item was included on the question involving committee shortcomings.

c. _____ Lack of active participation

Twenty-five percent of the members surveyed indicated that lack of active participation was a problem.

Hypothesis 3 states that

3. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which too much time is not spent on unimportant issues.

To determine if members perceived that there was too much time spent on unimportant issues in their committee meetings, the following item was included on the shortcomings questions.

d. _____ Too much time spent on unimportant issues

Too much time spent on unimportant issues was indicated as a problem by 27% of the members.

Hypothesis 4 states that

4. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have a high level of dissension.
The following item was included on the question regarding committee shortcomings to determine if members believed that there was too much dissension on their committee.

3. ____ Too much dissension

Only one member (2% of the respondents) indicated that too much dissension was a problem.

Hypothesis 5 states that

5. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which one person does not dominate the meetings.

To measure whether or not members believed that one person dominated their committee meetings, the following question was included in the questionnaire.

5. Do you find that one person on the committee is dominating the meeting? Yes ____ No ____

Twenty-one percent of the respondents stated that one person dominates their committee meetings.

External Influences on the Committees

Hypothesis 6 states that

6. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have external influences which make the job difficult to do.

The following item was included on the questionnaire to measure whether members perceived that there were external influences which make their job difficult to do.

6. Are there external influences which make your advisory committee's job difficult to do? Yes____ No____
External influences were found to be a problem by 31% of the members.

Hypothesis 7 states that

7. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that do not have duplication with other committees.

The following item was included in the questionnaire to measure whether or not members perceived that there was duplication with other committees.

7. Is there any duplication of organization issues or goals with other advisory committees? Yes ____ No ____

Nineteen percent of the respondents stated that there was duplication with other advisory committees.

Hypothesis 8 states that

8. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with their agency.

To determine whether or not the committees consulted with their agencies, one three-part question was included in Section V of the questionnaire. Members were asked to rank items based on the following scale:

1—very important; 2—fairly important; 3—somewhat important; 4—minimal importance; 5—unimportant; N/A—not applicable.

The question stated:

3. Committee consults with agency staff in order to make recommendations:
   a. Modifying staff proposals  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. Vetoing staff proposals   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   c. Suggesting alternatives   1 2 3 4 5 N/A
to staff proposals
Hypothesis 8 was then divided into three correlaries based on items a, b, and c above.

8a. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with agency staff in order to make recommendations modifying staff proposals.

The response to item a was as follows: 1 - 10 members; 2 - 8 members; 3 - 11 members; 4 - 2 members; and 5 - 3 members.

8b. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with agency staff in order to make recommendations vetoing staff proposals.

Members rated item b in the following manner: 1 - 6 members; 2 - 3 members; 3 - 7 members; 4 - 5 members; and 5 - 5 members.

8c. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that consult with agency staff in order to make recommendations suggesting alternatives to staff proposals.

Item c was rated as follows: 1 - 12 members; 2 - 13 members; 3 - 10 members; 4 - 2 members; and 5 - 5 members.

Information

Hypothesis 9 states that

9. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees on which the members are sufficiently informed.

The following item was included on the committee shortcomings question to determine if members believed that their committees were sufficiently informed.

b. ______ Members not sufficiently informed

Lack of sufficient information was indicated as a problem by 25% of the respondents.
Hypothesis 10 states that

10. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees which receive information from the staff.

A four-part question was included in Section V of the questionnaire to determine if a member's committee received information from the agency staff.

2. Committee receives information from staff:
   a. As written reports at the meeting 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. As written reports prior to the meetings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   c. Verbally at meetings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   d. Verbally prior to meetings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

These items were to be ranked in the following manner: 1 -- very important; 2 -- fairly important; 3 -- somewhat important; 4 -- minimal importance; 5 -- unimportant; and N/A -- not applicable.

Each of the four sub-parts of this question have been formulated into the following correlatives of Hypothesis 10.

10a Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that receive information from staff as written reports at the meetings.

Members rated item a as follows: 1 - 16 members; 2 - 16 members; 3 - 4 members; 4 - 4 members; and 5 - 0 members.

10b Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that receive information from staff as written reports prior to the meeting.

The distribution of responses for item b is: 1 - 14 members; 2 - 13 members; 3 - 6 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 1 member.

10c Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that receive information from staff verbally at meetings.
Verbal reports from staff at meetings were rated in the following manner: 1 - 27 members; 2 - 9 members; 3 - 5 members; 4 - 1 member; and 5 - 1 member.

10d Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that receive information from staff verbally prior to meetings.

Verbal reports from staff prior to meetings are rated as follows: 1 - 10 members; 2 - 9 members; 3 - 12 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 4 members.

Tasks

Hypothesis 11 states that

11 Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy.

A multi-part question was included in Section V, the Specific Tasks section of the questionnaire, to determine if the committees make policy. This item was to be ranked in the same manner as the item related to Hypothesis 10.

4. Committee has in the past been asked to make policy, subject to the approval of the city commission about:

   a. New programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. Changing present programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   c. Administrative regulations 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   d. Usage of public facilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   e. Equipment (buses, park equipment, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Hypothesis 11 has been divided into the following five sub-hypotheses, based on the above question.

11a Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy about new programs.
Making policy about new programs was rated in the following manner: 1 - 12 members; 2 - 12 members; 3 - 8 members; 4 - 1 member; and 5 - 1 member.

11b. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy about changing present programs.

The above item was rated as follows: 1 - 10 members; 1 - 9 members; 3 - 10 members; 4 - 1 member; and 5 - 2 members.

11c. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy about administrative regulations.

Members rated making policy about administrative regulations in the following manner: 1 - 8 members; 2 - 5 members; 3 - 5 members; 4 - 4 members; and 5 - 5 members.

11d. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy about usage of public facilities.

Making policy about the usage of public facilities was rated as follows: 1 - 9 members; 2 - 10 members; 3 - 7 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 1 member.

11e. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that make policy about equipment.

Item e was ranked in the following manner: 1 - 5 members; 2 - 6 members; 3 - 4 members; 4 - 1 member; and 5 - 6 members.

Hypothesis 12 states that

12. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support.

A multi-item question was included in Section V of the questionnaire to measure whether or not the committee solicited support.
The item was to be ranked in the same manner as the item related to Hypothesis 10, and states that

6. Committee solicits support for its recommendations by:

   a. Holding public hearings  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. Talking to individual friends  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   c. Speaking, officially at meetings of affected groups  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   d. Writing articles for the press  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   e. Meeting with the city commission  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   f. Meeting with the city manager  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   g. Meeting with affected groups  1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Each of the above 7 items is reflected in one of the following sub-hypotheses of Hypothesis 12.

12a. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by holding public hearings.

Holding public hearings was rated by members as follows: 1 - 11 members; 2 - 5 members; 3 - 5 members; 4 - 4 members; and 5 - 8 members.

12b. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by talking to individual friends.

Members rated talking to individual friends in the proceeding manner: 1 - 13 members; 2 - 13 members; 3 - 5 members; 4 - 7 members; and 5 - 1 member.

12c. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by speaking officially at meetings of affected groups.
Following is the rating of item C: 1 - 15 members; 2 - 9 members; 3 - 6 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 5 members.

12d. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by writing articles for the press.

The distribution of ratings of writing articles for the press as a method of support solicitation is: 1 - 11 members; 2 - 9 members; 3 - 5 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 8 members.

12e. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by meeting with the city commission.

Item e had a ratings distribution of: 1 - 12 members; 2 - 10 members; 3 - 7 members; 4 - 9 members; and 5 - 3 members.

12f. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by meeting with the city manager.

Meeting with the city manager was rated as follows: 1 - 15 members; 2 - 8 members; 3 - 9 members; 4 - 5 members; and 5 - 4 members.

12g. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that solicit support by meeting with affected groups.

Members rated item g in the following manner: 1 - 16 members; 2 - 9 members; 3 - 10 members; 4 - 2 members; and 2 - 2 members.

Hypothesis 13 states that

13. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public.

A multi-item question was developed to determine if the committees provide information to the public. This item was included in Section V, Specific Tasks, and was rated in the same manner as the
items related to Hypothesis 10.

7. Committee provides information to the public by:

a. Formal press releases  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
b. Meetings covered by and reported in the press  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Hold special public hearings  1 2 3 4 5 N/A
d. Speak at other organizations' meetings  1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Each of the above four items has been developed into a sub-hypothesis of Hypothesis 13. These sub-hypotheses, to be used in later data analysis, are presented below.

13a. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public by formal press releases.

Item a had the following response distribution: 1 - 15 members; 2 - 6 members; 3 - 8 members; 4 - 1 member; and 5 - 7 members.

13b. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public by meetings covered by and reported in the press.

The distribution of ratings for providing information by meetings covered by and reported in the press is: 1 - 5 members; 2 - 4 members; 3 - 10 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 12 members.

13c. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public by holding special public hearings.

Following are the ratings for above item c: 1 - 7 members; 2 - 6 members; 3 - 9 members; 4 - 3 members; and 5 - 3 members.

13d. Members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that provide information to the public by speaking at other organizations' meetings.
Speaking at other organizations' meetings was rated as follows:
1 - 13 members; 2 - 8 members; 3 - 7 members; 4 - 4 members; and
5 - 6 members.

Personal Factors

Hypothesis 14 states that
14. The longer a member of a citizen advisory committee
has served on the committee, the more satisfied he
or she is with the committee.

To determine how long members had served on their committee, the
following item was included on the questionnaire.

1. How long have you been a member of the committee on which
you are now serving?
   a. _____ less than a year
      _____ 1-2 years
      _____ 3-4 years
      _____ 5-6 years
      _____ More than 6 years

The distribution of responses to this item is: 25% less than one
year; 27% 1-2 years; 27% 3-4 years; 6% 5-6 years; 4% More than 6
years; and 12% no response.

Hypothesis 15 states that
15. Members of citizen advisory committees with high
political efficacy ratings are more satisfied with
the committees than are members with low political
efficacy ratings.

One four-item question was included to determine a member's feelings
of political efficacy.

   A. Please rate the following using SA - Strongly agree;
      A - Agree; N - Neutral; D - Disagree; and SD - Strongly
disagree.
1. I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.  
2. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.  
3. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.  
4. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.  

One point was given for each item that the members rated as either D or SD, to create an efficacy scale ranging from a low of 0 to a high of 4. The distribution of the political efficacy scale is:  
4 - 42%; 3 - 38%; 2 - 6%; 1 - 10%; and 0 - 4%.  

The results obtained from the preceding data collection methods, and a statistical analysis of the data obtained will be presented in Chapter IV.

Data Analysis

Two statistical methods for determining the degree of association have been used in the present study. In describing the relationship between one nominal and one ordinal scale, Freeman's coefficient of differentiation (θ) has been used. When discussing two ordinal scales, Goodman and Kruskal's Coefficient of Ordinal Association, G, has been used (Freeman, 1965).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The correlations between citizen advisory committee members' satisfaction with their committees and different aspects of the committees are presented in Table 4 on page 74. This chapter will present a discussion of the results of the correlations for each of the five categories of independent variables with member satisfaction.

Correlations

Shortcomings of the Committee

Five committee shortcomings have been explored in the present study: (a) lack of attendance; (b) lack of active participation; (c) too much time spent on unimportant issues; (d) dissension; and (e) dominance of committee meetings by one person. The present study found significant relationships between member satisfaction and the independent variables of active participation and one person not dominating the committee meetings.

Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 deal with shortcomings of the committees; Hypotheses 2 and 5 were found to be significant. Hypothesis 2, for which the independent variable is active participation by the members, has a substantial positive association of .58
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>$\Theta$</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.119</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time on Unimportant Issues</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissension</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duplication</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.348</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consult with Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Modify Staff Proposals</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Veto Staff Proposals</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Alternatives to Proposals</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sufficient Information</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.586</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Receive Information from Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Written Reports at Meetings</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Written Reports Prior to Meetings</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Reports Verbally at Meetings</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Verbal Reports Prior to Meetings</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Make Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>About New Programs</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>About Changing Programs</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>About Administrative Regulations</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>About Usage of Facilities</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>About Equipment</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Solicit Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Holding Public Hearings</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Talking to Individual Friends</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Speaking to Affected Groups</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Writing Articles for Press</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Meeting with City Commission</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Meeting with City Manager</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Meeting with Affected Groups</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Provide Information to the Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Formal Press Releases</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Meetings Covered by Press</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Holding Public Hearings</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Speaking at Organization Meetings</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Length of Service on Committee</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Member Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Participation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

θ = .58
z = 3.119
p = .001
Table 6
Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Domination of Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Person Does Not Dominate Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Person Dominates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \theta = 0.44 \]
\[ z = 2.232 \]
\[ p = 0.05 \]
Table 7

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \theta = 0.22 \]

\[ z = 1.203 \]

\[ p = n.s. \]
Table 8
Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Time Spent on Unimportant Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Time on Unimportant Issues</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much time on unimportant issues not a problem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on unimportant issues a problem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = .11$

$z = .600$

$p = n.s.$
Table 9

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Level of Committee Dissension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissension</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissension Not a Problem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Dissension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = .44$

$z = .771$

$p = \text{n.s.}$
with the satisfaction scale, and is significant at the .001 level (see Table 5). The independent variable of Hypothesis 5 is that one person does not dominate the committee meetings. There is a moderate positive association of .44 between the satisfaction scale and one person not dominating the meetings. The correlation for Hypothesis 5, as shown in Table 6, is significant at the .05 level. Adequate attendance, the independent variable of Hypothesis 1 was not found to have a significant correlation with the satisfaction scale (see Table 7). Hypothesis 3 is concerned with time spent on unimportant issues and the satisfaction scale, as shown on Table 8, was not found to be significant. The correlation between level of dissension and member satisfaction, the subject of Hypothesis 4, was not found to be significant (see Table 9).

The results of the correlations for Hypotheses 2 and 5 are congruent with Levine's (1973) study. Levine found that members of his experimental study were more satisfied with groups that had high level of participation. It was also discovered by Levine that members were more satisfied with groups that had balanced participation than they were with groups that were dominated by one person.

**External Influences on the Committee**

Three types of external influences on the committees have been explored in this paper: (a) external influences that make the committee's job difficult to do; (b) duplication with other committees; and (c) consultation with the agency. All of the above forms of
external influences have been found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees in the present study.

Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8 are concerned with external influences on the committee. Not having external influences which make the job difficult to do is the independent variable of Hypothesis 6. This variable has a moderate positive correlation with the satisfaction scale of .46, an association that is significant at the .01 level (see Table 10). Not having duplication with other committees is the subject of Hypothesis 7. There is a moderate positive association between lack of duplication and the satisfaction scale of .48; this correlation is significant at the .01 level (see Table 11). Hypothesis 8 involves consulting with the agency, and was divided into three correlaries regarding the nature of the consultation: (a) modify staff proposals; (b) veto staff proposals; and (c) alternatives to staff proposals. Vetoing staff proposals (8b) was a means of consultation has a very strong positive association of 1.00 with the satisfaction scale, an association that is significant at the .05 level (see Table 12). Consulting with the agency to offer alternatives to staff proposals (8c) as shown in Table 13, has a substantial positive association with member satisfaction which is significant at the .05 level. Consulting with the agency to modify staff proposals (8a) is not significantly associated with member satisfaction (see Table 14).

The finding that consulting with the agency both to veto and to suggest alternatives to staff proposals is significantly related
### Table 10

**Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And External Influences on the Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences Which Make Job Difficult to Do</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No External Influences Which Make Job Difficult to Do</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences Which Make Job Difficult to Do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

θ = .46  

z = 2.576  

p = .01
Table 11

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale and Duplication With Other Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Duplication with Other Committees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication with Other Committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = .48$

$z = 2.348$

$p = .01$
Table 12

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Vetoing Staff Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vetoing Staff Proposals</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = 1.00 \]
\[ z = 2.012 \]
\[ p = .05 \]
Table 13

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Suggesting Alternatives to Staff Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Staff Proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .53

z = 1.739

p = .05
Table 14

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Modifying Staff Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modify Staff Proposals</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .52
z = 1.44
p = n.s.
to member satisfaction is consistent with Cole's (1974) study. Cole found that members of programs that had a considerable amount of coordination with city hall were the most satisfied with their membership.

**Information Available to the Committee**

Two hypotheses were formulated regarding information available to the committees. The first, Hypothesis 9, deals solely with whether or not the committees received sufficient information. The second, Hypothesis 10, is concerned with types of information received from the staff: (a) written reports at the committee meetings; (b) written reports given prior to the meetings; (c) verbal reports given at the meetings; and (d) verbal reports given prior to the meetings. It was hypothesized that members would be satisfied with committees that had as much information as possible.

The independent variable of Hypothesis 9 is that members are sufficiently informed; this has a moderate positive association with the satisfaction scale of .48, as shown in Table 15, and is significant at the .01 level. Hypothesis 10 is concerned with information received from the staff: (a) written reports at meetings; (b) written reports prior to meetings; (c) reports verbally at meetings; and (d) verbal reports prior to meetings. Correlaries 10a, 10b, and 10c were all found to have significant associations with the satisfaction scale. Written reports at meetings, as depicted in Table 16, has a very strong positive association of .77
Table 15

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Level of Committee Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Information</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently Informed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sufficiently Informed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = .48$

$z = 2.586$

$p = .01$
Table 16

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Receiving Information from Staff
As Written Reports at the Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Reports at Meetings</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .77 \]
\[ z = 3.159 \]
\[ p = .001 \]
with the satisfaction scale, which is significant at the .001 level. Written reports given prior to meetings has a substantial positive association of .53 with the satisfaction scale, which is significant at the .05 level (see Table 17). Verbal reports at the meetings, as shown in Table 18, has a moderate positive association of .41, that is significant at the .05 level. Verbal reports given prior to the meetings has no significant correlation with member satisfaction (see Table 19).

To summarize, being sufficiently informed, and receiving all but verbal reports prior to the meetings were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees. These findings are consistent with the findings of Hamner and Tosi (1974) and Schuler (1975), regarding the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction. It has been found by these researchers that role ambiguity, a lack of information, is negatively related to job satisfaction.

**Specific Actions Performed by the Committee**

It has been hypothesized that members of citizen advisory committees would be satisfied with committees that performed specific tasks. Three general types of tasks have been explored in the present study, making policy, soliciting support, and providing information to the public. Hypothesis 11 is concerned with policy making, 12 with support solicitation, and 13 with providing information to the public. Each of these hypotheses has been divided into correlates, to further delineate the types of actions performed.
### Table 17

**Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Receiving Information from Staff As Written Reports Prior to the Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Reports Prior to Meetings</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$G = .53$

$z = 1.857$

$p = .05$
### Table 18

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Receiving Information from Staff
Verbally at Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Verbal Reports at Meetings</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .41 \]
\[ z = 1.73 \]
\[ p = .05 \]
Table 19

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Receiving Information from Staff
Verbally Prior to Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Reports Prior to Meetings</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .51
z = 1.443
p = n.s.
Talking to individual friends to solicit support (12b) and meeting with affected groups to solicit support (12g) each has a significant correlation with member satisfaction. Talking to individual friends as a method of support solicitation has a substantial positive association of .61, which is significant at the .05 level (see Table 20). Meeting with affected groups in order to solicit support, as shown in Table 21, has a substantial positive association of .55 with the satisfaction scale, and is significant at the .05 level. Holding public hearings (see Table 22), speaking to affected groups (see Table 23), writing articles for the press (see Table 24), meeting with the City Commission (see Table 25), and meeting with the City Manager (see Table 26), all additional methods of support solicitation, were not found to be significantly associated with member satisfaction.

Two methods of providing information to the public have been found to have significant associations with the satisfaction scale—formal press releases and holding public hearings. Providing information to the public through formal press releases, as shown in Table 27, has a moderate positive association with member satisfaction of .46, an association significant at the .05 level. A very strong positive association of .79, as depicted in Table 28, exists between holding public hearings and member satisfaction; this association is also significant at the .05 level. Methods of providing information to the public that were not found to be significantly associated with member satisfaction are meetings
Table 20

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Soliciting Support by Talking to Individual Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Talking to Individual Friends</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = 0.61 \]
\[ z = 2.01 \]
\[ p = 0.05 \]
Table 21

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Soliciting Support by Meeting with Affected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings with Affected Groups</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .55  
z = 2.08  
p = .05
Table 22

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Soliciting Support by Holding Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding Public Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .39 \]
\[ z = 1.137 \]
\[ p = \text{n.s.} \]
Table 23

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Soliciting Support by Speaking Officially
At Meetings of Affected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking at Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$G = .28$
$z = .968$
$z = n.s.$
Table 24

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Soliciting Support by Writing Articles
For the Press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing for Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .44 \]

\[ z = 1.286 \]

\[ p = n.s. \]
Table 25

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Soliciting Support by Meeting
With the City Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Meeting with City Commission</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .04  
z = .105  
p = n.s.
Table 26

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Soliciting Support by Meeting With the City Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Meeting with City Manager</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .130
z = 1.074
p = n.s.
### Table 27

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Providing Information to the Public
By Formal Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Formal Press Releases</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .46

z = 1.67

p = .05
Table 28

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Providing Information to the Public
By Holding Special Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Hold Special Public Hearings</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
G = .79 \\
z = 1.75 \\
p = .05
\]
covered by the press (see Table 29) and speaking at organization meetings (see Table 30).

No forms of policy making were found to be significantly associated with member satisfaction (Hypothesis 11). Five specific types of policy formation were explored. Making policy about new programs (see Table 31) was not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. Policy making with regards to changing present programs, as shown in Table 32, was not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. As shown in Table 33, the relationship between making policy about administrative regulations and member satisfaction was also found to be nonsignificant. The correlation between member satisfaction and making policy about usage of public facilities was not found to be significant (see Table 34). The final type of policy formulation explored was that of making policy about equipment. Once again, no significant relationship with member satisfaction was discovered (see Table 35).

It was anticipated from the literature of industrial psychology, that performing any specific actions would be significantly related to member satisfaction. Starcevich (1972) and Halpern (1966) each found job satisfaction to be positively related to tasks performed in the job. The present study is not consistent with these findings. In addition, Steggert (1975) found that successful committees were the committees that were able to solicit support from the community. It was hypothesized that members would be satisfied with successful committees, and would therefore be satisfied with committees that
Table 29

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Providing Information to the Public
By Meetings Covered by and Reported in the Press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings Covered by Press</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .08 \]
\[ z = .127 \]
\[ p = n.s. \]
Table 30

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Providing Information to the Public
By Speaking at Other Organizations' Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking at Other Organizations' Meetings</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .37
z = 1.19
p = n.s.
Table 31

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Making Policy About New Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$G = .29$

$z = .89$

$p = n.s.$
Table 32

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Making Policy About Changing Present Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing Present Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .36

z = .97

p = n.s.
Table 33

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Making Policy About Administrative Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Regulations</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .28
z = .68
p = n.s.
Table 34

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Making Policy About Usage of Public Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>Usage of Public Facilities</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .25
z = .65
p = n.s.
Table 35

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Making Policy About Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (8-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = 0.67 \]
\[ z = 1.206 \]
\[ p = n.s. \]
solicited support from the community. However, this was not strongly supported by the present study.

**Personal Characteristics of the Members**

Neither length of service on the committee (see Table 36) nor member feelings of political efficacy (see Table 37) were found to be significantly related to members' feelings of satisfaction with their committee membership.
Table 36

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale
And Length of Service on the Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time on Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .04
z = .016
p = n.s.
Table 37

Correlation of Satisfaction Scale And Member Political Efficacy Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Scale (S-5)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .01
z = .016
p = n.s.
CHAPTER V

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND MEMBER SATISFACTION

Introduction

It has been sought through this paper to expand the present knowledge available regarding locally initiated citizen advisory committees. Chapter I provided an overview of the literature currently available on citizen advisory committees, and on satisfaction (both with job and with political participation). Chapter II presented a description of the charges, activities, and accomplishments of eight locally initiated citizen advisory committees in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Chapter III discussed the methods used to obtain information about the committee members and committees presently under study. Chapter IV presented the results obtained in the present study, the correlations between member satisfaction and different committee variables. The present chapter will attempt to present the conclusions that have been drawn from this study. First, will be a restatement of the problem. Second, will be a summarized report on the findings, both positive and negative. Finally, will be a discussion of possible implications of the study.
Restatement of the Problem

It was the object of this researcher to explore the relationship between the satisfaction members of locally initiated citizen advisory committees had with their committee membership, and five different types of variables. The variables examined were: (a) shortcomings of the committees such as lack of attendance, lack of active member participation, too much time devoted to unimportant issues, a high level of dissension, and one person dominating the meetings; (b) external influences on the committees such as duplication with other committees, consultation with the agency, and external influences in general; (c) information such as whether or not the members were sufficiently informed, and whether or not the committees receive information from the agency staff; (d) specific actions performed by the committees, such as policy formation, solicitation of support, and providing of information to the public; and (e) personal characteristics of the members, the length of time they had served on the committee and the members' feelings of political efficacy. The above variables were all correlated with the members' feelings of satisfaction with their committees, to determine if they had an effect on a member's satisfaction.
Report of the Findings

Positive Findings

Two types of committee shortcomings, lack of active participation, and one person dominating the committees were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees. For members to be satisfied, there had to be an active committee, but one on which the participation was balanced, not controlled by one member.

External influences on the committee were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees. The lack of duplication with other committees and the lack of external influences which made the job difficult to do were both found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees. In addition, consultation with the agency staff in the form of vetoing staff proposals and suggesting alternatives to staff proposals were both found to be significantly related to member satisfaction.

The level of information available to the committees is also an important factor in whether or not members are satisfied with their committees. Members were found to be satisfied with committees that had sufficient information available to them. Members were also satisfied with committees that received three forms of information from the staff: (a) written reports at the meetings; (b) written reports prior to the meetings; (b) written reports prior to the meetings; and (c) verbal reports at the meetings.
The level of information available to the committees is also an important factor in whether or not members are satisfied with their committees. Members were found to be satisfied with committees that had sufficient information available to them. Members were also satisfied with committees that received three forms of information from the staff: (a) written reports at the meetings; (b) written reports prior to the meetings; and (c) verbal reports at the meetings.

Specific actions performed by the committees were not found to be as important as the above forms of variables in determining member satisfaction. However, two forms of support solicitation, talking to individual friends and meeting with affected groups were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction with their committees. These are both more personal forms of support solicitation than the five that were not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction (holding public hearings, speaking to affected groups, writing articles for the press, meeting with the City Commission, and meeting with the City Manager). In addition, a member would receive more direct feedback on general community support through talking with individual friends and meeting with affected groups than they might by writing articles for the press, meeting with the City Commission, meeting with the City Manager, holding public hearings, or speaking formally at meetings of affected groups. Two methods of providing information to the public, formal press releases, and holding public hearings, were found to be
significantly related to member satisfaction. These are both methods by which the members of the committees are in control of the situation, they send the press release to the media, they conduct the public hearing.

**Negative Findings**

Three types of committee shortcomings were not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction: (a) lack of attendance; (b) too much time spent on unimportant issues; and (c) dis- sension. Members were satisfied with committees that had active participation. Perhaps, as long as all members are participating, it is not important whether or not they all agree, or whether or not they are discussing "important" or "unimportant" issues.

Only one form of external influences, that of consulting with the staff to modify staff proposals, was found to not be significantly related to member satisfaction. Members were satisfied with committees that reacted to the staff in a more active manner, that of vetoing or suggesting alternatives to staff proposals. It would appear that members are satisfied with committees that take a more active relationship to their agency staff, than the more passive one of simply modifying staff proposals.

Being sufficiently informed was extremely important to member satisfaction with their committees. Only one form of information, receiving verbal reports prior to meetings from the staff was not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. Two
forms of reports given at meetings force the agency staff to appear at the committee meetings, on the committee's "home ground." Additionally, a written report presented prior to the meeting is a more formal method of contact. Verbal reports given prior to meetings could be viewed by committee members as a demeaning of their position. Instead of the agency giving them a formal written report, or appearing at their meeting, they simply talk to the committee or committee members before the meetings begin.

Specific actions performed by the committees were overall not found to be significantly related to the members' satisfaction. Five types of policy formation were studied, none of which were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. The types of policy formation considered are: (a) making policy about new programs; (b) making policy about changing programs; (c) making policy about administrative regulation; (d) making policy about usage of facilities; and (e) making policy about equipment. Of the seven methods of support solicitation examined, five were not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. These are: (a) holding public hearings; (b) speaking to affected groups; (c) writing articles for the press; (d) meeting with the City Commission; (e) meeting with the City Manager. The final type of specific action examined was that of providing information to the public. Two methods were not found to be significantly related: (a) meetings covered by the press and (b) speaking at organization meetings. These are both methods of providing information in which
the members are not completely in control. The press takes the action to cover the meeting, and they go to another organization's meetings. These are different from the two forms of providing information that were found to be significantly associated with member satisfaction. Those two were methods by which the committee members took the initiative and were in control; members are in control when they release information to the press, and when they hold public hearings.

Two types of personal variables, length of service on the committee, and a member's feelings of political efficacy, were examined in the present study, in relationship to the member's satisfaction with their committee membership. Neither of these two personal variables were found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. It was expected that members would be more satisfied with their committees the longer they had served on the committee. The response to the item regarding length of service on the committee revealed that very few members had actually served on the committee for what could be considered a long time. Only 4% had served longer than six years, and only 6% from five to six years. There were more members who had served a shorter period of time, 25% less than one year, 27% one to two years, and 27% three to four years. The distribution of responses to this item may be the reason why this item was not found to be significantly related to member satisfaction. It was expected that members with high political efficacy ratings would be more satisfied with their committee
membership than would members with low efficacy ratings. This was not proven true in the present study. One possible explanation for this may be in the nature of the members themselves. All of the members of the committees, by the very nature of their membership, are politically active. Perhaps the political efficacy scale did not prove sensitive enough to monitor the feelings of political efficacy that political activists have.

Implications of the Study

The present study has examined the relationship between the satisfaction of members of citizen advisory committees with their committees and different committee and personal variables. To study the level of satisfaction, a satisfaction scale was created, composed of five items. It was discovered that the members of the eight committees presently under study are quite satisfied with their committees. On the satisfaction scale of 0 to 5, with 5 being the highest level of satisfaction, 11% had a score of 0 (which also reflected not answering any of the items), 7% had a score of 1, 5% a score of 2, 23% a score of 3, 25% a score of 4, and 26% a score of 5.

It can be concluded from the present study that members of citizen advisory committees are satisfied with committees that have active, balanced participation by the members, and with committees that are well-informed. Additionally, it would appear that members
are satisfied with committees that have an active relationship with their agencies, the media, and the community, one in which the committees, rather than the other organizations, are in control.
APPENDIX:
Citizens Advisory Committee Questionnaire
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Background Data

1. What is your age? ______

2. Are you
   a. _____ Female
   b. _____ Male

3. What is your marital status?
   a. _____ Single
   b. _____ Married
   c. _____ Divorced
   d. _____ Widowed

4. Are you a member of any voluntary association(s)?
   Yes _____ No _____
   (If yes, please list)

5. Do you tend to vote in (check as many as appropriate)
   National _____ State _____ Local elections _____

6. Are you presently employed?
   a. If yes, as:
      (1) _____ Professional
      (2) _____ Technical
      (3) _____ Manager, Official, Proprietor
      (4) _____ Clerical
      (5) _____ Sales
      (6) _____ Foreman
      (7) _____ Craftsman
      (8) _____ Operative
      (9) _____ Non-farm laborer
   b. If no, are you
      (1) _____ Housewife
      (2) _____ Student
      (3) _____ Retired
      (4) _____ Welfare group
      (5) _____ Other, please specify __________________________
8. Please check as many categories as appropriate from the following:
   a. _____ Rent apartment
   b. _____ Own home
   c. _____ Rent home
   d. _____ Own business building
   e. _____ Rent business building
   f. _____ Own other real property

9. Ethnicity
   a. _____ American Indian
   b. _____ Oriental
   c. _____ Spanish American
   d. _____ Black
   e. _____ White
   f. _____ Other (please specify) ________________

10. On what income level would you place yourself?
    a. _____ Less than $6,000
    b. _____ $6,000 - $15,000
    c. _____ $15,000 - $30,000
    d. _____ $30,000 and above

11. What level of education have you completed?
    a. _____ Grade School
    b. _____ High School
    c. _____ Trade School
    d. _____ Junior College
    e. _____ College
    f. _____ Post-graduate

12. Do you reside within the
    a. _____ City of Kalamazoo (proper)
    b. _____ County

II. Advisory Committee Experience

1. How long have you been a member of the committee on which you are now serving?
   a. _____ Less than a year
   b. _____ 1-2 years
   c. _____ 3-4 years
   d. _____ 5-6 years
   e. _____ More than 6 years

2. How did you become a member of this advisory committee?
   a. _____ By submitting an application
   b. _____ Appointed without an application

3. Who selected you to become a member of this advisory committee?
   a. _____ Mayor
   b. _____ City Commission
   c. _____ Committee Chairman
   d. _____ Committee itself
4. What membership restrictions are there for your committee?
   a. ___ Age
   b. ___ Ethnic
   c. ___ Group membership
   d. ___ Income level
   e. ___ Neighborhood
   f. ___ Occupational
   g. ___ None

5. How many advisory committee meetings were scheduled during the last 3 months?

6. How many advisory committee meetings did you attend in the last 3 months?
   a. ___ All of them
   b. ___ All but one
   c. ___ All but two
   d. ___ None of them

7. Are you a member of a subcommittee of this advisory committee?
   Yes ___ No ___
   a. If yes, please identify ________________________________________________
   b. How many scheduled meetings were there during the last 3 months? _____
   c. If yes, how many subcommittee meetings did you attend in the last 3 months.
      1. ___ All those scheduled
      2. ___ All but one
      3. ___ All but two
      4. ___ None of the scheduled meetings

III. Tasks of Advisory Committees

A. 1. To whom (mayor, city commission, agency head) does this advisory committee normally report?
   a. ___ Agency head or director
   b. ___ City commission
   c. ___ City manager
   d. ___ Mayor
   e. ___ Other (please specify) ______________________________________________

2. Does your committee exchange information with any state, or national organizations or conferences? Yes ____ No ____
   a. If yes, please identify organization or conference _______________________

   b. How often does this exchange of information occur? (Please specify for each organization or conference listed.)
3. Do you exchange information with any local organizations or associations in Kalamazoo? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please identify

   b. How often does this exchange occur. (Please specify for each group listed).

4. Is your committee related in any way to any Federal government programs? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please specify.

5. Is your committee related in any way to any State government programs? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please specify.

B'. Committee Purposes

1. What is the main purpose of this advisory committee?

2. What specific problem(s) has this advisory committee been most concerned with in the last 6 months?

IV. 1. Please rate the following:

   1 - satisfied;  2 - fairly satisfied;  3 - somewhat satisfied;
   4 - minimally satisfied;  5 - dissatisfied

   a. Are you satisfied with your committee's meetings?  1  2  3  4  5

   b. Are you satisfied with your committee's recommendations?  1  2  3  4  5

   c. Are you satisfied with what happens to these recommendations?  1  2  3  4  5
2. What has been your committee's most successful project in the last 6 months?

3. What has been your committee's least successful project in the last 6 months?

4. Does it make a difference to you whether this advisory committee exists or not?
   Yes _____  No _____
   a. If yes, please explain

5. Do you intend to seek reappointment? Yes _____  No _____
   a. If yes, please explain

V. Specific Tasks

Please rank each of the following, using:
1 - very important;  2 - fairly important;  3 - somewhat important;  
4 - minimal importance;  5 - unimportant;  N/A - not applicable

1. Committee collects its own information by:
   a. Conducting formal surveys  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. Consulting public records  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. Attending conferences  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   d. Consulting experts  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   e. Consulting groups  1  2  3  4  5  N/A

2. Committee receives information from staff:
   a. As written reports at the meeting  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. As written reports prior to the meeting  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. Verbally at meetings  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   d. Verbally prior to meetings  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
3. Committee consults with agency staff in order to make recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Modifying staff proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vetoing staff proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Suggesting alternatives to staff proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Committee has in the past been asked to make policy, subject to the approval of the city commission about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. New programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changing present programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ordinances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Budgets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Agency structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Administrative regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staffing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Zoning and/or land use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. New public facilities (buildings &amp; land)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Maintenance of public facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Usage of public facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Fees for public facilities (e.g. parks or golf courses)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Equipment (buses, park equipment etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Maintenance of equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Usage of equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Fees for equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Federal grant possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. State grant possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Private funding possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Committee initiates recommendations about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. New programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changing present programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ordinances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Budgets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Agency structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Administrative regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staffing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Zoning and/or land use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. New public facilities (buildings &amp; land)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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k. Maintenance of public facilities  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

l. Usage of public facilities  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

m. Fees for public facilities  
(e.g. parks or golf courses)  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

n. Equipment (buses, park equipment etc.)  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

o. Maintenance of equipment  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

p. Usage of equipment  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

q. Fees for equipment  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

r. Federal grant possibilities  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

s. State grant possibilities  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

t. Private funding possibilities  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Committee solicits support for its recommendations by:

a. Holding public hearings  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

b. Talking to individual friends  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

c. Speaking, officially at meetings  
of affected groups  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

d. Writing articles for the press  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

e. Meeting with the city commission  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

f. Meeting with the city manager  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

g. Meeting with affected groups  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Committee provides information to the public by:

a. Formal press releases  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

b. Meetings covered by and reported in  
the press  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

c. Radio coverage  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

d. Hold special public hearings  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

e. Speak at other organizations' meetings  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

f. Indirectly through other individuals  
(If so, please specify)  
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

VI. Organizational

1. Do you have

a. An agenda?  _____ Yes  _____ No

b. Formal minutes?  _____ Yes  _____ No

1 If yes, are these minutes complete & self-explanatory?

 _____ Yes  _____ No
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2. What is the chairperson's role?

3. How many people from Kalamazoo usually attend the committee's meetings?
   - None
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - More than 10

4. What are some of the short-comings of the advisory committee on which you are seated?
   a. Lack of attendance
   b. Members not sufficiently informed
   c. Lack of active participation
   d. Too much time spent on unimportant issues
   e. Too much dissension
   f. Other (specify)
   g. None

5. Do you find that one person on the committee is dominating the meeting?
   Yes ______ No _____ If yes, who ____________________

6. Are there any external influences which make your advisory committee's job difficult to do?
   Yes ______ No _____ If yes, please identify.

7. Is there any duplication of organizational issues or goals with other advisory committees?
   Yes ______ No _____ If yes, please specify.

8. In your opinion what can be done to improve the effectiveness of your advisory committee?
VII. This section is designed to obtain a profile of the average committee member's attitudes.

A. Please rate the following using SA - Strongly agree; A - Agree; N - Neutral; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly disagree.
   1. I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.
      SA  A  N  D  SD
   2. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.
      SA  A  N  D  SD
   3. People like me don't have any say about what the government does?
      SA  A  N  D  SD
   4. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
      SA  A  N  D  SD

B. Please answer the following Yes or No.
   1. Do you make your own decisions regardless of what other people say?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   2. If something goes wrong do you usually attribute it to bad luck rather than bad management?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   3. Do you set out to get what you want with a clear course of action rather than trusting to luck?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   4. Do you often feel that you have little influence over the things that happen to you?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   5. Are you easily persuaded by the arguments of other people?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   6. Do you find it a waste of time planning ahead because something always turns up that causes you to change your plans?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   7. Would you prefer a job in which somebody else made the decisions and told you what to do?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   8. Do you usually have clear-cut goals and a sense of purpose in life?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
   9. Do you often have the feeling that other people are using you?
      ____ Yes      ____ No
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