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ABSTRACT

Utilizing a survey research methodology, this investigation seeks to answer the question, "What are the significant initiating and sustaining factors which influence citizen participation in social planning?" It also provides previously nonexistent demographic data about Neighborhood Board members. A combination of closed-end and open-ended questions is used to gather data from 112 current and past members of Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards, a legislated mechanism providing for designated communities within the City and County of Honolulu to advise the Mayor and the City Council on neighborhood issues.

The majority of the sample reflects middle and upper socio-economic attributes such as: home ownership; high educational attainment; active participation in community affairs via membership in multiple organizations; and high sense of civic duty. Other demographic data contributing to initiation of participation include: environmental concerns; the belief in citizens having an increased voice in decisions that affect them; a median of 14 years of residence in the neighborhood; being married and belonging to the 45-54 age bracket.

Sustaining factors primarily relate to themes of territoriality, assertiveness, and recognition of the need to keep in touch with decision makers in government. Whereas rationality, task orientation and individualism are characteristic of the primary reasons for sustained participation, secondary reasons convey themes of social and group oriented attributes.
Frustrations and discouragement from participation stem primarily from intragroup factors, followed respectively by factors dealing with the municipal structure and with factors dealing with linkages with the community.

The significance and implications for practitioners and policy makers include: the desirability of broadening the base of participation; the desirability of socioeconomically heterogeneous participation; the need and importance of assisting citizens in addressing intragroup dynamics; recognition that issue-focused, issue-specific (temporary) participation is reflective of the adult learning model and not a sign of pathology; and that public health activities would benefit from continued improvement of citizen participation activities.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The open society will teach people to question, to doubt, to seek answers through data and reason. It will encourage students to explore the unknown where no useful data exist. The open society will encourage the potential of group thinking and action. As Gardner Murphy says, "The fresh discovery of social meanings and of ways of using group organization can still be a major invention of today . . . to teach . . . ways of discovering and using the new group structure of today in the sense of finding creative solutions for shared problems . . . a major challenge for social research and education."

Dorothy Nyswander (1967)

A Brief Statement of Purpose for the Investigation

The involvement of citizens in decision making is a growing dimension in national and international public health practice (World Health Organization, 1983, p. 13). However, efforts to make full use of this process as part of the achievement of public health goals are hampered by our limited understanding of the factors which influence the process and the understanding which Public Health and related professionals require in the development of effective community organization practices. The large number of participants, as well as the large number of programs calling for citizen input, have brought attention to the need for information that would be useful for program improvement and to foster increased and enhanced citizen participation.

Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards, which have existed for the past 11 years, provide an opportunity, as yet untapped, to systematically examine
the questions basic to the development of a more efficient and effective approach to achieving the goals of citizen participation.

The objectives of this investigation recognize: (a) the need for more information and understanding of citizen participation processes; (b) the implications for public health practice in planning, management, and training (p. 21); and (c) the need and importance of learning about gathering data from those involved in community participation programs.

Research Objective

The primary objective of this research activity is to address the question: "What are the significant factors and processes that contribute to the initiation and sustainment of citizen participation in social planning?"

The sub-objectives of the investigation are:

To identify the factors and processes that contribute to the initiation (seeking election) of citizen participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

To identify the factors and processes that contribute to sustained (seeking election beyond a two-year term) participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

To identify the factors and processes that contribute to exit from participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

This chapter provides the reader with a background of citizen participation and the research setting. It begins with a broad, societal perspective on the forces that led to the movement to include citizens into decision-making processes. From this generic and broad perspective, it then proceeds to describe the processes of Honolulu's experience with citizen participation and the formation of the Neighborhood Boards. The inherent dilemmas of citizen participation are introduced as a preface to the statement of need.
History and Background of Citizen Participation in Social Planning

Since the 1960s there has been an increasing number of citizens demanding and providing input into the decisions that affect them. Similarly, there has been a movement by government to require more input by citizens in the planning process. Occurring in different sectors and levels of society at different times, several factors have been converging to weave a fabric of what is generally called citizen participation. Listed below are several factors which serve to lay the groundwork and to provide a background for the evolving nature of citizen participation in America and serve to give the reader a background from which to understand the primary research question of this investigation, "What are the significant factors and processes which influence the initiation and sustainment of citizen participation in social planning?"

1. The shift from an industrial society to an information society;
2. The changing decision environment;
3. The changing medical model;
4. Federally sponsored health and social programs;
5. The self-help movement;¹
6. The neighborhood movement.

¹A social movement is a set of attitudes and self-conscious action on the part of a group of people directed toward change in the social structure and/or ideology of a society and carried on outside of ideologically legitimated channels or which uses these channels in innovative ways (Roberta Ash, Social Movements in America [Chicago, 1972], p. 1).

A group of people who are organized for, ideologically motivated by, and committed to a purpose which implements some form of personal or
The Shift from an Industrial Society to an Information Society

One of the major factors contributing to the citizen participation movement has been a transformation of the industrial society. The major change that is evolving is that the mass economy is being replaced by the informative economy (Hawken, 1985, p. 16) thereby changing the interactions of the economic components within the total economy. This mass economy, which had its beginnings in 1880 and lasting until approximately 1973, is characterized by the central role of oil, the internal combustion engine, and the widespread generation and distribution of electrical power which transformed nations into complex industrialized, consumer-oriented societies. Its decline was the result of one major shift: the changing relation in value among labor (people), capital (money), and resources (energy) (p. 16). Since 1973, when energy and capital rose in value or cost while the value of a worker's time began to decline (p. 16), our economy has been contracting. Among others, Harken lists the following effects as a result of this contraction:

1. High capital costs--Money became more expensive to obtain, hold, and use. Citizens and businesses who borrow money experience extremely high interest rates.

social change: who are actively engaged in the recruitment of others; and whose influence is spreading in opposition to the established order within which it originated. Luther P. Gerlach and Virginia H. Hine, People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation (Indianapolis, 1970), p. xvi.

2 The energy, materials, and embodied resources required to produce a product or perform a service. Paul Hawken, "Growth or Change?" Modern Office Technology, July 1985, pp. 16-20.
2. The contraction of government--Government income decreased because of the lower revenues from a contracted mass economy which was a source of tax revenues. Services that were once provided to the public were decreased or discontinued.

3. The higher cost of energy raised the transportation and distribution costs of goods and services. This led to more companies seeking to combine the manufacture of products with direct sales to the consumer and the elimination of the "middle-man."³ A good example of disintermediation in the health field is the American Association of Orthodontists' campaign to assist small business in establishing their own dental plans. This approach eliminates the insurance company and makes the employer assume minimal responsibilities of reimbursement to the employee for dental costs with considerable savings to the employers and employees.⁴

5. The end of mass markets--Mass markets existed as long as the economy expanded and consumer markets grew. With individual incomes slowly declining and with markets stagnant, people became more cautious consumers, demanding more from products (and services), demanding more information per unit of mass. (Hawken, 1985, p. 18)

The mass economy was characterized by expansion, mass production, the degradation of the environment, technological innovation, affluence, high wages, the specialization and division of labor, the declining durability of goods, and the professionalization of services. In contrast, the informative economy is characterized by people producing and consuming smaller numbers of goods that contain more information. This information is: design, utility, craft, durability and knowledge. It is quality and intelligence, making for more useful, longer-lasting,

³The elimination of the "middle-man" is frequently called disintermediation.

⁴For more information on this plan, contact the American Association of Orthodontists, 460 North Lindbergh Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63141.
easier to repair, lighter, stronger and better goods and services which
consume less energy.  

Similarly, advocating new ways of dealing with the changes taking
place, Hala (1980, p. 239) states:

Now the demand is to provide efficient non-polluting
transportation systems, to manage the environment with
prudence, to assist individuals in maintaining their
health in a holistic fashion, to handle data and
knowledge more conveniently, to assure peace and order,
and a variety of other such urgent concerns.

Naisbitt reports that the shift from an industrial economy to
an information economy began in 1956 (p. 12) when, for the first time
in American history, "white-collar workers in technical, managerial,
and clerical positions outnumbered blue-collar workers. Industrial
America was giving way to a new society where most of us worked with
information rather than producing goods" (p. 12). The end product of
the industrial era, which Bell termed "the post-industrial society"
(p. 13) "... is the information society [p. 13] ... where only 13
percent of our labor force is engaged in manufacturing operations today
[p. 14] and where the number of professional workers (almost all
information producers or users of information) doubled between the years
1960 to 1979" (p. 15).

---

5 A poignant example is when Pacific Gas and Electric found it less
expensive to offer loans for homeowners to insulate their homes rather
than to borrow capital and build new power plants (Hawken, 1985, p.
16).

6 For an incisive coverage of the major trends affecting the United
States, see John Naisbitt, Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming
Our Lives (New York, 1982).
"The following year--1957--marked the beginning of the globalization of the information revolution: The Russians launched Sputnik, the missing technological catalyst in a growing information society. The real importance of Sputnik is not that it began the space age, but that it introduced the era of global satellite communications. . . . the satellites transformed the earth into what Marshall McLuhan called a global village. Instead of turning us outward toward space, the satellite era turned the globe inward upon itself" (pp. 12-13).

This decreased availability of resources (mostly energy sources) hastened the merging of the science of economics with the newer science of ecology.\(^7\) Previously, it would have been difficult to predict or envision ecology and economics having a direct relationship with the daily lives of citizens. But the increasing population and the nature of industrial progress intensified and highlighted issues which addressed the accessibility of all the environmental elements required for a good life, such as clean air and pure contaminant-free drinking water.\(^8\) Society was finally realizing that the once infinite and inexhaustible environment was actually finite and exhaustible.

\(^7\)The study of the relationship between organisms and their environments.

\(^8\)The ancient Hawaiian culture had a concept called Malama'aina which, literally translated meant "to care for the earth." The two basic tenets of this concept were (1) that everyone had a right to all the basic things to live and (2) that these resources were to be preserved, to be cared for and protected and that no one had ownership of real property . . . that at the most, one was a caretaker of the land. Mary Kawena Pukui, Samuel H. Elbert, and Esther T. Mookini, The Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), pp. 8, 100.
Within the realm of the densely populated urban environments, citizens learned new ways of adapting to their neo-nature. The additional perspective of a neo-environment added to the scope of adaptations necessary for physical, emotional and psychological survival. Social ecology developed as a result of these new entities.

All of these interacting phenomena contributed to a closing of the gap between ecology and economics. The increasing population and industrial progress intensified and highlighted economic and ecological issues which at one time were seen as separate and disparate entities. "Progress" and issues of the deteriorating natural and "neo" environments were affecting each other at more sectors of societal life than ever before. A more informed and heterogeneous public, improved electronic technology and other advances were converging on the decision-making arena. The role that citizens play in determining and shaping their physical, socio-psychological, and spiritual environment was increasing, all of them influenced by the transformation towards the post-industrial era.

The Changing Decision Environment (Burke, 1979, p. 14)

Whereas pre-industrial society was homogeneous, "the industrial age greatly expanded cultural diversity." and post-industrial society

---

9 Philosopher James Ogilvy coined the term "neo nature" to describe the human-made environment; cities, institutions, employers, neighborhoods, and laws.

10 The way people relate to their greater environment.

11 The degree to which people are alike with respect to the particular characteristics of the community being studied, such as their ethnicity or income level.

12 Rittel and Webber remind us when, during the 1950s, quasios Sociological literature predicted a Mass Society--in which most persons
is likely to be far more differentiated than any in all of past history" (Rittel & Weber, 1973, p. 167). "... the high scale societies of the western world are becoming increasingly heterogeneous. They are becoming increasingly differentiated, comprising thousands of minority groups, each joined around common interests, common value systems" (p. 167) and shared lifestyles that differ from those of other groups. In large populations, minority groups amount to large numbers of people. These sub-publics with differing viewpoints, values and interests, and their needs to have access to the environment (both natural and "neo") increased the competition for limited resources, creating complex problem-solving dilemmas. Coupled with this phenomenon, the public distrust of large institutions added to the movement towards changes in decision-making styles. Benjamin observed that in post-industrial society, people are no longer willing to delegate their rights to the leaders of established and centralized institutions, therefore "becoming the age of participation, not authority" (Benjamin, 1980, p. 72).

Another major factor altered the course of local community planning. Decision making became uncertain when once, in the period before the '50s, "the decision center for community planning was fixed, known, and centralized" (Burke, 1979, p. 14). Both formal and informal

would share common values and beliefs, follow mass life-styles and behave in similar ways. "(You will recall the popular literature on suburbia of ten years ago.) It is now apparent that those forecasts were wrong." Horst W. J. Rittel and Melvin W. Webber, "Dilemmas in A General Theory of Planning." Policy Sciences, 4 (1973), p. 167.
decision making in American communities became dispersed. A single planning agency no longer created a master plan for the entire city. The scientific, prescribed approach to planning was replaced by a number of organizations competing for influence and pursuing special interests. The traditional centralized model of planning, which excluded, "except at the planner's discretion, the involvement of anyone other than the planner; . . . did not allow for the existence of competing planning organizations. When at one time, the method of community planning was defined and understood, it is now confused and frustrating" (p. 15).

A classic example of this kind of decision environment is Honolulu's proposed H-3 highway. The proposed construction of this $750 million dollar, federally funded highway has been a source of conflict involving the city administration, the state administration, the federal government and citizen groups in Honolulu. It has embroiled Honolulu in controversies with considerations that include: housing and development, transportation, construction, the environment, anthropology and water conservation. The city and state transportation departments have opposing views. Citizen and community groups also view the H-3 from opposite perspectives: some opposing and some advocating its construction. Jurisdictional arguments in court between the city and the state are further complicated by the contending citizen groups as well as some of Hawaii's Congressional delegation, who are seeking Congressional waiver of certain environmental restrictions so that construction can continue. All of these stakeholders, some with formal jurisdiction, others being more informal (without statutory sanctions), constitute a decision-making environment characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity,
diffuse power, emotions playing larger roles once monopolized by logic, and processes replacing objectives. (1) Professional planners no longer held the singular position of making decisions on behalf of the entire community. (2) They accommodated additional players in the planning process. These citizens and citizen organizations that were affected by the decisions also were including themselves in the process. In a similar pattern, parallel events were occurring in the medical and health care industries.

The Changing Medical Model

The medical profession and the hospital industry have deeply-rooted traditions and practices that were influenced by the industrial revolution. These practices, reinforced by early knowledge of infectious diseases at the beginning of the industrial revolution (Georgopoulos, 1974, p. 208) coupled with the predominantly scientific model of medical education, have perpetuated the practice of separating illness from the whole person. The model of the physician as expert and technician and a primary preoccupation with organic disease left the psycho-social aspects of health all but ignored.

A shifting focus, from plagues and communicable diseases to an increasing concern with chronic conditions such as asthma, peptic ulcers, diabetes, arthritis and hypertension, has been steadily evolving within the medical field. For the first time in history, a reduction in mortality from the leading causes of death in the United States is seen as lying essentially within the province of individual action. Heart disease and related disorders—the leading cause of death and a prominent cause of disability are being sharply reduced by changes in
personal habits and lifestyle (Howard, 1972, p. 706). "In the last 50 years the incidence of infectious illness has been reduced largely as a result of improved food, sanitary and housing conditions, but in the longer lives that people live, they are subject, instead, to a broad range of chronic disorders, such as diabetes, mental illness, cancer, heart disorder, hypertension, arthritis and emphysema (Gartner & Reissman, 1976, p. 783). Hancock (1980, p. 352) reporting about the 1970s states, "Among the more significant developments on the concept of health was the "rediscovery" of the importance of environment and lifestyle and the recognition that man is part of and not apart from the planetary ecosystem." The 1970s saw the emergence of serious opposition to the medicalization of society, as exemplified in Ivan Illich's Medical Nemesis (1975), and an increasing demand by patients, and particularly by women (Gartner & Reisman, 1976, p. 784) to be treated with more concern and to reassume more personal responsibility for their own health" (Hancock, 1980, p. 353).

The physical fitness boom and this re-evaluation of the concepts of sickness and health contributes to the radical departure from the traditional mode of medicine to a diverse and colorful group of unorthodox healers, human potential theorists, and innovative physicians, loosely grouped under the banner of "holistic health" or the "wellness movement." Although differing in method and style, they share certain common assumptions: That good health is primarily a function of the way you live; that positive wellness, not just the absence of disease is the ultimate goal; and, most important of all, that responsibility
for good health rests not with the physician but with the individual self (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 134; Hancock, 1980, p. 353).

In addition to the re-evaluation of the concepts of sickness and health, there are added economic considerations as well. "This is occurring within the framework of serious fiscal constraints in our economy and considerable criticism of the nature and organization of professional care regarding quality, efficiency and cost. The problem, then, is to develop models of health care that are economical or cost efficient and are consonant with the special health problems of an advanced technological society" (Gartner & Reissman, 1976, p. 783).

Although he was primarily addressing the larger arena of public health practice around the world, Hancock (1980) addressed emerging factors which highlighted the important foci of public health practice in the United States (excluding the primary health care concept) as well. Calling it the "Soft Health Path," this approach synthesized environmental health, community-based public health, the primary health-care concept, the holistic health movement and the self-care movement:

Environmental sensitivity, recognition of the need for social change on the one hand and personal responsibility for health on the other, and the growing use of non-physicians and community aides will mean an increasingly important role for public health, which has languished for some decades. We are perhaps witnessing the birth of a second public health revolution, one that will be more global in its outlook and yet more based in local community action than the first.

Carlson, then Chairman of California's Wellness Council, contributed a similar viewpoint, citing three ways to improve health care: "You can introduce outside agents such as drugs and surgery (which we have been doing since the 1930s), or you can try to improve either the human
being or the environment" (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 146). Gartner and Riessman (1976, p. 783) add:

While there are those whose main approach to solving our modern health problems is to look passively to the medical professional for help, there are two alternative and complementary approaches which may prove more effective. One is to introduce basic social control measures such as controlling cigarette and alcohol advertising, requiring safety belts in cars, etc. A second is to involve the patients themselves, both individually and in self-help groups, recognizing that the most significant potential for improving people's health is through changes in what they do and do not do for themselves.

A recognition of individual responsibility in health and the impact of environmental factors became more pronounced during this period. "What began happening in the 1960s is that we shifted over to working on the human side, the idea being that a stronger population can better resist disease. The next big shift will be to focus more on the environmental influence in health" (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 146).

One of the more significant events in the shift of the medical model occurred in 1983. In a radical departure from its support of the traditional bio-medical model, the American Medical Association placed a 28-page advertising supplement in Newsweek (American Medical Association, 1983) openly espousing the wellness movement's point of view: "It has taken members of the health care field and administrators of health programs in business, industry and government a long time to realize that the key to good health is not found in hospitals, clinics or physicians' offices, regardless of their advances and their excellence." The supplement went on, stating that doctors and hospitals generally provide "sickness care," not "health care," and that real health care consists of prevention. Never before had there been such
an endorsement of the preventive aspects of health by the AMA. Not only in the United States but in other parts of the world, prevention was to play a larger role in health care delivery.

The shift of the medical model from a bio-medical stance to one that placed more emphases on prevention, individual responsibility and a holistic approach to improved health was to influence consumer participation in an arena that extended beyond the doctor's office or the hospital. It literally brought health "home" to each and every neighborhood. Economics, ecology, high technology, improved electronic communication, varied lifestyles and health were becoming more intertwined, each affecting the other. At the national governmental level, other phenomena took place that further contributed to the intersection with these factors and processes.

Federally Sponsored Health and Social Programs

The federal government contributed likewise to the trend towards increased involvement of citizens in decision making. Beginning in the early 1960s and continuing until the late 1970s, federally funded programs in social, health and urban renewal programs included requirements for the input of citizens in policy and decision making. The United States Federal Regional Council reported that 137 (61%) of the 226 public participation programs operating in federal agencies in the late 1970s had been created during that decade (United States Federal Regional Council, 1978). Seventy-five percent of state utility regulatory commissions had a high level of groups representing the public (Gormley, 1981, p. 446). Surveys of city and county governments revealed a growing incidence of citizen involvement opportunities, many
in response to the participatory requirements of federal policies (Cole, 1974, p. 53). The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act (P.L. 88-452), with a primary focus on urban communities, was "the most dramatic assault upon economic and social inequality since the New Deal . . ." (Baroni, 1983, p. 178).

"Maximum feasible participation," the core concept of the Economic Opportunity Act, triggered hotly contested debates. Activists in the field and some members of the Office of Economic Opportunity contended that one of the major goals of the program was to empower the people at the grassroots. Marked by powerlessness, a condition that accompanied poverty, the economically disadvantaged needed to participate in the formation and administration of policy. Many congressmen and urban analysts disagreed. To them, the concept of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor did not intend to empower the poor; it was intended to "insure that persons excluded from the political process in the South and elsewhere would nonetheless participate in the benefits of the community-action programs" (Moynihan, 1968, p. 58). Regardless of the interpretation of this issue, the Community Action Program, in addition to the Model Cities Program (Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966: P.L. 89-754) which followed, contributed historical legacies to the involvement of citizens in decision making. Burke (1979, pp. 71-72) succinctly states:

1. The base of participation was legislatively widened to include specifically identified individuals and groups. Citizens are defined as those who have an interest in a particular planning organization as well as those who would be affected by a plan or program of service. The latter are often referred to as "consumers."
2. The purpose of citizen participation shifted from a value premise to one of necessity:

   a. Organizational support was necessary. Citizens involved in planning activities tend to endorse and support such activities. They become constituents of their own actions. (Burke, 1979, p. 71).

   b. Citizen participants were seen as a source of information and collective wisdom.

3. Citizen Participation became institutionalized: It became a normal part of the planning process. (pp. 71-72)

The enactment of programs at the national and local levels is a good example of the third point. Congressionally legislated health programs which contained some mandates for citizen input included.\(^\text{13}\)

--P.L. 89-239 Regional Medical Program under the Heart Disease, Cancer & Stroke Amendments of 1965.

--P.L. 89-749 Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966.


--P.L. 93-322 Health Maintenance Act of 1973

---\(^\text{13}\)Lawrence K. Koseki and John M. Hayakawa reviewed these federal health laws enacted by Congress, and identified some issues and dilemmas of consumer participation activities (to be discussed in a later chapter of this investigation). "Consumer Participation and Community Organization Practice: Implications of National Health Legislation," Medical Care, March 1979, vol. 17, no. 3.
Similarly addressing citizen input factors in energy development programs, Canan, Hennessy et al. (1981) listed five reasons for citizen input in community development projects:

1. Only residents can speak about the qualitative or subjective aspects of the environment in which they live.

2. People vary in their social priorities.

3. Community involvement reduces the psychological propensity to be contrary and resistant to proposed changes.

5. Local residents have a moral right to participate in the determination of their future.

Federal legislation gave statutory life to citizen input in many national programs. However, they did not, nor could not, fulfill all of the needs of the neighborhoods and their residents. As a result, citizens responded by seeking to do things for themselves.

The Self-Help Movement

Parallel with the shifting stance of the medical model which began to see the value of placing greater emphasis on individual responsibility for improved health, there had been a proliferation of self-help activity within the general public. Fifteen million Americans

---

Self-help groups are defined as: "voluntary small group structures for mutual aid in the accomplishment of a specific purpose. They are usually formed by peers who have come together for mutual assistance in satisfying a common need, overcoming a common handicap or life disrupting problem, and bringing about desired social and/or
belong to 500,000 self-help groups that range from alcoholism to Big Spenders (compulsive debtors) (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 150). Additionally, approximately fifteen thousand community organizations in urban, suburban, and rural communities exist throughout the United States. Ranging from block clubs to community development corporations with million-dollar budgets, large well-trained staffs, and sophisticated long-range plans, citizens throughout the country are engaged in clean-ups, anti-crime campaigns, construction and neighborhood restoration (Baroni, 1983, p. 190). The results of their efforts deserve recognition. Non-governmental cooperatives and other privately funded community enterprises in New York City have constructed and refurbished more homes than the city government since the end of World War II (p. 190).

The self-help movement was implicitly a critique of professionalism (Gartner & Reissman, 1976, p. 785) and a reaction to bureaucracy. "The mutual aid groups developed, in large measure, because of various limitations of professional organizations--unwillingness to deal with certain problems, a limited reach with regard to various populations, an overly intellectual orientation, monopolistic credentialism, etc."

---

"In a sense, all service seeking is self-help, whether one goes to the doctor, psychiatrist, or to school. In what has been called self-help approaches, the significant element is the active role of the recipient or consumer in providing the service to himself or herself or to a peer and the relatively secondary or absent role of the professional provider." Alan Gartner and Frank Riessman, "Self-Help Models and Consumer Intensive Health Practice," American Journal of Public Health (August, 1976), vol. 66, no. 8, p. 783.
The entire ethos of the professional orientation is very different from the self-help orientation which is much more activistic, peer-oriented, informal, open and inexpensive. The self-help approach stresses what might be called an "aprofessional" dimension—the concrete, the subjective, the experiential, the intuitive, and the emphatic, in contrast to the more professional accent on distance, perspective, systematic knowledge, understanding and overspecialization" (p. 785).

Bureaucracies often serve themselves rather than the citizen: internal efficiency being more important than the response to the needs of those for whom the organization was originally established. By contrast, self-help groups are antihierarchical and antibureaucratic (p. 785), striving to provide the kinds of services and goods which institutions have failed to or stopped providing at less cost, with more focus on specific needs of the citizens and incorporating citizen knowledge and experience. Citizens and citizen groups that had experienced the negating factors in dealing with professionals and bureaucracies joined forces to support one another in achieving personal and social change. Naisbitt (1982, p. 150) reports, "people feel unable to control big government and the distant bureaucracies and so are drawn to mutual-aid groups that enable them to deal directly with some immediate problems of everyday life."

All of the following factors contributed to the growth and development of the self-help movement: Preventive focuses in the health field; economic constraints caused by higher costs of goods and services; and top-down, media-based information and instructional approaches. Rather than being people-to-people and consumer-centered,
goods and services were delivered in de-personalized, institutional, lock-step fashion, alienating and often denigrating the individuality and sense of dignity of citizens and citizen groups (Gartner & Reissman, 1976, p. 785). Out of a need to feel independent and competent, citizens began to do things that they once had relied on institutions and professionals to provide: they began to build their own houses rather than just remodel them (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 156); they formed neighborhood safety watches; and they began co-op day care centers with parents providing much of the classroom instruction and monitoring. Nearly every form of daily life was touched by some aspect of people doing things for themselves, both individually and in groups.

The Neighborhood Movement

By the late 1960s, the working class and lower middle-class neighborhoods faced many similar problems of their less affluent neighbors. The federal government's decreased support of programs such as the Community Action Program and the decreased support of older cities and neighborhoods because they were viewed as no longer economically viable forced citizens to seek non-governmental resources in stemming the tide of deterioration within their neighborhoods. Through collective self-help endeavors, citizens found social and psychological significance in their lives (Baroni, 1983, p. 179).

Commonly attributed to the 1970s when enthusiasm and commitment to neighborhood issues were at a peak, local residents and urban planners called attention to their concerns caused by frustration with urban renewal and model cities programs and "out of a deep-grained feeling that neighborhood residents understand their own problems better than Congress, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and even city hall." (Bratt, 1983, p. 133)
This viewpoint acknowledged the neighborhood as the most manageable unit for understanding problems rather than the city or urban area as a whole, and acknowledged that positive neighborhood change is desirable and that both citizen initiative and vision play vital roles in the change process. The term "grassroots," which had become synonymous with the Model Cities and the Community Action Programs, now encompassed neighborhood activities within all of the socio-economic neighborhoods. As federal assistance decreased, citizen groups had to seek alternative ways of solving social dilemmas that were once seen as governmental responsibilities. "They grew in numbers and quality and during that period the neighborhood movement of the 1970s was born" (Baroni, 1983, p. 190). During the next 10 years, neighborhoods organized themselves to check the threats to their communities and to revitalize them. It was a time when collective action by neighbors influenced decisions in city hall. Rather than playing advocacy or social services roles alone, neighborhood-development organizations (NDOs) were formed to undertake housing, economic development, and energy projects (Mayer, 1983, p. 151). Although many citizens' actions involved the vetoing of proposals, a more positive atmosphere evolved, with constructive input and planning of projects to revitalize the neighborhoods.

A significant milestone of the neighborhood movement at the national level was reached when, in 1978, President Carter formed a new agency in the Department of Housing and Urban Development—the Office of Neighborhood Voluntary Associations and Consumer Protection. Its mission was to advocate for community organizations and other
self-help associations within the federal government and to encourage agencies to revise, coordinate, and expand their programs to assist them. Another vital function was to provide technical assistance directly to neighborhood organizations so they could better utilize their resources and take advantage of public programs. Rounding off the continuum of participation activities that ranged from the grass-roots to the Capitol, the office also coordinated intergovernmental-neighborhood-conservation activities (Baroni, 1983, p. 188).

Summary of the History and Background of Citizen Participation in Social Planning

Numerous forces have influenced the recent trend towards increased citizen participation. Economic, post-industrial, political, structural and population shifts have dynamically influenced the changes taking place in society. Starting from the disadvantaged and poor communities and moving upwards to include working class neighborhoods, a significant amount of activism has also advanced to include increased participation of the middle class and upper middle class. From a top-down perspective, social and health programs initiated by Congress have fostered citizen input at the local level, evidenced by the legacies of the Community Action Program and Model Cities and the establishment of commissions and bureaus such as the Office of Neighborhood Voluntary Associations and Consumer Protection mentioned earlier. Although Congressional legislation specifically mandated the inclusion of citizen input in decision making, much of the citizen participation activities were adverse reactions of citizens to
government and large institutions because of their de-personalizing
and unresponsive nature. This bottom-up groundswell has been growing,
evolving from negative reactions to more constructive, innovative and
proactive activities.

The national setting has been presented with some of the salient
factors that affected the movement towards increased demands for
citizens to provide input in the decision making that affects them.
The next section introduces and describes the Neighborhood Board con-
cept, which has been selected as the setting for this investigation.

The Research Setting: Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards

Factors that influenced the mainland USA similarly affected
Honolulu. From national programs such as the Community Action Program,
the Model Cities Program and numerous federal legislation in health
and social services to locally generated programs that followed the
mode of federal legislation (such as the Progressive Neighborhoods
Program), Honolulu was following the trends towards increased citizen
input. From a history and experiences steeped in programs for the
"disadvantaged," Honolulu was moving towards a form of legislated
citizen input that included the eligibility of the larger socio-economic
spectrum.

Under the theme of "The Responsible City," the Honolulu City
Council and Mayor Frank Fasi formed a nine-member Charter Commission
in April, 1971, assigned to develop a plan for a legal form of
institutionalized citizen participation. In 1972, the electorate
approved a revised City Charter for the City and County of Honolulu
"to increase and assure effective citizen participation in the decisions of the city." The first commission was officially sworn in on June 29, 1973 to designate the boundaries of the neighborhoods and establish the procedures by which the residents could organize themselves. A major premise of the concept was that the residents were to initiate organization, in recognition of the unique and distinctive ways that various communities had in doing things. A final product of the Commission was the Neighborhood Plan, which created the groundwork for 32 neighborhood boards to be formed through an initiative petition of 100 registered voters of 5% of voters within the area (whichever is less) (PAC WEST, 1979). To date, 30 neighborhoods have formed boards through this process, each with the following roles and function:

--Review and make recommendations on the General Plan, Development Plan, and variance applications for zoning changes affecting their neighborhoods.

--Prepare a list of recommended capital improvement projects.

--Set goals, objectives, and priorities for the growth of the neighborhood.

--Sponsor studies, hold public hearings and make recommendations on problems in the neighborhood.

15 From Honolulu's entry in the 1978 National Association of Counties competition for which the city received an Achievement Award. The entire text of the pamphlet is included in the appendix to afford the reader an overview of the Neighborhood Board system in Honolulu.

16 Four members appointed by the mayor, four appointed by the City Council and one member appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the council: each member to serve a five-year term.
--Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness or efficiency of the government's delivery of services to citizens and assist in advocating residents' interests to public agencies, the City Council, governmental bodies and other organizations and persons.

--Conduct educational programs for the general public and assist other governmental agencies in their educational programs. Neighborhood Boards may make recommendations on a number of activities and may function as a public forum for the community. (Refer to Appendix A for more details.)

Several significant factors made the Neighborhood Boards a suitable setting for this investigation:

1. The Neighborhood Boards concept is a unique, institutionalized experiment in citizen participation. It represents a form of citizen input which has been included as part of the decision-making process of city administration. Their statutory existence assures input in major forms of planning such as in the Development Plan, identifying objectives for the growth and development of the communities on the island of Oahu (City and County of Honolulu, March 1, 1982).

2. The Neighborhood Boards followed in the footsteps of Honolulu's experience with the Community Action Program and the Model Cities Program. Previous participants of these programs continued their community participation through the neighborhood boards. Additionally, the first person to head the Neighborhood Commission Office had previously been the Director of the Resident Participation Organization of the Kalihi-Palama Model Cities Program. Phil Chun, Executive Director of the Kalihi Branch YMCA (which had been actively

17 One of two designated Model Cities Neighborhood Areas (MNA) in Honolulu.
involved in CAP and Model Cities programs), was the first chairperson of the Neighborhood Commission. It was a natural step to study an organization and process that followed a progression of citizen participation experiences in Honolulu.

3. The criteria for participation on Neighborhood Boards included the entire City and County of Honolulu. Unlike the anti-poverty and other health and social programs which designated a specific sector of the population, the entire adult population of Honolulu qualified to seek election to the Neighborhood Boards:

Candidacy is open to all residents 18 years and older, of the island of Oahu, State of Hawaii, including military personnel and aliens who reside in the Neighborhood Board area and sub-district for which they are running. A candidacy declaration form must be filed but no filing fees or nominating papers are required. Neighborhood Board elections are conducted biennially through a mail ballot system.18

In essence, the Neighborhood Boards included all socio-economic and community settings, thus making them desirable settings for the study of citizen input in decision making in a comprehensive context.

4. The inclusion of the entire socio-economic and geographic spectrum of the City and County of Honolulu held the potential promise of highlighting public health concerns within each neighborhood. The implications for environmental impacts on public health were considerable since the Neighborhood Boards served as a public forum on matters such as the Development Plan in general, as well as land-use zoning for each neighborhood in particular. Population density and residential

18 See Appendix A.
or industrial land use are but examples of issues which have direct effects on the natural and neo-environments, thereby affecting the physical and emotional well-being of citizens residing in the neighborhood.

5. The Neighborhood Board concept represented a combination of a top-down and bottom-up approach to citizen participation. It combined the municipal government's recognition of the need and utility of neighborhood input with the growing demands of citizens to be involved. Statutory validity added strength to neighborhood efforts. This validity gave citizens better access to data and added a new dimension of communication with city government. Previously, citizen groups had difficulty getting the cooperation of governmental departments and services as well as obtaining vital information for planning and decision-making purposes. Bringing them into the formal structure of the city governance structure promised a better approach to problem solving between once-contentious factions as witnessed in the adversarial confrontations of the early-sixties.

6. In addition to being voluntary, Neighborhood Board membership is electoral which adds another dimension to citizen participation. The usual criteria for membership are appointments, invitation or attendance at meetings. This elective aspect placed citizen participation in a new perspective that fell between elective political activity and voluntary neighborhood service, thus calling for more than altruistic intent, community service or self-interest. There were possible implications of other variables necessitating an additional capacity to organize and mobilize, if only on a small scale, a political campaign.
7. A paid, professional staff provided logistical support to the boards as well as serving as the liaison with the city administration. This structure paralleled those found in other legislatively mandated citizen participation programs. It presented a potential of yielding information on needs, problems and solutions to similar organizations in which a paid staff, accountable to a larger bureaucratic administrative structure, provided logistical support to consumer/constituent groups.

8. Participation on Neighborhood Boards falls well within the definition of Public Health Administration. Enunciated by C.E.A. Winslow, it is the "art and science of preventing disease, prolonging life, and promoting physical and mental efficiency, through organized community effort" (Smille, 1963, p. 503).

9. The evolution of the Neighborhood Board concept had paralleled the national experience in citizen participation. This historical evolution, as well as the structure and function of the Neighborhood Boards, was consonant with this investigator's focus on public health practice, social planning and citizen participation.

In addition to the previous reasons for choosing Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards as the setting of this investigation, several other geographic and environmental factors contributed to the attractiveness of their study. Honolulu offers unique characteristics, opportunities, and conditions as an investigative setting. It represents and reflects industrial and post-industrial society in miniature. Its isolation, multi-cultural population and urban environment represent a microcosm of a global environment in transition.
1. Honolulu's location on an island presents a unique laboratory for the study of citizen participation. Whereas continental land masses that are unexploited offer larger borders and frontiers which perpetuate the spirit of expansion with little regard for the environment, an island environment of 595 square miles (Bushnell, 1970, p. 36) quickly limits and feeds back consequences of imbalances of its natural and man-made resources. Critical tolerances of the balance are much smaller on islands than on large continents where inhabitants may rely on adjacent territories more readily for resources such as water.

"Unlike mainland communities, which can divert a river or pipe water in from elsewhere, Hawaii is limited to what the sky drops and the islands catch. Projections are that Oahu will be using all of its water by the year 2000 (Board of Water Supply, 1982, p. 30). In 1969 the Hawaii State Department of Agriculture reported that Hawaii was the biggest user (per capita) of pesticides in the United States (Christensen, 1985, p. A7). In 1983, the citizens of Mililani Town learned that their water supply was contaminated by pesticide residues. Their Neighborhood Board launched a campaign of public forums, written and personal appeals to elected and appointed officials and the submission of a petition representing nearly every one of the town's households. As a result, $3 million in federal funds were released, a developer of Mililani Town agreed to fund and construct a $2.7 million filter system and the State of Hawaii committed $2.5 million to drill new wells. Because of this accomplishment initiated by the Mililani Neighborhood Board, the town was one of nine communities to
win the All-America City award sponsored by the Citizens Forum on Self-Government National Municipal League and USA Today (Honolulu Star Bulletin, 1986, p. A-3). (By 1985, 15 Oahu wells serving the public and five private wells were closed because of pesticide contamination [Christensen, 1985, p. A7]).

2. A casual glance of the world map places Hawaii in the center of the largest body of water on earth, making it one of the most isolated archipelagos in the world (Bushnell & Berger, 1970, p. 7). The physical isolation, coupled with its urban environment in an island setting offers a unique opportunity to study social change. Whereas continental land masses provide large expanses for resettlement, exits from islands are more of an "all or nothing" proposition. Ecological time cycles are shorter on islands, making it more advantageous to observe change and to institute (hopefully) positive interventions.

3. Honolulu's population is steeped in the many cultures and traditions of East and West. Its history has involved individuals and organizations from diverse cultures and combinations of these cultures, providing a laboratory of citizen participation involving unique circumstances which cannot be duplicated elsewhere.

The Inherent Dilemmas of Citizen Participation

Although many significant factors and forces contributed to the concept and practice of citizens and consumers providing input into decisions that affect them, there have attendantly been significant problems which have hindered the movement. The following text begins from a broad perspective and leads up to a more specific and current
assessment of the problem addressed by this investigation. It is not possible to create a comprehensive listing of all problems that are relevant to this subject. However it includes what this investigator considers to be among the more salient factors:

1. Differing philosophies of citizen participation by those who sponsor citizen participation programs.

2. (a) The preoccupation of the social sciences with alienation and (b) the extreme focus on poverty, and the underprivileged in the 1960s.

3. Wicked planning problems.

4. The call for both expertise and wisdom.

5. Inadequate data and support structures.

Differing Perspectives of Citizen Participation Sponsors

The prime source of legislated citizen participation efforts (Congress) has ironically contributed to the dilemmas of citizen participation. The following passage, written 16 years ago, still touches on relevant issues.

Federal legislation and, more telling, the demands of citizens themselves, have combined to make citizen participation an essential requirement in any urban project. Yet, nothing in planning to date has caused more contention. In city after city, program after program, citizen participation is the principal source of confusion and conflict. To conceive of citizen participation as a single undifferentiated, and overriding strategy is misleading. To even think that citizen participation is only a strategy is also misleading. For some, citizen participation is value; something that "should be", something that is deemed to be the essence of democracy. (Burke, 1969, pp. 287-288)
Whether they were viewed as strategies or as values, there is no doubt that the problems faced by the numerous citizen participation programs were caused by differing and often conflicting philosophies. Koseki and Hayakawa (1979) reviewed 10 federal laws sponsoring consumer participation. Using the following criteria (p. 245) to analyze the original legislation, they found "uncertainty of outcomes, conflicting strategies, and conflicts relating to representativeness, legitimacy and consumer role."

1. Clarity of stated purposes and outcomes of participation.
2. Acknowledgment of consumer/citizen role in program.
3. Clarity of key concepts, terms, phrases and categories of participants.
4. Role of consumer involvement body--policy making or advisory.
5. Definition of nature and scope of responsibilities and activities of participants.
7. Extent of consumer representation on policy making/advisory bodies.

They cite a national policy on consumer participation that lacked coherence and consistency, stating that "Federal legislation to mandate consumer participation can be described as being ambiguous in purpose, uncertain in function and difficult in implementation" (p. 244).

Looking at the table "A Comparison of the Statutory Language of 10 National Participatory Legislation by Selected Variables," none of the 10 laws had any clear statement of the purpose or goal of consumer participation.

---

19 Reprinted with permission of the authors.
participation; eight failed to define "participants"; and only two definitively stated the nature of responsibilities and activities of participants.

In the realm of the corporate world, Kanter (1983, p. 5) contends that participation programs are fragile and temporary because of:
(1) Unrealistic expectations about the use of participation: it is often approached as a campaign or special program rather than as an ongoing process of solving problems and managing change. (2) Failure to manage participation: This is particularly true when those who are participating are literally thrown up into the air without being given the means to "land" safely. Sparse training and preparation, both for the participants and for those who have the responsibility of managing participation programs, contribute little to assist all parties in the successful implementation and sustainment of these programs.

Besides the inconsistencies of participation program sponsors, another problem, with historical roots, has plagued the citizen participation movement.

The Historical Base of Citizen Participation: Poverty and Alienation

In the 1960s, much of the literature about the "War on Poverty" focused on the failures of the "deprived" and the "underprivileged." "Project after project, and publication after publication during the 'War on Poverty' era focused on explaining the 'failure' of 'deprived' cultures, examining the 'pathology' of the 'underprivileged,' and articulating 'obstructions' to the 'empowerment' of the culturally disadvantaged" (Kieffer, 1981, pp. 33-34). Part of the problem lay
in the previous preoccupation on helplessness and alienation. Leonard (1984, p. 335) noted that the field of psychology "had by and large concentrated on mental illness, neglecting or entirely ignoring psychological health. Symptoms had been relentlessly pursued, abnormalities endlessly analyzed" (p. 335). The early giants of social science had been fascinated with themes of "alienation" and the normal personality continued to be viewed primarily as a vague, gray area of little interest or concern and "positive psychological health was terra incognita" (p. 336). Social scientists "produced a preponderance of knowledge regarding the experience of helplessness and alienation" (Kieffer, 1981, p. 46). The imbalance of research foci in the social sciences had prevented and precluded the generation of more information on the dynamics and processes of other aspects of citizen participation till then.

Humanistic psychologists such as Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers provided the needed innovative perspectives for the social sciences. It was not until Maslow completed work on "Principles of Abnormal Psychology" that the positive aspects of mental health gained stature (Leonard, 1984, p. 327). His theory on the hierarchy of needs focused on the tendency of every human being--once the basic deficiency-needs are adequately fulfilled--to make real his or her full potential, to become everything he or she can be. For Maslow, the self-actualizing person is not a normal person with something added, but a normal person with nothing taken away (p. 328). His investigation of the exceptionally healthy person rather than the pathological individual serves as a discretionary guide for this study.
Wicked Planning Problems

The inclusion of citizens in the decision-making process assumes to some degree that they must face and consider the dilemmas faced by other decision makers. However peripheral their roles might be, citizen participants are touched by an "all or nothing" nature of some aspects of planning. Whether they are self-managed or only invited to review and comment on major decisions, citizens are exposed to situations which generate dilemmas with which they must wrestle. The underlying point is not how much of the final decision-making powers are accorded to citizens nor is it to pretend that they are assumed to be competent planners; it is recognition of the mutual hazards faced by individuals of any organization that addresses planning issues. Rittel and Webber (1973) elaborated specifically on these "wicked problems" encountered by planners. This investigator feels that it is appropriate and necessary to include the main portions of their literature, however long, in order to lay the context in which many citizen participants themselves become totally immersed. Rittel and Webber define the context of the phrase "wicked problems": "... we are calling them 'wicked' not because these properties are themselves ethically deplorable. We use the term 'wicked' in a meaning akin to that of 'malignant' (in contrast to 'benign' or 'vicious' (like a circle) or 'tricky' (like a leprechaun) or 'aggressive' (like a lion, in contrast to the docility of a lamb). But then, you may agree that it becomes morally objectionable for the planner to treat a wicked problem as though it were a tame one, or to tame a wicked problem
as though it were a tame one, or to tame a wicked problem prematurely, or to refuse to recognize the inherent wickedness of social problems" (pp. 160-161).

Wicked problems have 10 propositions:

1. There is no definitive formulation of a wicked problem. The information needed to understand the problem depends upon one's idea for solving it. In order to describe a wicked problem in sufficient detail, one has to develop an exhaustive inventory of all conceivable solutions ahead of time. The reason is that every question asking for additional information depends upon the understanding of the problem—and its resolution—at that time. Problem understanding and problem resolution are concomitant to each other. Therefore, in order to anticipate all questions (in order to anticipate all information required for resolution ahead of time), knowledge of all conceivable solutions is required.

2. Wicked problems have no stopping rule. Contrasted to chess problems or mathematical equations, wicked problems have no ways of signalling the planner when a solution has been found. Work is terminated on a wicked problem because of "external" considerations: running out of time, money, or patience.

3. Solutions to wicked problems are not true-or-false, but good-or-bad. Because social problems have no established criteria and thus have ambiguous answers, there is no way to objectively test whether any solutions are true or false. Normally, many parties are equally equipped, interested, and/or entitled to determine correctness. Their judgments are likely to differ widely to accord with their group or personal interests, their special value-sets, and their ideological predilections. Their assessments of proposed solutions are expressed as "good" or "bad" or, more likely, as "better or worse" or "satisfying" or "good enough."

4. There is no immediate and no ultimate test of a solution to a wicked problem. Wicked problems have long term effects which cannot be evaluated until the entire process of repercussions are completely run out, and ... we have no way of tracing all the waves through all the affected lives ahead of time within a limited time span.

5. Every solution to a wicked problem is a "one-shot operation" because there is no opportunity to learn by trial-and-error, every attempt counts significantly.
In the sciences and in fields like mathematics, chess, puzzle solving or mechanical engineering design, the problem solver can try various runs without penalty. With wicked planning problems, however, every implemented solution is consequential. It leaves "traces" that cannot be undone. One cannot build a freeway to see how it works, and then easily correct it after unsatisfactory performance. Large public works are effectively irreversible, and the consequences they generate have long half-lives. Whenever actions are effectively irreversible and whenever the half-lives of the consequences are long, every trial counts. And every attempt to reverse a decision or to correct for the undesired consequences poses another set of wicked problems, which are in turn subject to the same dilemmas.

6. Wicked problems do not have an enumerable (or an exhaustively describable) set of potential solutions, nor is there a well-described set of permissible operations that may be incorporated into the plan. There are no criteria which enable one to prove that all solutions to a wicked problem have been identified and considered.

7. Every wicked problem is essentially unique. "Despite seeming similarities among wicked problems, one can never be certain that the particulars of a problem do not over-ride its commonalities with other problems" with which one has already dealt.

8. Every wicked problem can be considered to be a symptom of another problem. Problems can be described as discrepancies between the state of affairs as it is and as it ought to be. The process of resolving the problem starts with the search for causal explanation of the discrepancy. Removal of that cause poses another problem of which the original problem is a "symptom." In turn, it can be considered the symptom of still another, "higher level" problem. A good example of this is "crime in the streets." A focus on one causal factor such as deficient opportunity, general moral decay, or wealth, or poverty will uncover symptoms of another problem.

9. The existence of a discrepancy representing a wicked problem can be explained in numerous ways. The choice of explanation determines the nature of the problem's resolution. "Crime in the streets" can be explained by not enough police, by too many criminals, by inadequate laws, too many police, cultural deprivation, deficient opportunity, too many guns, phrenologic aberrations, etc. Each one of these offers a procedure to determine the "correct" explanation or combination of them. The reason is that in dealing with wicked problems there are several
more ways of refuting a hypothesis than there are permissible in the sciences. An individual's view of the world is the strongest determining factor in explaining a problem and, therefore, in resolving a wicked problem.

10. The planner has no right to be wrong. . . . it is a principle of science that solutions to problems are only hypotheses offered for refutation. This habit is based on the insight that there are no proofs to hypotheses, only potential refutations. The more a hypothesis withstands numerous attempts at refutation, the better its "corroboration" is considered to be. Consequently, the scientific community does not blame its members for postulating hypotheses that are later refuted--so long as the author abides by the rules of the game, of course.

In the world of planning and wicked problems no such immunity is tolerated. (Rittel & Webber, 1973, pp. 144-146)

Given these "wicked" problems, one can begin to understand some of the inherent dilemmas of social planning that professional planners and government officials face on a regular basis. Although citizens are included in many of the processes at the various levels of input and intensity, it does not give them equal and instant expertise as "planners" nor does it give them equal powers as the officially designated decision makers. But the fact that Neighborhood Boards serve as a public forum on matters such as the Oahu Development Plan places its members "at risk" along similar lines as City Council and the Mayor. Additionally, because of the "all or nothing" characteristics of the social planning process, the citizens who do become involved in some aspects of inputs into the process cannot avoid these "wicked" situations.

The Call for Both Expertise and Wisdom in Content Areas

An added dilemma to wicked problems is the simultaneous call for both expertise in the technical aspects as well as for wisdom and
experience. At times these two are diametrically opposed ends of a continuum. In other situations, it is also not possible to simultaneously have expertise and experience. In many instances, some people have the expertise and others have the experience/wisdom, but no one has both expertise and experience/wisdom. This phenomenon relates most closely to proposition #5 of wicked problems which concerns "one-shot operations" when there are no prior experiences to rely on for subsequent decisions. The implicit call is for all parties involved to possess all of the knowledge and all of the experiences necessary to resolve problem areas. This call is not only from sources external to the respective individual but is also one of high and idealistic expectations of oneself.

Coupled with the reality that no one individual or group or institution possesses all of the experience and knowledge about any special content area, there is also the problem of inadequate data and the lack of experience in the processes and dynamics of the participation experience.

Inadequate Data and Lack of Experience in the Dynamics of Participation

One of the weaknesses of the participatory process is that it "relies on an individual learning process to move people from participation in decision-making without providing for any social-structural supports for this concern or activity" (Olsen, 1982, p. 55), nor does it "specify any procedures through which individuals are to expand their participation in public decision-making, but merely assumes that
people will become more involved in traditional political affairs" (p. 55). Berkowitz (1982, p. 6) mentions the desired functions served by support mechanisms.

- **Security**—Giving participants a positive feeling of simply being there, like money in the bank.

- **Recognition**—It recognizes members as unique and individual persons.

- **Affirmation**—Members are made to feel worthwhile—as valuable members of the group.

- **Task-oriented assistance**—For example members are given technical assistance in legal matters or grant-writing activities or in simple activities such as babysitting while members attend a meeting.

- **Emotional comfort**—It guides members through difficult times.

- **Personal Growth**—It encourages risk-taking, giving approval for successes and providing a cushion in the event of failures.

- **Stimulates community participation**—It encourages members to get involved in community affairs.

The presence of support structures in our lives contributes strongly to psychological and emotional well-being. Conversely, an absence of these structures is a major determinant of emotional illness. Failure to secure adequate support increases personal and social disorganization (p. 6). Similarly, organizations and human groupings suffer from similar symptoms when they do not have parallel support structures. Beginning with bases in families and friendship groups and rippling beyond the home, support structures provide the needed meaning to individuals in the community, some better than others. While many evolve naturally, there are other needs for which structures have to be created: block associations, parent cooperatives, mediation
centers, community gardens, anti-crime patrols, after-school programs, and ad hoc action committees. They require collective work, some resulting in easily tangible services such as day care and others more abstract, such as a network of presidents of neighborhood associations. Citizens and citizen groups have the most difficulty in the creation and the maintenance of support structures for the more abstract activities of participation. Long-range plans and policy determination present abstract and conceptual frameworks which are difficult to transform into immediate and tangible activities.

The failure of support structures to develop fully for these latter activities have several causes. One of them is the infinite number of publics and the wide variation of expectations of the concept and practice of citizen participation. Another is the relative newness of citizen participation efforts. Many of the participants do not have the experience nor the organizational skills necessary to function as both a participant and as part of a support structure. Combined with the fact that so much time and energy are taken up by the participation activity itself, little is left for the development of support structures (p. 8). The abstract and long-range nature of many policy and decision-making bodies is difficult for participants to conceptualize unless something "concrete" and tangible evolves as a result of their efforts. In essence, much of the policy-making activities remain at the conceptual and abstract level, thereby making the structures or the needs for support structures more ethereal than the activities and processes they are meant to support.
The relatively recent development of Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards and the lack of adequate resources and low administrative priority has left the Neighborhood Commission with a sparse data base. This has hampered efforts at reconciling the ideals of full participation with the realities of managing and developing the quality and quantity of Board participation. With its minimal resources and continued existence at risk, the Commission office and Neighborhood Boards use evaluation and assessment processes that do not adequately address the full scope of citizen participation of the neighborhoods in Honolulu. The current method of evaluating and assessing the strength of participation on Neighborhood Boards are primarily concerned with:

1. Attendance by the public at Neighborhood Board meetings.

2. The frequency that quorums are met by each board.

3. The return rates of mail-out surveys sent by each board.

4. The size of the mailing list of each board, based on requests by neighborhood residents to be placed on the mailing list. (This is also used to determine the budget allocation of funds for each Neighborhood Board.)

In a reversal of his support of the Neighborhood Boards, Mayor Frank Fasi had attempted to alter the structure and the powers of the Neighborhood Boards. His attempts were aimed at diminishing the amount of voice and input that Neighborhood Boards would have.

To date, there are no compiled demographic data on the Neighborhood Board participants. Ready availability of these data would have prevented a controversy in which allegations were made that Filipinos were proportionately under-represented on Neighborhood Boards. Alan Isbell, "Racial Survey Angers Board Members," Windward Sun Press (18 July 1985), p. A-3.
These data are useful in the ongoing operations of the Neighborhood Board mechanism, representing painstaking labor and effort on the part of the administration in maintaining the Neighborhood Boards. However, the problem of relying entirely on discrete "counts" of the occurrences of a phenomenon, such as meeting attendance, alone do not provide a comprehensive picture. Data gathered from the experiences and perspectives of participants are necessary to provide the feedback to make necessary interventions possible.

Summary: Dilemmas and Problems of Citizen Participation

The primary problems faced by citizen participation projects such as the Neighborhood Boards have both generic and specific bases. On the one hand, there are wicked problems which are inherent in most social planning endeavors. There is also the relatively small amount of data about citizen participation experiences and research devoted to the more phenomenological aspects of participation—some due to historical foci on such aspects as alienation, powerlessness and poverty, others simply because of the relatively recent arrival of Neighborhood Boards to the citizen participation scene. All of these factors have contributed to the current approach to evaluating participation on the Neighborhood Boards. The criteria that are utilized provide discrete, static counts such as quorums of the boards and attendance rates of neighborhood residents. However, there are some vital areas of participation that have not been addressed. These are primarily in the realm of the factors that contribute to the initiation and sustainment of participation on the Neighborhood Boards. Addressing issues of the achievement of the ideal principle of self-management,
Rich argues that the potential for citizen participation can be realized only if barriers to citizen involvement can be identified and institutions and policies designed that will encourage sustained and fruitful participation (Rich, 1981, p. 5).

Knowledge of these factors would be useful to both citizen groups and to staff who seek to provide support services and mechanisms to those who participate in these programs.

**Statement of Need**

Title XV of the Public Health Service Act (established by Public Law 93-641) mandates that all governing bodies for health planning of Health Systems Agencies (HSA) have a majority of consumers who are broadly representative of the general population served by an HSA. This requirement builds upon a similar requirement in the Comprehensive Health Planning Program (created by P.L. 93-641's predecessor, P.L. 89-749). Both statutes were and are founded upon the notion that the needs for health care services, and plans for changing the health care system to meet those needs, must be determined by those directly receiving these services in partnership with those providing them.

In keeping with these mandates, a substantial level of participation and involvement has been generated in these health planning programs. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that it is largely voluntary. Over 9,000 persons from all walks of life and sectors of American society serve as consumer and provider members of governing bodies, with about 53% of those being consumers (U.S.
Department of Health and Human Services, "Report on Consumer Participation in the Health Planning Program," 1981, p. 1). Another 2,000 persons serve on Statewide Health Coordinating Councils (p. 1). One hundred twenty-six HSAs in the nation have Subarea Advisory Councils with an aggregate membership of about 16,000 consumer members (p. 1). Since approximately 15,000 volunteers are recruited every year, it is estimated that the 50,000 volunteers contribute 1.5 million hours of their time to the health planning program annually (p. 1).

The voluminous number of volunteer hours expended in the health planning processes have highlighted some common issues facing consumers. Three principal needs in planning have been identified as priorities for further investigation (p. 3):

1. The problems which make it difficult for consumers to participate.23

2. Establishing greater accountability of consumers to those they represent.

3. What constitutes an effective consumer (consumer effectiveness).

(Of these three, this investigation primarily addresses issues surrounding item #1.)

In order to prevent citizen participation from becoming (or remaining) perfunctory activities generated by mandated programs, it is only prudent to gather as much data and knowledge as possible from each project in order to build upon cumulative participation experiences in all areas of citizen involvement.

Coupled with the data presented in the previous sections (i.e., the lack of support groups and the lack of feedback from consumers), and the large number of hours that are expended by volunteers in the other non-health-related citizen participation projects, there is an even greater need to seek answers and solutions to the dilemmas like those pinpointed above. Because of the interdependence between all aspects of societal life (i.e., economic, social, political, health), it is necessary to continue to seek ways of finding solutions and ways of enhancing consumer participation efforts at all levels. Based on the concept of interdependence, solutions applicable to one field can then be applied to other fields. Solutions or advances in one area affect the others as well.

This investigation places a greater conceptual focus on prevention in health rather than treatment. There are practical and economic advantages to strive for prevention in addition to ethereal and philosophical values. The increasing cost of medical care and the decreased purchasing power of the dollar make it necessary and prudent for the development of a superior process to improve health, primarily through prevention efforts, while driving down the cost of medical care. 24 The decreased costs of care consequently increase the accessibility of care for those who otherwise would not be able to afford it. The experiences of the citizen participation movement and the inroads it makes in the future in social planning plays an important

24 Health care costs rose 11.9% in 1983 while the consumer price index rose only 3.9% (Business Week, 1983, p. 46).
role in the future of the health care of this country. Since prevention is a key factor in the shifting model for health, it is imperative to prevent further "alienation" between providers and consumers.

Not only is it critical for the consumer to prevent further alienation from the larger "provider" organizations. Consumer wishes and needs are becoming a critical factor for the ongoing survival of these institutions themselves. Hospitals are seeking more input from consumers to offer more attractive services and amenities to bolster their patient rolls. They are diversifying into new profit making operations as their reimbursements from Medicare are decreasing as a result of governmental cost control measures (Business Week, July 25, 1983). For example, Dayton, Ohio's Miami Valley Hospital, in reorganizing itself to create a for-profit holding company to move into management consulting, home health care, and other activities, used Madison Avenue-style market research, including in-depth consumer surveys to find out what citizens wanted (p. 52).

In a similar context of medical care and its interface with consumer needs and the environment, the following "futuristic" scenario was presented at the International Congress of Pediatrics in Honolulu (Matsunaga, 1986, p. C-1). Dr. Robert Haggerty, professor of pediatrics at Cornell University and past president of the American Academy of Pediatricians stated that more attention must be paid to "the interaction between behavior, environment and biology."

Once again, the shift from one-on-one medical practice between the child and the doctor was noted when Haggerty pointed out that pediatricians of the future will work more closely with urban planners,
architects and politicians. Dr. Kobayashi of Japan's National Children's Medical Research Center in Tokyo concurred that while pediatricians have done much to improve the biological lot of children worldwide much remains to be done to develop "holistic and comprehensive approaches" to children's health.

Acknowledging the fact that U.S. cities have been designed exclusively by and for adults and neglecting the needs of teenagers and children, the city of Seattle has included children in the planning process by establishing a Children's Advisory Board (composed of 40 children between the ages of 11 and 15) to input into such issues as curfew, the city budget and parks policy and expansion. This is an innovative and progressive example of the level to which citizen participation has evolved. (It also parallels Dayton's Miami Valley Hospital's pursuit of input by consumers.) Essentially it is recognition of the idea that the problems of today's children in the developed countries will be the problems of the twenty-first century (p. C-1). Starting at such an early point of participation of young citizens accomplishes the (1) gathering of firsthand data from these young consumers as well as (2) developing their confidence and skills and their faith in the democratic experience.

Summary of the Statement of Need

In summary, then, several factors contribute to the need for a better understanding of the nature and processes of citizen participation. The overriding value behind this need is to insure that members of the community, as the end-users of goods and services, are involved
in the decision-making process in seeking solutions to the improvement of the public health. The members of the community are the primary point of intervention and it is vital to assure them access to the information, technical and financial resources necessary to adopt appropriate remedies. More importantly, it is vital that opportunities for the development of competent participation are provided to the consumers.

At a more realistic level, there are practical factors which necessitate a more thorough understanding of citizen participation processes: Health care costs are rising; there are more people needing medical care; self-help groups are proliferating; there is more competition for the consumer dollar among hospitals and health care plans; and studies of federal participation projects have pinpointed the need for answers to specific dilemmas, which, if left unanswered, result in perfunctory acts of participation with little substance.

Both consumer groups and provider organizations need to understand the processes of participation on the basis of pure economics. Whereas consumer groups are seeking the best value for their dollars, provider organizations are finding themselves more actively seeking to bolster revenues that have been diminishing in the wake of federal budget cutting.

The inclusion of consumer needs and wishes creates new implications for institutional management. Sound decision making and policy formation cannot be made without adequate data. All individuals in the power structure need the wisdom and the practical expertise (which,
in some cases is the currency of policy making)\textsuperscript{25} of the consumer. Investigations that explore the processes and dynamics of participation provide much of the data that is needed to enhance institutional management (i.e., the city governance process). These supportive data strengthen the participatory management capacities of the organizations that sponsor participation programs, thus making it more feasible for continued pursuit of the organization to include consumer input.

Extending this train of thought further, a strengthened institutional management capability provided by consumer input reinforces the integration of consumer participation as a regular part of the organization, thus decreasing references to consumer participation as "special projects" or as afterthoughts and appendages to the organization.

Consumers, on the other hand, require support structures and mechanisms to initiate and to sustain their efforts at participation. In order to strengthen citizen participation efforts, there is a need for a better understanding of the citizen participation process. Understanding the factors which encourage as well as those that discourage participation would add to the cumulative knowledge that can be used to enhance the development of citizen participation support structures.

The data thus presented indicate that both consumers and providers are mutually interdependent. There is need for more practical and action-based knowledge of the processes of participation. In the case of the Neighborhood Boards, some pertinent demographic data would

\textsuperscript{25}A good example of this occurs during election year. Another example is when citizen sanctions are needed in rezoning issues.
provide answers to questions such as, "Are the Boards truly representing the population of each of the neighborhoods?" Answers to questions like this could then form the basis for adjustments to the program. Consumers also would use the data to formulate priorities of representation based on some of these data.

Statement of Purpose, The Research Question/Objectives

Organizational structures and processes in both the public and private sectors require certain fundamental factors in order to function effectively: Human resources, funds, capital, access to reliable and current data/information, corrective mechanisms for goal attainment feedback from staff, feedback from consumers, technical and moral support mechanisms, staff training and orientation, leadership, and sanctions and legitimacy.

Citizen participation programs similarly require these critical elements in order to effectively achieve their goals. Regretfully, the voluntary nature of the participation efforts, the diverse and inconsistent motives of sponsors of these programs, and the ineffectual and fractured evaluations of these programs have contributed to a sparsity of data about them. The lack of feedback from those who are affected by decisions makes it difficult, if not impossible, to make corrections and adjustments of the critical processes of organizations. Without the viewpoint and input of participants, it is difficult to develop, maintain, and to improve the support mechanisms which are necessary to perpetuate and extend the participatory efforts of participants. Without the feedback from participants and without
adequate data about the human resources within the organization, it is difficult to develop appropriate training and orientation programs as well as to effectively recruit for more members. In consideration of these factors, the purpose of this investigation is to provide data which would contribute to the practice and policy formation elements of the citizen participation movement.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much of the literature about the participation of citizens in social planning is rooted in works that described and reflected on the experiences of federal programs such as the War on Poverty and the Model Cities programs. They also spawned works which served to analyze and integrate the collective experiences of these federal programs. Burke (1979) traced the growth of citizen participation and community decision making from the 1950s, when community planning "was the exclusive domain of a single organization--the city planning agency or department" (p. 11) to the late 1970s. He is credited with the articulation of the strategies of citizen participation: Education-therapy, behavioral change, staff supplement, cooptation, community power, and advocacy (Burke, 1968).

Dinell (1968) addressed the concept of participatory planning, defining it as involving "individuals and groups in influencing the decisions which come out of the planning process that affect them and their interests" (p. 2). The phrase "citizen participation" was avoided in this work. Dinell explained, "It is avoided in this discussion because it tends to imply a monolithic point of view put forth by a collective citizen. It seems to leave little room for disagreement and conflict among citizens and all too often it has meant a passive type of participation" (p. 2). Of particular significance to this investigator was Dinell's articulation of the "Promises of Participatory
Planning" (p. 11) which were formulated into five concepts of a "preferred future state":

1. The individual will have increased influence over what happens to him and his family and his associates.
2. There will be opportunity for greater self-fulfillment and a more equitable distribution of society's benefits.
3. The power of those now substantially excluded from the decision-making processes will be increased.
4. The political process will be more open to change.
5. Solutions to problems will reflect a broader range of values and interest than at present.

A hypothesis was then specified: "The hypothesis of the advocates of participatory planning is that effective, widespread participation in planning and decision-making processes will contribute to achieving this preferred state" (p. 11). Although this investigation's purpose was not specifically meant to test Dinell's hypothesis, these five points still had significant relevance 18 years later.

Parker (1972) addressed the various aspects of consumer participation in health programs such as training and orientation and the roles of consumer participants in policy making for Neighborhood Health Centers, etc. She found boundless rhetoric favoring consumer participation in health programs but could locate little actual documentation of its impact on health services or patient care, finding that it was generally difficult for experts to agree on the criteria that should be used to demonstrate the value of consumer participation programs. She presented salient criteria (p. 7) which any evaluation of the value of consumer participation must address:
1. The benefits to the participating individuals
2. The benefits to the participating groups
3. The benefits to the health professionals (providers of services)
4. The changes in the system which provide the benefits to clients
5. Benefits to the community as a whole.

Several works specifically relating to Neighborhood Boards were reviewed in order to determine the scope and depth of research conducted specifically on the subject. Liebmann (1975) wrote his Master's thesis, "The Potential for Increased Community Participation Through Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards System," immediately prior to the implementation of the program in Honolulu. He addressed the various trends that contributed to the increase of varied strategies of decentralization of various cities. Among the supporting data, Liebman cited a survey indicating that of 928 municipalities with more than 25,000 population, almost two-thirds reported some program involving decentralization (p. 2), portraying five different models:

(1) Exchange: exemplified by the establishment of information and complaint bureaus and "little city halls." These programs have a low level of service and low levels of political risk.

(2) Bureaucratic: exemplified by the delegation of authority from central governments to field offices where a variety of government services are located under one roof (multi-service centers). Moderate levels of municipal service and low political risk are characteristic of this model.

(3) Advisory: exemplified by formal recognition of communities/neighborhoods through ordinance of charter revisions and obtaining citizen input in the form of consultation and opinions from them. There is a moderate
level of political risk in advisory models of decentralization.

(4) Developmental: exemplified by the formation of community corporations in ghetto areas for the express purpose of economic activities and service delivery functions which are usually assumed by the central government of a region. High levels of political risk are involved in this model.

(5) Governmental/Political: exemplified by the delegation of legal sub-unit control services such as education systems within the sub-unit, with responsibilities for budgetary and personnel decisions. An example of this kind of mode would be that each neighborhood in Honolulu would control the public school system within its borders. This mode entails high levels of municipal service and high degrees of political risk. (p. 12)

Interestingly noted was the fact that the City and County of Honolulu had fewer citizen boards and commissions than the Hawaii state government. There were 10 at the county level and 50 at the state level (p. 2).

After a comparison and analysis of six multiservice and advisory board programs around the country which had parallel functions and objectives with Honolulu's Neighborhood Boards, Liebmann made recommendations for the implementation of the Neighborhood Boards including projections of the impacts of the Neighborhood Boards on the quality and nature of citizen participation in the City and County of Honolulu. The major recommendations (p. 68) are: (1) That the Neighborhood Commission should ensure that the community has early access to all information concerning land-use changes in their areas to ensure that the Neighborhood Boards would be included in the planning process rather than to be placed in a "reactionary" position; (2) That the Neighborhood Boards should develop a priority-setting strategy for fulfilling its second function, the review of Capital Improvement projects; and
(3) That the Neighborhood Commission should develop a plan that will provide for local Boards the means to carry out all their mandated functions (which included the sponsorship of studies and education/training), especially those requiring the assistance of paid staff. (This recommendation is based on such experiences as the New York City Community Boards—that advisory boards without resources and political support are largely ineffective and inactive.) (p. 71)

Conclusions of the thesis included projections based on the adoption of the Liebmann recommendations (p. 73) as follows:

1. A successful Neighborhood Board System would provide another point of public access to government in addition to Satellite City Halls and Community Service Centers.

2. Citizens would become involved in activities previously unavailable to them.

3. The Neighborhood Board System would encourage more authentic participation by citizens in city government with a resultant emergence of new leadership and enhanced community capacities.

An uneasy relationship between the citizen groups and some elected officials was predicted but with "less administrative chaos" and "political disorder" than feared by Advisory Board critics (p. 74). The paper concluded with a positive note, stating that "the activities of citizen groups including those seeking self-management are not a threat to political traditions and administrative practices. They may rather be seen as a way of improving the performance of government at the local level while providing residents the opportunity to develop their own capabilities in service to their own communities" (p. 75).

In 1979, PAC West Community Associates, Inc. evaluated the Neighborhood Boards and Neighborhood Plan (PAC West Community Associates,
Inc., 1979). The key objective was to measure the effectiveness of the Neighborhood Boards and the Neighborhood Plan against the intent of the Charter Commission members who drafted the Neighborhood Plan. Their views and intent were that the "boards were to be relatively informal, minimal cost, unbureaucratic organizations encouraging citizen input through the city administration and its (city administration) support" (p. 2). Their evaluation primarily used data provided by the Executive Director of the Neighborhood Commission and the Corporation Counsel. The various secondary sources of information included: minutes of the Charter Commission, minutes of the Neighborhood Commission, Neighborhood Board minutes, press clippings, opinion surveys, opinions about Neighborhood Boards rendered by the Corporation Counsel, a senior thesis of one Commission member, a research paper by student Bill Kloos.

To gather primary information, PAC West interviewed persons who were related in some way with Neighborhood Boards, such as: members of the Neighborhood Commission, City Council members, Charter Commission members and one staff member, City Corporate counsel, the former City Managing Director, the present City Managing Director, and several key department directors within the city administration.

In a nine-item conclusion (pp. 3, 4, 5) several points were raised and subsequently rebutted by the Neighborhood Commission in correspondence dated January 18, 1980, from Robert Shuford, then Chairman of the Neighborhood Commission to Robert P. Dye, President of PAC West:

There is no available evidence to indicate that Boards have increased "effective citizen participation in the decisions of the City."
There is no available evidence to indicate that the Boards have been able to affect noticeably the "decisions of the City." The Development Plan process with its emphasis on Board input may provide such evidence.

Surveys indicate that Board members perceive that the Boards have become enmeshed in bureaucratic red tape. The election process is costly and there is little voter participation.

The cost of operating the Board system is, in our view, excessive. For example, the Budget for 1980 anticipates expenditures of $375,968. Of that total $153,163 is in support of the Development Plan process.

The Neighborhood Commission staff and its director receive very high marks from all Boards for their assistance and enthusiastic support.

The highly structured Neighborhood Plan may exceed the stated intent of the City Charter and the desire of the City Charter and the desire of the Charter Commissioners.

More Board experience is required and more information generated and gathered before a clearly factual determination can be made as to the effectiveness of the plan.

Neighborhood boundaries drawn do not seem to conform to the standards outlined in the Neighborhood Plan part III--Boundaries.

Board member perception of the role of the Neighborhood Commission and its effectiveness is mixed.

The final conclusions of the PAC West evaluation point to a high cost, formal bureaucratic system which eventually discourages rather than encourages citizen input. Predictions of decreased participation by the general public and of increased power to a few individuals is held out as a strong and probable reality for the Neighborhood Board system.

Also reviewed was a 1979 opinion survey conducted around the island of Oahu by the Neighborhood Commission to gather general information about neighborhood problems and Neighborhood Board operations. Tabulations for this survey (600 responses mailed in)
were general in nature. In the same year, a survey among the Neighborhood Board members was sponsored by the Commission of which only 66 of a population of more than 400 Board members responded.¹

As part of its "study, consensus and action process" (League of Women Voters of Honolulu, 1985, p. 1), the League of Women Voters of Honolulu initiated a process which provided "background information for League members to consider before they participated in consensus meetings or before they responded to a poll from which a position statement was made. The primary objective of this study considered "whether or not the principles and goals of the Neighborhood Board System have been fulfilled in its over ten years of existence" (p. 1).

Among the pertinent questions raised for discussion in this process:

Can citizen participation [with] in the system respond effectively to the system?

Are taxpayers getting a fair return for the money?

Are the results worth the volunteer hours devoted to Neighborhood Boards?

Is the Board system designed to develop good leaders or does it make effective leadership more difficult to achieve?

Are the Boards a vital and necessary contribution to democracy, or just one more step in the bureaucratic ladder? (p. 1)

¹Chairman Mary Jane McMurdo sent a formal letter of objection (dated March 1, 1982) to all Neighborhood Board Chairmen, the Neighborhood Commission and Neighborhood Commissioners. The two basic arguments against the survey were that (1) the information sought was already available and (2) the data sought and the outcome measures were inappropriate to the survey goals. It was felt that quantitative data alone were useless or could be taken out of context without supporting qualitative, process-oriented information.
Twenty-two interviews were also conducted by League of Women Voters members to collect qualitative data about the Neighborhood Boards with past and present Neighborhood Board members, government officials, representatives of business organizations and the media and citizens who have attended Neighborhood Board meetings. (The report on these interviews admits to the unrepresentativeness of the sample by stating, "These people were selected for their knowledge and experience, therefore, they do not necessarily represent the attitudes of the community.") (p. 9)

The final outcome of the entire process culminated in a position statement on Neighborhood Boards:

The League of Women Voters of Honolulu believes the Neighborhood Board system should be continued.

Changes in the Neighborhood Board system should be considered which will facilitate neighborhood participation in government or governmental processes.

Areas in which changes should be considered include the qualifications for commission members and their assistance with Neighborhood Board operations. (League of Women Voters of Honolulu, 1985, p. 2)

**Summary: Literature Review**

The concept of the Neighborhood Boards was greeted by many organizations and individuals with enthusiasm and high expectations. Studies conducted by university students, private contractors, organizations such as the League of Women Voters of Honolulu and by the Neighborhood Commission itself addressed various aspects of the Neighborhood Boards operations. Several areas were inadequately covered or left untouched. Liebmann's paper was an anticipatory treatise about a project that
was yet to be implemented by PAC West's evaluation process included the review of documents as well as interviews with persons who primarily worked within the governing structures of city government. Based on these sources of information the findings were negative in terms of the impact of citizens on the city administration process. There was little if any significant feedback sought from the grassroots. Findings and conclusions are based on assumptions and expectations that citizen participation and citizen impact on "decisions of the City" were supposed to be virtually "instant," "spontaneous" and cost beneficial. The opinion that $375,968 (Pac West) is an excessive cost for programs to encourage citizen participation and in making significant impacts on city decision making sets inordinately high expectations for a neophyte program. It is an unrealistic expectation to address citizen participation and issues of citizen empowerment only in terms of getting things done in city decisions. (There are other significantly important facets of empowerment which are addressed in the conceptual framework section of this investigation.)

Although the 1979 Neighborhood Commission's opinion survey had 600 mail-in responses, the tabulations are general in nature and inconclusive in many instances. The sampling is not uniform for each of the neighborhoods, raising some question about its reliability. The survey of Neighborhood Boards (Interim Progress Report) in the same year yielded too small a sample (66 out of a population of more than 400 members) and once again, the representation of each Neighborhood Board was not consistent. Also, the resistance to this process by certain individuals and Neighborhood Boards detracts from validity and reliability of the study.
The League of Women Voters' report is more the result of a process of consciousness raising and education for its membership rather than one of objective fact-finding. Although interviews which raised pertinent questions were conducted during the process, once again the sampling is biased and selective with little reference to any sizable or significant number of Neighborhood Board members included.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURE

The Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this investigation serves two functions: (1) It provides a theoretical and philosophical rationale for the investigation, and (2) It provides a foundation from which the findings will be analyzed and interpreted.

As a whole, the concepts and theories introduced in this chapter contribute to a philosophy that views the citizen as a total entity, fully developed in the physical, mental and emotional dimensions, interacting with the physical and neo-environments. In this context, the fully developed citizen contributes to the rich texture of a society. Ecologically speaking, this particular framework recognizes the interdependence between citizens and providers (of goods and services). This ideal advocates that the knowledge, skills and experiences (wisdom) of citizens should be incorporated into the planning process. It advocates for the input of all persons who are affected by decisions to "voice" their opinions and concerns. Because of the large number of concerns represented by the myriad number of "publics" with their special interests in this participatory model, an interactive and advocacy based planning process is supported: that planners (those who make decisions in the allocation of resources) consult with the citizens in the problem-solving process.
Citizen participation is considered both as a value and a strategy. Additionally, citizens are viewed as consumers in the economic sense, subject to the forces and dynamics that drive them to choose, consume or to voice their concerns about the products they are consuming. This model also takes into account the dialogue between decision makers and the consumers, not from an adversarial context but in a problem-solving mode—a contrast to the confrontational modes of social change that were dominant in the 1960s.

The fact that citizens are self-directed in the participative process also is integral to this conceptual framework. By a process of self-direction and actualization, citizens take responsibility for their lives and for their environment. Through the process of actual, real-life experiences, citizens learn in a mode that is consistent with the adult learning model. It is contrasted with the linear and quantitative paradigm that has been predominant for many years, most often manifested in evaluation efforts, which primarily sought to measure citizen participation efforts by literally "counting" and isolating specific behaviors such as attendance, with minimal attempts to integrate related aspects of a larger phenomenon or set of interactions.

By looking at data and feedback from the participants themselves, there is a departure from merely quantifying behavior and reporting them. Instead, it is hoped that relationships between certain variables can be interpreted and synthesized into a simple and elegant scenario of factors and processes which motivate citizens begin participation, to continue their participation, and to exit from legislated citizen participation activities. What follows is a more detailed elaboration
of the theories and concepts which formed the conceptual framework discussed in the preceding paragraphs.

Sources of the Theories and Concepts Used in the Conceptual Framework

The concept of citizens providing input into the decisions that affect them is closely related to basic principles of educational philosophy. Brazilian educator Paulo Freire's (1973, p. vii) concept of critical consciousness (Conscientization) supports the philosophy that people can reject being merely "objects" in nature and social history and become "subjects" of their own destinies. Addressing issues of modernization and development, this concept holds to the belief that educators and educatees, "donors" and "recipients," consumers and providers share a common ground of equalness--that in the development process, both sides can mutually learn and benefit, each contributing unique and important elements to problem solving. The context of the term "development" to be used in this investigation is provided by economist Albert Hirschman (1970, p. 12): development depends not so much on finding optimal combinations for given resources and factors of production as on calling forth and enlisting for development purposes resources and abilities that are hidden, scattered or badly utilized."

The ecological principle that components of an environment are inextricably connected and related to other parts is also applied within the broader scope of this investigation. The broad context of this analogy is national, the more specific is the neighborhood, and the most specific is the individual citizen. The actions of one affects
the others, as is more visibly evident when Congress enacts policies which affect each and every individual. This investigation supports the belief that the development and consequent actions of individuals and groups of individuals (such as Neighborhood Boards) can impact upon the surrounding larger neo- and natural environments as well.

Transposing the idea of development, mutuality, and the interdependence of actors into a problem solving context to the health care model, this approach emphasizes the health and medical care system as a vital component of the national fabric. It is this interrelatedness, this interdependence that makes it necessary to study the phenomenon of citizen participation within a larger context rather than in an isolated neighborhood context. Proponents of this approach argue that health "reform" cannot occur except within the context of broader social transformations. Although the investigation focuses on the Neighborhood Boards in Honolulu, it recognizes the importance of the broader regional and national contexts of participation in planning, in public health and in government. The context of citizen participation within this investigation is based on the tenets of small group theory, with the philosophy that in order for policies/goals to be effective and meaningful, those persons who are affected need to be involved in the decision-making process (Allport, 1945; Collins & Guetzkow, 1964; Lewin, 1947). It adheres to the belief that keeping the locus of decision making within the segment of the population undergoing change is a basic requirement of true development¹ in the

¹The term is used in the context of Freire's (1973) definition provided in the first paragraph of this section.
modernization process. The reasons for adherence to this belief for active involvement in decision making are (1) groups involved in planning activities tend to become committed to the goals they have devised and (2) the goals that are devised tend to reflect the needs of the larger community; moreso than if devised by someone from an external position. Without the involvement of those affected there would only be modernization without development (Freire, 1973, p. xiii).

Society has placed a high premium on technical expertise and "objectivity" in the modernizing process. This objectivity takes problems and issues out of their original contexts, solves them and develops policies characteristically external to the human experience. Sociology, psychology and other social sciences have expended time and energy in studying the "separateness" that has resulted from this detached problem-solving process. Volumes of studies on alienation have covered many facets of this tearing of the social fabric. But the focus on alienation has also only targeted populations that are viewed in a negative sense, of being anomalous, ill, or wanting in some way. Maslow's (1954) work on hierarchy of needs and his study of healthy,\(^2\) self-actualized persons reversed the trend. This investigation follows Maslow's path away from the metapathologies--seeking to include a greater cross section of the entire population of the City and County of Honolulu.

---

\(^2\)Marie Jahoda (in Erikson, 1980) defined a "healthy personality" as a person who actively masters his environment, shows a certain unity of personality and is able to perceive the world and himself correctly.
A greater focus on prevention in health rather than treatment is a central philosophy of this investigation. Economic advantages accompany the holistic and humanistic reasons for such an approach. The increasing cost of medical care and the decreased purchasing power of the dollar makes it necessary for the development of a superior process to improve health, primarily through prevention efforts, while driving down the cost of medical care. The decreased costs of care consequently increase the accessibility of care for those who otherwise would not be able to afford it. The experiences of the citizen participation movement and the inroads it makes in the future of social planning play an important role in the future of the health care of this country. Since prevention is a key factor in the shifting model for health, it is imperative to prevent further "alienation" between providers and consumers.

Hirschman's Concept of Voice, Exit, and Loyalty

A model that encompasses broader aspects of the socio-economic spectrum rather than focusing only on disadvantaged populations serves as part of the conceptual frame of this investigation. The concepts in the book Voice, Exit, and Loyalty, by Hirschman (1970), are felt to be relevant to the study of citizen participation and social planning because, in addition to the educational, sociological and psychological approaches, the aspect of the citizen as a consumer is highlighted. As consumers, citizens provide input in decision making for reasons other than altruism or community service. It also relates to ecological principles, accounting for competition in the light of diminishing resources: People are consuming goods and services more cautiously.
and demanding more value for their money. There is an interface with the social planning model, recognizing the phenomenon of the allocation of vital human, social, and natural resources. "Voice," "Exit," and "Loyalty" offer a unique framework from which to explain and interpret certain factors as they relate to citizen participation.

The principles of voice and exit are elaborated to lay the groundwork for this investigation:

When the quality of an organization, product or service deteriorates, management learns about it through two basic response mechanisms:

1. Some customers (employees) stop buying the firm's goods or services as they leave the organization (this is the "exit" factor). Consequently, revenues drop and management is impelled to search for ways and means to correct whatever faults have led to this "exit."

2. The firm's customers or the organization's members express their dissatisfaction directly to management or to some other authority which management is subordinate to or through general protest addressed to anyone who cares to listen (this is the "voice" option). Management once again engages in a search for the causes and possible cures of the customers' dissatisfaction. (p. 4)

Voice is the opposite of exit. It is a "messier" concept because it can be a mix of activities, all the way from faint grumbling to violent protest; it implies articulation of one's critical opinion rather than a private "secret" vote in the anonymity of a voting booth; and finally, it is direct and straightforward rather than round-about. "... the role of voice increases as the opportunities for exit decline, up to the point where, with exit wholly unavailable, voice must carry the entire burden of alerting management to its failings" (p. 34). Voice is political action "par excellence" (p. 16).
Besides the economic consequences when consumers stop buying a product, there is another impact of exit. Social psychologists have noticed that the disappearance of the source of communication leads to a change of opinion in its favor. Exit is unsettling to those who stay behind as there can be no "talking back" to those who have exited. By exiting, one renders his arguments unanswerable. The remarkable influence wielded by martyrs throughout history can be understood in those terms, for the martyr's death is exit at its most irreversible and argument at its most irrefutable (p. 113).

"Loyalty" is the other factor which, in some cases, prevents the improvement of a product or an organization for the following reasons:

(1) individuals will tolerate the situation with the hope that matters will improve.

(2) Individuals continue to purchase the product because of tradition or habit ("because it's what mom and dad used to buy!")

(3) Individuals will continue with the situation with a blind or purposeful loyalty to an individual or product for "loyalty's" sake. Consequently, management fails to hear about or to feel the consequences of these situations. Loyalty in this context is inversely related to effectiveness and the improvement of a service, product or organization.

In order for an organization to maintain integrity and good health, an "optimal mix concept" is vital:

(1) In order to retain their ability to fight deterioration, those organizations that rely primarily on one of the two reaction (voice or exit) mechanisms need an occasional injection of the other.

(2) Other organizations may have to go through regular cycles in which exit and voice alternate as principal actors.
(3) An awareness of the inborn tendencies toward instability of any optimal mix may be helpful in improving the design of institutions that need both exit and voice to be maintained in good health. (Hirschman, 1970, p. 126)

Voice, exit and loyalty add another dimension to the concept of "supply and demand." They add a social process perspective which links disciplines such as the social sciences and planning with economics.

The Adult Learning Model

The following concepts of adult learning theory contribute to the context in which citizen participation is interpreted and analyzed:

(1) Andragogy: Coined by European adult educators in the late 1950s this term served as a way for them to discuss the growing body of knowledge about adult learners (Knowles, 1984, p. 6.3). Whereas pedagogy (literally defined as "paid, leader of children") (p. 6.3) describes traditional methods of transmitting knowledge by "pouring" it into the "empty vessels" of students, andragogy is derived from the Greek word anere, for adult, and agogus, meaning "the art and science of helping students learn" (p. 6.4). The advantage of the androgogical model in the study of a phenomenon such as citizen participation stems from its process orientation which incorporates principles and technologies from various theories while still maintaining its own integrity (p. 6.13). The traditional content models, behaviorist and cognitive, dogmatically and idealistically adhere respectively to the stimulus-response-operant conditioning strategy and didactic instruction models.

(2) The principle of the need for adult learners to be Self-Directing makes the androgogical model the logical framework from which to base a study of adult learning in the community setting. Adults have a deep psychological need to take responsibility for their own lives—to be self-directing. "In fact, the psychological definition of adult is "one who has arrived at the self-concept of being in charge of one's life, being responsible for one's own decisions and actions" (p. 6.8), coinciding with Freire's concept of conscientization. This and Rogers' dictum that "learning occurs only when learners have the freedom
to learn what is particularly relevant to their personal life situation" are relevant to the context from which to investigate citizen participation.

(3) Experiential: The situations which are faced by citizens in their everyday lives are not measured in curriculum units or approached in abstract ways--these are real life situations which are not under the control of "teachers" who decide what is to be learned and how it will be learned. Whereas the self-identity of children and youth come from external sources (parents, peer groups, school), adults gain their self-identity primarily from experience: "they are their experience" (p. 6.11). In addition to the anticipated experiential learning that takes place in citizen participation activities, it is also assumed that adults bring with them a rich array of accumulated life experiences which are critical ingredients in the community problem solving process.

The Process Oriented Planning Models

Friedmann (1973, p. 52) generally defines planning as the "distribution of limited resources among a number of competing users."

The term "social planning" is defined in this investigation as the allocative process of diminishing goods and services provided by government as well as by private agencies. Paul Davidoff (1965, pp. 331-338), seeking to redress the imbalance of planning processes in the 1950s and 1960s which excluded many publics in the decision-making processes, argued for the inclusion of well-informed citizens in the planning and decision-making processes. The process that he favored was that of citizens who were well informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals and were "able to respond to them in the technical language of professional planners" with the assistance of "advocate planners" who assisted them in the entire planning process (p. 333).

Friedmann introduced the approach to planning which viewed it as "a form of social learning that occurs in the transactions between
planners and clients" (Burke, 1979, p. 15), the prime objective of this approach being "to support and enhance the individual's own development as a person in the course of transforming action itself (p. 15). Calling it transactive planning, this approach recognized a large communication gap between technical planners and clients (p. 296).

To close the gap, a continuing series of personal, and primarily verbal, transaction between planners and clients is necessary. The transactions are through a medium of dialogue in which two kinds of knowledge are shared. One is the processed and analytical knowledge of the planner and the other is the experiential knowledge of the client. By sharing this knowledge, a process of mutual learning takes place (p. 296). The joining of scientific and technical intelligence with personal wisdom and experience at the critical points of social intervention is necessary in order to avoid decision making at the exclusive hands of the technocrat.3

The model of transactive planning4 is adapted to this investigation in the following manner: First of all, "planners" are those persons

3 The social work method of Community organization evolved out of this concern when Eduard Lindeman proposed a working relationship between the "democratic process and specialism" (Burke, 1979, p. 296).

4 The social process model of planning adopted as part of the conceptual framework of this research. It should be noted that in the planning process itself, there are two distinct activities: (1) Substantive—consisting of fact-finding, study, examination of alternatives and the proposing of solutions. (2) Social process aspects of planning --"part of the political process in which the planner intervenes into a set of existing or newly constructed social network for the purpose of achieving planned social change. It generates a process of planning that is collaborative in nature" (Burke, 1979, p. 16). This conception of planning recognizes that successful intervention requires a mandate or permission to intervene as well as an appropriate strategy to influence decision outcomes. The choice of the process oriented model as part of the conceptual framework does not discount the importance of the substantive component of the planning process. The citizen is not only viewed here as being an important part of the planning
who are in positions of power to make decisions about what goes on in each and every neighborhood. "Clients," in this context are those persons who are being consulted or who have the potential of being consulted—in essence, they are the citizens. Respectively substituting the words "decision maker" and "citizens" for the terms "planner/technocrat" and "clients" simplifies the use and application of the transactive planning framework for the purposes of this investigation.

Planning is viewed here as a comprehensive set of real-world interactions. As such, it is impossible and impractical to expect professional planners to possess all of the information and wisdom necessary to make decisions for a community without the input of the community itself. Planning is acknowledged as an interactive and collaborative venture, with an air of mutuality of trust and respect between the "stakeholders" (those that are or will be affected) and the decision makers. It recognizes the citizen as a mutual collaborator in the decision-making process. With this perspective, it puts the citizen in the role of amateur planner—amateur only in the sense that he/she is not paid. In terms of wisdom the citizen is placed on par with professional planners—with a special set of expertise and skills and experiences that complement those of the decision makers.

In this light, citizens and planners are placed within the same arena. Or, if in certain instances that is not considered to be process but is also viewed as being capable of carrying on certain aspects of the substantive processes of planning as well.
realistic, at least the chasm between the decision makers and the citizens is narrowed, and the outside-inside dichotomies are brought closer together. Similarly, adversarial positions are replaced by more "interest"-based stances in the problem-solving process. As in the arena of business management and unions, which have been influenced by the changing environments, the "Who gets what" arguments have been replaced increasingly by the "who gives what" compromises in order for both parties to survive and to prevent devastating losses. The increased emphasis on collaboration, cooperation, communication and shared decision making between parties heralds the evolving atmosphere in citizen participation activities. In this atmosphere of problem solving, differing opinion and interest groups increase the likelihood of gaining and "winning" on behalf of their interests. Zurcher's Overlap Model serves as an example of this approach to community problem solving.

The Overlap Model

Zurcher (1970) presented a model which primarily worked from "within the system." This "overlap model" is characterized as bringing

together disparate components of the community into a single program for social change.

This "inside" model is contrasted to the Alinsky model\(^6\) which uses "whatever serves the purpose": picketing, sit-ins, demonstrations, boycotts and special harassing techniques (e.g., mailing a box of dead rats from a housing project to the mayor's office to dramatize the squalid living conditions; dumping mounds of garbage onto the front lawn of the Superintendent of City Sanitation, to protest neglected garbage services) (Zurcher, 1970, p. 14).

Two main points distinguish the Overlap Model's assumption about working "within the system":

1. Vital opportunities could be lost by direct conflict methods.

2. There could be further alienation between citizens and the Establishment--cutting them off from the opportunity to expand their social roles through participation in community affairs. It assumes that the organizational structure which evolves with time develops a climate of give and take, thereby having a socializing effect on all parties involved.

The scope of this Overlap Model is larger than the Alinsky Model. It takes into consideration a broader community-wide representation and views the community as a totality, with a more universal scope. It also expects the self-esteem of participants to grow as they expand the number and variety of their social roles as they develop expertise in using the Establishment to meet their needs and goals. "Further, the Overlap Model expects members of the various socio-economic strata

to influence each other, breaking down stereotypes and opening new lines of communication, as they work jointly" (Zurcher, 1970, p. 15) to implement community action proposals.

Reissman capped the advantage of the "inside" model by concluding that "social actionists functioning outside of the system, and various social planners functioning within the system, have much to gain from mutual contact and exploration. From this union a much more rounded, meaningful strategy of change may emerge together with the necessary theoretic base" (Reissman, 1965, p. 9). In essence, the Overlap Model is a long range and more stable model, allowing for the socialization process to occur with more enduring and stable effects of change. It gives a more flexible and adaptive style for community work and community change, adding the important perspective of seeing the community as more of an open power system in which citizens can have an input and impact on the decision-making process. The "outside" viewpoint is adversarial, conflict oriented, short-term and has a win-lose mentality: operationally, it singles out minorities in conflict with the larger, closed system.

The process oriented models of planning interface with the other components of the conceptual framework for this investigation. The common themes they support are consistent with the rest of the framework, espousing collaboration, dialogue and interaction between the planners and the citizens: Reality-based, real world solutions to problems and issues are addressed with foci on more interest-based rather than adversarial (position-based) positions; longer term, more stable collaboration; and coalescing rather than a fragmentary spirit;
larger system rather than isolationist and fragmented viewpoints and a more universal scope; with a belief in the context of true "development" of both physical and human resources. The process models also include a broader socio-economic spectrum in the community planning process, thereby being more expansive in the empowerment of citizens and citizen groups in contrast with the exclusionary, oppressive and pedagogic models.

These components of the conceptual framework bear similar themes which either interface with or complement each other. They all point in the direction of the idea of empowering people and groups of people. The adult education model, transactional planning, voice, exit, and loyalty, and small group theory, all give credence to the developmental aspects of each citizen. Each concept supports the enhancement of the spiritual and intellectual growth of the individual person. However, it is necessary to elaborate on the context of the terms "power" and "empowerment" as they are used within this investigation as they differ slightly from the usual contexts.

The usual, broad context and meaning of power is one that denotes "the ability of individuals or groups to exert sufficient stimulus to provoke some specified environmental response" (Kieffer, 1981, p. 19). A modification of the meaning was first proposed by Bertrand Russell--i.e., "Power is the capacity of some persons to produce intended and foreseen effects on others" (p. 19).

In his review of the literature Kieffer disclosed a departure from the usual orientation. He mentioned some inadequacies of the usual definitions of power: (a) presumptions that observable behaviors
are the only manifestations of power; (b) implications that power is relevant only in the arena of decision making; (c) assumptions that social conflict is observable and is manifest predominantly in concerns for policy-preference; and (d) assumptions that political participation as visible in the traditional electoral process is the most viable measure of involvement and influence. Taking these inadequacies and borrowing from Freire (1970), the emerging process of empowerment emerges as a re-definition as the "assertion of self as Subject of one's own history" (p. 21). Quoting Freire's notion of conscientizacao or "critical consciousness," Kieffer further develops the case for an added dimension to the context of empowerment:

"... men develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves." "... they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation." It is recognition of one's ability to act consciously and critically upon the world, and to "transform the world" in consequence, that constitutes a working definition of "empowerment" relevant to this study. Like its converse, "powerlessness," empowerment is not approached as an objective entity, but as a subjective sense of capability and consciousness. It represents an analytic and intentional engagement in the continuous process of construction and transformation of social meanings and social systems. While most theory views power predominantly as a commodity or "control over," this study explores empowerment more directly as the "ability to." Rather than focusing on power as an enforcer of domination, this research examines empowerment as an enabler of liberation. (Kieffer, 1981, pp. 21, 22)

This definition is parallel to the previously stated definition of the term "adult." The process of citizen participation, of taking action to solve problems can then be analogous to the achievement of a certain level of adulthood in modern society.
When people feel like subjects, and not objects, and when they can act on the social and political environment, we are addressing an ultimate condition of "health," of self care, of being activated and not powerless. The emphasis here is on how they feel about empowerment. There is a tremendous difference between having real political power and feeling empowered as active agents of change on behalf of oneself or on behalf of collective efforts to change (or to preserve) the environment.

The ancient Hawaiian concept of Malama aina brings the conceptual framework for this investigation full round. It has two basic doctrines which have as much relevance today as it did before the industrial revolution.

1. Everyone had the right to all the things required to live.

2. People had the responsibility of conserving and generally taking care of these resources. (Devaney, Kelly, Lele & Motteler, 1976, p. 2)

It encompasses relevant issues that are currently faced by society in general and more specifically, the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii. Where once the Hawaiian Islands supported boundless economic and population growth there are increasing signs of environmental and socio-economic limitations. An urban environment with a population approaching one million on an island occupying 595 square miles (Boswell, 1959, p. 51) presents a legitimate, appropriate and necessary case for voice. The population squeeze, environmental degradation, an informed public, improved electronic technology and other advances have converged onto the arena of citizen input in decision making. The demand for this inclusion, in addition to motivations based on
consumerism and the democratic ideal, is consonant with the concept of Malama aina--of achieving and maintaining individual and collective good health.

Summary of the Conceptual Framework

The concepts mentioned above form the conceptual framework from which the findings of this investigation will be analyzed and interpreted. They are primarily based on a humanistic psychology which envisions citizen participation in terms of "human development," and not only that of "power" in the traditional context. This conceptual framework recognizes the interdependence between the social, political and physical environments in the influencing of citizens to participate in community planning. It integrates the concepts of prevention in public health, the principles of adult learning, ecology and small-group theory. Economist Albert Hirschman's concept of "voice, exit, and loyalty" provides an added dimension. This concept reinforces the citizen participation model, supporting the case for citizen "voice" based on theories of economics.

The process oriented modes of planning are also used to form the framework. The recognition of these modes of citizen input into the planning process reflects the trend away from centralized and authoritarian modes of planning towards a better understanding and utilization of the knowledge and the wisdom that citizens impart to the planning process.

Zurcher's "Overlap Model" of social change contributes to the common themes of collaboration, cooperation, dialogue and of human development. Its recognition of the community as a totality rather
than as a closed and fixed system and the value it places on the
increased self-esteem of the citizen are critical additions to the
framework. This model values the ability of citizens to achieve com-
petence in using the establishment to meet their needs and goals.

And finally, Kieffer's concept of empowerment sets the stage for
a conceptual shift. He changed the conventional definition of "empower-
ment" from "the ability of individuals or groups to exert sufficient
stimulus to provoke some specified environmental response" (Kieffer,
1981, p. 19), to a more subjective sense of capability and conscious-
ness. His definition of empowerment which connotes more of an "ability
to" rather than as "control over" is consonant with and bolsters the
other concepts employed in this framework.

Scope and Limitations

Within the context of this investigation, the term "participation"
refers to the activities of persons who were duly elected to seats
on their respective Neighborhood Board. Hence, this definition excludes
the study of un-elected (to Neighborhood Board seats) individuals who
attend(ed) Neighborhood Board meetings as members of the audience or
as invited guests/speakers. Although there are many citizens who
"participate" in community meetings and activities as members of an
audience and who provide valuable input, the context of participation
in this investigation focused on elected members only in order to learn
more about the phenomenon of legislated participation. The reason
for such a focus was due to the substantial number of programs with
similar requirements, structures and dynamics. Findings within this
kind of context could then be generally applicable to other programs.
Because survey research was chosen as the primary methodology to gather the data for this investigation, it is necessary to point out some of its caveats and liabilities:

(1) Survey research can seldom deal with the context of social life. Although questionnaires can provide information in this area, the survey researcher can seldom develop the "feel" for the total life situation in which respondents are thinking and acting—in contrast with the participant observer. (Babbie, 1975, p. 277)

(2) Surveys cannot measure social action; they can only collect self-reports of recalled past action, or of prospective or hypothetical action (p. 278). It is expected that due to the passage of time, the selective perception of the respondent and to memory loss, there will be some omissions of detail and distortions of facts. Additionally, if some of the questions involve sensitive issues or issues that call for some form of self-disclosure, a survey respondent may opt to answer in such a way that evades or hides the truth.

This study does not attempt to analyze or attribute personality types with participation on the Neighborhood Boards. Such a psychodynamic approach is felt to be outside the scope and knowledge of the investigator. However, some reference to personality traits are made in the thumbnail sketches of the sample (see Appendix D).

Methodology

The community setting of the Neighborhood Boards had a bearing on the choice of methodology for the investigation. Because of the highly interactive and subjective nature of the Boards, the survey research method as espoused by Babbie (1975) and Backstrom and Hursh
(1963)\textsuperscript{7} was chosen as the chief methodology for the following reasons:

1. It is the best method available to the investigator interested in collecting primary data for purposes of describing a population and for the measurement of attitudes and orientations prevalent within a large population too large to observe directly. (Babbie, 1975, p. 259)

2. The data from survey research can be used for conclusive and predictive purposes.

3. Probability sampling provides the best means of obtaining a representative sample.

Once a determination was made to use the survey research method, a decision had to be made about which specific mode of survey research would be most appropriate. A personal interview approach rather than a mailout or telephone survey was chosen because it offered the following advantages:

1. It provided a higher percentage of results than a mail out.

2. The investigator could ask for clarifications when necessary.

3. Personal involvement through the interviews, however brief, allowed for recognition of and some interaction with the personal and social environment of each respondent in the data gathering process.\textsuperscript{8} (Backstrom & Hursh, 1963, pp. 9-10)

\textsuperscript{7}Backstrom and Hursh, Survey Research, Northwestern University Press, 1963, Minneapolis: also provided guidance in the operational aspects of questionnaire development as well as in the interview strategies.

\textsuperscript{8}Kieffer (1981) emphasizes the importance of these factors in investigations of community-based participation programs.
The Sample Selection

The sampling method used was stratified random sampling. The total target population was divided into the 28 Neighborhood Boards (strata) and then a random sample was taken from each board. Normally, a sample that would be within 5% or 10%, 95% of the time would require sample sizes of 385 and 97 respectively. The following factors were considered in determining the final sample size:

1. Due to the data collection techniques used, a sample size of 385 was considered impractical,

2. A sample size of 97 would not equitably represent the 28 Boards.

3. Due to the timetable and data collection techniques selected, it was decided that 4 members from each Neighborhood Board would be selected for a total sample size of 112. Based on previous sample size calculations, the results would be within 9%, 95% of the time.

Two names from an inactive list for each board were literally pulled "out of a hat" (in most cases, the combined total of both lists for each Neighborhood Board numbered no more than 40 names). Similarly, two names from the active list of each Neighborhood Board.

The inclusion of current and previously active members of the boards was considered as crucial to allow for the factor of an evolving and changing nature of the citizens that participated. This was based on the notion that the profile of citizen participants might be changing with the passage of time. Additionally, the inclusion of previously active members was crucial in the gathering data that described or explained reasons for exit from the Boards.

Between the years 1979 to 1984, 1,094 individuals had served or were currently serving on Neighborhood Boards. Using the Neighborhood
membership rosters for this time period had the advantages of primacy (it included those persons who had served since the inception of the Neighborhood Boards) and of recency (it included members who had most recently been elected to the Boards).

**Construction of Questionnaire Interview Schedule**

The initial plan for designing the survey questions was to collect qualitative data alone and to conduct content analyses of the responses from the sample. However, the pretesting of the open-ended questions indicated that the range and variety of responses received would generate an inordinately large and unwieldy set of responses, thus hindering the interpretation of the results. Pretesting indicated general trends and categories of responses that should be included in closed-end questions, thereby preventing and circumventing the anticipated interpretive problems. For example, the questions designed to collect data reflecting the respondents' self-reported reasons for their initiation and sustained participation were designed to include a broad range of possible reasons from which they could select as many as were relevant to them. The foundation on which the questions were constructed revolved around the six major social drives or motives which are:

(1) Affiliation (the desire to be associated with or to be in the presence of other people);

(2) Acquisition (the desire to possess or hoard material things);

(3) Prestige (the desire to be highly regarded by other people);

(4) Power (the desire to control or influence other persons);
(5) Altruism (the desire to help others);
(6) Curiosity (the desire to explore and investigate one's surroundings). (Worcester & Downham, 1986, p. 30)

Based on these considerations, the questionnaire included:

(1) Closed-end questions to facilitate statistical analyses for both descriptive and conclusive purposes.

(2) Open-ended questions to allow for the elaboration needed in order to define the complex information desired.

The questionnaire was then prepared for application in the interview process.

The Interviews

One hundred and twelve (112) interviews were conducted from January through June, 1985. (There were eight refusals to participate in the investigation.) Stressing total confidentiality interview appointments were arranged over the telephone, with explanations given about how the sample was picked and with the identification of the investigator given to validate his legitimacy. The sites and times for the interviews were decided by each potential interviewee. Ranging from meeting at their homes to more neutral sites such as in libraries or at fast food restaurants for breakfast or during work breaks, the survey process found the investigator conducting interviews at irregular hours and in varying environments. It was not unusual to meet at the corner tavern, the Honolulu waterfront district or at the district park.

The determination for the investigator to conduct all of the interviews was based on the rationale that he had spent more than 20 years
performing face-to-face community work. His work experiences consisted of being a street gang worker for the YMCA, an outreach counselor for the Hawaii State Department of Education, a community coordinator/organizer for the Community Action Program, Director of a Model Cities Drug Abuse Outreach Project and as Director of a Community College Adult Education outreach program. Related community participation included membership or participation on the governing boards of Palama Settlement (an Aloha United Way multi-service private agency), The American Red Cross, The Hawaii Planned Parenthood Agency, The Hawaii Job Corps, The Hawaii Teacher Corps, and the Kalihi YMCA. These activities provided him with opportunities for face-to-face contacts with the entire socio-economic spectrum. Actual experiences in working with people and organizations included: mediating the riots in Miami Beach at the 1972 Democratic and Republican national conventions; working with the various alienated youth groups in Honolulu, assisting in the organization of the refugee camp in Camp Pendleton after the fall of Saigon in 1975, coordinating the Anti-Poverty program efforts in a section of Honolulu as well as to administer an outreach adult education program sponsored by the Honolulu Community College. With this background, it was felt that he would be able to handle nearly any interview setting and process with confidence, sensitivity and empathy. The extensive work experience was considered to be adequate preparation and training for the interview process and that this work experience would provide valuable interpretive and analytic expertise. Also the factor of a single interviewer assured consistency in the investigative process.
The interviews were conducted on a one-to-one basis. On a one-time basis, each interview lasted approximately 70 minutes. The interviewee was handed a copy of the questions that were to be asked to give him/her some familiarity with the questions as well as to alleviate any anxiety about their nature and format. Each question was read aloud to the interviewee and responses were recorded manually by the investigator. This procedure was chosen to free the respondents of the encumbrances of writing (which the majority expressed relief when they learned that no writing of any kind was required on their part) and it also gave them the freedom to answer without concern for grammatical considerations, yielding more spontaneous responses "in their own words." The initial question was asked and the respondents were probed\(^9\) for greater, more precise answers. Additionally the investigator was able to include observations that complemented and supplemented responses from the interviews.

At the end of the interview, approximately 45 minutes were devoted to "talking story."\(^{10}\) This interaction served as a vehicle for both

---

\(^9\) A probe is a neutral, nondirective question designed to elicit an elaboration on an incomplete or ambiguous response, given in an interview in response to an open-ended question. Examples would include: "Anything else?" "How is that?" "In what ways?" (Babbie, 1975, p. 279).

\(^{10}\) A term frequently used in Hawaii which refers to a style of informal conversation. Implicit factors in this type of interaction are mutual trust, spontaneity, the use of vernacular language, and the complete dispensing of social or professional formalities. It is the telling of stories, the sharing of experiences, the expression of attitudes and values without adversity between the participants. It requires mutuality, total acceptance and good humor. The topics of conversation are varied and freewheeling, with little conscious thought given to content, focus or to problem solving (although many problems are resolved in the process (Investigator's definition).
parties to "let down their hair," fostering a positive, informal closure to the interview. Although not as in-depth as interviews conducted in Kieffer's (1981) biographic interviews, the investigator attempted to maintain some parallels:

A biographic interview combines aspects of a research interview, a clinical interview and a conversation between friends. It is like a structured research interview in that certain topics must be covered and the main purpose is research. As in a clinical interview, the interviewer is sensitive to the feelings expressed and follows the threads of meaning as they lead through diverse topics. Finally as in a conversation between friends, the relationship is equal and the interviewer is free to respond in terms of his own experiences. Yet each party has a defined role in a sustained work task, which imposes its own constraints. (p. 112)

Observational notes were made immediately after the interview (in private) to capture impressions of the interview, the respondent, and any pertinent data that were considered to be critical in characterizing each participant alive in the mind's eye of the investigator, adding color, flavor, and texture to the entire survey process. (Refer to Appendix D for specific examples of these sketches.)

These notes assisted the investigator during the content analysis process of the responses to the open-ended questions. In the cases when the interviewees' responses to the questions were ambiguous and when some kind of confirmation was needed about their attitude and values, they served to assist in the interpretive process.

Although they were often inferentially derived and not statistically supported, these sketches nevertheless recorded the investigator's "gut" reactions and observations, providing a source of data which supplemented the data gathered in the structured interviews.
The Coding Process: Quantitative Data

The responses to the closed-end questions were entered into a codebook. Each column was reserved for specific responses to the questionnaire. For instance, columns 1-3 were reserved to designate the interview number. Three columns were reserved because the sample number (N=112) contained three digits. Following this regimen, the responses to the objective questions in the survey were placed on a coding sheet (one per interview) which served to instruct the key-puncher to punch the card in the appropriate column with the appropriate numbers.

Once the 112 cards had been transferred to the computer cards, the information was transferred onto a tape at the university computing center. The data were analyzed using the pre-programmed procedures of SPSSX.

Analysis of Open-Ended Responses

The procedure used to process responses to the question, "What satisfactions did you receive from serving on the Neighborhood Board?" is used to describe the principle methodology of analyzing responses to open-ended questions. This process utilizes a portion of the content analysis process used by Kieffer (1981).

One persistent question prevailed throughout the analytical process. Although it referred to phenomenological research (which this investigation is not) the following quote (Kieffer, 1981, p. 119) served to

11 A set of rules for translating answers to questions into numbers or other symbols to be processed by the computer (Olsen, 1972, p. 497).
remind this investigator of the importance of maintaining the "core meanings" which were articulated by the respondents:

The phenomenological researcher . . . here . . . is involved in that ineffable thing known as creative insight; he must leap from what his subjects say to what they mean. This is a precarious leap because, while moving beyond the protocol statements, the meanings he arrives at and formulates should never sever . . . connection with the original protocols.

With this cautionary thought, the analysis of the qualitative data was begun.

A review of responses to this question was initially conducted to obtain a general grasp of the range of the responses. This process produced a categorization of responses with preliminary non-redundant themes:

- **Influence theme**: typified by responses such as, "It felt good to see my input get implemented into policy changes in city government."

- **Service theme**: typified by responses such as, "I feel that I did the neighborhood a service by being its representative."

- **Ego satisfaction theme**: typified by responses such as, "I feel good when I do good."

- **Learning theme**: typified by responses such as, "I learned a lot about how government works."

- **No response**: In a few cases, some individuals did not respond.

---

12A preliminary screen question had been asked in the interview to gather participants' feelings of satisfaction from serving on the Neighborhood Boards: "What satisfactions do/did you receive from serving on the Neighborhood Board?" A follow-up question then asked the respondent to narrow his/her responses down to one choice: "Of these satisfactions, which is/was the most gratifying?"
After the initial review and categorization of responses, a second, more detailed inspection was then conducted to develop more precise classifications of non-redundant themes. Two general kinds of responses reflected "influence" themes. There were individuals who expressed feelings of satisfaction from getting results of their input in the Neighborhood Board process and those that expressed positive feelings referring primarily to having had the opportunities to voice their opinions but not to actually getting results. A typical response reflecting the latter category was, "Being able to express my concerns to people of some influence in the city."

A third and final review of the classifications was made to consider ambiguous or questionable classifications. The following are examples of the final classifications.

Influence . . . referring to feelings of power but not necessarily culminating in actual results:

"Feeling that you have some level of influence/impact on the neighborhood and on the system."

"Resolving problems based on the feeling that I am fully informed and know both sides of the story."

"Being able to express my concerns to people of some influence in the city."

"Getting the people of the neighborhood to care and to get involved."

"Voting on issues that I felt were in the community interest."

"I expressed my views and my rights."

Influence . . . References to actual influence—seeing results of the efforts of the Neighborhood Board member.
"I can correct and protect our community and neighborhood interest by serving on the planning and zoning committee."

"Getting results of your efforts on certain issues. Being able to pull a concept together and have responses to our voice."

"Seeing results of my recommendations."

"Seeing your ideas listened to and put into practice."

"Seeing our recommendations to the City Council and city departments are normally accepted or result in positive action."

"Achieving our goals in specific projects."

"Getting a district design ordinance passed."

"Getting a project that I like into action."

"Being able to present my thoughts and to have them carried forward to a motion and passed and sent to the Neighborhood Commission."

"That I had a say."

"We were instrumental in setting up a community association and put them in touch with developers and the city."

"We do have some power. We can write a letter and get responses from local government and officials. Neighborhood Boards cut through red tape."

"Seeing things get done . . . getting results."

"Doing something effective . . . one of the best things about living is to leave the world better than when you found it."

"Having an input in decision making."

"Seeing results of my participation, however little I contribute. Knowing that I provided input to the city from the people."

Learning (Intrinsic): referring to the value of learning experiences in and of themselves.
"A good opportunity to use my mind. Dealing with different problems besides my farming."

"Learning new things."

"I developed. I can face people and talk in public and think on my feet now, learned how to organize."

Learning (Extrinsic): referring to content, of facts, of external phenomena.

"Learning of the other issues and concerns of the Neighborhood."

"I got information about development issues of the neighborhood."

"I learned more about the neighborhood."

"I got information. Learned how the community works ... learned the nuts and bolts of neighborhood dynamics."

"I learned a great deal about the geography, the history and the politics and the people of the neighborhood. Also got to understand local language."

References to service to the community and fellow neighbors.

"Helping people."

"I like to feel I'm doing some good."

"A good feeling that I'm representing the community and meeting some needs, especially youth."

"It is a public service."

"That I have a small part in accomplishing things for my community, large or small."

"I feel that I am doing my share as a citizen."

"Feeling of accomplishment that my attendance is doing something for the community."

"I'm doing something as a citizen besides just eating, sleeping and working."
Ego satisfaction ... references to self, self esteem, of well being.

"I got elected."

"The thanks I get for informing people about Neighborhood Board events--they are grateful, especially the condominium dwellers."

"I feel good in knowing that in helping my neighbors, I help myself."

"I get a feeling of self worth, of self actualization, having another opportunity to be fulfilled."

"When people call and thank me and knowing when the residents are happy."

"I'm a voice of the people."

"I feel good when I do good."

"My wife thinks it is good for me and is proud of me and fellow condominium owners are behind me."

"Feeling of doing something worthwhile; meeting lots of people; personal development in my leadership abilities; improved communication skills; learning how to relate better."

No response--10

Miscellaneous--7

All of the data from open-ended questions were analyzed and interpreted in the manner described above solely by the investigator. In cases where there was some ambiguity to the responses made by the interviewee, the thumbnail sketches of each respondent provided reference and the proper context of that respective interview. Additionally, the fact that the investigator was the only person involved in the entire process of data collection and analyses provides
assurances of an implicit thread of consistency throughout the entire research process.

**Analysis of the Closed-end Responses**

The closed-end responses were analyzed by visually inspecting the data for significant trends and by conducting chi square analysis. The pre-programmed SPSSX computer package was used to conduct the statistical operations whenever possible. Manual computations were conducted when the investigator did not have access to the university computer facilities.

**Summary: Data Analysis Procedures**

If only examined individually as separate entities, the responses to the individuals would not have provided adequate explanations of the initiation, sustainment and exit from participation. In order to develop a plausible explanation of the processes of participation, it was necessary to synthesize meaningful relationships between variables. Combinations of some factors had more probable contributory effects on initiation than others. The various theories and concepts of the conceptual framework provided the needed linkages and relationships between the variables. In situations where the conceptual framework did not provide adequate supporting detail, inferences were ventured, often in figurative "leaps and bounds," to span gaps in knowledge or data. These inferences were based on the gut level feelings of the investigator, based on (a) his 15 years of grass roots work in citizen participation projects and outreach work in the Model Cities and the Community Action Programs, and (b) recall of the
interviews with the aid of the thumbnail sketches of each respondent (refer to Appendix D).

Only after following this procedure was it possible to develop a coherent and integrated model of participation.
CHAPTER IV
THE DATA PRESENTED AND ANALYZED

This chapter will present the characteristics of the sample, responses to questions, and factor related to the initiation of participation, the sustainment of participation and exit from neighborhood boards.

Characteristics of the Sample

Composition by Gender

Table 1
Frequency Distribution of the Gender of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender composition of the Neighborhood Board sample was approximately 5/8 male and 3/8 female. When Table 1 was compared with the City and County's population and representation in the Hawaii State Legislature, significant factors were discovered. Males age 18 and over comprised 51.0% of the City and County of Honolulu's population—a slight majority. In the Hawaii State Legislature of 1985, males
comprised 84.3%. In the Neighborhood Board sample, 63.4% were male. Female representation on the Neighborhood Boards (36.6%) was more than twice that of the State Legislature (15.7%) (see Table 2).

Table 2
Composition by Gender: The Neighborhood Boards, the City and County of Honolulu and the Hawaii State Legislature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu(^a)</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Boards</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii State Legislature(^b)</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^b\)Table 256--"Composition of the 1985 Hawaii State Legislature," p. 255.

Age Distribution

In comparison with the population of the City and County of Honolulu, the Neighborhood Board represents an older population. Of the participants on Neighborhood Boards, 86.2% were in the 25-64 age range with nearly equal participation in the age groups 25-44 (42%) and 45-64 (42.9%). This contrasts with the 67.9 percent of the City and County of Honolulu's population in the 25-64 age range. The largest discrepancy between the two populations is in the 25-44 age bracket.
Here, the Neighborhood Boards had a 17.7% advantage over the population of the City and County of Honolulu (see Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of the Ages of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110^a</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Two people refused to answer

Table 4

Comparison of Age Groupings Neighborhood Boards and the Population of the City and County of Honolulu^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Neighborhood Boards</th>
<th>City and County (Honolulu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 years</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 or more years</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of the Marital Status of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single--Never Married</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently Married</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110(^a)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two individuals refused to answer

Ethnicity

Table 6

Frequency of Distribution of Self-Reported Ethnicity in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 reflects a high proportion of Caucasians serving on the Neighborhood Boards. Although they comprise 25.3% of the population of the City and County of Honolulu, the Caucasian membership on the Neighborhood Boards is 46.4%. The Japanese, comprising 23.2% of the City and County of Honolulu reflect a nearly parallel 20.5% on the Boards.

A comparison of the ethnic representation of the Hawaii State Legislature indicated significant percentages. Although Caucasians are the largest ethnic group in Honolulu, they ranked third (17%) in representation in the Hawaii State Legislature, following behind the Japanese (38%) and the Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiians (18%).
complete reversal of ranking within the Neighborhood Board membership. When considering simple ordinal ranking, the Neighborhood Boards more congruently reflect the population of the City and County of Honolulu. However, in terms of percentages, the Caucasians are significantly over-represented on the Boards.

The Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian population is under-represented on Neighborhood Boards with a difference of 11.9 percentage points between the Neighborhood Board representation and their representation in the general population of the City and County of Honolulu.

Of special note is the consistency of the Filipino representation in both the Neighborhood Board sample and within the general population of the City and County of Honolulu, ranking fifth in both cases (Hawaii State Data Book: 1985, Table 25, p. 45).

Education

Table 8
Frequency of the Education of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to Grade 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Technical School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a whole, the Neighborhood Board members are better educated than the general population of the City and County of Honolulu; 89.3% of the Neighborhood Board sample attended college compared to 42% of the population of the City and County of Honolulu. A high percentage (37.5%) of Neighborhood Board members have graduate or professional degrees compared to the adult population of the City and County of Honolulu (9.6%). Neighborhood Board members had approximately 300% more Bachelor's degrees and 400% more graduate and professional degrees than the adult population of the City and County of Honolulu.

Table 9
A Comparison of Educational Characteristics Between the Neighborhood Boards and the City and County of Honolulu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Graduate/Professional Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu*</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Boards</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 10

**Frequency Distribution of Home Ownership/Rental Status of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with Parent (Homeowners)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., lived on homesteads)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11

**A Comparison of Owner-Occupied Housing Units in the City and County of Honolulu in 1985 with a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner-occupied Units</th>
<th>Renter-occupied Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu(a)</td>
<td>119,992 (43.0%)</td>
<td>154,135 (57.0%)</td>
<td>273,127 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Board Sample</td>
<td>92 (82.1%)</td>
<td>20 (17.9%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Board Sample (Adjusted)(b)</td>
<td>99 (88.0%)</td>
<td>13 (12.0%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(b\)Members of the sample who lived with parents (who owned their own homes) were included in the "Owner-occupied" category to take into account the probability that children serving on Neighborhood Boards would represent the property-related interests of the households.
Table 11 indicates that 88.0% of the sample represented "properly-tied" households. This contrasts with 43% of all of the housing units in the City and County of Honolulu being owner occupied, the majority (57%) being renter-occupied. Renters were clearly under-represented on the Neighborhood Boards.

Length of Residence in Hawaii

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 - 4.9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 9.9 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 19.9 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of life</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the sample, 97.0% (109 of 112) had resided in Hawaii for five or more years. Of the portion of the sample that had lived in Hawaii for five or more years 41% (45 of 109) had lived in Hawaii all of their lives. Individuals who had lived in Hawaii 20 or more years comprised the second largest category. Combining individuals who had lived in Hawaii 20 or more years with those who had lived in Hawaii all of their lives yielded a majority (67.0% of all Neighborhood Board members). The median number of years of residence in Hawaii for Neighborhood Board members fell in the 20-or-more-years category.
Length of Residence in the Neighborhood

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Length of Residence in the Neighborhood of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 - 10.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 - 15.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 - 20.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 - 25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1 - 30.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 - 35.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1 - 40.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.0 - 50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.1 - 60.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median length of residence in the neighborhood = 14 years
Mean length of residence in the neighborhood = 17.34
Most frequent length of residence in the neighborhood = 9 years and 20 years

Offices Held on the Neighborhood Board

Table 14

Frequency Distribution of Offices Held on the Neighborhood Board by Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Treasurer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 73% of the sample had held office of some kind on their respective Neighborhood Board.

Civic/Voluntary Activity Before Election to the Neighborhood Board

Table 15

Frequency Distribution of Civic/Voluntary Activity Before Election to the Neighborhood Board of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 5.1 Past membership in civic or service organizations
Median 5.0 Past membership in civic or service organizations
Mode 8.0 Past membership in civic or service organizations

Civic/Voluntary Activity After Election to the Neighborhood Board

There was a difference between the number of current and past membership in civic or service organizations (see Table 15). The median number of past number of organizations belonged to was 5.0 and the figure for the current period was 4.0. Although not seemingly
significant, there was a decrease. A comparison of the modes for each of the two categories were much more significant: current membership was 2.0 and past membership in organizations was 8.0.

Table 16

Frequency of Distribution of Civic/Voluntary Activity After Election to the Neighborhood Board of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.4 Present membership in civic or service organizations
Median 4.0 Present membership in civic or service organizations
Mode 2.0 Present membership in civic or service organizations

Political Affiliation of the Sample

In comparison with the City and County of Honolulu, a poll taken by the Honolulu Advertiser (Feb. 9, 1986, p. 1), the Neighborhood Board respondents indicated a larger percentage of persons who called themselves independents (see Tables 17 and 18).
### Table 17

Frequency Distribution of Political Affiliation of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107(^a)</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Five individuals refused to answer

### Table 18

A Comparison of Political Affiliation Between Respondents in a Survey of the Neighborhood Boards and the Population of the City and County of Honolulu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Boards(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^b\)Five individuals refused to answer.
## Length of Service on the Neighborhood Board

### Table 19

Frequency Distribution of Length of Service on the Neighborhood Boards of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to =1.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 - 2.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 - 3.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 - 4.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 - 5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 - 6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 - 6.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 - 8.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 - 9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 -10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.5 years of service on the Neighborhood Boards
Median 2.0 years of service on the Neighborhood Boards
Mode 2.0 years of service on the Neighborhood Boards
**Employment Status of the Sample**

**Table 20**

Frequency Distribution of the Employment Status of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full Time</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (Employed in second career)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers of the Sample**

**Table 21**

Frequency Distribution of Employers of Respondents in a Survey of Neighborhood Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Civil Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Hawaii</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; County of Honolulu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (non-profit)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (profit)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority (54.5%) of the sample was self-employed or employed by the private sector.

Responses to Questions

Responses to the following questions are given below:

1. "Would you: (a) Give the Neighborhood Board more power? (b) Give the Neighborhood Board less power? (c) Give the Neighborhood Board no less nor more power?"

2. "Which step on the ladder best describes the Neighborhood Board as it is currently organized?"

Table 22

Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Question: Would you: (a) Give the Neighborhood Board More Power? (b) Give the Neighborhood Board Less Power? (c) Give the Neighborhood Board No Less Nor More Power?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give more power to Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give less power to Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No less nor more power to Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Question:
Which Step on the Ladder Best Describes the Neighborhood Board as it is Currently Organized?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code for values:

1 Neighborhood Board members are placed on rubber stamp committees in order to "educate" them or to gain their support.

2 N/A

3 Each Neighborhood Board is informed of what is happening through pamphlets, posters, and radio announcements. (Communication is one-way)

4 The Mayor asks Neighborhood Boards for their view on proposed ordinances that have city-wide impact.

5 Each Neighborhood Board advises and informs the City Council but the City Council has the final say.

6 Each Neighborhood Board shares decision-making powers with the City Council.

7 Each Neighborhood Board administers the local park.

8 Each Neighborhood Board passes ordinances for its district (instead of the City Council).
Summary of Sample Characteristics and Responses to Questions

The following is a condensation of the characteristics of the investigative sample.

Males comprised the majority at 71%

The majority fell within the 35-54 age group

Approximately 72% were married at the time of the investigation

The Caucasians (43.8%) and Japanese (16.1%) combined to equal a simple majority

The Neighborhood Board had four times more professional and graduate degrees than the population of the City and County of Honolulu

Eighty-eight percent represented homeowners

Sixty-seven percent had lived in Hawaii 20 or more years or all of their lives

The median length of residence in the neighborhood was 14 years

Seventy-three percent had held office on their Neighborhood Board

The members of the board were very active in other organizations before their election to the Neighborhood Boards and became less active after their election

There was a relatively high percentage of Independents (approximately 33%) compared to the City and County of Honolulu (20.0%)

There was an equal representation of persons who had served less than or equal to one term and those that served more than one term on the Neighborhood Board within the sample

Seventy-two percent were employed full time

As a whole, the majority had favorable feelings towards the Neighborhood Board process. Ninety-eight percent felt positive about their experience and 92% felt that it had been worth their time and energy to participate
In terms of influence, 85% felt influential in the decision-making process of their respective boards.

Fifty-five percent felt that more than half of their recommendations were adopted by their respective boards.

If given a choice, 61% would choose to have the Neighborhood Boards remain advisory and 49% would give the boards more power and 2% would give the Boards less power.

Eighty-six percent correctly chose the appropriate role and function of the Neighborhood Boards as "advising and informing" the City Council but that "the City Council has the final say." Fourteen percent responded incorrectly.

The data presented above provided the beginning point of analyzing and interpreting the research objective. Some were so highly skewed that they immediately created initial notions about some contributory factors or possible relationships with other variables. The next three sections incorporate the descriptive data and responses to questions to address the factors and processes related to the initiation, sustainment and exit from participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

Although more than 60 variables were included in the data gathering process, this large number and the infinite possible combinations of these variables made it necessary for the investigator to focus on the most basic and plausible factors in the analytical and interpretive process. There was a conscious effort to maintain simplicity and straightforwardness in the statistical operations and interpretation of the data.
Factors Related to the Initiation of Participation

This section: (a) presents and discusses the self-reported reasons for the initiation of participation to the Neighborhood Board; (b) integrates these self-reported factors with the descriptive and demographic data, and (c) interprets them in a comprehensive context of the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

Table 24

Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Question: "Which of the Following Factors were Reasons for You to Seek Election to the Neighborhood Board?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Sense of Duty as a Citizen</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Particular Issue</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Personal Reasons</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited to Run</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Plans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Particular Reason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 112 = 100%

The ordinal ranking above provided the beginning point for the analysis and interpretation of the factors that contributed to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards. The top three (of 9) reasons, which were chosen by more than 50 percent of the respondents provide the beginning point of the analysis and interpretation.
Based on these self-reported responses, "A sense of duty as a citizen" was the most popular reason for the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards. Verba and Nie (1972, pp. 133-134) reported that socioeconomic status increases political participation by increasing civic orientations, defined as feelings of efficacy, information about politics, and a sense of responsibility to contribute to the community. The factor of a high educational attainment contributes to the high rate of community participation by the sample.

"A particular issue" was the second most popular reason for the initiation of participation. Approximately 72% (43 out of 60) of the respondents who chose "particular issues" as motivating them to seek election to the neighborhood boards expressed anti-development sentiments. The remaining 28% (17 out of 60) articulated pro-development inclinations. Whether they were in favor of or against development in their respective neighborhood, some kind of sentiment relating to implications of change to the physical environment contributed to the seeking of election to the Neighborhood Board for these individuals.

In 33 out of 57 instances (59%) the most common themes that were articulated as "personal reasons" to participate reflected implications of the concept of "voice." That is, the sample stated factors that reflected some aspect of self assertion, of becoming involved and of taking action rather than passively witnessing events. Typical responses included:

"To get involved in the community and to be heard."
"Concern over what is happening in the community."
"To get involved in community decision making and to input into issues."
"To have an input into steering the Neighborhood Board in the right direction."
"To get involved because I am sick and tired of grumbling to elected officials."
"To get involved in community decision making. To have a voice in it."
"I wanted more nuts and bolts inputs in order to address local concerns."
"To get responses from city government."

Elective politics were considered by more than one-fourth of the sample in seeking election to the Neighborhood Boards. The Neighborhood Boards might be considered as a "foot in the door" to more substantial elective offices. The Boards would be a logical and natural place to learn about the elective and representative process and to learn about the issues from which to develop a campaign platform. In essence, it is a "minor league" of political activity for those with political ambitions.

In addition to the self-reported reasons given by the sample for their initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards, demographic factors and responses to questions which were provided in the previous section were scrutinized for possible contributing reasons. This approach was taken to prevent the prima-facie acceptance of the self-reported factors as the sole contributing factors to the initiation on participation on the Boards. Seemingly independent factors were woven into a network of interactive causes, one factor complementing or reinforcing the other. What follows is an inferentially developed analysis and interpretation.

Analysis and Interpretation of Demographic Data and of Findings Related to the Initiation of Participation

One of the more obviously skewed factors was home ownership. The fact that 88% of the sample represented "propertied" households was a
primary consideration in forming an inferential notion that persons who are propertied would have more of a "vested interest" in what went on in their neighborhoods than renters. A supporting detail for this logic is that the major roles and functions of the Neighborhood Boards included the study and review of land use changes, capital improvement projects, and to serve as a public forum for the community. The implication of these roles and functions of the Neighborhood Boards is that homeowners would be concerned about the impacts of decisions that affected the value of real estate, density of population, zoning and other factors that changed the overall makeup of their neighborhoods.

That physical development has long-range and lasting effects on a neighborhood is a possible factor in more permanent residents being concerned about these changes. Individuals who have not and do not expect to reside permanently or on a long-range basis in a neighborhood would not be as concerned.

The factor of homeownership is related to Hirschman's concept of "voice." In this context, citizens with their own homes are considered to be the ultimate stakeholders in the most literal terms. Their vested stake in real estate (one of the largest consumer commodities) presents a valid case for them, as consumers, to "voice" their concerns whenever changes in the physical and neo-environment were anticipated. Any threat (either real or proposed) to a lifestyle provides necessary and sufficient cause to defend and to protect it. Home ownership in an island state

---

2 Reference is made to a definition of environmentalists as "those persons who buy a home in the first increment and contend that there is no utility or need for a second increment."
highlights the interaction and confluence of ecology and economics. In an island environment where the population and real estate prices are escalating, home ownership becomes an increasingly valuable commodity which needs to be "defended."

Although citizen participation is often seen in an altruistic and "service"-oriented context, there is yet another perspective. In addition to personal decisions to participate in social planning, there are forces that act upon citizens, moving them to act in response to the social and economic environment.

The mood is one of digging in... Retrenchment tightens its hold... American society in decline, the best of times a memory, inflation as a way of life, energy shortages, stagnating productivity, resource depletion, foreign competition, global confrontation, second-rate power, diminished expectations, doing with less... in difficult times individuals act like nations. They retrench. When nations feel their security threatened, they increase their appropriations for defense and cut back on other spending. So do individuals, in their way. Individual defense expenditures do not result in missiles and bombers, but in barricades between the self and the outside world. People under economic stress pull closer into themselves, guard against attack, engage in personal energy conservation. (Berkowitz, 1982, pp. 1, 2)

The participation of citizens in times like these changes from altruistic, helping and self-actualizing motivations to more "self-interest"-oriented motivations. Cunningham (1972, p. 597) states:

Persons of like interest combine to advance their interests, and organizations proliferate. More of the strong are enabled to participate, but more organizations stand in the way of the weak. This places the phenomenon of participation in our time on a par with ancient Athens where the citizens of one city-state sat upon the necks of the citizens of several other city-states. The self-interest view is implicit in such explanations as: people participate to gain needed social changes; to relieve psychic suffering; for material gain; to learn skills; to reform agencies in government; to achieve decentralization; to secure a basic right.
Internal theories of citizen participation are related to the increased intellectual capacity and information flow to individuals. Perhaps post-war amateurs have had more capacity for seeking to fulfill their need for self-determination. At the outbreak of World War II the average adult in the U.S. had little more than an elementary education (8.6 years). Today (1972) the average adult has a high school education and by 1980 it is likely to be one or two years of college. Through the electronic media he has immediate access to immense amounts of information. McClosky reports that many studies show a correlation between education and political participation. Such a society has more capacity for ideas and initiative, just as citizens of classical times had more capacity than the primitives, and the merchants and artisans of medieval towns had more than the peasant groups which begot them. Educated people, it could be claimed, have shown themselves better able to implement their internal design.

The fact that the sample previously belonged to 5.0 (median) civic or service organizations and that they had resided in the neighborhood for 14 years (median) suggest several other possible implications:

(1) These are the people who had developed social, business and professional networks in the course of their participation in voluntary organizations within their neighborhood. Their community involvement led from informal to formal participation "because of a perceived need for formal organizational affiliation in order to be able to command the economic and personnel resources necessary to make one's voice heard in community decision making." (Smith, Macaulay and Associates, 1980, p. 155)

(2) These activities in other organizations contributed to their pursuit of the acquisition and development of participation skills. Many of the agenda items that were

---

3Kieffer (1981, pp. 25-26) developed his own definition of participatory competence to be used interchangeably with the term "empowerment" and "citizen competence," which is adopted in this investigation: (1) A personal attitude or sense of self that promotes active social involvement. (2) A knowledge and capacity for critical analysis of the social and political systems which define one's environment. (3) An ability to develop action strategies and cultivate resources for attainment of one's own goals. (4) An ability to act efficaciously in concert with others in defining and attaining collective goals.
handled by the Boards called for an ability of the members to be able to deal with a wide range of personalities and governmental staff as well as to be conversant with "bureaucratese" in oral and written communication.

(3) The nature of the civic organizations mentioned reflect an involvement in areas that had critical relevance to the lifestyles of the neighborhoods. For example, PTAs, community associations, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, etc.

(4) The high visibility and the competence they developed may partly explain the factor of approximately 40% of the sample indicating that they had been invited to run for the Neighborhood Boards. Tied to this implication is the networking effect resulting from participation in community activities. People charged with recruitment and selection select people whose views are compatible with their own (Smith, Macaulay and Associates, 1980, p. 165). "Organizations interested in a board's central concerns also can be expected to be alert to the opportunity to exert influence by proposing candidates for elections or appointments and by sending their members to open meetings at which board members are elected" (p. 165).

(5) Onibokun and Curry (1976) and Steggert (1975) reported that greater length of local residence was associated with higher levels of community activity and with more interest in neighborhood problems.

Smith, Macaulay and Associates (1980, p. 120) state that one of the most important predictors of individual political participation is organizational involvement. The close relationship between organizational and community activity occurs not only because of the common characteristics and attitudes shared by the members but also because voluntary groups are important mobilizers of political activities. "The greater the number of one's organizational affiliations, the greater the likelihood of one's participation in political (voluntary community) activity" (p. 120).

The high level of educational attainment and the high proportion of the sample holding administrative, planning, and other professional occupations may represent a body of individuals who are not intimidated
by power holders. In fact, it may be an inherent truth that many of these individuals are power holders in their own right. Smith, Macaulay and Associates (1980, p. 113) cited 23 sources supporting the factor of education as being one of the most significant variables in the participation of citizens in community affairs nationally, in Western Europe as well as in the developing nations.

Better-educated persons are more likely to have higher incomes, to be exposed to more mass media, to occupy higher-status positions, to be more informed about government and politics, to perceive higher stakes in politics, and to feel more efficacious. (p. 113)

Almond and Verba (1963, pp. 381-382) comment:

In each nation the educated classes are more likely to be cognitively aware of politics (to be aware of the impact of government, to have information about government, to follow politics in the various media), to have political opinions on a wide range of subjects, and to engage in political discussions. The more highly educated are also more likely to consider themselves competent to influence the government and free to engage in political discussions.

Participation in the Neighborhood Boards may have offered the following opportunities:

(1) It gave many individuals the chance to use their experience in working with and within the political and bureaucratic environment to work towards change on behalf of their neighborhood. (In this context, the term "change" refers to the establishment of a greater force for a voice from the neighborhood level.)

(2) It provided citizens with a legitimate opportunity to engage in politically high risk activities on behalf of their neighborhood without jeopardizing their jobs. For instance, citizens who happened to work for the state or the city as planners or as department heads
could now participate legally on behalf of themselves and their neighborhoods. In many cases, the Board agenda items may have been adversarial with the state or city government. But, nonetheless, the participation of these citizens was legally protected. In essence, the Neighborhood Boards provided legally and sanctioned participation of persons who, under more "politically" vested positions norms, would not venture their "voice to be raised against their municipal or state employers.

The finding that the Neighborhood Board sample represented a middle-aged population is best explained by Lane (1959, p. 218), who suggests several reasons:

In maturity certain things occur in the normal lifetime which tend to increase motivation and the pressure to take part in the political life of the community. A person acquires property, hence one of the most important forces politicizing the local citizen comes to bear upon him—the question of the assessment and tax on his house. Then too, the family includes children who need play­grounds and schools and therefore the mother finds new stakes in politics. Because of the children . . . the parents become conscious of themselves as civic models . . . They are geographically less mobile. . . . The increased economic security associated with middle age provides freedom of attention and psychic energy for political matters often not available at an earlier stage in life.

Thus, in consideration of all of the factors discussed above, a picture of the "typical" participant on the Neighborhood Board is suggested.

4Up until 1978, City and County employees could not participate on the Boards. Under a revised City Charter that was ratified by the citizens of Honolulu, they are now legally allowed to participate.
Profile of the "Typical" Neighborhood Board Participant

This profile was developed to assist in conveying a typical picture of the citizen participant. It draws on the demographic data and the self-reported reasons for the initiation of participation that were collected in the survey interviews. The criteria for choice of the data to be included in the profile were based on a simple majority or the median in each selected data set. Speculations were drawn to span gaps in existing knowledge and information in order to provide coherence to the profile. The thumbnail sketches that were written by the investigator (refer to Appendix D) also contributed in providing data to make the inferential "leaps and bounds" that were necessary to coalesce the sometimes disparate and seemingly disconnected factors. This is a generic and simplified model which may not be appropriate at all times to all participants. However, it is meant to provide some of the common denominators of the initiation of participation that were collected in the investigation. Although the male gender is used, the profile is meant to apply to both sexes.

The typical member of the Neighborhood Board is a male between the ages of 45-54. He is married and lives in the house in the neighborhood where he has resided for 14 years. He is either Caucasian or Japanese and went to college, earning a Bachelor's degree. He is either self-employed or works in the private sector. He had been active in five other civic/voluntary organizations before his election to the Neighborhood Board. Since being elected to the Neighborhood Board, he reduced his community activity to four other organizations. A sense of duty is
a significant value which contributes to his service on the Neighborhood Board and peripherally, he considers community participation as a path to further professional growth.

Politically, he is more apt to consider himself a democrat or an independent. If he is Caucasian, he most likely calls himself an independent. If he is Japanese, he calls himself a democrat. Whether democrat or independent, whether Caucasian or Japanese, the chances are that he considers issues to be more important than voting "party line."

If he is Caucasian, he was born and raised on the mainland U.S.A. He plans to retire in Hawaii.

Thoughts of a future in elective politics crossed his mind when he was considering whether or not to seek election to the Neighborhood Board. His network of numerous business, social, and community contacts were a source of encouragement to support thoughts of a future in politics.

He is concerned about the world around him, recently becoming more concerned about what has been happening in his neighborhood. Increased traffic and noise, the crime rate, and increased construction in the neighborhood comprise his major concerns. The diminishing and deteriorating natural resources such as fresh water, land area and air quality have also come to his attention and concern. Most significantly he has become disturbed about how he has not been included in the process of decision making that affect him and his neighborhood, in a sense feeling a "loss of control" over his life. Considering himself as a person who takes action rather than to witness events, he decided to participate on
the Neighborhood Board with the intent of influencing these decisions to reverse what he considered to be a gross encroachment into his neighborhood.

His occupation is consonant with his responsible, assertive and "take charge" characteristics. He is a supervisor of some kind. On the job, he deals with people more than the production of goods. Rather than being directly responsible for the generation of goods and services, he most likely generates information, ideas and policies. Verbal and written communication are important components of his daily tasks. His decision to become involved in the Neighborhood Board was influenced by a combination of several inter-related events and factors:

A particular issue that impacted his (neo) environment (most probably regarding development) was a current or upcoming issue.

His friends and acquaintances in the various community activities as well as neighbors looked to him for answers and encouraged him to represent them on the Board.

A sense of duty as a citizen was an ever present consideration in the decision to run. This was related to the fact that he had little chance for community service in his occupation, resulting in activities that put him in touch once again.

The fact that less than qualified persons currently serving or intending to run for a seat on the Board was another consideration.

The need to communicate to elected officials what citizens thought, coupled with the growing feelings that important decisions were being made by individuals who did not live in the neighborhood.

Previous activity in civic/voluntary organizations had not provided legal sanctions and access of information to citizens who were working towards more "voice" in decision-making processes. Legal sanctions provided by the revised City Charter encouraged the citizen to take advantage of the opportunity.
A "last straw" incident provided the necessary push for the citizen to decide to run for a seat on the Board. Most likely, it was an incident which made him feel that unless he took the initiative, there would be further occurrences of this situation which made him feel like there was no other recourse but to seek action through the Neighborhood Board.

These circumstances and events included personal and professional concerns, concerns about the (neo) environment, and most of all, feelings that citizens like himself needed to take action to preserve and to protect lifestyles which were being threatened by decisions made by persons that did not share similar views or values.

A Summary of the Factors Contributing to the Initiation of Participation

In summary, the following factors have been identified as factors that contribute to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards:

**Primary reasons** (chosen by a simple majority of the sample)

- A sense of duty as a citizen
- Particular issues (primarily involving development issues within the neighborhood)
- Personal reasons (primarily revolving around "voice" themes)

**Secondary reasons** (chosen by more than 20% but less than 50% of the sample)

- Being invited to seek election to a seat on the Neighborhood Board
- Political aspiration
- Appointment to a seat

Additionally, the following demographic and descriptive factors were identified as contributing to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards.
Home ownership in the respective neighborhood (approximately 9/10 of the sample represented propertied households)
High educational attainment (Median attainment was a Bachelor's degree)
Active participation in other civic/voluntary organizations (median of five organizations—past membership in community organizations before being elected to the Neighborhood Board)
Ethnicity—Being either Japanese (16.1% of the sample) or Caucasian (43.8% of the sample)—the combination of these two groups comprised a simple majority on the Neighborhood Boards
Residence in the neighborhood for 14 years (median)
Full-time employment in the private sector
Being married
Belonging to the 45-54 age bracket (the median age bracket).

The items listed clustered around several generic themes: home ownership in the neighborhood, high educational attainment, the adult learning model, environmental concerns and the need for the raising of citizen "voice." For instance, a median length of 14 years of residence in the neighborhood and motivation to participate to address issues of encroachment into the environment of the neighborhood (development) are related to home ownership. Being married is inferred to be related to home ownership on the basis that home mortgages are more affordable when there are (potentially) two persons to pay for them and the fact that married couples have an easier time obtaining home loans than single persons. Olsen (1972) reported a similar finding regarding being married and high rates of participation. Alford and Scoble (1968) related the owning of a home with increased social participation.

As confirmed by other research findings, active participation in other civic and volunteer community activities also contribute to high levels of citizen participation. The large number of personal and
professional contacts as the result of community participation, as well as possible personality factors (which are not addressed in this study) contributed to the participation of citizens. The types of organizations in which the sample participated were largely related to their neighborhoods (Parent-Teacher Guilds, Boy Scouts, Community Associations) and their business/professions (Lions, Rotary, Business Associations, Bar Associations).

The data reflect a group of individuals which fits the general characteristics of "healthy adults." They typify the adult learner, seeking to solve real life, reality based problems and issues which are relevant to their personal lives. These are adults who have made themselves subjects rather than objects of their destinies. They characterize human beings that are willing to act upon and to shape events within the immediate environment rather than to be passive witnesses and victims of events that affect them. These motivations to "voice" their concerns and to provide input into the planning and decision-making process characterize the healthy adult.

Finally, the factor of "a sense of duty" was reported as the leading contributing factor to the initiation of participation by the sample. This is confirmed by Verba and Nie's (1972, pp. 133-134) report that civic orientations and a sense of responsibility to the community increase with an increase in socioeconomic status. Once again, the factor of high educational attainment is related to socio-economic status, which is then contributory to "a sense of duty" to participate.

The following sections on the sustainment and exit factors will include many of the factors mentioned above. Many of them represent
common threads which are present throughout the entire participatory process.

Factors Related to the Sustainment of Participation

This section discusses the factors and processes that contribute to the sustained participation of citizens on Neighborhood Boards. It begins with the analysis and interpretation of the responses to the request, "Please choose as many statements that explain your sustained participation on Neighborhood Boards." A realistic and appropriate texture of participation is made possible by using self-reported rankings of the respondents. Additionally, they served as the basis for the synthesis of a scenario of sustained participation, providing a framework onto which other variables could then be appropriately interwoven.

The data gathered from the following questions/requests were also utilized or referred to in interpreting and analyzing the contributing factors to sustainment.

- Offices held in the Neighborhood Boards by the sample
- Occupations of the Sample (see Appendix C)
- Responses to the question, "Do you feel that you were influential in the Neighborhood Board decision-making process?"
- Responses to the question, "Of the motions you initiated, what percent of the time did the Neighborhood Board adopt your recommendations?"

The factors that were used in this request were developed as a result of the preliminary interviews in the pre-test portion of the investigation as well as from the investigator's previous experiences in the Model Cities Program and the Community Action Program.
Responses to the question, "How many civic or service organizations have you belonged to?"
Responses to the question, "Do you feel it was worth your time and energy to participate on the Neighborhood Board?"
Responses to the question, "How many civic or service organizations do you presently belong to?"
Responses to the request, "The following statements are some ways of defining "citizen voice." Please choose the one that best describes your feelings about the subject."
Of the recommendations it initiated, what percent of the time did your Neighborhood Board influence the decisions of the city government? (City Council or city department).
Responses to the question, "Overall, how do you feel about your Neighborhood Board experience?"
Responses to the question, "What satisfactions did you receive from serving on the Neighborhood Board?"
Length of residence in Hawaii.
Length of residence in the neighborhood.
Age.
Ethnicity.
Home ownership.

Performing a visual inspection of the relative frequency of the percent of "yes" responses, one can see that all the possible responses can be grouped into three categories. The following items, chosen by more than 50% of the 112 respondents were designated as "primary" reasons: (See Table 25 for ordinal rankings of responses.)

(a) To keep up with what is happening in the neighborhood
(b) To carry out my duty as a citizen
(c) I have a responsibility to fulfill my commitment
(d) It is a way to make sure that decisions that affect me are not made by someone else
(e) To keep in touch with state or city officials, were combined and integrated in the following manner

Secondary reasons, those selected by more than 20% but less than 50% of the sample, consisted of the following:

(a) The teamwork, support and encouragement among members keeps me going
(b) It contributes to my professional growth
### Table 25
Ordinal Rankings of Responses to the Request:
"Please Choose as many Statements that Explain Your Sustained Participation on Neighborhood Boards"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To keep up with what is happening in the neighborhood</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To carry out my duty as a citizen</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a responsibility to fulfill my commitment</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a way to make sure that decisions that affect me are not made by someone else</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep in touch with state or city officials</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teamwork, support and encouragement among members keep me going</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It contributes to my professional growth</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a special project/cause that I would like to continue to support</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good leadership keeps me going</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People come to me for advice and help</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialize with neighbors and friends</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am inspired by other members</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me prestige</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone convinced me to stay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important in my plans to run for another political office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Respondents = 112 (100%)
There is a special project/cause that I would like to continue supporting.
The good leadership keeps me going.
People came to me for advice.
To socialize with neighbors.
It gave me prestige.
I am inspired by other members.

Tertiary reasons, chosen by less than 20% of the sample, consisted of the remaining two reasons on the list:

(a) Someone convinced me to stay.
(b) It is important in my plans to run for another political office.

There were slight variations in a comparison of the self-reported reasons for sustainment between members who served one term or less and those who served for more than one term. The most significant variations dealt with issues of leadership on the Neighborhood Board and of the importance placed on the influence of other Board members. The data suggest that issues of leadership and the interpersonal dynamics between members on the Neighborhood Boards are more important to newer members than to veterans. Members who have served for a shorter time look to the leadership for guidance, encouragement and "example."

Although these issues of leadership and of inspiration from other members belong to the secondary reasons for sustained participation, they comprise the primary features of socialization in human organizations.

A comparison of the nature of the primary and secondary reasons for participation reflected the following significant pattern:

Except for the factor, "There is a special project/cause that I would like to continue supporting," the secondary reasons were comprised of factors that referred to "social" considerations. That is, they referred to the social context of participation rather than the task orientations that were reflected in the primary reasons. Terms and phrases such as "teamwork," "support and encouragement of members," "good
leadership," "people," "socialize," "prestige," and "other members," refer to phenomena and people who comprise the human (external) environment of the citizen. These terms and phrases refer to other people and the social environments that are symbolically significant to people. The context of belonging to a group of people, organization, or profession is inherently dominant in this cluster of reasons.

By contrast, the general contexts of the primary reasons have more of a task orientation. Terms and phrases such as "duty," "to keep up," "responsibility," "fulfill," and "to keep in touch with state or city officials," reflect conditions of action or of purpose. Although themes associated with "voice" were involved, there was an absence of a sense of teamwork. The reasons mentioned had an underlying theme which reflected an individualistic tone in sharp contrast to the secondary reasons which placed a higher value on group norms.

In another context, the primary factors can be said to be cognitively based whereas the secondary factors are affectively based.

The general implication of this finding suggests that a conscious and sustained effort to provide encouragement and support to members of the Neighborhood Boards is important. The absence or neglect of providing a support system would leave the Boards with a cluster of primary reasons for sustainment which are comprised of individual task orientations.

A General Context of Sustained Participation

Using the top five self-reported reasons for sustainment, a contextual background was constructed from which further interpretations and analyses of the sustaining factors and processes could be conducted. What follows was developed with the aid of the conceptual framework as well as the factors which were presented in the history and background section of this investigation.
1. In order to be able to make sound decisions of their own and to prevent others from making decisions for them, it is necessary for the groups or individuals to keep abreast of pertinent phenomena about the neighborhood and to have access to the right kinds of information. The renewed and focused interest in the neighborhood is parallel to the interest of the consumer looking for "value" and quality in the marketplace, where informed choice and purposeful purchasing are emerging trends. The motivation to take action and not let others make decisions for them is evidence of citizens taking responsibility to assert themselves to improve community life (Berkowitz, 1982, p. 253). It is also a reflection of citizens moving from a dependence and trust of major social institutions and acting on their own (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 131).

2. Keeping in touch with the appropriate state and city departments is viewed as vital to gaining and maintaining access to appropriate (and often crucial) information, especially those related to zoning, housing and development plans.

3. Keeping in touch with state and city officials marks the new mood of community problem solving (a marked contrast with the adversarial/confrontive movements of the 1960s). This suggests a strong relationship to the Overlap theory (Reissman, 1965, p. 9) a component

---

6 With as high a percentage of home owners on the Neighborhood Boards, it would be natural to infer that in general, the sustaining factors of participation are primarily focused on territoriality--of tangible "stakes." Real estate is one of the greatest single item consumer purchases an individual can make in a lifetime.
of the Conceptual Framework, which calls for working "within the system" to solve problems.

4. The combination of these three factors characterized assertive behaviors by individuals who were not content to passively witness events around them nor to let others make decisions for them. Naisbitt (1982f p. 131) commented on the move by citizens from a dependence and trust of major social institutions to one of taking action on their own.

5. "Duty as a citizen" and a "responsibility to fulfill my commitment" are important factors in the sustained participation process although "duty" no longer is considered as important to the respondents as it was when they first sought election to the Boards. As will be discussed later, these two factors had different priorities between individuals that served one term or less and those that served for more than one term on the Neighborhood Boards.

The age, occupation, education, and home ownership variables were then interwoven to complete the general picture of participation.

6. The data suggest that these individuals are not intimidated by power holders. Their high levels of education, the nature of their occupations and positions, their older age level (compared to that of the City and County of Honolulu), their high level of participation in other organized voluntary organizations, coupled with a strong sense of duty and responsibility and their territorial "stakes" (home ownership) constitute a combination of viable factors marking a substantial

---

7 Refer to Appendix X for occupations of the sample.
Table 26
A Comparison of Self-Reported Reasons for Sustained Participation on Neighborhood Boards:
Total Sample (112=100%) vs. Members Who Served Less Than One Term
vs. Members Who Served More Than One Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>≤ 1 Term (n=56)</th>
<th>≥ 1 Term (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To keep up with Neighborhood happening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96/112 (85.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty as Citizen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81/112 (72.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility to finish term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79/112 (70.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid decisions being made by others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76/112 (67.9)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep in touch with elected officials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62/112 (55.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teamwork of NB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48/112 (42.9)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped my professional growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47/112 (42.0)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue support of special project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46/112 (41.1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People came to me for advice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43/112 (37.5)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good leadership kept me going</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42/112 (37.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialize with neighbors</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30/112 (26.7)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 (continued) A Comparison of Self-Reported Reasons for Sustained Participation on Neighborhood Boards: Total Sample (112=100%) vs. Members Who Served Less Than One Term vs. Members Who Served More Than One Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>&lt; = 1 Term (n=56)</th>
<th>&gt; = 1 Term (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>% of 112</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29/112 (26.7)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gave me prestige</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27/112 (24.1)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone convinced me to continue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14/112 (13.4)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political plans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/112 (8.9)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community force. These factors are consonant with Cunningham's (1972: 599) statement that "as increased information, education and experience raises the capacity of amateurs, their efficacy probably will increase and so will their pressure to be included in." Once again, the factor of a gathering of individuals with motivations and capacity of raising their citizen "voice" is inherent in this cluster of variables.

A Comparison of the Ordinal Rankings Between Members Who Served for One Term or Less and Those Who Served More Than One Term

In order to determine more definitive factors of sustained participation, it was considered to be appropriate to compare data between individuals who were sustained (served more than one term on the Boards) with those that were not. Comparisons (Table 26) between these two groups yielded the following:

1. "To Keep Up With Neighborhood Happenings" ranked first in both groups as well as for the entire sample. The group that served for more than one term selected this item 89.0% of the time compared to 82.0% for the group that served less-than or equal-to one term.

2. In terms of percentages, the group that served more than one term had higher percentages in 11 of the 16 reasons for sustained participation. For instance, the individuals who served for more than one term chose "to carry out my duty as a citizen" 80.0% of the time while the group that served one term or less chose it 64.0% of the time. The difference in percentages between the two groups ranged from a minimum of 2% to a maximum of 25%.
3. "Duty . . ." was more important (second place) to the more-than-one-term group than it was to the less-than-or equal-to-one-term group, which ranked it in fourth place, while "responsibility to finish the term" seemed to be more of an immediately important sustaining factor to the less-than-or-equal-to-one-term group. This could be interpreted to be an indication that "duty as a citizen" as a value, has more of a long-term sustaining effect. It might be the sign of an inherent characteristic of people who are more "generic" participants. People who served less than one term and were ambivalent about their continued participation on the Neighborhood Board may have been more likely to place greater value on fulfilling their commitment honorably and "responsibly." Also, it is probable that persons whose participation is more issue based do not have long-range participation in mind. People who served less than one term were more anxious to finish their commitment whereas "sustainers," did not need to rely on a sense of responsibility to complete their term of office.

4. "To keep in touch with elected officials" was not as much of a priority to the group that served less-than-or-equal-to-one term as it was for those who served for more than one term. The 25% margin between these two groups was the highest among the 16 items. We do not know whether serving for longer than one term is a learning experience in which an individual learns that Neighborhood Board participation is an effective means of keeping in touch with officials or whether people who are inclined to serve for a long period on Neighborhood Boards hold this as a higher value.
5. The group that served more than one term considered "... teamwork..." to be more important than the "one term" group (sixth place and eighth place respectively). This might have a relationship to the definition of participatory competence which describes it as a capacity to enlist and to enhance group strategies in achieving common goals. The implication is that sustained participation and the value on team efforts and "teamwork" are related.

6. Differences on two specific items between the two groups were significant. The item showing the largest discrepancy in ordinal ranking was "The good leadership kept me going." Here, the one-term-or-less group ranked it sixth compared to the group that served more than one term, which ranked it tenth. The one-term-or-less group chose "I was inspired by the other members" 32% to the more-than-one-term group's 23%. The discrepancy of four ordinal steps (the largest discrepancy in this listing of factors) in "the good leadership kept me going" plus the eleventh place ranking by the less-than-or-equal-to-one-term group (compared to fourteenth place for the more-than-one-term group) of being "inspired by the other members" contributes to the summary statement of this section.

Summary of Comparison Between Members Who Served for More Than One Term and Those Who Served for One Term or Less

Factors that are external to the participant (such as good leadership and inspiration from other members) may have special significance in shaping an environment for the sustainment of participation of newer and less experienced Board members. They need more assistance and support than the individuals who have served for a longer time.
Being new to the organization, they are more amenable (or vulnerable) to interpersonal and intra-organizational dynamics which implicate the key roles played by leadership and the general membership of the group.

Among other salient factors that were identified in the comparison are:

Keeping up with neighborhood happenings is important to both long-term participants as well as those who serve for shorter periods.

Duty is an important factor in the sustained participation of citizens, probably an indicator of citizens more prone to various civic participation activities.

There is a probable relationship between valuing contact between elected officials and sustained participation.

Analysis of Factors Responses to Open-ended Question:

Factors Contributing to Sustained Participation

To add to the data analysis and interpretation of factors related to the sustained participation of citizens on the Neighborhood Board, data from closed-end questions were statistically processed to provide further insights into the relationships between variables.

The approach to analyzing and interpreting the sustaining factors was to test the validity of some of the assumptions that were held about sustainment. The central premise of these assumptions was that positive experiences in any mode would reinforce continued participation more than negative experiences. The following assumptions were tested to see if they would be statistically supported.
1. Those persons who had a preponderance of positive experiences would serve for a longer time on the Neighborhood Boards than those who had negative experiences.

2. Individuals who felt that they had some sort of influence in the decision-making process would feel satisfied, thus motivating them to continue. (There is a relationship between voice and feelings of empowerment.)

3. Persons who had a high satisfaction rate would be sustained longer on the Neighborhood Boards than those who were not satisfied with their Neighborhood Board experiences.

Table 27
Mean Number of Positive Experiences by Length of Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Experiences on Neighborhood Board</th>
<th>One Term or Less</th>
<th>More than One Term</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6429</td>
<td>4.0714</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assumption that persons who had a preponderance of positive experiences would serve for a longer time on the Neighborhood Boards than those who had negative experiences was not statistically (t-test) supported.
Table 28

Feelings about the Neighborhood Board Experience by Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Served one term or less</th>
<th>Served more than one term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt positive</td>
<td>42 (100.0%)</td>
<td>58 (98.3%)</td>
<td>90 (98.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt negative</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (100.0%)</td>
<td>59 (100.0%)</td>
<td>91* (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*21 had mixed feelings

A chi-square of 0.72 (P > .05), suggests that there is no relationship between these two factors.

Table 29

Length of Service on the Neighborhood Boards by Satisfaction with How Decisions Were Made on the Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>1 term or less</th>
<th>More than 1 term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>43 (77.0%)</td>
<td>49 (92.0%)</td>
<td>92 (84.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>13 (23.0%)</td>
<td>4 (8.0%)</td>
<td>17 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>53* (100.0%)</td>
<td>109 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 individuals were not sure

A chi-square of 5.08 (.01 < P < .05), indicates that serving more than one term on Neighborhood Boards is positively related to satisfaction with the decision-making processes on the Boards.
Table 30
Percent of Time that the Neighborhood Boards Adopted Member Recommendation by Length of Service on the Neighborhood Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>1 term or less</th>
<th>More than 1 term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motions adopted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50%</td>
<td>37 (66.0%)</td>
<td>13 (23.0%)</td>
<td>50 (45.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100%</td>
<td>19 (34.0%)</td>
<td>43 (77.0%)</td>
<td>62 (55.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square of 20.81 (p < .001) indicates a relationship between the percentage of times that recommendations made by members were adopted by the Boards and their membership on the Neighborhood Boards for more than one term.

Table 31
Feelings of Influence on the Neighborhood Board by Percent of Recommendations that Were Adopted by the Neighborhood Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt Influential</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were adopted</td>
<td>0-50%</td>
<td>13 (72.0%)</td>
<td>34 (31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100%</td>
<td>70 (77.0%)</td>
<td>5 (18.0%)</td>
<td>75 (69.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91 (100.0%)</td>
<td>189 (100.0%)</td>
<td>109 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square of 17.09 (p < .001) indicates a relationship between feeling influential and the frequency in which recommendations of Neighborhood Board members were adopted by their respective Boards.

Table 32
Feelings of Influence by Holding of Office on the Neighborhood Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Held Office of Some Kind</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt influential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78 (95.0%)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>78 (70.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (5.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
<td>34 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-two individuals in the sample (112) held office of some kind on the Neighborhood Board. Seventy-eight of these 82 persons said they felt influential in the Neighborhood Board decision-making process and four did not while none of the 30 individuals who did not hold office of any kind on the Boards felt influential in the decision-making process. A chi-square of 94.0 (p < .001) suggests a relationship between holding office and feelings of influence in the decision-making process.
Table 33
Home Ownership by Length of Service on the Neighborhood Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>1 term or less</th>
<th>More than one term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>50 (89.0%)</td>
<td>49 (87.5%)</td>
<td>99 (88.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>6 (11.0%)</td>
<td>7 (12.5%)</td>
<td>13 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi square of .087 (P > .05) indicates no significant relationship between the two factors. However, when placed into a table (Table 34) and visually checked, it initially appeared that home owners were more likely to participate more than four years compared to renters.

Table 34
Years Served on the Neighborhood Board by Homeowners and Renters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service (Years)</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>Less than 2</th>
<th>Less than 3</th>
<th>Less than 4</th>
<th>More than 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service (years)</th>
<th>4 or less</th>
<th>more than 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>13 (14.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>13 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners</td>
<td>76 (85.4%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>99 (88.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>89 (100.0%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>112 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square of 3.801 did not statistically support the fact that homeowners serve significantly longer than renters on the Boards.

Length of service on the Neighborhood Board by belief in Statement X or Statement Y yielded the following:

Table 35
Length of Service on the Neighborhood Board by Belief in Statement X or Statement Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 term or less</td>
<td>More than 1 term</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Xa</td>
<td>Yes 33 (71.7%)</td>
<td>24 (44.4%)</td>
<td>57 (57.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 13 (28.3%)</td>
<td>30 (55.6%)</td>
<td>43 (43.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 46 (100.0%)</td>
<td>54 (100.0%)</td>
<td>100 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Yb</td>
<td>Yes 13 (28.3%)</td>
<td>30 (55.5%)</td>
<td>43 (43.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 33 (71.7%)</td>
<td>24 (45.5%)</td>
<td>67 (67.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 46 (100.0%)</td>
<td>54 (100.0%)</td>
<td>100 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aStatement X--"I believe that the term 'voice' means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something with the expectation that the recommendations or points of view would be considered in making a decision."

bStatement Y--"I believe that the term 'voice' means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something but also that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process."

Statement "X" was chosen significantly ($X^2 = 7.55$) (P-Value = .006) more times by those who served less than or equal to one term on the Neighborhood Boards ($P = < .05$), suggesting that there is a relationship between sustained participation on the Neighborhood Boards and
the belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process (per statement "Y")

Table 36
Summary Listing of Variables that Were Found to be Related/Unrelated Using Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstabulated Variables</th>
<th>Related</th>
<th>Not Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive/negative feelings about Neighborhood Boards and length of service on the Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with how decisions were made on the Neighborhood Boards and length of service on the Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time recommendations made by the sample were adopted by the Neighborhood Board and length of service on the Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of influence on the Neighborhood Boards and the holding of office on the Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership and length of service on the Neighborhood Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/negative feelings about the Neighborhood Boards and the holding of office on the Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service on the Neighborhood Boards and the belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Quantitative Analysis of Contributing Factors to Sustained Participation

The following conclusions drawn from quantitative analysis are presented as factors which contribute to the understanding of the processes of sustainment on the Neighborhood Boards:

1. Length of service on the Neighborhood Boards is not related to either positive or negative feelings. In other words, how a person feels about the Neighborhood Boards does not have a bearing on his or her length of service on the Boards.

2. There is no relationship between how a person feels about the Neighborhood Boards and whether that person held office on the boards or not. It is possible that persons who held office on the Boards had negative feelings about the Boards--the reverse is also possible.

3. There is a relationship between a member's satisfaction with the decision-making process on the Boards and sustained service on them.

4. There is a relationship between the satisfaction members have about the decision-making process, the percent of time the recommendations of members were adopted by the Boards and length of service on the Boards. This is reflected by the fact that members who felt that more than 50% of their recommendations were adopted by their respective Board served for more than one term.

5. Feelings of influence on the Neighborhood Board were found to be related to the factor of whether or not the member had held office on the Board.
In general, there are several general implications in these findings.

6. There is a relationship between sustained service on the Neighborhood Boards and a belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process.

The rewards in citizen voice being heard seem to be related to further (sustained) participation. Satisfaction drawn from having recommendations adopted by the Boards as well as satisfaction with the decision-making process seem to be related to feelings of influence. That approximately 70% of the sample had held office on their Board suggests the relationship among all of these factors. In the long-range view, homeowners would more naturally be sustained because of the more permanent nature of their residence in the community as well as their larger investment in the neighborhood. And finally, sustained service on the Neighborhood Boards is related to the belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process.\(^8\)

**Data from Open-ended Questions**

In addition to collecting data from closed-end questions, responses to the open-ended question, "What satisfactions did you receive from serving on the Neighborhood Board?" were gathered. The following is a categorization of these responses.

---

\(^8\)This investigation did not go so far as to determine causation. It is possible that prolonged participation would reinforce a value or feeling that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process.
Forty-four persons stated reasons with influence/voice themes. Thirty-three of these persons (33/44=75%) gave responses referring to satisfactions from achieving results through Board activities. Typical responses were:

"Getting results of your efforts on certain issues."

"Being able to pull a concept together and have responses to our voice."

Eleven of the 44 (25%) individuals made references to "feelings" of influence which did not necessarily culminate in actual results, typified by statements such as: "Feeling that you have some level of influence/impact on the neighborhood and on the system."

Twenty individuals stated reasons referring to service to the community and to fellow neighbors exemplified by statements such as "Helping people makes me feel good."

Sixteen individuals mentioned reasons which referred to gaining satisfaction from learning experiences. Nine of them referred to extrinsic factors with mainly content orientations. Examples include, "I got information about development issues of the neighborhood."

Six out of 19 persons mentioned the intrinsic values of learning such as, "I learned new things. A good opportunity to use my mind, dealing with different problems besides my farming."

Thirteen persons stated reasons with references to self-esteem, well-being, or ego satisfaction. A typical response was, "I got a feeling of self-worth, of self-actualization, [and] have another opportunity to be fulfilled."

---

9 Refer to pp. 94-97 for detailed presentations of the statements that were made by the sample.
Ten persons gave no responses and nine made responses which did not have any significant theme or pattern.

Influence/voice themes scored twice as many times as "duty" or "service" themes, suggesting that task, the need to "voice" and to assert oneself, was greater than the need to serve as a duty, especially when the stakes were high (Dine11, 1969, p. 7). If interpreted in terms of combinations of themes working together, "service" and "duty," combined with with the "voice" factors accounted for more than half of all the stated sources of satisfaction gained from participation on Neighborhood Boards. The qualitative results from this question parallel the self-reported rankings presented at the beginning of this section.

A Comparison Between Rankings of Similar Items: Initiation and Sustainment

The following observations were made when comparing the factors that contributed to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards with sustaining factors: 10

"Duty as a citizen," which was at the top of the list of initiating factors, was replaced by "To keep up with what is happening in the neighborhood" as a reason for sustained participation.

---

10The request asking the respondents to select reasons for initiating participation consisted of nine items. The list of sustaining reasons consisted of 16 items. It was not possible to maintain a uniform number of factors because of the different dynamics involved in initiation and of sustainment of participation. Hence, the comparison was made strictly in terms of relative movement and relative position.
"To get involved in elective politics" which ranked fifth (of 9 factors) in reasons for becoming involved in Neighborhood Boards, slipped to last place of 16 factors) as a reason for sustained participation.11

"A particular issue," which ranked second (of 9 factors) as a reason to begin participating on the Boards, fell to eighth place (of 16 factors) as a sustaining reason.

"A continued interest in a special project or cause," which scored second (of 9 factors) as a reason to seek election to the Neighborhood Boards12 ended up in the lower third of the scale as a reason given for sustained participation by the entire sample (112 persons). However, the breakout between persons who served more than one term and those who served equal to or less than one term reflected a higher priority (seventh of 16 items) given by the group that served longer.

Plans to run for future political office ranked fifth (of 9 factors) as reasons to seek election (initiation

11 The listing for the question asking for reasons for initiating participation consisted of nine factors. The listing for reasons for sustained participation consisted of 16 factors. It was not possible to keep a consistent number of factors because of the different variables entailed in sustaining factors. The comparison of parallel factors between these two questions is made in terms of relative movement.

12 It ranked second, following "A Sense of Duty as a Citizen."
of participation) to the Neighborhood Boards, but these aspirations dwindled to a low priority after the first term of office on the Neighborhood Boards. Twenty-seven percent of the entire sample of 112 individuals indicated that future political plans contributed to their initiation of participation on the Boards. This figure decreased to approximately 9% of the entire sample as a sustaining factor. In ordinal ranking, it slipped from fifth place (of 9 factors contributing to the initiation of participation) to sixteenth place (of 16 factors contributing to sustained participation).

Summary of All Factors Contributing to Sustainment

The selection of the most salient factors and processes that contributed to the sustained participation on the Neighborhood Boards are the result of combining the results from the self-reported data, the demographic and descriptive data, and the data consisting of the "satisfaction" gained from participation on the Neighborhood Boards. The results of content analysis, ordinal listing, cross-tabulations, and inferential reasoning were compared with each other to determine common elements among variables as well as to verify or reinforce the findings of one method by another. The selections were based on the manner in which the responses to the open-ended questions and to closed-end questions matched or verified each other. This process led to the selection of the factors which were felt to contribute most significantly to sustained participation. The conformity of data to the conceptual framework was a critical determinant in choosing the factors. At times, the investigator had to arbitrarily determine a
cut-off point of inclusion of a factor. This was necessary because of the possibility of excessively stretching relationships between factors. The process of selecting the most significant factors posed the "wicked problem" of having no stopping rule. In essence, "wicked problems have no ways of signalling the planner (investigator) when a solution has been found. Work is terminated on a wicked problem because of "external" considerations: running out of time, money or patience." In this investigator's case, the determination was made when conceptual circles repeatedly appeared.

As was presented in the section discussing initiating factors, a profile of sustained participation is presented in this section to present a condensed and probable model of sustained participation.

The following self-reported factors were considered to be important to the sample members who served more than one term on their respective Neighborhood Boards. As such, they are considered to be important factors which sustain citizen participation.

A need to keep up with what is happening in the neighborhood.

A sense of duty and commitment to the community.

A need to take responsibility for decisions that affect the respective citizen and to avoid having others make decisions for them.

Recognition of the importance of keeping in touch with state and city officials.

However, a categorical comparison between the primary and secondary self-reported reasons for sustained participation indicated that the primary reasons contained individualistic and task oriented themes.
The secondary category referred to a social context of participation. Whereas the primary factors were cognitively based, the secondary factors were affectively based.

Derivations from the chi-square operations and the qualitative reports of "satisfaction" gained from participation on the Boards confirmed the following factors to be critical in sustained participation:

"Satisfaction" derived from: (a) having more than 50% of one's recommendations adopted by the Board; (b) holding office on the Board; (c) feelings of influence on the Board.

The belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process.

And finally, as was prominent in reasons for initiation of participation, home ownership repeated itself as a significant factor.

These factors can be categorized into two basic categories. The first is the "motivator" category. These are the factors which "drive" individuals to continue to participate. A need to keep up with neighborhood happenings, as well as duty, fall within this category. The second is the "reinforcer" category. These factors have more of a "payoff" value to the citizen, providing some intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for being involved. Such factors as "feelings of influence" and satisfactions from having recommendations adopted by the Board represent this category. This category is synonymous with the empowerment theme discussed earlier.

Adopting and applying the "reinforcer"/"driver" dichotomy to the self-reported reasons for sustainment resulted in the following: The primary reasons for sustainment fell into the "driver" category and the secondary reasons fell into the "reinforcer" category.
A Profile of the Sustained Member of the Neighborhood Board

To conclude this section on the factors of sustainment, the following profile of the sustained member is presented. It is meant to provide a thumbnail sketch of sustained participation, providing some insight and emphasis on the probable dynamics and processes that may have been operant in having the citizen participant seek election to the Boards beyond his first term.

Towards the end of his first term of office on the Neighborhood Board, the member noticed that his thoughts of running for office were not as significant as when he had initially considered running for a seat on the Board. Although political aspirations were never high as reasons for either his initiation of participation or for his sustained participation, he had entertained thoughts of a future in elective politics. However, some of his neighbors who would subsequently serve for one term may have still considered running for other electoral public office more seriously than he. The member never really was candid about his political plans and to this day, his political aspirations remain a very private matter.

His initial sense of duty was replaced by a more sober and practical need to keep up with neighborhood happenings. Much of this need was related to particular issues that involved changes that were planned for the neighborhood. These changes either implicated the physical and geographical environment or they encompassed laws or governmental services (the neo-environment) which would affect the citizens within the neighborhood.

Compared to fellow neighbors who served for one term only, the sustained citizen did not consider good leadership to be as important in his decision to seek another term. Personal and particular issues (many of which were tied to his stake in the neighborhood) seemed to fuel his desire to "keep on top of things." The decision to continue serving on the Board, though reinforced by neighbors and friends, was based on the desire to resolve personal and particular issues which were part of the reason for the initiation of participation. In conversations between the sustained member and the neighbor who served for only one term, both
individuals learned something of significance about how each saw the leadership and the membership of the Board. The neighbor who served for one term only considered good leadership and inspiration from the other members to be of more importance compared to the neighbor who decided to run for another term. To the neighbor who would serve for only one term, the thoughts of continued or discontinued service on the board had heavier considerations of the behavior and influence of other members. The neighbor who decided to run for another term focused more on considerations of issues that needed to be resolved.

The Neighborhood Board experience reinforced the sustained participant's feelings about keeping in touch with elected officials. This was a result of the contacts that had been made with both the city council members as well as the members of the state legislature.

The sustained member had a feeling of influence within his own Board. He felt that his opinions and recommendations were considered and adopted most of the time. He was also quite satisfied with the manner in which decisions were made on the Board concerning important issues. It is significant to the member to have held some kind of office on the Board, not because of the prestige that it gave him but more because of the responsibilities delegated to him.

In terms of beliefs, the sustained member believed that "voice" means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something with the expectation that the recommendations or points of view would be considered in making a decision and/or with the expectation of having a part in the decision-making process. His viewpoint, however, was tempered with a realistic attitude. This particular point about his beliefs and values reflects to some extent what Almond and Verba (1965), Hirschman (1970, p. 33), and Zurcher (1970, p. 14) stated regarding "voice" and "empowerment."
the democratic political system requires "blending of apparent contradictions," on the one hand, the citizen must express his point of view so that the political elites know and can be responsive to what he wants, but, on the other, these elites must be allowed to make decisions. The citizen must thus be in turn influential and deferential. (Almond & Verba, 1965)

In order for voice to be effective, it must stay within the bounds. "Voice has the function of alerting a firm or organization to its failings, but it must then give management, old or new, some time to respond to the pressures that have been brought to bear on it." (Hirschman, 1970, p. 33)

(1) Vital opportunities could be lost by direct conflict methods. (2) There could be further alienation between citizens and the Establishment--cutting them off from the opportunity to expand their social roles through participation in community affairs. It assumes that the organizational structure which evolves with time develops a climate of give and take, thereby having a socializing effect on all parties involved. (Zurcher, 1970, p. 14)

Thus, the sustained member continued his participation on the Board beyond one term. As dutiful and committed as he had been to the community, eventual considerations of ending his participation had to be addressed for various reasons. These considerations of "exit" from the Boards by citizens are explored in the next section.

The Factors Related to the Exit of Members from Neighborhood Boards

A natural assumption as to why people discontinue their involvement in community activities is because they do not find enjoyment from them or because negative experiences quell their enthusiasm. This investigator's assumption was that frustration and discouragement would comprise the bulk of the reasons for discontinuance of service on the neighborhood boards. The results of this investigation refuted
this assumption. Table 37 lists the self-reported reasons for "exit" given by 57 previous members of the Neighborhood Board who were part of the sample.

Table 37
The Self-Reported Reasons for Exit from Neighborhood Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of (N=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want more time to do other things</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I did my part as a citizen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration/disappointment in the Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My goals for participating were achieved</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not re-elected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To seek election to another office</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality conflict(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents who chose "I want more time to do other things" some individuals stated that they wanted to travel more, others mentioned that they wanted to take adult education courses, and others mentioned wanting to spend more time with the family. Whatever their reasons, the common denominator was that of changing priorities in their lives--active participation no longer was as important as other activities which superseded their Neighborhood Board participation.

Once again, the "duty" factor was among the top factors as in the initiating and sustaining factors. "Duty" accounted for approximately 30% (17/57) of the previously active Neighborhood Board members.
Those who selected it simply stated that they felt they had done their duty and that it was time to move on.

The "other" category comprised a mix of reasons such as, "To give someone else a chance" (chosen five times), "I moved" (chosen five times), "tired/bored" (chosen once), "the Neighborhood Board was in good hands" (chosen once), and "I couldn't give the time that was needed to do a good job" (chosen once).

Of the 28% (16/57) persons who chose "frustration/disappointment in the Neighborhood Board," only four mentioned that nothing would make them run again. Twelve of the 16 persons who chose "frustration/disappointment in the Neighborhood Boards mentioned "more power given to the Neighborhood Boards" or crucial issues coming up again" as reasons to seek re-election to the Boards. An interpretation of this is that the "disappointment and frustration with the Neighborhood Board" factor alone was not a final and deciding factor in dissuading individuals from participating again. When asked, "Overall how do you feel about your neighborhood board experience?", 11 of 16 respondents had "mixed feelings," four chose "positive feelings," while none chose "negative feelings." When asked "Do you feel it was worth your time and energy to participate on the neighborhood board," nine said yes, three said no, and four were unsure.

Although 16 individuals mentioned that disappointments and frustrations were part of the reason to stop participating on the Neighborhood Boards, more than half of them still felt that it had been worth their time to participate. When asked whether or not they felt influential in the Neighborhood Board decision-making process, nine said yes, six said no, and one was not sure.
To determine the possible kind of interventions that could have been implemented to encourage their sustained participation on the Neighborhood Boards, the 57 inactive members of the sample were asked: "Is there anything that could have been done to influence you to remain on the Neighborhood Board?" Thirty-nine (68.4%) of the inactive sample (57 respondents) mentioned that nothing could have been done to influence them to remain on the Neighborhood Board, suggesting that decisions to exit are firm and difficult to change. The majority of the reasons given for the decision to stop participating were related to the "time" factor and to the "duty" factor. These are positive signs as they reflect more proactive choices to stop participation. This is in contrast to more negative reasons (which are reactive in nature) such as frustration or disappointment in the Neighborhood Boards.

Eighteen (31.6%) indicated that something could have been done to influence them to remain on the Neighborhood Boards. The valid factors that could be considered as "sustaining" interventions were: (a) "being given more responsibility" and (b) being "invited to remain." Another related factor that was mentioned: "If Neighborhood Boards accomplished something rather than talk issues to death," with an implication towards making the Neighborhood Boards more action-oriented rather than rhetoric oriented.

Eight individuals mentioned that they had sought re-election but failed in their bids.

To determine if there were any significant factors about individuals who mentioned that nothing could be done to influence them
to continue participating on the Neighborhood Boards, their responses to the question, "Which of the following factors would influence you to seek re-election to the neighborhood board?" were collated and analyzed. Only five of these individuals mentioned that nothing would make them run again. However, "crucial issues coming up again" were chosen 21 times by these same individuals who said that nothing could have been done to influence them to remain on the Neighborhood Boards. This suggests that although former members mentioned that nothing that anyone could have said or done to influence them to remain on the Neighborhood Boards, "crucial issues" had the power to influence them to consider re-entering the participative arena. Three factors are suggested by this response.

1. That interventions by the staff or other parties external to the citizen to sustain participation on Neighborhood Boards may not be as influential as crucial issues which are germane to the citizen's perception of his/her need to participate.

2. That "social" and altruistic motives once again are not as strong and influential as other factors which the individual considers as "crucial." Threats to the individual's immediate environment and neo-environment are more influential factors on the decision to participate and to continue to participate than service, duty, and other more "socially" and altruistically oriented factors (Dinell, 1969, p. 7).

3. Another implication is that the responses to this question reflect specific motivations of issue-focused, issue-specific participation. The frequent lament of Neighborhood Board members that "people
come out to participate on certain issues and disappear" is true to some extent. It reflects a reality which needs to be accepted by those who hold the value and expectation that participation should be consistent, no matter what the issue. An implication of this finding is the need to validate the legitimacy and acceptability of issue-focused participation. Individuals who express disappointment and discouragement by the "sporadic participation" at Neighborhood Board meetings should be assisted in understanding this reality of adult education (androgogy) in which people seek to solve their daily problems in a realistic and pragmatic manner.

Several studies provide special insight into the adult learning model. Cross (1981, p. 181) reported results of the largest and most representative sample of American adults on the subject. Each respondent was asked to describe one learning project. The projects were then classified into three subject matter groups: formal topics (6.9%); practical topics (75.9%); and intraself topics (17.2%). The findings support the conclusion that "most adult learning begins because of a problem or responsibility, or at least a question or puzzle, not because of a grand desire for a liberal education" (p. 188). Knowles (1978) identified a basic assumption about adult learning: Children have been conditioned to have a subject-centered orientation to most learning, whereas adults tend to have a problem-solving orientation to most learning (p. 58). This difference is primarily the result of the difference in time perspective. The child's time perspective toward learning is one of postponed application. The adult, on the other hand, comes into an educational activity largely because he is
experiencing some inadequacy in coping with current life problems.

He wants to apply tomorrow what he learns today, so his time perspective is one of immediacy of application. Therefore, he enters into education with a problem-centered orientation to learning. Cross (1981, p. 192) adds:

"Interestingly, the two reasons that are almost always listed on survey questionnaires as major barriers to adult education classes, lack of time and money, are not very important in the context of making a choice between self-directed learning and classroom instruction. This suggests that removing the two barriers cited most frequently by survey respondents would not move many people from self-directed learning into the classroom. Permitting learners to start when they want to and to proceed at their own pace would presumably be a far more effective recruiting device than offering transportation or financial aid. The desire for individualized subject matter was an important factor in almost half of all self-directed learning. The man or woman wishing to fix the back patio, for instance, does not want to spend time learning about laying brick or constructing plank flooring if the patio is to be poured cement. At a commonsense level, the efficiency factor seems to be one of the major problems in satisfying problem-oriented learners. By definition, they want to learn enough to solve their rather unique problem (bricks, wood, or cement, but not all three), and they do want a solution (how to mix and shape cement, not a lesson on the history of chemistry or cement). . . . Professional people, who are among the most active self-directed learners in society, may also have highly focused problems. They usually know what they need to learn, and a course general enough to appeal to sufficiently large numbers would probably contain much that is redundant or irrelevant to the problem-oriented learners is that the more sharply the potential learner has managed to define the problem, the less satisfactory traditional classes will be. At the same time, self-directed learning is likely to be inefficient if the learner cannot define what he wants to know or needs help in locating the relevant resources. In such instances, the learner will be dependent on outside help. (p. 193)

Thus we see how the adult learning model and the results of other research implicate the findings of this investigation. Relating the
adult learning model with that of the "time" factor that was mentioned by the sample, one primary question is raised, "If people were no longer willing to devote their time to participate on the Neighborhood Boards, what made them participate in the first place, and what sustained them?" Logically, the answer is that these busy and active people had participated because of some burning issue in combination with other factors. They had addressed this burning issue for a while and after the issue was resolved, or after specific individual needs were satisfied, they withdrew from active participation, but did not completely detach themselves from possible re-involvement.

Applying an allegory to American military service, these citizens carried out their duty, serving with a sense of satisfaction and honor. But not all of them would wish to do it all over again. After serving on "active duty," they progressed to the Reserves--with acknowledgment that they could serve or be asked to serve in an emergency--such as when an issue they were interested in surfaced again. This time, the participation would be more specific and focused, based on the area of interest/expertise of the citizen. The Kahaluu Neighborhood Board has a position called the Associate Member which fits this allegory. An associate member is someone who is no longer active but who is noted for his/her expertise or interest so that in times of need, the neighborhood board may enlist his/her services.

The other explanation of sustainment and exit is related to the home ownership factor. Although an individual may choose to participate or not to participate on any neighborhood matters, the one constant (for the 88% of members representing propertied households) is territoriality. Coupled with this territoriality is the longevity
and stability of residence (living in the same neighborhood for a long time) of homeowners. This contributes to the intermittent and sporadic participation that is so often alluded to in derogatory terms by Neighborhood Board members, when in fact, it is a common factor in the economic marketplace as well as a maxim of adult learning. Citizens consume goods and services as they are needed. In the case of the homeowner, he or she will participate when lifestyles or territory are at stake. As an adult learner he will seek answers to immediate problems and go on to seek solutions to others at hand.

Frustrating and Discouraging Factors in the Neighborhood Board Participation Process

Although factors related to "time" were mentioned by the sample as being the most significant reasons for exit, an analysis of the discouraging and frustrating factors of serving on the Neighborhood Boards provided a significant contribution to the investigative findings. This analysis provided insight into one of the major weaknesses of the participatory process of the Boards.

The frustrating and discouraging factors of serving on the Neighborhood Boards were initially categorized into as many as 11 diverse groupings (not mutually exclusive).

Frustrating and Discouraging Factors of Serving on the Neighborhood Boards

Powerlessness/feelings of not being heard, not being listened by government and/or elected officials:
1. "A feeling that you cannot really effect change."
2. "Government listens and then does what it wants to do (contrary to our facts)."
3. "You get the feeling that elected officials do not really pay attention to what you are saying."
4. "After we do a lot of research, it is ignored."
5. "Rhetoric from elected officials."
6. "You run into a brick wall when dealing with officialdom."
7. "Our recommendations are not heeded."
8. "No action or response from city government. They go against our recommendations."
9. "Decisions are made before-hand by government."
10. "Issues keep on coming out without resolution."
11. "Too much time spent on surveys."
12. "Government officials don't respect citizen knowledge."
13. "The bus and sewer rate increases ... we opposed ... went through anyway."
14. "A development went through even if we did not want it."
15. "The city council voted our recommendations down and re-cycled the issue ... making us go through the same thing again."
16. "The decisions we made did not count or have bearing on final outcome."
17. "Being blocked by city council from doing good things."
18. "Not having the clout to do what we wanted to do."
19. "Neighborhood views were not accepted by the city council."
20. "Our City Councilman went against our wishes."
21. "The attitudes of certain council members who demean the accomplishments of the Neighborhood Board."
22. "Feeling helpless in the light of what residents complain about ... Being constrained by ordinances."
23. "Losing on an issue, even if the community voted 98 to 2."

24. "Not much can be done about the road maintenance in this area."

25. "It took a long time to get action from government."


27. "Slow process of government."

28. "The time it takes to get something done."

29. "Bureaucracy."

30. "The slow process of getting things done."

Frustrations relating to intra-group dynamics:

1. "We had a one-man board . . . would not let members have responsibility."

2. "Lots of no-win neighbor-to-neighbor fights."

3. "A small minority was allowed to run meetings."

4. "Inordinate amount of power given to small but vocal minority."

5. "The boards dwelt too much on social issues rather than on development issues."

6. "Long, dragged-out meetings."

7. "People who run off at the mouth when they have the floor."

8. "The other board members are too zealous and emotional. I just couldn't voice my opinion. I was afraid . . . I live in the area. You feel that someone is going to hurt me or my family. I've seen what damage the board members can do."

9. "People are too controlling . . . they are not open to other information."

10. "Manipulation of fellow board members by others."

11. "Members don't keep the goals of the Board in mind."

12. "Meetings too long."

13. "Too many small, interpersonal concerns that could be handled privately."
14. "Fellow members respond to my sex (female) and to my ethnicity rather than concentrate on the issues at hand."

15. "Bloc and cliques on the boards. The Boards disintegrated because of this."

16. "Too much time spent on minor details."

17. "Realism and logic are not paramount . . . members too emotional."

18. "We did not know what our goals were."

19. "Meetings went on late into the night."

20. "Too much in-fighting."

Poor attendance/Low interest of elected Board Members:

1. "Too many members of the board take their responsibility too lightly and feel it is a pastime."

2. "No one on the neighborhood board attends meetings."

3. "Ineffective members on the board . . . they do not attend meetings."

4. "Lack of quorums."

5. "Lack of attendance by board members."

6. "Members don't pull their weight."

7. "Fallout of neighborhood members."

8. "Elected members do not participate."

9. "Members who do not attend meetings."

10. "Lack of quorums."

Miscellaneous factors:

1. "There is an overwhelming conservatism on neighborhood boards."

2. "Everything is 'status quo.' 'Not in my backyard (NIMBY).''

3. "Neighborhood members are not willing to take a stand."
4. "I could not understand all of the terms (acronyms) used by members."
5. "Too many diverse problems for too many sub-communities."
6. "I wish I had more time to devote."
7. "Newly-formed boards take a long time to learn the ropes."
8. "The members of the board discourage any form of change. Too zealous, they discourage development without listening."
9. "Neighborhood boards restrict development. Not realistic to 'progress.'"

Lack of power/clout/funding
1. "Lack of legal power in the governmental process . . . no vote on the city council."
2. "Inadequacy neighborhood board budget."
3. "We don't really have power."
4. "Not enough power of the neighborhood boards."
5. "Neighborhood boards have no authority."
6. "Lack of neighborhood board power."
7. "The neighborhood boards don't have enough power/authority."

Use of Neighborhood Boards for Political/Personal advancement
1. "People sit on the boards for political ambition."
2. "Elected members use the Neighborhood Board for profit and personal gain."
3. "Use of the neighborhood board for political advancement."
4. "Neighborhood board used as stepping stone for political office."
5. "Illegal and unethical use of Neighborhood Board seat . . . collusion with developers."
References to qualifications of members/representation on Neighborhood Boards:

1. "Ill-qualified neighborhood board members."
2. "The Neighborhood Board was not serving its purpose . . . not representative of community. Anybody can get elected onto the board."
3. "Unqualified morons get elected to the neighborhood boards."

Quorum Policy

1. "The quorum policy of the neighborhood boards."

Lack of participation, support or interest by the community

1. "Lack of community support."
2. "Apathy of community."
3. "People who don't believe in democracy . . . apathy."
4. "Non-participation of the silent majority (the ones that complain when things go wrong)."
5. "Not enough citizen participation."
6. "Lack of participation of community . . . apathy."
7. "People go home early or don't show up at all."
8. "Lack of community interest on broader issues."
9. "Lack of citizen interest."
10. "Lack of citizen participation at meetings."
11. "Not enough participation of residents."

Special interests of community, self-seeking individuals:

1. "Only personal and special stakes rather than community representation."
2. "I wish more people would take interest not only when it affects them."
3. "People come only for self-interests."

No responses (6).
By noting the frequency of factors mentioned for each of the categories, the nature of the problems facing the Boards and their members became evident. For example, feelings of powerlessness in dealing with the city and elected officials were the most numerous sources of discouragement and frustration, followed by feelings of non-support or apathy of the community. Lippett's (1958, p. 35) internal-external group model provided an elegant method of determining the significance of these factors. Lippett's model hypothesizes that a group's total energy, less the energy expended to maintain itself, equals a remainder of energy left to influence its external environment.

Adopting this model, the anecdotal responses from the sample were categorized using only two major divisions—internal and external. The internal category encompassed factors which dealt with issues of the internal maintenance of the organization such as: Ambiguities over the goals and objectives of the Neighborhood Boards; Interpersonal conflict; poor or non-attendance of members; leadership and the conduct of meetings, and conflicts between various community groups at the Neighborhood Board meetings. The following factors represent the examples of problems categorized as relating to the internal functioning of the Boards.

1. "We had a one-man board . . . would not let members have responsibility."

2. "Lots of no-win neighbor-to-neighbor fights."

3. "A small minority was allowed to run meetings."

4. "The boards dwelt too much on social issues rather than on development issues."
5. "Long, dragged-out meetings."

6. "People who run off at the mouth when they have the floor."

7. "The other board members are too zealous and emotional. I just couldn't voice my opinion. I was afraid... I live in the area. You feel that someone is going to hurt me or my family. I've seen what damage the board members can do."

8. "People are too controlling... they are not open to other information."

9. "Manipulation of fellow board members by others."

10. "Members don't keep the goals of the Board in mind."

11. "Unresolvable issues... some belong in civil court."

12. "Too many small, interpersonal concerns that could be handled privately."

13. "Fellow members respond to my sex (female) and to my ethnicity rather than concentrate on the issues at hand."

14. " Blocs and cliques on the boards. The Boards disintegrated because of this."

15. "Too much time spent on minor details."

16. "Realism and logic are not paramount... members too emotional."

17. "We did not know what our goals were."

18. "Too many members of the board take their responsibility too lightly and feel it is a pastime."

19. "Ineffective members on the board... they do not attend meetings."

20. "Lack of quorums."

21. "Members don't pull their weight."

22. "There is an overwhelming conservatism on neighborhood boards."

23. "Everything is 'status quo.' 'Not in my backyard (NIMBY).'

24. "Neighborhood members are not willing to take a stand."
25. "I could not understand all of the terms (acronyms) used by members."

26. "Only personal and special stakes rather than community representation."

27. "Too many diverse problems for too many subcommunities."

28. "Newly-formed boards take a long time to learn the ropes."

29. "The members of the board discourage any form of change. Too zealous, they discourage development without listening."

30. "People sit on the boards for political ambition."

31. "Elected members use the Neighborhood Board for profit and personal gain."

32. "Use of the neighborhood board for political advancement."

33. "Illegal and unethical use of Neighborhood Board seat . . . collusion with developers."

34. "The Neighborhood Board was not serving its purpose . . . not representative of community. Anybody can get elected onto the Board."

35. "Unqualified morons get elected to the neighborhood boards."

36. "Too much time spent on surveys."

The external category included issues which referred to discouraging and frustrating factors which dealt with the "target" of influence, the city government and its representatives. The following represents examples of various factors which referred to the city government and its representatives.

1. "A feeling that you cannot really effect change."

2. "Government listens and then does what it wants to do (contrary to our facts)."

3. "You get the feeling that elected officials do not really pay attention to what you are saying."

4. "After we do a lot of research, it is ignored."

5. "Rhetoric from elected officials."
6. "You run into a brick wall when dealing with official-dom."
7. "No action or response from city government. They go against our recommendations."
8. "Decisions are made before-hand by government."
9. "Going over and over the same things without changes."
10. "Issues keep on coming out without resolution."
11. "Government officials don't respect citizen knowledge."
12. "The bus and sewer rate increases ... we opposed ... went through anyway."
13. "A development went through even if we did not want it."
14. "The city council voted our recommendations down and recycled the issue making us go through the same thing again."
15. "The decisions we made did not count or have bearing on final outcome."
16. "Not having the clout to do what we wanted to do."
17. "Neighborhood views were not accepted by the city council."
18. "Our City Councilman went against our wishes."
19. "The attitudes of certain council members who demean the accomplishments of the Neighborhood Board."
20. "Feeling helpless in the light of what residents complain about ... Being constrained by ordinances."
21. "Losing on an issue, even if the community voted 98 to 2."
22. "Not much can be done about the road maintenance in this area."
23. "It took a long time to get action from government."
24. "Slow process of government."
25. "Bureaucracy and red tape."
26. "Lack of legal power in the governmental process."
27. "... no vote on the city council."
28. "Inadequate neighborhood board budget."
29. "Not enough power of the neighborhood boards."

30. "The quorum policy of the neighborhood boards."

After the assignment of the frustrating/discouraging factors to either internal or external categories, what remained formed a natural, third category. The comments in this category contained common references to the community. The following list reflects the common theme of these comments.

1. "Lack of community interest."
2. "Apathy of community."
3. "People who don't believe in democracy . . . apathy."
4. "Non-participation of the silent majority (the ones that complain when things go wrong)."
5. "Not enough citizen participation."
6. "People go home early or don't show up at all."
7. "Lack of community interest on broader issues."
8. "Not enough participation of residents."
9. "I wish more people would take interest not only when it affects them."
10. "People come only for self-interests."

The categorization of the reasons for disappointments and frustrations into these three categories resulted in the following finding. The majority of the frustrations that the sample expressed emanated from the internal dynamics and processes of the Neighborhood Boards. The third category, pertaining to factors which implicated frustrations and disappointments with the community and neighborhood, pointed out problems of communication, diversity of interests and lack of support from the community at large. Although it was perceived
by the sample that the community did not support the citizens on the Boards, there is a possibility that this actually points out a situation where there is considerable isolation between the Board members and the community as a whole. This highlighted another area that is indeed significant in discussing the roles, functions and future of citizen participation mechanisms like the Neighborhood Boards in terms of their relationship to the community which they represent. The significance of these factors will be discussed in the following chapter.

Summary of Factors Related to Exit from Neighborhood Boards

The following factors and processes are considered to be the most significant in influencing the dynamics of exit from the Neighborhood Boards:

1. The interplay between factors of "time" and having discharged one's duty as a citizen were most predominant as reasons for exit. Changes in priorities in the lives of the participants were inferred to be signs of certain needs to have been met while serving on the Boards.

2. Thus, it is suggested that the reasons for exit are primarily based on the fact that citizens exit from the Boards after specific issues in which they are concerned are resolved. This is consistent with the adult learning model: That people will seek to find immediate solutions to problems in their lives and move on to solve other problems as they arise.

3. Exit was not mainly attributable to bad experiences while serving on the Boards.
4. However, frustrations and discouragements inherently exist in the participatory process. The most prevalent themes of these factors dealt with issues of powerlessness in the face of dealing with city government officials and the elected officials. Secondly, feelings of non support from or apathy of the community contribute to the frustration and discouragement of the Neighborhood Board members.

5. On another continuum of frustrations and discouragements, the most prevalent themes implicated problems emanating from internal problems of the Boards themselves, exemplified by phenomena such as interpersonal conflicts, too long meetings and unclear objectives.

6. Decisions by members to exit are firm and are not subject to interventions by other persons. However, exit from participation does not implicate a permanent detachment from neighborhood or community participation. Previously active members would consider active participation once again as crucial issues arose within the neighborhood.

The presentation of the factors related to the exit of participation by Neighborhood Board members culminates this chapter. Data describing the sample have been presented in addition to data which were felt to be related to the initiation, sustainment and exit of members from the Neighborhood Boards. The following chapter discusses the significance of the findings with an emphasis on their future implications for the Neighborhood Board system in Honolulu as well as the implications that they hold for similar kinds of citizen participation projects elsewhere.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This investigation was undertaken on the premise that citizen participation is an indispensable aspect of public health and social development. It is, at the same time, a process which is carried out with difficulty, without a sound conceptual foundation or tested methodology.

This study grew out of an opportunity to analyze a formal, legislated citizen participation process that was implemented under the auspices of Honolulu's City Charter. It provided a natural setting for the gathering of information and consequent understanding about legislatively mandated citizen participation programs.

The research objective was determined in recognition of:

1. The need for more information and understanding of citizen participation processes;
2. The implications for public health practice in planning, management, and training; and
3. The need and importance of learning about gathering data from those involved in community participation programs.

The primary question of this research activity was: "What are the significant factors and processes that contribute to the initiation and sustainment of citizen participation in social planning?"

The sub-objectives of the investigation were:

1. To identify the factors and processes that contribute to the initiation (seeking election) of participation on the Neighborhood Boards.
2. To identify the factors and processes that contributed to sustained (seeking election beyond a two-year term) participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

3. To identify the factors and processes that contribute to the exit of citizens from participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

The chapter begins by summarizing the research findings and discussing their implications for the Neighborhood Boards, other citizen participation programs and for practitioners in public health and other community-based activities. Speculations about future research are also presented.

**Factors Contributing to the Initiation of Participation:**

**Major Findings**

The following were identified as factors that contribute to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards.

- A sense of duty as a citizen
- Particular issues (primarily involving development issues within the neighborhood)
- Personal reasons (primarily revolving around "voice" themes)
- Home ownership in the respective neighborhood (approximately 9/10 of the sample represented propertied households)
- High educational attainment (median attainment was a Bachelor's degree)
- Active participation in other civic/voluntary organizations (median of belonging to five organizations before being elected to the Neighborhood Board)
Ethnicity—Being Caucasian (the Caucasians are significantly overrepresented on the Neighborhood Boards; they comprise approximately 25% of the population of the City and County of Honolulu and 46% on the Neighborhood Boards)

Residence in the neighborhood for 14 years (median)

Full-time employment in the private sector

Being married

Belonging to the 45-54 age bracket (the median age bracket)

As a whole these factors point out significantly that citizens from the higher strata of the socioeconomic spectrum seek election to the Neighborhood Boards. Wilenski (1975) reported that in the United States in general, channels for participation are dominated by the upper middle class. The findings of other studies were consistent with those of this investigation: "A sense of duty as a citizen" (Verba & Nie, 1972); high educational attainment (Rosenau, 1974; Inkeles, 1969; DiPalma, 1970); the dominance of whites in planning and environmental issues (Robbins, 1975; Zinger, Dalsemer, & Margargle, 1973); active participation in multiple organizations (Brown & Rehfuss, 1975; Parkum & Parkum, 1973); higher participation among males (Milbraith, 1965; Agger, Goldrich, & Swanson, 1964; Nie, Verba, & Kim, 1974); being married (Olsen, 1972); stable residence in the community—attributable to home ownership (Onibokum & Curry, 1976; Stegger, 1975); and belonging to the middle age (Nie, Verba & Kim, 1974; Rosenau, 1974; Bell, et al., 1961).

Other studies confirmed this investigation's findings of the relationship between feelings of political efficacy and competence
and community participation. Friedmann (1974) and Almond and Verba (1963) noted that the sense of political efficacy is a major explanatory factor for citizen complaint behavior (voice). Smith, Macaulay and Associates (1980) concur that community involvement often leads from informal to formal participation. "The decision to be active frequently leads to a perceived need for formal organizational affiliation in order to be able to command the economic and personnel resources necessary to make one's voice heard in community decision-making" (p. 155).

Attitudes or beliefs are also believed to be related to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards. As reflected in the personal reasons and in the particular issues that motivated initiation in the sample, frequent references were made regarding the wisdom of the citizens and of their input in the decision-making processes of the city. References were also made regarding the perceived needs to correct and prevent unjust decisions that were being made by public officials. Parkum (1973) verified that specific attitudes and beliefs were more significant in explaining the involvement of citizens than demographic variables of sex, race, age, education, and income. The specific beliefs used as variables in another (Chapin's Social Participation Scale) study with similar results were feelings of opportunity to make views known in community meetings; feelings of having a say in committee decisions; and belief that a health care delivery system controlled solely by providers will have to be adopted.
Ethnicity plays a strong part in the disproportionately high representation of Caucasians on the Neighborhood Boards. This may best be explained by the fact that Neighborhood Boards are perceived as the next best vehicle for "voice" in government compared to the traditional active participation in bi-partisan elective politics. The Japanese use the legislative process (where they have comprised the majority ethnic group in the Hawaii State Legislature for the past generation). The Caucasians, relative newcomers (except for the "old name" families associated with turn-of-the-century Hawaiian history) find the Neighborhood Boards to be the best entry point and the most accessible means of providing opportunities for "voice" in the governmental decision-making process. For the Caucasian, the Boards present opportunities for added leverage in the decision-making process which differ from the Japanese and other ethnic groups. The Neighborhood Board mechanism additionally provides opportunities to become involved without as much campaigning and networking as in the traditional elective political arena.

In summary, the factors contributing to the initiation of participation on the Neighborhood Boards are associated with the characteristics of the middle class and upper social classes: high educational attainment; home ownership; active participation in community affairs via membership in multiple organizations; and generally high feelings of political efficacy and competence (which are related to the belief that citizen voice is necessary to effect changes in the decision-making process. Being middle-aged and married
also are significant contributing factors to the initiation of participation.

Factors Relating to the Initiation of Participation:

Implication of the Findings for the Neighborhood Boards

The implications of these findings for the Neighborhood Boards primarily refer to the issue of appropriate and equitable representation of the population of the City and County of Honolulu. If Neighborhood Boards are to serve as the primary vehicles to influence public policy, then the question is raised, "How representative of the entire socio-economic spectrum of the city is the current system?"

The Neighborhood Boards were established to increase grass roots participation of Honolulu's citizens and "to increase and assure effective citizen participation in the decisions of the city" (Neighborhood Commission, "Honolulu's Neighborhood Board System"). The qualifications for seeking election were minimal, opening candidacy to "all residents 18 years and older, of the island of Oahu, State of Hawaii, including military personnel and aliens ..." (Honolulu's Neighborhood Board System).

In spite of the minimum qualifications for candidacy, persons with characteristics of the middle and upper classes are disproportionately represented on the Boards. This finding warrants the following considerations:

The opportunities for voice of the dominant stratum of the socio-economic spectrum are increased and enhanced. The strata that are not represented on the Boards are not heard by the decision makers. The interaction and the subsequent learning of the dominant
group is, once again, enhanced over that of the group that is not represented.

Continuance of this trend would lead to an increased gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots." It would be in contradiction of a dictum of the Overlap Theory—to expand the number and variety of the social roles of citizens. The theory expects members of the various socio-economic strata to influence each other, "breaking down stereotypes and opening new lines of communication as they work jointly to implement community action proposals. (Zurcher, 1970, p. 14)

If the Boards should continue in this mode of selective representation of interests, and if they come to be perceived as a closed system, then there is a possibility that the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" will increase. Continued participation on the part of a select stratum of the population will affect the perception of the general population, contributing to the discrediting of the Boards as being a genuine "grass roots" organization.

Therefore, in light of these implications, some suggestions are presented:

1. Implementation of a mechanism to elect or select a membership that reflects the characteristics of the population of the neighborhood according to criteria (to be determined) would be in keeping with the original intent of the City Charter. An equitable representation of the socio-economic strata would then enhance the development of a "culture" of common experiences within each Neighborhood Board. The central themes of the conceptual framework of this investigation, consisting of collaboration, dialogue and interaction within the Board membership could then be duplicated in their efforts toward working with the City Council and city government.
2. Consonant with the Overlap Theory's principle of the development of a socializing effect on the members of an organization, the development of an association of Neighborhood Boards\(^1\) is encouraged for the following reasons:

   a. It would serve to unite the citizen efforts of the various neighborhoods across the entire City and County of Honolulu by highlighting the common denominators of all of the various neighborhoods and decrease the tendency for the separate boards to operate in an insular manner;

   b. It would provide a variety of social contexts and experiences for each individual, thereby contributing to his personal growth (which is an important component of achieving participatory competence);

   c. It would contribute to the expanded consciousness and awareness of the citizen of the world about him. To quote Kieffer (1981) when he addressed the intrinsic aspects of empowerment of citizens:

   Men develop their power to perceive critically the way they exert in the world with which and in which they find themselves. . . . they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation. Like its converse, "powerlessness," empowerment is not approached as an objective entity, but as a subjective sense of capability and consciousness. It represents an analytic and intentional engagement in the continuous process of construction and transformation of social meanings of social systems. (pp. 21-22)

\(^1\)This is not a new concept. It has been suggested for years by many Neighborhood Board members.
Factors Relating to the Initiation of Participation:  
Implications of the Findings for Public Health Practitioners

How does this investigation and its findings relate to public health? The response lies in referring to the opening sentence of Chapter I--"The involvement of citizens in decision making is a growing dimension in national and international public health practice." This statement underscores the various aspects of public health practice in several areas which seek more information and data to enhance the participation processes:

1. The Primary Health Care Movement in which citizen participation is a key component.

2. The ongoing operations of federally initiated programs which called for consumer input. A local example is the State Health Planning and Development Agency which was initially implemented under the auspices of P.L. 93-641 (amended by P.L. 96-79).

3. The pursuit by hospitals and health care programs to gain the needed input of consumer to meet consumer needs and consequently to survive a highly competitive health care industry.

4. The infinite number of self-help groups which provide services and support to specific strata of the population.

5. Community Organization: Groups that are seeking to organize and mobilize themselves or others in order to achieve better states of personal and community health.

6. Policy formation and planning activities sponsored by private agencies, municipal, state and federal governments.

For persons involved in projects which entail citizen input, it is critical to consider from which segment(s) of the population they are seeking participation. Leaving participation open to anyone does not guarantee heterogeneous representation of the population. In most cases, the more educated citizens will aggressively participate in
community affairs than those who are less educated and who belong to the lower socio-economic strata. Given an equal opportunity to participate in a project, a sponsor can expect to have those persons who have a vested stake in the neighborhood will participate more than those that do not. (If the problem that was under consideration involved rent control and high home rental rates, a higher percentage of renters would be expected to participate. The assumption that the motivation to participate in community affairs is primarily based on altruism is rejected in favor of the fact that individuals participate out of a problem-solving, solution-seeking need which is consistent with the adult learning model.

Although mandated or voluntary associations such as fraternal societies and civic associations are not the structures where lower-income individuals are apt to become involved and although mandated citizen organizations fail to promote community participation, political influence, and leadership development in non-middle class populations (Kieffer, 1981, p. 28), there are arguments to support the recruitment of lower socio-economic participants into any aspects of community participation. The proportionately higher gains of non-middle class participants as reported by Smith, Macaulay and Associates (1980, p. 120) reinforces the fact that in order to increase the representation

2The context of the phrase "non-middle class" as used by Kieffer is interpreted in the following manner: Although he (Kieffer) may have alluded to the fact that the middle class is the strongest portion of the population to become involved in legislated or mandated citizen participation programs, it should also include the upper socio-economic echelon as well.
of lower socio-economic strata of the population, sustained or increased
efforts of recruiting from these populations is highly warranted.

An obvious implication for practitioners in the community is that
they will need to encourage and support the participation of lower-
income groups with which they are in contact. It means that beyond
the mere delivery of direct services to the community, practitioners
will need to consciously, methodically, and persistently seek to become
involved in community activities in order to serve not only as role
models for participation, but also to keep abreast of developments
which affect the citizens who are affected. In this manner, they will
be able to mutually problem-solve with the citizens. Smith, Macaulay
and Associates (1980), note the natural progression of community
involvement from informal types of participation to formal ones. It
means that practitioners will need to seek the development of the total
person rather than only in specialized aspects of health care delivery.
It means that practitioners will need to look at seeking to empower
citizens, especially those in the lower socio-economic strata implic-
cating the fostering of environments which encourage the participation
of citizens in any and all aspects of group endeavor, from rudimentary
self-help and social groups to more sophisticated social action
organizations. The primary strategy of these actions is to bring forth,
to bring out, and to encourage the self-expression of the citizens--
beginning from where the citizens are performing and encouraging them
to move forward and outward in relating to their environments.
Besides the efforts of community practitioners in recruiting and encouraging low income and underrepresented groups of citizens in citizen participation activities, a few policy-based recommendations are suggested:

1. Legislation such as Title XV of the Public Health Service Act of the Comprehensive Health Planning Programs, serve as initial models (in principle) from which to increase the participation of citizens that broadly represent the population served.

2. Random selection of participants would partially address the issue of proportionate representation of the population served.\(^3\)

3. The University of Hawaii School of Public Health could serve as a resource in providing ongoing training for citizens who are involved in community activities. The training would entail the principles of adult education, small group theory in practice, and in the various applications of the behavioral sciences.

The implementation of some or all of these recommendations would partially address and prevent the disproportionate representation in citizen participation programs of one group over another. The domination of one group over an underrepresented or unrepresented group would thus be prevented. This would be in keeping with the democratic ideal of achieving equitable representation of the various strata that comprise a community.

Factors Contributing to the Sustainment of Participation:

**Major Findings**

The factors listed below were identified to be significant in the sustainment of participation by citizens.

---

\(^3\)This has been popularly advocated by Tom Dinell (a member of the investigator's doctoral committee).
A need to keep up with what is happening in the neighborhood

A sense of duty and commitment to the community

A need to take responsibility for decisions that affect the respective citizen and to avoid having others make decisions for them

A recognition of the importance of keeping in touch with state and city officials

The teamwork, support and encouragement among members of the Neighborhood Board

Satisfaction derived from (a) having more than 50% of one's recommendations adopted by the Board; (b) holding office on the Board; and (c) feelings of influence on the Board

The belief that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process

Home ownership.

The "inside model," introduced in the conceptual framework is supported by the fact that "to keep in touch with state or city officials" was among the primary reasons for sustained participation. Maintaining communication and dialogue with the state or city officials is critical because vital opportunities could be lost by direct conflict methods and because further alienation between citizens and the Establishment would cut them off from the opportunity to expand their social roles through participation in community affairs. An atmosphere of give-and-take has more of a socializing effect on all parties involved—the implicit factor being that not only the citizens become socialized in the process, but that the city officials are also influenced in the process.

There were slight variations in a comparison of the self-reported reasons for sustainment between members who served one term or less
and those that served for more than one term. The most significant variations dealt with issues of leadership on the Neighborhood Board and of the import that was placed on the influence of other Board members. The data suggest that issues of leadership and the interpersonal dynamics between members on the Neighborhood Board are more important to newer members than to veterans. Members who have served for a shorter time look to the leadership for guidance, encouragement and "example." Although these issues of leadership and of inspiration from other members belong to the secondary reasons for sustained participation, they comprise the primary features of socialization in human organizations.

A conscious and sustained effort to provide encouragement and support to members is important because the absence of these factors would leave the Neighborhood Boards with a cluster of primary factors of sustainment which are comprised of preoccupations with individual task orientations. A comparison of the nature of the primary and secondary reasons for participation reflected the following significant trend:

Except for the factor, "There is a special project/cause that I would like to continue supporting," the secondary reasons were comprised of factors that referred to "social" considerations. That is, they referred to the social context of participation rather than the task orientations that were reflected in the primary reasons. Terms and phrases such as "teamwork," "support and encouragement of members," "good leadership," "people," "socialize," "prestige," and "other members," refer to phenomena and people who comprise the human (external) environment of the citizen. These terms and phrases refer to other people and the social environments that are symbolically significant to people. The context of belonging to a group of people, organization, or profession is inherently dominant in this cluster of reasons.
By contrast, the general contexts of the primary reasons have more of a task orientation. Terms and phrases such as "duty," "to keep up," "responsibility," "fulfill," and "to keep in touch with state or city officials," reflect conditions of action or of purpose. Although themes associated with "voice" were involved, there was an absence of a sense of teamwork. The reasons mentioned had an underlying theme which reflected an individualistic tone in sharp contrast to the secondary reasons which placed a higher value on group norms.

In another context, the primary factors can be said to be cognitively based whereas the secondary factors are affectively based.

The primary and secondary reasons can also be categorized into two basic groups. The first is the "motivator" category. These are the factors which "drive" individuals to continue to participate. "A need to keep up with neighborhood happenings," as well as "duty," fall within this category. The second is the "reinforcer" category. These factors have more of a "payoff" value to the citizen, providing some intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for being involved. Such factors as "feelings of influence" and satisfactions from having recommendations adopted by the Board represent this category. This category is synonymous with the empowerment theme discussed earlier. Adopting and applying this "reinforcer"/"driver" dichotomy to the self-reported reasons for sustainment resulted in the following: The primary reasons for sustainment fell into the "driver" category and the secondary reasons fell into the "reinforcer" category.

The finding that the primary sustaining reasons are predominantly rational and task-oriented and that the secondary reasons are socially oriented support Argyris' (1962) Type 1 and Type 2 categories. The Type 1 category is characterized as a "closed" model. It is "closed"
to new attitudes, values, and feelings, and requires the same of others. This is contrasted with the Type 2 category, which is characterized by openness to new attitudes, values, and feelings, and permits others to experience the same.

**Implications of the Findings Relating to Sustained Participation for Citizen Participation Programs and Neighborhood Boards**

The general implication of these findings suggests that citizen participation programs need to develop and to focus on processes to coalesce the membership around group and affective factors. The road to participatory competence lies first in the development of interpersonal communication within the group before addressing the external environment with clarity and unity of purpose. In order for citizen groups to voice their opinions more clearly and effectively, they must be able to communicate and voice themselves to the external environment. Empowerment then follows as a result of effective intragroup communication. The intermingling of people who lack shared meanings leads to a throttling of communication (Lippitt, Watson & Westley, 1958, p. 30). The throttling of communication is the throttling of citizen voice. "Eventually, through the sharing of affect and the successful solving of problems, new shared meanings can be developed to bridge the differences between the disparate elements, and more communication can ensue among all the people concerned" (p. 30).

It is critical for any citizen participation organization to stabilize and strengthen its internal dynamics before it can effectively influence the external environment. A group's total energy (synergy),
less the energy expended on internal dynamics (maintenance energy) determines the amount of energy remaining (residue) that enables the group to carry out its purposes (Lippett et al., 1958, p. 35). If energy is wasted in persistent internal conflict, irrelevant activities and in modes of behavior which produce only negative or destructive effects within the system, then the organization will lose its membership through exit and lose its effective voice (p. 38).

A suggested strategy in addressing the need to coalesce the board membership around group and affective factors lies in the implementation of what have popularly been called T-groups, encounter groups or sensitivity training. The common base of these groups, whatever they are called, is experiential group learning. Blumberg and Golembiewski (1976, p. 13) cite the positive impacts on members of these groups, which include:

- experiencing a rare sense of community;
- becoming close to people in an unusually intense way;
- being able to share their warmth with another person;
- becoming free to reveal themselves as people; and
- developing a sense of their own personal worth that might have been previously lacking.

Communities fail to grow because of apathy and "fragmentation" (p. 36). Apathy originates in past failures, factionalism and loss of communal self-confidence. Fragmentation derives from the tendency to rely on community subgroups (interest or pressure groups) instead of on a community-wide organization, in the belief that one's own group can prevail over another group. In the case of the Neighborhood
Boards, it is critical that they be able to resolve and to coalesce the various interest groups into a community-wide effort. Applying the principle to other citizen participation projects which include various interest groups within the community, it is crucial that a community-wide spirit of problem-solving take precedence over win-lose conflicts between interest groups. Within the model presented by Bennis (1969), individuals will learn how to be more effective "linking pins," serving as relayers of information and as mediators between the many contending interest groups. Members would also serve more effectively in relaying information to the greater community-at-large to avoid the isolation of their participation efforts.

The application of the principles of planned change are appropriate in this context. The application of small-group methods to develop the ability of citizens to participate in "temporary systems" of "strangers" is important. In these training programs, citizens would learn to develop a common culture of experience through intensive and guided group interaction conducted by a trainer. They would learn to establish common grounds of communication and interpersonal relationships which would enhance the development of a group-oriented, affectively cohesive team. This team would have more residual energy to expend on group goals. In other words, the solidarity incentives and purposive incentives would be strengthened. Sullivan (1984)

---

4A conscious, deliberate, and collaborative effort to improve the operations of a human system, whether it be self-system, social system, or cultural system, through the utilization of scientific knowledge (Bennis et al., 1969, p. 4).
reinforces the fact that in voluntary associations which cannot or do not rely heavily on material incentives such as monetary compensation, titles and honors, the esteem of fellow members and the commitment to a common goal play large roles in maintaining a group.

Sponsors of citizen participation programs, in addition to implementing the programs for citizen input, need to consider the inclusion of the training and support components of the participatory processes. In the case of the Neighborhood Boards, the City and County of Honolulu would be the appropriate party responsible for the provision of adequate funding for the ongoing training of Neighborhood Board members. Assistance to the Boards needs to be available on a continuous basis, with the contracting of resource individuals or organizations to provide the necessary consultation and training sessions to the Board members.

The findings of this investigation corroborate the fact that citizens "come and go" in response to specific issues that need to be solved. Instead of envisioning the Neighborhood Boards as one organization that enables citizen participation, it seems more realistic to view it in terms of a series of temporary groupings of strangers coming together to solve specific problems. This supports Bennis' (1966, p. 11) statement that "... we will tend to rely more heavily ... on temporary social arrangements ..." He goes on to state how organizations of the future will be rapidly changing temporary systems organized around problems-to-be-solved by relative strangers (p. 12).

The concepts of the "Normative-Re-educative strategies of changing" (Bennis et al., 1969, p. 43) are central to this approach. In it,
the interrelationship between research, training, and action in the problem-solving process are emphasized (p. 43). The goals of the approach being: (1) the improvement of the problem-solving capabilities of a system (p. 46); and (2) releasing and fostering growth in the persons who make up the system to be changed (p. 48). More specific to the problem-solving process are the collection of data about how the organization is functioning and providing feedback to the organization leaders, the training of managers in methods of problem solving via laboratory sessions. In short, the programs for implementing planned organizational change, which are suggested for organizations such as the Neighborhood Boards include training [where participants examine their interpersonal relationships in an unstructured setting (p. 70)], consultation (where the problems of the organization are presented and action taken), and applied research [where data are reported in "feedback meetings where subjects become clients and have a chance to review the findings and to test them against their own experiences" (p. 71)].

It is important for citizens to learn from their experiences, especially regarding the impacts of their participation. As presented earlier, the notion of empowerment as presented by Kieffer is instructive--It is how citizens perceive and achieve feelings of their "ability to" rather than their achieving "control over" that is critical.

A prime example of the differences of perception of the terms "power" and "influence" can be seen by comparing the findings of this
study with the PAC West Community Associates evaluation of the Neighborhood Boards.

In this study, there was a distinct pattern of satisfaction that the participants received from participating on the Boards. The self-reports from the sample primarily reflected satisfaction from having voiced their concerns and opinions as well as from feelings of having had an influence on the outcomes of decisions of the city. "Voice" and "influence" themes scored twice as many times as the themes as the themes reflecting "duty." These themes combined to represent a majority of the satisfactions received from participating on the Neighborhood Boards. These results contradict the evaluation of the Neighborhood Boards conducted by PAC West Community Associates, Inc. in 1979 (refer to Chapter I of this report). In that evaluation, it was stated that "There is no available evidence to indicate that the Boards have been able to noticeably affect the decisions of the City. The PAC West statement primarily referred to the Development Plan process as being the possible source of evidence of non-impact of the Boards. The important point here is the disparate interpretations and the subsequent perceptions of different segments of the community of the term "influence." The real issue of empowerment within the context of this investigation is to fathom the perceptions and feelings of the participants themselves. Having participated and voiced their input is but the beginning towards the more concrete, linear definition of "empowerment." Additionally, it is not realistic nor fair to expect a group of citizens given an "advisory" role to the City Council to influence the decisions of the city without giving them similar privileges of decision making.
The fact that the self-reported reasons for their sustainment on the Boards were primarily task-oriented and laden with individualistic reasons leaves the investigator with some apprehensions about the future of the Neighborhood Boards and of any citizen participation program which does not address the development of a support system for its members.

Whereas the presence of support structures in our lives contributes strongly to psychological and emotional well-being, conversely, an absence of these structures is a major determinant of emotional illness. Failures to secure adequate support increase personal and social disorganization (Berkowitz, 1982, p. 6). Similarly, organizations and human groupings suffer from similar symptoms when they do not have parallel support structures. Beginning with bases in families, friendship groups and emanating outward beyond the home, support structures provide the needed functions to individuals in the community, some better than others. While many evolve naturally, there are other needs for which structures have to be created: block associations, parent cooperatives, mediation centers, community gardens, anti-crime patrols, after-school programs, and ad hoc action committees. They require collective work, some resulting in easily tangible services such as day care and others more abstract, such as a network of presidents of neighborhood associations. Citizens and citizen groups have the most difficulty in the creation and the maintenance of support structures for the more abstract activities of participation. The activities that deal with long-range plans and policy determination are the activities which present abstract and conceptual frameworks which do not manifest themselves in immediate and tangible products and services.
Other forms of support systems include coalitions of agencies that can provide the necessary training and consultation functions for citizens. The Health and Community Services Council of Hawaii is such an organization with a membership comprised of private agencies which have the capacity to develop support programs. As mentioned in Chapter I of this report, Berkowitz (1982) summarizes the desired functions served by support mechanisms:

Security--Giving participants a positive feeling of simply being there, like money in the bank.

Recognition--It recognizes members as unique and individual persons.

Affirmation--Members are made to feel worthwhile--as valuable members of the group.

Task-oriented assistance--For example, members are given technical assistance in legal matters or grant-writing activities or in simple activities such as babysitting while members attend a meeting.

Emotional comfort--It guides members through difficult times.

Personal growth--It encourages risk-taking, giving approval for successes and providing a cushion in the event of failures.

Stimulates community participation--It encourages members to get involved in community affairs.

If the development of group cohesion and strength within citizen groups are either neglected or left to chance without benefit of concerted, conscious efforts towards planned change and for the development of support systems, there is the possibility that the organization will literally wither away as the last of the charismatic and great leaders exit from the organization. Additionally, there is a possibility that those persons remaining in the organizations are loyal hangers-on with behavioral characteristics that would discourage or
downplay the participation of citizens who require support and
guidance through the complexity of the participatory process.

In summary, the implications for practitioners who work with
community groups are related to the fact that the mere introduction
of programs espousing citizen input alone will not necessarily result
in equitable and desired citizen participation. Olsen (1972, p. 185),
commenting on the weakness of the participatory process states, "... it
relies on an individual learning process to move people from par­
ticipation in decision-making without providing for any social­
structural supports for this concern or activity," nor does it
"specify any procedures through which individuals are to expand their
participation in public decision-making, but merely assumes that people
will become more involved in traditional affairs. Training programs,
especially those that are group and process oriented, are necessary
to augment the citizen participation programs. It is recommended that
community practitioners of citizen participation, and more specifically,
public health practitioners, become more competent in the arenas of
small group facilitation and of planned change. Three contexts of
working with the citizen groups fall into three general categories:

1. as targets of change
2. as mediums of change
3. as agents of change

In some instances, the groups are the targets of change. Time and
energy are spent on changing the group or the individuals within the
group. In others, the group is used as a means of change. The group
setting and its dynamics serving as the means of change. Finally,
the groups may become agents of change, functioning as the intervening variables that provide guidance and models for other organizations. In this vein, the Boards serve as the link between the community and the city government.

The training functions are primarily the responsibility of the organization that sponsors citizen participation projects (such as the City and County of Honolulu), the agencies and institutions within the respective community (such as the University of Hawaii's Graduate School of Public Health), and the various community organizations which seek to promote and extend the level of citizen participation. In the participatory and the training processes, it is incumbent on the community (public health) practitioners to advocate and enhance the input of less competent participants by encouraging, advising, and providing ongoing reinforcements to them: Concentrating on the reinforcing factors rather than driving forces--the ultimate goal being the effective, sustained participation of citizens.

Factors Relevant to the Exit of Members from Neighborhood Boards.

Before discussing the factors which contribute to exit, the assets and liabilities of sustained participation are presented to provide a proper context for exit. This is necessary because of the interrelatedness among initiating, sustaining and exit factors.

One of the advantages of sustained citizen participation is that it provides continuity from one time period to the next. The following factors are important considerations in advocating for sustained participation:
1. Because Neighborhood Boards meet once a month, it is doubtful whether adequate time is spent on agenda items for adequate discussion, exploration and resolution.

2. It is doubtful whether 12 meetings a year provide enough opportunity for dialogue and interaction among members and between them and the city officials to resolve and explore issues as well as to learn from each other.

3. It takes time and frequency of contact to forge effective relationships which foster the cooperation and sense of interdependence among fellow members and between them and the city officials.

4. It takes a relatively long time to achieve conditions of participatory competence.

5. Many issues addressed by the Neighborhood Boards are cumulative in nature. The life cycle of these issues is often inextricably tied to specific individuals and personalities who dedicate themselves to the resolution of these issues. Continued momentum is possible only through the sustained efforts of certain members to insure the needed momentum.

A stereotypical characteristic of a bureaucracy is its ability to resist change. Two terms that best define the advantage of sustained participation are "continuity" and "momentum." They are especially critical in arenas where change strategies within grinding bureaucratic institutions are involved. The sustained effort of citizen organizations often require the participation of certain key figures who provide the steady and constant maintenance of effort which is frequently required for long-range issues and projects.
Given the positive perspectives of sustained participation, there are liabilities which detract from citizens remaining involved for too long a time period. Although the implicit tenor of discussions about sustained citizen participation are usually positive, its liabilities also need to be considered. A discussion of loyalty serves this purpose.

Thus far, exit and voice, as presented within the context introduced by Hirschman (1970) have been discussed to some extent. The third concept, "loyalty," needs to be elaborated. In this context of voice and exit, loyalty has nothing to do with an organizationally positive factor. It refers to a tendency for the consumer (the citizen) to continue consuming a good or service despite negative returns compared to the time and monetary (tax dollars) amounts that have been invested.

The negative connotation of loyalty in terms of voice and exit is that it discourages or prevents "voice." Carried to logical ends, loyalty is the antithesis of voice and consequently is the death knell of change—the muting force of voice.

Further, sustained participation by "incompetent" citizens is a discouraging factor to other participants. This is a reality because of the minimal requirements for qualifications to seek election to the Neighborhood Boards. Sustained participation by even competent "veterans" has a tendency to discourage the participation of newer members. The formation of a "club" atmosphere, which provides less opportunities to other potential participants, is a real and present
danger to any participatory mechanism. Hirschman (1970) recognized this when he stated:

In order to retain their ability to fight deterioration, those organizations that rely primarily on one of the two reactions (voice or exit) mechanisms need an occasional injection of the other. (p. 126)

There are advantages of a high turnover rate of citizen participation on the Boards. It assures a revolving door atmosphere, developing a larger base of citizens who have been initiated to the participation experience. As mentioned earlier, those who are introduced to the participation experience have a high probability of renewed participation, thereby forming a larger pool of citizens with participatory experience.

In the context of the loyalty as presented above, exit takes on a new and positive implication for organizations. The implication of loyalty and exit for organizations such as Neighborhood Boards is that instead of prolonging the participation of citizens for its own sake, it becomes necessary to temper sustained participation with a more rational logic. It calls for the preparation of citizens to question the factors underlying their loyalty and to consider voice as a more viable option. It means that citizens must consider exit as a better alternative than loyalty to insure opportunities for other citizens to exercise their voice options.

With these considerations presented, the factors contributing to exit from participation on the Neighborhood Boards are presented with an accompanying discussion of their significance and implications for the Boards as well as for other citizen participation projects.
Factors Contributing to the Exit of Citizens from the Neighborhood Boards

Exit from the Boards was not attributable to reported bad experiences. The factor of time was the most prominent reason for exit given by 36 out of 57 (63.2%) former members of the Neighborhood Boards. Changes in priorities in the lives of the participants were inferred to be signs of certain needs of the participants to have been met while serving on the Boards. The primary reasons for the initiation and sustainment of participation had also reflected issue-focused/issue-specific themes, thus supporting a logical inferential extension for related reasons for exit. It is suggested that the reasons for exit are primarily based on the fact that citizens exit from the Boards after specific issues in which they are concerned are resolved. This is consistent with the adult learning model—that people will seek immediate solutions to problems and then move on to other life activities.

The generally positive tone of the exit of members from the Boards reflects a confidence and certain level of comfort which might be based on the following factors:

1. As mentioned previously, it is a reflection of the adult-learning model—that adults will participate to solve immediate problems at hand and go on to solve the next problem.

2. The network of associations with other persons and organizations in the neighborhood provide the citizen who exits with a confidence that he can once again rely upon when necessary.
3. The citizen has been able to determine the appropriate modes of expression of voice between the various alternatives that are available. For example, Neighborhood Boards might be appropriate for resolving one kind of issue and the community association for another. Approximately three-tenths of the reasons for exit were due to frustrations and discouragements in the Neighborhood Boards. However, not even these reasons were strong enough to permanently discourage further participation by citizens.

Exit from participation did not implicate a permanent detachment from neighborhood or community participation, not even among members who had quit participating because of frustration or disappointment. Previously active members would consider active participation once again as crucial issues arose within the neighborhood. The significant implications of this finding are:

1. Efforts by persons or parties external to the citizen to sustain participation on Neighborhood Boards may not be as influential as crucial issues which are germane to the citizen's perception of his/her need to participate.

2. Social and altruistic motives once again are not as influential in the initiation and sustainment of participation as other more "crucial" factors. Threats to the individual's immediate environment and man-made environment are more influential factors on the decision to participate and to continue to participate than service, duty, and other socially and altruistically oriented factors (Dinell, 1969).
After citizens participate in such programs as the Neighborhood Boards, it is highly probable that although they no longer participate on the Neighborhood Boards (hold elected seats to the Board), they will actively participate if issues that impact them surface. Once voice is activated, people expect and demand more of the same. Participatory competence, similar to self-actualization, cannot be stripped from citizens. Although frustrations and discouragements may be realities to self-actualized persons as they are to non-actualized and oppressed peoples, the positive conditions of empowerment provide the momentum and sustained effort for those persons who have experienced some or all of the conditions leading to participatory competence. Additionally, the effects of organizational participation on political (voluntary citizen) participation are cumulative (Smith, Macaulay & Associates, 1980, p. 120). Group membership boosts the participation rate of lower socio-economic status individuals to a greater extent than similar membership does for higher socio-economic status individuals (p. 120). The implication of this finding is that the Neighborhood Board experience for persons of lower socio-economic status may have more relative impact in their empowerment process than it does for those of higher socio-economic status. This is possible even if these persons of lower status had previously less affiliations in organizations and less experience in community participation. In

---

5The findings of this investigation indicate a decrease in the participation in other organizations by the sample after their election to the Neighborhood Board.
essence, participation experiences in organizations such as Neighborhood Boards are the participatory "equalizers."

The following excerpts support the redeeming value of exit and the "apathy" that is so often pinpointed as a liability and weakness of the participatory process:

The discovery that citizens do not normally use more than a fraction of their political resources came originally as a surprise and disappointment to political scientists who had been brought up to believe that democracy requires for its functioning the fullest possible participation of all citizens. But soon enough a degree of apathy was found to have some compensating advantages inasmuch as it contributes to the stability and flexibility of a political system and provides for "reserves" of political resources which can be thrown into the battle in crisis situations. (Hirschman, 1970, p. 14)

... it has long been an article of faith of political theory that the proper functioning of democracy requires a maximally alert, active, and vocal public. In the United States, this belief was shaken by empirical studies of voting and political behavior which demonstrated the existence of considerable political apathy on the part of large sections of the public, for long periods of time. (p. 32)

... a mixture of alert and inert citizens, or even an alternation of involvement and withdrawal may actually serve democracy better than either total, permanent activism or total apathy. One reason, stressed by Robert Dahl, is that the ordinary failure, on the part of most citizens, to use their potential political resources to the full makes it possible for them to react with unexpected vigor--by using normally unused reserves of political power and influence--whenever their vital interests are directly threatened. (p. 32)

6 A recent example of this is the recall of three City Councilmen who "bolted" from the Democratic to the Republican party. They had not anticipated nor expected the negative reaction from their respective constituents.
The anchoring of participation to home ownership implicates the long-term-but-intermittent participation by citizens. Whether an individual chooses to participate on neighborhood matters or not, the singular and significant constant (for the 88% of members representing propertied households on the Neighborhood Boards) is territoriality. Coupled with this territoriality is the longevity and stability of residence of homeowners. He or she will participate when lifestyles or territory are at stake. This contributes to the intermittent and sporadic participation that is so often alluded to in derogatory terms by Neighborhood Board members, when in fact it is a common factor in the economic marketplace as well as a maxim of adult learning.

The fact that exit has positive implications for citizen participation has applicability to citizen participation training programs. Sustained participation and proactive exit, need to be viewed, not as well-defined entities limited only to the activities within a specific citizen participation project, but also from a broader scope. As consumers of goods and services, citizens face daily issues which implicate actions of voice, exit and loyalty beyond the narrow scopes of citizen participation projects. On this basis, then, the nature and content of citizen participation training efforts implicate broader, socio-political themes rather than focusing on learning the techniques of Parliamentary Procedure. The content of such training is suggested by referring to the conceptualization of participatory competence\(^7\) developed by Kieffer (1981, p. 26):

\(^7\)Kieffer interchangeably used the term "participatory competence" with "empowerment," "citizen competence," and "socio-political literacy."
1. A personal attitude or sense of self that promotes active social involvement.

2. A knowledge and capacity for critical analysis of the social and political systems which define one's environment.

3. An ability to develop action strategies and cultivate resources for attaining of one's own goals, and

4. An ability to act efficaciously in concert with others in defining and attaining collective goals.

The members of the sample that no longer served on Neighborhood Boards expressed strong indications of remaining vigilant about goings on in the neighborhood, supporting the fact that exit from one specific participatory activity need not be interpreted as a total and complete exit from the total context of community participation. The feedback they provided reflected a strong sense of defining the conditions or becoming involved once again on the Neighborhood Boards on their own terms. There was a sense of empowerment in their delineation of the kind and level of potential re-involvement. There were no expressions of "giving up" or abandonment of the process of providing voice in the Neighborhood Board process. The investigator perceived a sense of empowerment in their being able to withhold further participation. Perhaps those who no longer served felt more personally empowered than those who were currently holding seats on the Neighborhood Boards ... simply based on the fact that the current elected members of neighborhood boards were not in a position to "exit" gracefully from their responsibilities. In contrast, the veterans were in a position to choose when and under what conditions they would become re-involved.
The investigator contends here that empowerment is not only the acquisition of feelings of influence and of the capability of "doing," but also having the capability to withhold participation.

Being active in other community organizations also provides the members of the Neighborhood Board viable options for voice as well as for exit. Since bureaucracies are often perceived as serving themselves rather than the citizen (internal efficiency being more important than the response to the needs of those for whom the organization was originally established) citizens may fall back on other community organizations in cases where actions of the Boards are met with frustrating and discouraging resistance by the city government. Naisbitt (1982, p. 150) mentions a fact that supports the philosophy of the self-help, mutual aid movements: "... people feel unable to control big government and the distant bureaucracies and so are drawn to mutual-aid groups that enable them to deal directly with some immediate problems of everyday life." If Neighborhood Boards are not given the voice that was offered by the City Charter, then citizens will rely on their networks within other community organizations.

Based on a long range continuum of empowerment, the Neighborhood Boards and similarly structured processes of citizen participation belong to the "long term process of adult learning and development" (Kieffer, 1983, p. 3).

Significance of the Findings: Factors Contributing to Exit

The most salient implication of the findings of this investigation in regard to exit is the relationship that is maintained with the adult learning model. That exit from participation in projects like
the Neighborhood Boards do not necessarily mean total and permanent exit from community participation highlights the importance of recognizing the adult learning motivations of citizens to participate in decision making. It serves to underscore the reality that in most cases, motivations to exit are inextricably connected to the factors that contributed to the initiation and sustainment of participation.

Although the investigative procedure isolated initiation, sustainment and exit factors as separate entities and were scrutinized independently, a final analysis indicates the necessity to view them as a continuum within each individual's participatory experience. The implication for practitioners is that exit from one participatory experience may be the signal for readiness for another level of participation. Within the context of the adult learning model, it may be the reflection of movement and growth of the individual's participatory competence.

Concluding Remarks

The combination of career experiences in the Community Action Program and the Model Cities Program with those of this research effort serve to highlight a significant factor for this investigator: there is no singular panacea or process of citizen participation which serves entire populations for extended periods of time. The Community Action Program and the Model Cities Programs were conceived to ameliorate specific needs of the country at a specific time period. The Neighborhood Board concept evolved out of legacies of these two programs in Honolulu. From the disadvantaged citizen, the citizen participation
movement shifted upward to include the working and middle classes and the upper strata of the socio-economic scale.

The levels of participation of socio-economic groups are as varied as the issues under consideration for final decisions. The definition of the term "citizen" as "any person that is or is potentially impacted by a policy decision," implicitly may include any echelon of society at any given time, depending on the issues in question. Thus, it is almost natural for society to accept the ad hoc nature of participation, where citizens with like interests or concerns will come forward to advocate their points of view till there is resolution to their specific goals.

As a value, then, it is a hope that citizen participation will continue to be held as a high priority for societies. As strategies and as specific actions of individuals and groups of citizens, it is also hoped that citizen participation will continue, more often on spontaneous and ad hoc bases, without dependence on guided and often manipulated sponsorship of the larger power-wielding institutions. Berkowitz (1982, p. 13), citing reasons for alienation caused by institutionalized help states:

Helping agencies . . . attract power away from individuals and local supportive networks, absorbing it into the larger organization. If I as an individual no longer feel as responsible for helping, I suppress much of my own capacity to help; I give it over to the helping agency as the legitimate authority on the matter. In this sense, my own helping power diminishes, strained though it might have been by continuous demands. If those around me think the same, the mutual dependencies in our community--a source of community strength--weaken, for we have transferred our dependency from ourselves to an institution. We are that much more separate from each other.
Goodman (1971) addressed the issue of the trend of all socio-economic strata of society, from the poor and disadvantaged to the upper-middle and upper classes, converging onto the arena of participation in planning:

Grafting a system of pluralist mechanisms, like advocacy planning, to this structure cannot solve the dilemma of the basically undemocratic nature of societies which are based on a capitalist model. Promoting democracy in a capitalist economy through pluralist mechanisms carries with it the likelihood that those with more economic means have more ability to control their personal and political lives. (p. 173)

Within the present structure of our society, giving citizens more access to planning expertise doesn't basically change their chances of getting the same goods as wealthier citizens. What it gives them is more power to compete among themselves for the government's...products...designed by both liberal and conservatives to make sure the status quo will not be disrupted. (p. 174)

Pluralist opportunities are therefore a necessary, but hardly sufficient condition for real social equality. For such equality to occur, pluralism must be tied to a political ideology which deals directly with the means of equally distributing economic power. (p. 175)

The preceding paragraph is not meant to detract from the capitalist model, nor does it embrace a repressive socialist economic system (the equal sharing of all resources of a society by all its people) as in the Soviet Union with its unresponsive, centralized bureaucratic institutions. This investigator primarily shares a concern with Goodman of the danger of the loss of personal control (p. 176) of citizens to produce and consume goods and services based on their needs rather than the norms of those in power (p. 196). The equal distribution of economic power is held to be the responsible exercise of voice and exit options by citizens in response to their environments.
It is also suggested that spontaneous and ad hoc responses by citizens can work effectively with the larger institutions in forging solutions which are larger and more comprehensive than the original presenting problems.

The following speculations are presented to exemplify the previous text as well as to suggest possible future research efforts.

1. Home ownership, male gender, and being married and significant interest in development issues (an area which would interest homeowners more than renters) were found to be among significant characteristics of Neighborhood Board members. Although the numbers are too small to be statistically valid, there might be validity to the fact that women comprise the majority of renters on the Neighborhood Boards. (Six of the 10 individuals in the sample who rented were female, four of whom were single or divorced.) Additionally, women might comprise the majority of single individuals on the Neighborhood Boards. Further studies of this factor would be warranted. If there is a concerted effort to increase the number of renters on the Neighborhood Boards or if there is a movement to increase the participation of women on the Neighborhood Boards, recruitment efforts among renters would possibly serve this purpose. There are implications also that recruitment among renters would increase the representation of single individuals as well.

2. The high percentage of Caucasians serving on the Neighborhood Boards, plus the high percentage of persons claiming to be "Independents" might have implications in elective politics. These two factors comprise a new pool of voters who constitute the swing vote
in elective politics. Because they do not claim to be members of either
the Republican or the Democratic parties, and because they are more
"issue-oriented," these individuals might represent the emergent
political trends. Neighborhood Boards might serve as the springboard
for political minority groups seeking to gain political voice.

Berkowitz (1982) presented a utopian view that citizens in the
community of the future will:

- feel closer to people around them
- gain more security through mutual support
- cooperate more with their neighbors
- acquire more personal coping skills
- have more attachment for their communities
- hold more power to shape community direction
- take more responsibility for community life
- participate more in community affairs
- fulfill more of their individual potentials
(p. 253-254)

This is supported by Meadows, Meadows, Randers, and Behrens (1974)
who said that the "majority of the world's people are concerned with
matters that affect only family or friends over a short period of time.
Others look farther ahead in time or over a larger area--a city or
a nation. Only a very few people have a global perspective that extends
far into the future" (p. 19).

Although it is not possible to predict the future with confidence
and precision, one pervading issue remains to be addressed by govern-
ments and by all citizens. Citizen participation groups, especially
those in the health areas, will require practitioners to be cognizant
of the dynamics of groups and between groups. They will need to be
able to address and to work with a cross section of the socio-economic
spectrum in order to foster growth, communication and interchange
between them. Gartner and Reisman (1976, p. 785) highlight an
essential point that characterizes the self-help movement when they state that whereas professionalism accents distance, perspective, systematic knowledge, understanding and overspecialization—a professionalism provides a potential for a return to the concrete, the subjective, the experiential, and intuitive, and the emphatic. These qualities provide an egalitarian approach, providing a common ground for all parties in the social planning process to come to terms. Berkowitz's utopian view will not be achieved spontaneously in an atmosphere of pure serendipity—it will require conscious and persistent efforts in applying the accumulated knowledge and experience of the social and behavioral sciences to achieve states of social development which begin to resemble the ideals stated above. Individuals dedicated to enhance participatory competence are faced with this challenge to work within and amongst the various groups. Berkowitz summarily articulates the point:

Whether living in affluence, in poverty, or somewhere in between, people will need to know how to assess, to plan, to execute, to evaluate, to make things happen in the most efficient and supporting ways. They will need to sharpen the skills they already have, and to acquire those they do not. And just as important, they will need to believe in their own personal power and want to use it for the common good. These points apply equally to liberals and conservatives, radicals and reactionaries. They are ideological common ground. (p. 255)
APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview #_____
Male_____ Female_____
Name________________________
Date___________
Home Phone__________ Bus. Phone__________

1. Are you presently serving a term on the Neighborhood Board?
   Yes 1  
   No 2

2. What Neighborhood Board did you belong to? __________

3. What is the name of your Neighborhood Board District? __________

4. How many years did you serve on the Neighborhood Board? __________

5. How many years have you lived in the neighborhood? __________

6. What is the highest office that you achieved on the Neighborhood Board?
   Chairman 1
   Vice Chairman 2
   Treasurer 3
   Secretary 4
   Secretary Treasurer 5
   Committee Chairman 6
   None 9

7. Was this your first elective office?
   Yes (go to question 11) 1
   No (go to question 8) 2

8. Which of the following factors was a reason for you to seek election to the Neighborhood Board?
   A. Someone or a group asked you to run
      (Specify person or group) __________  Yes No 1 2

   B. A personal reason (specify reason) __________ 1 2

   C. To get involved in elective politics __________ 1 2
9. Of the motions you initiated, what percent of the time did the Neighborhood Board adopt your recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. A. Were you satisfied with how decisions were made on your Neighborhood Board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you feel it was worth your time and energy to participate on the Neighborhood Board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain

12. Do you feel that you were influential in the Neighborhood Board decision-making process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Yes (go to question 21A)</th>
<th>No (go to question 21B)</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21a What were the signs/indicators that you had influence?

21b What makes you feel that you did not have influence?

13. Before being elected to the neighborhood board, in how many civic or service organizations did you belong? (For example, PTA, Lions Club, Community Associations?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four 4
Five 5
Six 6
Seven 7
Eight or more 8

14. At the present time, in how many civic or service organizations are you active?

None 9
One 1
Two 2
Three 3
Four 4
Five 5
Six 6
Seven 7
Eight or more 8

15. Pictured below is a ladder representing the different levels of citizen participation.

8 Each Neighborhood Board passes ordinances for its district (instead of the City Council)
7 Each Neighborhood Board administers the local park
6 Each Neighborhood Board shares decision-making powers with the City Council
5 Each Neighborhood Board advises and informs the City Council but the City Council has the final say
4 The Mayor asks Neighborhood Boards for their view on proposed ordinances that have city-wide impact
Each Neighborhood Board is informed of what is happening through pamphlets, posters, and radio announcements. (Communication is one-way)

(Not applicable)

Neighborhood Board members are placed on Rubberstamp committees in order to "educate" them or to gain their support.

16. Which step on the ladder best describes the Neighborhood Board as it is currently organized? (Darken the appropriate number below.)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

17. Which step on the ladder best describes how you would like the Neighborhood Boards to function? (Darken the appropriate number below.)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

18. Would you:
   A. Give the Neighborhood Board more power?
   B. Give the Neighborhood Board less power?
   C. Give the Neighborhood Board no less nor more power?

19. Please circle a number next to any statement that gave your reasons to continue to participate on your Neighborhood Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. It was important in my plans to run for another political office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To socialize with neighbors/friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To keep up with what was happening in the neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. To keep in touch with state or city officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To carry out my duty as a citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. It gave me prestige</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. People came to me for advice and help because they know I was on the Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. It was a way to make sure that decisions that affected me were not made by someone else</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Someone convinced me to stay on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. What were frustrating or discouraging things about serving on your Neighborhood Board?

21. Which of the above was the most frustrating/discouraging?

22. A. What satisfactions did you receive from serving on the Neighborhood Board?

B. Of these satisfactions, which was the most gratifying?

23. The following statements are some ways of defining "citizen voice." I would like you to read and choose the one that best describes your feelings about the subject.

1 I believe that the term "voice" means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something. I do not expect government to listen or do anything about it.

2 I believe that the term "voice" means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something with the expectation that the recommendations or points of view would be considered in making a decision.

3 I believe that the term "voice" means to speak out on issues to let government know about how citizens feel about something and expect government to listen and to do something about it.
4 I believe that the term "voice" means to speak out on issues to let government know how citizens feel about something but also that citizens can expect to have a part in the decision-making process.

24. Of the recommendations it initiated, what percent of the time did your Neighborhood Board influence the decisions of the City Government? (City Councilor or City Departments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1-25%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 26-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 51-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 76-99%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Which of the following factors explain why you no longer hold a seat on the Neighborhood Board? (Choose as many items that apply to you.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To seek election to another office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Health problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Family problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I feel I did my part as a citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Frustration/Disappointment in Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Personality conflict(s) with other members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. I want more time to do other things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. My goals for participating were achieved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. I was not re-elected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Which of the following factors would influence you to seek re-election to the Neighborhood Board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Nothing would make me run again</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Better health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. More power is given to the Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Crucial issues are coming up again</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Some kind of salary or stipend is given to elected members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Better leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Better teamwork, support and encouragement among members of the Board
H. Other factor that has not been mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation:

27. Overall how do you feel about your Neighborhood Board Experience?

A. Positive 1
B. Negative 2
C. Mixed Feelings 3
D. Not Sure 4

Please explain:

28. Are you:

- 18 to 24 1
- 25-34 2
- 35-44 3
- 45-54 4
- 55-64 5
- 65 or older 6
- Refused to answer 9

29. What is the highest grade of school that you completed?

- Grade 8 or less 1
- Some high school 2
- Graduated H/S 3
- Some Tech. School 4
- Graduate Tech. School 5
- Some college 6
- Bachelor's Degree 7
- Graduate School 8
- Refused to answer 9

30. What is your current marital status?

- Single-never married 1
- Now married 2
- Divorced 3
- Separated 4
- Widowed 5
- Refused to answer 9
31. What ethnic background are you?

Caucasian 1
Black 2
Chinese 3
Filipino 4
Hawaiian 5
Korean 6
Japanese 7
Mixture 8
Other 9

32. How long have you lived in Hawaii?

Less than 1 year 1
1.1 to 4.9 years 2
5.0 to 9.9 years 3
10.0 to 19.9 years 4
More than 20 years 5
All of my life 6

33. Do you?

Own the house/apt. that you live in 1
Rent 2

34. Occupational Status:

Currently employed 1
Retired 2
Retired--employed in 2nd career 3

35. Employer

Military 1
Federal (civilian) 2
State of Hawaii 3
City and County of Honolulu 4
Private (non-profit) 5
Private (profit) 6
Other 9

36. Profession/Trade

37. Do you think of yourself as a:

Democrat 1
Republican 2
Independent 3
Other 4
Refused to answer 9
FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO NO LONGER HOLD ELECTED SEATS ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD

38. Is there anything that could have been done to influence you to remain on the Neighborhood Board?

Yes 1
No 2

Explanation:

39. Although you are not currently elected to the Neighborhood Board, are you in any way still participating in its activities? (For example: Do you still attend meetings or serve as an advisor?)

Yes (Go to Question 40) 1
No (Thank you, this is the end of the interview.) 2

40. In what manner are you participating?

41. What keeps you participating?

THIS IS THE END OF THE INTERVIEW
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Honolulu’s Neighborhood Board System
**APPENDIX B**

"HONOLULU'S NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD SYSTEM"

**WHAT IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD SYSTEM?**

Honolulu's Neighborhood Board System was created to assure and increase community participation in the decision-making process of government. The system applies the concept of participatory democracy, involving communities in the decisions affecting them. It establishes an islandwide network of elected Neighborhood Boards as communication channels, expanding and facilitating opportunities for community and government interaction.

**HOW WAS THE SYSTEM CREATED?**

The process for development of the Neighborhood Board System began when the Revised City Charter of Honolulu (1973) called for the establishment of a nine-member Neighborhood Commission. The Commission was responsible for developing a Neighborhood Plan outlining a uniform system of Neighborhood Boards on Oahu. Neighborhood Boards were then formed in accordance with the Plan.

**WHAT ARE THE MAJOR POINTS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN?**

The Neighborhood Plan designates Neighborhood boundaries throughout Oahu and provides procedures for forming Neighborhood areas and Neighborhood Boards. Some of the Plan's major points are:

- Thirty-three Neighborhood areas (boundaries)
- Initiative petition of 100 registered voters or five percent of voters within the area (whichever is less) for the formation of a neighborhood.
- Election of board members by residents 18 years and older.
- Two-year terms for board members.
- Advisory role for all Neighborhood Boards.

Copies of the Neighborhood Plan are available from the Neighborhood Commission office.

**WHAT ARE THE FUNCTIONS OF A NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD?**

Neighborhood Boards may serve as a key mechanism through which each neighborhood may communicate its needs and desires, both in the delivery of basic government services and in economic development and land use questions. While the Neighborhood Plan emphasizes the advisory nature of the boards, suggested activities include study and review of capital improvement projects and zoning concerns. In addition, boards may conduct educational programs on governmental decision making processes and may establish community goals, objectives, and priorities.

Neighborhood Boards are required to hold monthly meetings and prepare an annual report.

**WHO CAN RUN FOR A NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD?**

Candidacy for a Neighborhood Board is open to all residents of Oahu, including military personnel and aliens, who reside in the Neighborhood Board area and Sub-district to which they are being elected. A candidacy declaration form must be filed but no filing fees or nominating papers are required. Neighborhood Board elections are conducted biennially through a mail ballot system.

**HOW CAN A CITIZEN PARTICIPATE IN THE SYSTEM?**

Community participation is encouraged and welcomed by the boards. There are many ways in which the community can participate, some of which are:

- Voicing your concerns to your board representatives through personal contact or letters.
- Attending the regular monthly meetings, public forums and other community events sponsored by your board.
- Volunteering to participate on a board committee. You can help resolve community problems or work on a community project.
- Responding to surveys conducted by the board.
- Be a candidate and/or vote in your board's election.
- Offering any resourceful skills or knowledge.

**WHAT IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION?**

The Neighborhood Commission consists of nine members. Four are appointed by the Mayor, four by the City Council, and the ninth member is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Each member serves a five-year term. The Commission is responsible for the periodic review and evaluation of the Plan and Neighborhood Boards, and assists in the formation of Neighborhood Boards upon request.
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The Neighborhood Board System was created as a community organizing process of the concept of expanding communities. It establishes an advisory board, with the ability to request and establish goals, objectives, and priorities.

Neighborhood Boards are required to hold monthly meetings and prepare an annual report.

WHO CAN RUN FOR A NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD?
Candidacy for a Neighborhood Board is open to all residents of Oahu, including military personnel and aliens, who reside in the Neighborhood Board area and Sub-district to which they are being elected. A candidacy declaration form must be filed but no filing fees or nominating papers are required. Neighborhood Board elections are conducted biennially through a mail ballot system.

HOW CAN A CITIZEN PARTICIPATE IN THE SYSTEM?
Community participation is encouraged and welcomed by the boards. There are many ways in which the community can participate, some of which are:
- Voicing your concerns to your board representatives through personal contact or letters.
- Attending the regular monthly meetings, public forums and other community events sponsored by your board.
- Volunteering to participate on a board committee. You can help resolve community problems or work on a community project.
- Responding to surveys conducted by the board.
- Be a candidate and/or vote in your board's election.
- Offering any resourceful skills or knowledge.

WHAT IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION?
The Neighborhood Commission consists of nine members. Four are appointed by the Mayor, four by the City Council, and the ninth member is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Each member serves a five-year term. The Commission is responsible for the periodic review and evaluation of the Plan and Neighborhood Boards, and assists in the formation of Neighborhood Boards upon request.

For more information call or write:
Neighborhood Commission Office
City Hall, Room 400
550 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Telephone: (808) 523-4087/527-5749

NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD   DATE FORMED
25 - Mililani/Waipio/Melemanu   4/23/75
24 - Waianae Coast               5/9/75
15 - Kalihi-Palama               5/16/75
2 - Kuliouou/Kalani Iki          5/16/75
32 - Waimanalo                   7/18/75
29 - Kahalu                      9/8/75
28 - Koolauloa                   2/10/76
30 - Kaneohe                     2/10/76
3 - Waialae/Kahala               4/16/76
16 - Kalihi Valley               5/4/76
8 - McCully/Moliili              5/4/76
31 - Kailua                       8/24/76
1 - Hawaii Kai                   3/1/77
7 - Manoa                        3/1/77
14 - Liliha/Kapalama             3/22/77
10 - Makiki/Lower Punchbowl/Tantalus  9/20/77
11 - Ala Moana/Kakaako           9/20/77
9 - Waikiki                      9/20/77
20 - Aiea                        9/20/77
6 - Palolo                      9/20/77
21 - Pearl City                 9/20/77
4 - Kaimuki                     9/20/77
12 - Nuuanu/Punchbowl          9/20/77
23 - Ewa                          9/20/77
13 - Downtown                   9/20/77
5 - Diamond Head/Kapahulu/St. Louis Heights 9/27/77
27 - North Shore                  10/11/77
18 - Aliamanu/Salt Lake/Foster Village 1/30/79
22 - Waipahu                       10/23/84
26 - Wahiawa                        3/19/85
17 - Moanalua                  * 19 - Airport
* 33 - Mokapu

* The initiative for forming these Neighborhood Boards must come from the residents, as specified in the Revised City Charter.
APPENDIX C

OCCUPATIONS OF THE SAMPLE

1. Administration, Community College
2. Administration, Department of Education
3. Administration, Department of Health (Program Evaluation)
4. Administration, Department of Social Services and Housing--State of Hawaii
5. Administration, Private Sector
6. Administration, Private Sector
7. Administration, Private Sector
8. Administration, Private Sector
9. Administration, Private University
10. Administration, Public Utility
11. Administrator of a Hawaii State Department--Retired Navy
12. Administrator, Golf Course
13. Administrator, Private School
14. Advertising Executive
15. Agronomist/Administration, major agricultural firm
16. Ambulance attendant, City and County of Honolulu
17. Artist (Ceramicist)
18. Attorney, Private practice
19. Attorney, Public sector
20. Attorney, Public sector
21. Builder/Contractor
22. Builder/Contractor
23. Clergy
24. Clerk, Insurance claims for health plan
25. Construction engineer
26. Cost Analyst
27. Curator of Birds, Paradise Park
28. Cytogeneticist
29. Developer, real estate
30. Draftsman
31. Economist
32. Engineer (Safety)--Retired Military
33. Engineer, Private Sector
34. Engineer, Private Sector
35. Engineer, Public utility
36. Equipment Installer, Public utility
37. Farmer
38. Financial Planner, Retired NYC fire department
39. Flight Attendant
40. Harbor Police--Retired military
41. Househusband, previously in sales
42. Housewife
43. Housewife
44. Housewife--Graduate degree in Planning
45. Housewife--previously employed as bookkeeper
46. Housewife--trained as a Nurse's aide
47. Insurance Underwriter
48. Landscaper/university student
49. Legislative aide
50. Legislator--House of Representatives
51. Loan Officer for a bank specializing in real estate loans
52. Marketing Director, radio station
53. Medical Doctor, Private practice
54. Military, Chief Warrant Officer, Navy
55. Military, officer, Navy
56. Military, officer, Navy
57. Musician/Secretary
58. Nurse
59. Operations manager--large bakery (MPH degree)
60. Planner, Federal program
61. Planner, Health, State of Hawaii
62. Planner, State of Hawaii
63. Planner, State of Hawaii
64. Planner, State of Hawaii
65. President of a council of construction trades--retired military
66. Property Manager, State of Hawaii
67. Public Relations--Private Sector
68. Real Estate Broker
69. Real Estate Broker
70. Real Estate Broker
71. Real Estate Broker
72. Real Estate Broker--Retired military
73. Recreation Manager for a private development
74. Resident Manager of condominium--retired Army
75. Resident Manager of condominium--retired Navy
76. Resident Manager, state housing project
77. Retired attorney for the Navy
78. Retired bookkeeper
79. Retired Federal Worker
80. Retired Food Services Director, Northwestern University
81. Retired gerontologist
82. Retired insurance executive
83. Retired librarian
84. Retired military
85. Retired Surveyor, City and County of Honolulu
86. Retired teacher
87. Retired Transportation Supervisor, major pineapple cannery
88. Retired--Optician
89. Sales
90. Sales
91. Secretary, former teacher
92. Security guard--retired military, Army
93. Self-employed--Maintenance company
94. Self-employed--Retired Foreign Service Staff Officer
95. Self-employed, Vending Business
96. Self-employed, public relations
97. Self-employed--Previously Congressional aide in Congress
98. Self-employed--Retired City and County Recreation Director
99. Self-employed--Retired Navy civilian employee--project engineer
100. Social Worker
101. Social Worker/writer
102. Staff, Credit Union
103. Student, community college, previous community worker
104. Student, University of Hawaii
105. Teacher, Elementary School
106. Teacher, High School
107. Travel Agent--Specializing in student travel
108. Trust Administrator
109. Union Representative, previously legislative aide
110. University Professor in a physical science
111. University Professor in Business Administration
112. Water Quality Laboratory Analyst, private sector
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THUMBNAIL SKETCHES OF THE SAMPLE

Queen of citizen participation--don't mess with her--she can organize--she can motivate--she can get a building permit in 10 minutes--she believes in citizen participation and the wonders that the Neighborhood Board can do for a private citizen--devoted mother and wife--pride in the Chinese family and the four generations that have lived there--proud of the several homes she has had built--some based on the knowledge she gained from being on the Neighborhood Board. .. she can articulate strategies for politicians in dilemmas ... she can cite regulations and ordinances ... she has a clear understanding of her goals and objectives for being on the Board--both personal and community service. On the personal side, she is motivated to protect her "turf" and the environment ... on the community side ... she has dreams of developing a neighborhood natural landmark (a waterfall and petroglyphs in the area) into a state park ... she knows people ... in the community and in government ... she wields her influence in working with the elected officials of the district without being offensive--she advised an elected official in a strategy of giving sunlight to a bill that he would have otherwise taken an unpopular stance ... if there were to be an all-star team of "empowerment" she would be at the top ... she is the kind of person that could speak to any group of people which is looking for the good things that citizen participation and Neighborhood Boards can do for everyone--the politicians ... the citizens ... the community. She mentioned a crucial factor in her development ... feels she does not need the Neighborhood Board to get things done anymore ... she is confident of her knowledge and ability to keep on fighting without getting pats on the back or recognition for participation--"It's all inside of me now!"

***

Young naval officer ... proud to be an Annapolis graduate ... articulate ... has strong feelings about what is right and wrong. Loves "command" and leadership ... feels that as a leader, one needs to be forceful and decisive. He is currently serving as Chairman of his Neighborhood Board. Plans to run again with the goal of garnering the highest number of votes for his district on the ticket. Has a protective attitude towards senior citizens (like his parents). When asked what he learned from the Neighborhood Board experience, his answer: "It's a jungle out there!" Very interested in the neighborhood and the goings on. Very committed--it seems that he will always be involved in community affairs and community service. (As of this date, he is running for a seat in the Hawaii State Legislature.)
Navy career man, stationed at Barber's Point. Confident, assertive and articulate. Steady game . . . no facades--trustworthy . . . comes to the point with tact . . . seems to have much experience in command roles . . . says he cannot idly sit by without being involved . . . is inspired by other people who work hard on the Neighborhood Board. He's the kind of guy you like to sit and talk with over coffee, over a beer--says his favorite pastime is to spend time with his family as a unit--to do anything as a unit. Said he was appalled at the changes in ____ (his district) over the past 10-20 years he's been away--dogs and high fences around each home--it wasn't like that previously. His home and neighbors' homes were recently burglarized at 10:30 p.m. with everyone at home and awake . . . his neighborhood is thinking of initiating a neighborhood watch program. Sincere, trustworthy, dutiful--All-American guy--plays straight, works hard. Assertive, good listener with an open mind.

* * * *

Dedicated protector of her community. Old family from ____ district with some Kuleana land. Administrator of resort shop. Articulate, fearless, assertive, confident . . . has been involved in citizen participation activities for a long time . . . much concern for child development and parent education. After all of her children are finished with college, she wants to work in social services again (what she loves most). She is the first respondent to say that citizen park costs money and you must pay for legal services if necessary. Articulates a firm understanding of the community organization process to organize a group of communities along the coast, she said the key to harmony and cohesiveness among communities is to recognize the uniqueness and autonomy of each community. She can organize, she fights, she can raise money, she can motivate and she confronts. Very open, very frank--a bright ray of life and vigor. She loves her community and she loves life--often refers to the cooperation and harmony of the Neighborhood Board. She sees herself as a "doer." Stands up to developers. A definite pace setter and leader.

* * * *

Professional planner who once doubted the power of citizen participation. Now is a firm believer . . . he knows it works--it also provides a stimulation for him . . . it has changed his professional approach to planning and decision making . . . firm believer that loss of the Neighborhood Boards would make the community more apathetic. He would like to see more "local" input and feels that local people are not able or willing to cope with what he claims is a "haole" (Caucasian) game--(he is Caucasian)--they are not able to cope with highly educated or professional people (mostly haoles) and retired military. He has a good sense of teamwork . . . he can see and articulate political processes as well as community dynamics--of the interplay of different forces within the community. Has an appreciation for diversity of viewpoints and values. Appreciates the ability of divergent viewpoint to converge on solutions that are better than those
originally proposed. I consider this individual to be a "Renaissance" planner . . . he is enlightened by citizen participation . . . he is enthusiastic . . . he wants to learn more . . . he accepts challenges—he does not fight just to fight, he is willing to work—laughs a lot—chuckles about the dynamics of community—an indicator of someone who has not lost perspective or sense of humor.

* * * *

She is proud to be referred to as "megamouth." She is the "Mother Theresa" of the ________ district. She is protective of and advocates for the residents of the district, especially the elderly and the youth on the street. She stands up in court to assist neighbors that do not understand English; she feeds any hungry youth that comes to the door (many homes except hers were burglarized recently); in case of emergencies, she has the keys to the homes of elderly people in the neighborhood; she advises people of their rights in cases which she has been asked for assistance. Her philosophy is articulated in a belief in outreach activities in every aspect—medical care, social services, public services and in good neighbor activities in general. She refuses to assume leadership roles as an officer on her neighborhood board but is one of the most active. She has an aversion towards owing anything to anyone (especially politicians) but will work for or against candidates on her own. She is most grateful for the neighborhood board and what it has done to empower herself and the neighborhood. She thoroughly believes in the neighborhood boards, in citizen voice and empowerment of the people. She is positive, she is active, she is honest with herself and has a wonderful sense of humor. She also possesses a "right hook" for those individuals that care to take her on. Her home is like a private social agency. People walk up or drive up for assistance in a variety of matters: domestic problems, court cases, landlord-tenant conflicts, etc. She articulates firm belief in citizen power. She can organize, she can canvass and influence people. Politicians are afraid of her—one aide of an elected official said, "Don't take her on—she knows what she's talking about." She understands why Mayor Fasi does not like neighborhood boards . . . they are too vocal and have too much influence within the neighborhood. She worked hard in her neighborhood, advocating initiative. She is the door-to-door canvasser for any neighborhood issue. Her main concerns are the elderly shut-ins. Her appreciation of the Neighborhood Board . . . how much she has learned and realized how little the public knows about goings on in the neighborhood. She likes to learn . . . she is assertive . . . she is loving (tough) . . . a straight shooter . . . attributes her attitude toward life (which is positive) from her religion (Catholicism). I want her on my side in any fight!

* * * *
Chief, Division (State government)--chairs the Neighborhood Board... steady and confident demeanor... has sense of humor... laughs a lot... sincere about the role of citizens in the government process... retired from Navy... aviator... active in the community association... logical and cool-headed approach to problems... graduate degree... was active all of his life... PTA, cub scouts, etc. Mentioned that most of the Board members in... are retired military officers of high rank... commanders, captains (Navy)... he proudly showed me certificates from the City for his civic contributions... he is well aware of his influence... City Council people recognize his face... Former elected official asks him to do things on the Neighborhood Board for the... (one of the policy making bodies in the State of Hawaii).

* * *

Previously married to prominent business leader in Hawaii. Related to a well-known union official. She has a feisty demeanor. Lives in a condominium... in downtown Honolulu... does not feel that the area is truly a safe place to live... high rise, high density... close to Chinatown and the street people... concerned about the health hazards they (street people) present... aesthetically and personal hygiene-wise... portrayed how one of the bag ladies was carrying a dead rat through the downtown area... she (Frances) upchucked in the middle of the street... claims that there is little participation in this area because condo dwellers like to come home to roost and not leave their apartments because of the fear and because condos are not conducive to neighborly feelings... ran unsuccessfully for a seat in the State legislature from the... district years back... she is still interested in politics... considers people to be like sheep when addressing the subject of citizen participation... she and a relative team up to dominate the Neighborhood Board... she has good grasp of "influence" politics... who she knows or what family she comes from... does not articulate any feel for the mutual support of working together in the attainment of neighborhood board objectives... centers much of her attention on personal influence... has a long list of membership in civic organizations. Proud to belong to a Hawaiian civic group as well as membership in an exclusive club in Honolulu.

* * *

Young farmer in three young children... he is from Big Island... wife from... he is having hard time farming this year... bad weather... lives in a newly constructed home... they live with wife's parents... he is high strung... gut level kind of person... loves a good argument... likes the Neighborhood Board because it gives him a good argument once a month... knowledgeable about development plans of the city... was a legislative aide... knows the process... has a good grasp of issues
Retired--founder of a major Honolulu firm--came to Hawaii in 1940 for an adventure from San Francisco--apprenticed as an optician--later opened his own business--well connected with the old Kamaaina families--business community--lives in a comfortable wooden cottage on the slopes of Diamond Head--is proud to be on neighborhood board--does a lot of walking around neighborhood--calls in his concerns about abandoned houses and derelicts living in them--three grown children all living in Hawaii--after the interview, asked me for a lift to the zoo--needed to do some investigating about the garden plots. This man has a sense of humor--comments about the infirmities of age with lighthearted touch--he hurt his back last week in a fall--joked about it--would be interesting to talk story with this man--he can go on and on about old Honolulu--lovable guy.

* * * *

Man-mountain--starts off as being soft-spoken--underneath he is a tough/rough guy who is working to shake the projection of being menacing--works as "PR" person for a major developer--has much aloha for his neighborhood and community--loves to work with wood--cabinetmaking--restoring old furniture--it is conjectured that this man knows many, many people from both sides of the law--the kind of guy you want on your side in a conflict--is also active with the ________ Hospital Board.

The value he places on Neighborhood Board;

The local folks need a way to fight against the wishes of the Japanese and the Haoles--otherwise we lose everything--the neighborhood boards gives the local folks a voice in making sure they are not run over with the wishes of the politicians who would otherwise be able to do as they wish.

I imagine that keeping plugged into the Neighborhood Board is a good way to promote the mission of his job with the developer--he is a perfect kind of citizen who can be the buffer in an area facing development issues. What keeps him participating are a combination of factors: his community mindedness, his job as pr for the development outfit, the pride he gets out of being a vital member of the community--the "education" he is getting--made a strong point of what he is getting
out of the whole experience--how to use intellect rather than just emotions and physical means--with implications of learning new behaviors in working with women--he cited a story of how he did not know how to deal with women on the Board who stuck by their convictions and used "due process" and coolheadedness in the face of his wrath.

Biography: Played football in high school and college. Said he used to be a bad dude. Is married--now very domestic and family oriented...heavily involved in the church.

* * * *

Feisty nisei--works for a real estate developer...chairs the planning and zoning committee...wants to make sure that his community is not overdeveloped...feels very protective of his community--believes in using governmental process and contacts to get things done--relies on person-to-person approach--outspoken--active in little league--has influence there--knows lots of people--a community minded hip-shooter--duty bound, has strong sense of responsibility--and holds people to theirs.

* * * *

Delightful person--full of vigor--positive...very active with the League of Women Voters...lives in condominium with husband--modest decor--functional--pictures on the wall of her 92 year old father whom she describes as being vigorous and full of pep...she is 70+ years old...she is outspoken and uninhibited--spontaneous about her feelings...has never been an officer on the Neighborhood Board but does a lot of the legwork for her board as well as for the League...attends College of Continuing Education noncredit classes--keeps busy and active...walks everywhere.

* * * *

Very low key--watches and listens more than she speaks. master's degree in Public Health. Belongs to Hawaii Public Health Association and the American Public Health Association. Her job is to manage public participation for a federally funded project...got elected to Neighborhood Boards to learn about local issues and political dynamics...she says she is impatient and doesn't care especially about people who don't listen...is committed to the Public Health profession...will work hard but not be up front vocalizing...joined the Neighborhood Boards for professional reasons to get to know and feel about citizen participation from a citizen's viewpoint

* * * *
Another great citizen participation all-star. His motivations are based on improving citizen voice and not power for himself—he is a former welder and carpenter now serving as an administrative assistant for a senator in the State legislature... He believes that citizens are demanding more voice and it will be stronger and greater as time passes. This man is dynamic without being boastful—he thinks through issues and questions and does not gloss over them—(made me feel I was rushing him through the interview)—he takes time on important details... he confesses that he had an intellectual view of citizen participation in the beginning—but this has been replaced by a more realistic practicality—he claims that staying with ideals does not help solve everyday problems. Speaking with this man made me feel that I was the most important person he had talked with all day—he gives his complete attention—he can articulate the philosophy of citizen participation as well as deal with practical issues dealing with citizen voice. He inspires, he believes in you—he is steady and he is confident—he is humble. He can listen to all sides of issues and is not argumentative—he is the enlightened planner (decision maker). He articulates the belief that the elected officials need to listen to the Neighborhood Boards—for they are vital in the neighborhood fabric and he feels that without resident input—the elected officials are sunk. He believes in people having voice—the policy in his Senator's office is that EVERY citizen input receives an affirmative response—he makes sure that the office goes to bat for the constituent. When asked why he doesn't run for office, his reply—"You think I'm crazy?"
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