THE MUNICIPAL GROUP UNIVERSE: CHANGES IN

AGENCY PENETRATION BY POLITICAL GROUPS, 1975-1986.

Howard A. Faye, University of Washington
Allan Cigler and Paul Schumaker, University of Kansas

The Municipal Group Universe: Changes in

Agency Penetration by Political Groups, 1975-1986.

Howard A. Faye, University of Washington

Allan Cigler and Paul Schumaker, University of Kansas

ABSTRACT

This paper describes changes in administrative attitudes towards group types between 1975 and 1986 and identifies behavioral, structural and demographic factors which might account for "agency penetration," or the degree to which (1) group types influence agencies; (2) agencies are dependent upon group types for support; and (3) group types are represented on oversight or advisory boards in agencies. The preliminary results indicate that business, civic groups, and political parties have maintained high levels of influence. Neighborhood groups have increased their influence significantly since 1975. Groups which are newer to the urban political environment (e.g., environmental groups, women's groups) are less influencial than older, more established groups. Groups which are perceived to be "community-regarding" rather than "self-regarding," and stylistically conventional, rather than militant, have also achieved greater agency penetration.

The Municipal Group Universe:

Changes in Agency Penetration by Political Groups, 1975-1986

The urban political arena has experienced a variety of significant
pressures during the past decade. Among the most noteworthy is the
financial stress on their governments in the face of increasing demands
for improved and expanded public services. A decline in revenue from
state and federal sources, the imposition of state tax limitation laws,
and decline in the property tax base in many cities, all have lead to a
situation where more groups are competing for limited resources. For
example, business interests seek to expand the revenue base through
public policies geared toward enhancing economic and population growth.
At the same time, neighborhood, social service, and minority groups seek
limited city funds for programs of a more redistributive nature. Thus,
cities have been characterized as having a hyperpluralistic environment,
where access to municipal agencies and administrative decisionmaking is
at a premium (Yates, 1977; Stone, Whelan, and Murin, 1986: 134-175).
While the hyperpluralistic model is clear about the increasing
representativeness of the group system -- as there are a greater number
and diversity of interests active in the group struggle -- the model
provides little insight into the distribution of access and influence
among active groups. Group participation does not necessarily translate
into group influence. Consequently, we need to understand better which
kinds of groups are increasing and decreasing in influence and the
factors associated with such changes.

Although groups continue to play major roles in local elections and
the resolution of community issues by elected officials, what is most
noteworthy about the hyperpluralistic environment is the degree to which

1

groups have become involved in policy implementation and service delivery at the agency level. Thus, there is a particularly acute need to understand changes in group interaction with local administrative agencies.

To analyze relationships between various types of political groups and urban administrative agencies in a period of fiscal stress, this paper focus on "agency penetration" in the urban political environment. Agency penetration by groups consists of three components: (1) the degree of influence which groups exert upon agencies, (2) the degree to which agencies rely on groups for support or the withholding of opposition in their jurisdictions, (3) and the presence of representatives of groups on advisory or oversight boards of local agencies. Agency penetration by various "group types"[1] is investigated using a research design that is similar to another study conducted in 1975 in which local administrators were surveyed to discover factors affecting group representation in local agencies (Schumaker and Billeaux, 1978). The concern of this study is to describe changes in influence of various types of groups within local governmental agencies and to determine if the factors which explained variations in influence in 1975 are similar to or different from those which explain variations at present.

Our analysis is divided into three sections. The first section describes the degree of agency penetration by various types of groups according to three measures. In addition, the rankings of influence by group types in the 1986 survey are compared with a similar ranking from the 1975 survey. In addition to reexamining nine group types investigated in the 1975 survey, four "new" group types are examined in the 1986 survey. Women's groups, environmental groups, gay and lesbian

2

groups, and ideological non-party groups (particularly on the right side
of the political spectrum) have heightened their mobilization at the
local level - sometimes because of organizational concerns (e.g., the
Moral Majority's emphasis on state and local organization), sometimes
because of emerging issues (e.g., housing and employment discrimination
against gays and lesbians), and sometimes simply because new
opportunities for access (or loss of old avenues of access) have
occurred (e.g., the deemphasized role of environmental policy under the
Reagan administration, the development of women's organizations
attempting to pass the Equal Rights Amendment at the state level). One
question which we will address is whether these newer groups have
penetrated urban agencies as extensively as older, more established
groups, such as business, civic, labor, and neighborhood organizations.

In this study we also examine the kinds of factors which enhance
or reduce group influence. The second part of our analysis addresses
some of these factors, focusing on a variety of structural, behavioral
and demographic characteristics. In light of the theories of the
political economy of groups (Olson, 1963; Salisbury, 1969; Bredemeier,
1978; Moe, 1980;), these factors may explain why some groups continue to
be prominent in the municipal group universe, while others have declined
in influence.

Finally, a number of variables relating to the characteristics of
the responding agencies, the form of urban government, and fiscal stress
are related to the three components of agency penetration. This aspect
of the study is included to avoid the fallacious assumption that the
success or failure of group types in exerting influence is solely a
function of group characterstics. Agency facilitation of group access

and participation, whether through local reform or through mandates accompanying state or federal funding, is posited to have some positive relationship to agency penetration. The form of government in cities has long been identified as affecting citizen access and equality (Lineberry and Fowler, 1967; Northrup and Dutton, 1979). Likewise, he debt accumulated by cities has been suggested as a cause of differences in access and participation (Clark and Ferguson, 1983; Fainstein, et al., 1983).

In short, this study can be considered an initial attempt to describe changes in the municipal group universe during the past decade and to identify factors that account for these changes.

THE STUDY

In January of 1986, a survey was sent to seven agencies in each of seven urban observatory cities and the 51 cities of the Permanent Community Sample (Schumaker and Billeaux, 1978; Clark, 1979).[2] The agencies surveyed were identical to those surveyed in 1975 in order to provide a comparable basis for examining changes between 1975 and 1986. The survey instrument consists of three parts measuring (1) various characteristics regarding the 13 group types; (2) the personnel and funding of the agencies; and (3) the existence and nature of community oversight and advisory boards for each agency.[3] In all, 32 questions were included in the survey (see appendix). The types of agencies surveyed were: housing, public health, air pollution control, redevelopment, social welfare, public schools, and police. Where a function was handled by a special or non-municipal jurisdiction, these were also contacted.

In addition to the four "new" groups already mentioned, the same

4

group types examined in the 1975 survey were also included on the 1986
4
survey: civic groups, business, parties, unions , professional

organizations, white ethnic, civil rights, neighborhood, and various

service delivery groups.

"Agency penetration" is the dependent variable in this study.   The

degree of agency penetration by groups was determined by a series of

questions which asked administrators to assess the substantive

representation and influence of various group types in terms of (1)

influence on agency decisions, (2) the necessity of their support for

implementing administrative programs, and (3) their representation in

the agencies' advisory or oversight boards.

The question about the amount of support or opposition each group

type receives from the other group types and actors in the community

(Q10 in the questionnaire in the appendix) was combined with the

question about the political influence of each group type (Q13) to

create INFLINDX, an index of group influence.   Agency dependency on

various group types, DEPENDX, was an index created from the question

about the importance of group types in the implementation of policies by

agencies (Q11) and the question about the likelihood that implementation

would be successful if opposed by group types (Q12).   Q22 provided our

measure of group representation on agency advisory or oversight boards.

Various indices for the independent variables were also

constructed.   An organizational stability index, STABILX, was created by

combining questions about the longevity and breadth of purpose of group

types (Q15) and the degree of organization (Q16) of each group type.

The cohesion index, COHESX, reflects the sum of responses to questions

about group types voting as blocs in local elections (Q5) and the degree

of unity concerning group goals (Q6).   An index of group size, SIZEINDX,

was computed by combining scores for questions about the number of participants in group types (Q17) and the number of group participants contacting the agencies during the preceding year (Q18). Aspects of group style were also measured using questions about the political orientation (leftist orientation - Q20), and the frequency of militant action of group types (Q21).

In addition, questions were asked about the minority (Q4) and female (Q3) compositions of groups.

To determine whether the structure of agencies affected group penetration, the second part of the survey measured various aspects of agencies: whether agency personnel were unionized, the sources of funding for agencies (implying how discretionary agencies could be towards group types) methods of selecting agency executives, and the existence of an agency ombudsman (indicating the existence of additional points of access to an agency). This part of the survey was constructed to determine whether certain types of agencies, because of their professionalization and/or structure, exhibit bias against some groups.

The third part of the survey sought to determine the number of access points in an agency. Questions determine the existence of submunicipal branches and neighborhood or city-wide advisory or oversight boards.

The advantage of surveying a cross section of local agencies lies in circumventing two problems faced in research on group power in a political environment: the lack of equivalence in "preferences" for various policy outputs and the inequality in importance of policy outputs. Therefore, such a survey measures general administrative attitudes rather than situational attitudes in given policy areas (see

6

Lyon and Bonjean, 1981).

<div align="center">RESULTS</div>

(A)   Changes in Agency Penetration by Various Types of Groups.
Table 1 provides summary statistics concerning the perceptions of agency
officials regarding the extent to which various types of groups have
penetrated their agencies.   Before turning to a discussion of specific
types of groups, two general observations are in order.   First, group
influence appears to be increasing.   With the exception of unions, the
overall change in influence of various group types is in the direction
of more influence,[5]   despite the fact that most agency officials see
groups as "getters" rather than "givers".[6]   This is, of course,
consistent with widely-accepted perspectives on increasing
hyperpluralism within American cities and with overall depictions of
post-reform politics.   Second, the perceptions of agency officials
regarding changes in group influence are generally consistent with
changes in their perception of group influence between 1975 and 1986,
thus suggesting the reliability of the measurement instruments.

Neighborhood groups had the highest aggregate scores for increasing
influence (Q14).   This is consistent with our other findings showing
that neighborhood groups were the seventh most influential type of group
in 1975, but the third most influential type of group by 1986.

Professional groups, which ranked third behind civic and business
groups in 1975, experienced a decline in influence relative to other
group types, even though such groups are perceived by agency officials
as more influential in 1986 than in 1975.   Civic groups also experienced
a relative decline in agency penetration, though they too are attributed
more influence now than in 1975.   Business groups experienced the second

<div align="center">7</div>

largest increase in influence, and had the highest aggregate scores for the influence index (INFLINDX) and agency board representation (Q22).

Political parties, which were ranked fourth in agency representation in 1975, experienced modest increases in influence in the 1986 data. While ranking high on INFLINDX, parties were ranked low on the index of agency dependency (DEPENDX) and agency board representation (Q22), where they were seventh and eight in rank, respectively.

Ethnic and civil rights groups, were tied with a ranking of third concerning their increase in influence. These groups had overall rankings of eighth and tenth in influence in 1975 and experienced only small changes in 1986 in their influence rankings. Agency officials may perceive such groups as more influential because of their higher rankings on agency dependency and agency board representation.

Service delivery groups, demand-oriented by definition, ranked only above unions in their change in influence, while maintaining a ranking of sixth in influence (they were also sixth in 1975), third on dependency, and fifth on agency board representation.

The "new" groups have all experienced increases in influence, with environmental groups showing the largest increase. However, in all measures of agency penetration, these group types, particularly gay and lesbian groups and ideological groups, fared poorly. The highest ranking by any of these groups in any of the three measures of agency penetration was achieved by women's groups in agency board representation, with a ranking of seventh. Gay and Lesbian groups fared poorest among all groups on all measures of agency penetration.

In summary, the rise in power of neighborhood groups seems most noteworthy. Perhaps due to the increased sophistication and activity among grassroots groups of all sorts (Boyte, 1980) and the emphasis on

8

community development during the sixties and seventies, neighborhood groups now rank highly on each measure of agency penetration. Also noteworthy, however, is the continuing and indeed increasing power of business groups. If neighborhood groups have emerged to better represent grassroot interests, business groups have not retreated. Rather our data suggest business groups have reasserted their dominance in the municipal group universe.

(B) Group Characteristics and Agency Penetration. In 1975, group representation in urban agencies was more affected by behavioral and demographic characteristics of groups rather than by structural characterstics of groups (Schumaker and Billeaux, 1978). In particular, predominantly black groups and groups making zero-sum demands and adopting more militant styles were found to be less influential than other groups.

To determine whether behavioral characteristics of groups were still more important than structural characteristics of groups (i.e., their permanency, cohesion and size), the 1975 analysis was replicated with a few modifications. First, three dependent variables were employed - INFLINDX, DEPENDX and Q22 (agency board representation) - rather than a single measure of representation. Differentiating among these three dimensions of agency penetration seems important because these dimensions may not be equally affected by various group characteristics. For example, the existence of review boards is often mandated through federal and state legislation attendant to funding from those sources. The composition of these boards may be most dependent on policymaker attempts to coopt various interests and provide "symbolic" participation (Browning, Marshall and Tabb, 1984) and thus independent

9

of group characteristics associated with influence.

Slight modifications were also made in some of the measures and indices used in the 1975 study. For example, the questions used to create indices of organizational stability and community regardingness of demands are slightly different in the 1975 and 1986 surveys. One additional measure was included in the 1986 study; gender composition of group type was estimated in order to determine the importance of gender cleavages in local politics (Gelb and Gittell, 1986).

Table 2 presents pearsonian correlations and beta-weights derived from stepwise regressions between structural, behavioral and demographic group characteristics, and measures of agency penetration.

Overall, structural characteristics explained more variation in the three measures of agency penetration than did either behavioral or demographic characteristics. In contrast to the 1975 results, organizational stability is positively and strongly related to various aspects of groups' agency penetration. Perception of group militancy became a weaker explanatory factor in 1986. As expected, more militant groups appeared to have less agency penetration. The strongest relationship involving militancy was with the index of influence (r=.19), and this relationship disappeared in the multivariate analysis for 1986. Levels of activity seems to be the behavioral variable most affecting various measures of agency penetration in 1986.

In Table 3, "old" and "new" groups from the 1986 survey are separated, and the relationships among group characteristics and agency penetration explored, again using a stepwise regression procedure. Certain patterns emerge. In terms of structural characteristics, organizational stability appears to be the most important factor in determining variation in levels of agency penetration by both older and

10

newer groups. In five of the six equations presented, organizational stability is a statistically significant variable, and the highest ranking beta-weight in three of the equations. Group size is a key factor in new group influence, and important to older groups in terms of agency dependency. But the perceived cohesiveness of a group seems largely unrelated to group penetration, and, in terms of newer groups, appears to actually retard influence.

Among behavioral characteristics, level of activity is an important variable in four of the six equations, being strongly related to both old and new group agency penetration. It is the second ranking beta-weight for both newer and older groups in predicting variation in agency dependency.

The demographic composition of groups may affect agency penetration as well, particularly for newer groups. Note the difference in impact upon variation in agency penetration between our minority composition (a measure of race and enthicity) and female composition variables. A higher proportion of ethnic minority composition appears to actually hurt older groups in terms of influence. But having a higher proportion of women among the membership appears to help both newer and older groups in terms of influence, and newer groups in terms of review board representation.

In general, the findings in Table 3 tend to confirm the conventional wisdom about agency penetration. Organizational stability is crucial, and a constant level of group activity pays dividends in terms of group impact upon the implementation process.

(C) Bureaucratic Characteristics, City Characteristics, and Agency Penetration. The findings in Table 4 suggest that agency

11

characteristics and city characteristics have little impact on agency

penetration. The strongest relationships exist between the presence of

submunicipal branches (Q29) - as opposed to an agency having one central

office or point of access - and agency dependency (r=.21). The presence

of advisory boards appears not to be related to either influence or

agency dependency. However, appointive boards -- as opposed to

voluntary boards -- are negatively related to agency dependency. Type

of municipal government (reformed or unreformed) appears not to affect

agency penetration by groups.

Overall, agency characteristics and city characteristics, which are

at best weakly related to agency penetration, seem to indicate that

structure and administrative culture are less obstructive of influence

and participation than other independent variables such as group

demography and behavior and, especially, organizational structure.

DISCUSSION

In the decade since the last survey measuring administrative

representation of groups, previously underrepresented groups have become

members, in some cases dominant members, of urban eletoral coalitions.

In the same period, new groups have entered the group universe

interacting with municipal agencies. Formerly nonexistent groups have

mobilized, uninfluential groups have increased their influence, and

influential groups, undercut by changes, have sometimes lost influence

-- at least relative to other groups.

Nevertheless, as measured by indices of influence, agency

dependency, and representation on agency review boards, older, more

stable, groups have been found to have greater agency penetration than

newer groups. This conclusion reverses the most general finding from

the 1975 survey. Behavioral characteristics seem less illuminating as explanatory factors in agency penetration than the longevity of groups. The older, more institutionalized groups, perhaps with established linkages or political clout, have reasserted their dominance -- with neighborhood groups now becoming an established part of the municipal group universe. The new groups with less organizational stability are attributed positive influence but at lower levels than more established interests. Resorting to unconventional behavior does not seem to enhance their ability to penetrate local agencies.

This analysis perhaps raises as many questions as it answers. Our preliminary findings are suggestive of the need for more complete data about the influence of various types of groups in municipal agencies. We have measured agency perceptions of group penetration -- not the actual influence of groups, and not group perceptions of their influence. Moreover, our analysis is presented at the most general level. For example, we do not compare various types of agencies (social service agencies vs. redevelopment agencies) to determine where various types of groups are influential. Civic groups might only penetrate a small number or agencies, but they might be very influential with those agencies with whom they regularly interact. Hence the aggregated results presented may underestimate their influence when they choose to become involved in policy implementation.

It is clear that there are more groups in the municipal group universe than previously. However, recognizing increased group actively tells us little about group influence. Agency perceptions of group influence offer encouragement to those who question the unchanging nature of group access at the local level. Neighborhood groups seem to have become more influential. And even newer groups are perceived as

somewhat influencial. If environmental groups, women's groups, and gay

groups increase their influence during the coming decade -- as did

neighborhood groups during.the past decade -- hopes for a genuinely

pluralistic municipal group universe may be more fully realized.

[1]
"Group types" are utilized rather than specific groups sharing similar demographics or purposes in different environments, since it is assumed that group types in different cities do not possess the exact same organizational, purposive or other characteristics.

[2]
The survey yielded a response rate of just above 20%, with 15 surveys returned as undeliverable. The majority of the undeliverable surveys were addressed to Model Cities agencies which had closed since the 1975 survey. It should be noted that demographic data on agency officials and surveys addressed to groups themselves would obviously provide a more complete portrait of the behavioral factors which account for levels of agency penetration.

[3]
Data concerning the degree of fiscal stress collected in 1976 (Clark, Ferguson and Shapiro, 1979) and form of government were collected separately and merged with survey responses.

[4]
Only public sector unions were included in the 1975 survey.

[5]
We used a five-point scale to measure change in influence; with "1" signifying less influence, "5" signifying more influence, and "3" signifying no change in influence.

[6]
Our analysis of Q9 resulted in a mean "negative" contribution score of .28, where "1" signifies groups "give more than they get; "5" signifies groups "get more than they give" and "3" signifies a balance between giving and getting.

TABLE 1

GROUP TYPES RANKED BY VARIOUS MEASURES OF INFLUENCE AND AGENCY PENETRATION

	Representation, 1975 [a]	Change in Influence, 1986 Q14	INFLINDX, 1986 Q10 + Q13	DEPENDX, 1986 Q11 + Q12	BOARD REPRESENTATION Q22
Business	2	2 (3.62)	1 (7.91)	2 (6.77)	1 (1.05)
Civic	1	6 (3.35)	4 (7.00)	4 (6.35)	3 (1.15)
Parties	4	10 (3.22)	3 (7.10)	7 (6.17)	8 (1.43)
Unions	9 [b]	13 (2.68)	7 (6.41)	8 (5.88)	7 (1.35)
Professional	3	11 (3.15)	5 (6.70)	9 (5.82)	2 (1.14)
Ethnic	8	3 (3.39)	9 (6.13)	6 (6.23)	4 (1.18)
Civil Rights	10	3 (3.39)	8 (6.17)	5 (6.25)	6 (1.26)
Neighborhood	7	1 (3.77)	2 (7.30)	1 (7.32)	2 (1.14)
Service Delivery	5/6	12 (3.14)	6 (6.46)	3 (6.64)	5 (1.22)
Environmental		5 (3.36)	10 (6.00)	10 (5.64)	9 (1.49)
Women		7 (3.30)	11 (5.96)	11 (5.21)	7 (1.38)
Gay/Lesbian		9 (3.25)	13 (3.63)	13 (4.23)	11 (1.76)
Ideological		8 (3.28)	12 (4.52)	12 (4.52)	10 (1.57)

(a) Schumaker and Billeaux, 1978.
(b) Applies for public sector unions only in the 1975 data.

TABLE 2

RELATIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUPS AND THEIR LEVELS OF AGENCY PENETRATION

	Representation, 1975		Group Influence, 1986 (INFLINDX)		Agency Dependency, 1986 (DEPENDX)		Review Board Representation, 1986	
	r	B	r	B	r	B	r	B
STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS								
—Organizational Stability								
"STABILX"	.21^	.09	.38^	.33^	.27^	.21^	.29^	.20^
—Cohesion "COHESX"	.06	-.05	-.11^	-.07	.01	.007	.03	-.09
—Size "SIZEINDX"	-.04	-.04	.40^	.13^	.44^	.21^	.28^	.11
BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS								
—Activity (Q1)	-.10	-.06	.29^	.14^	.38^	.25^	.30^	.20^
—Community-Regardingness of								
Demands "DEMANX"	.24^	.13^	.24^	.10^	.15^	.05	.09	.06
—Style "STYLEX"	-.26^	-.13^	—	—	—	—	—	—
—Militancy (Q21)	—	—	-.19^	-.02	-.11^	-.004	-.09^	.008
—Leftwardness (Q20)	—	—	-.27^	-.13^	-.13^	-.02	-.13^	.05
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS								
—Minority Composition (Q3)	-.23^	-.12^	.10^	-.003	.12^	.003	.12^	-.02
—Female Composition (Q4)	—	—	.13^	.14^	.07	.05	.16^	.13^
—SES Composition	.20^	-.02	—	—	—	—	—	—
—Ethnic Composition	.06	.04	—	—	—	—	—	—
R^2 =			.30		.25		.17	

^ - indicates a significance of .01 or better.

TABLE 3

RELATIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUPS AND THEIR LEVELS OF AGENCY PENETRATION: A COMPARISON OF "OLD" AND "NEW" GROUPS

	Group Influence, 1986 (INLFLINDX)		Agency Dependency (DEPENDX)		Review Board Representation, 1986 (Q22)	
	old B	new B	old B	new B	old B	new B
STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS						
—Organizational Stability "STABILX"	.31^	.15^	.12	.39^	.09	.24^
—Cohesion "COHESX"	.04	-.28^	.08	-.15	.09	.09
—SIZE "SIZEINDX"	.04	.26^	.25^	.04	.13	-.04
BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS						
—Activity (Q1)	.14^	.04	.23^	.23^	.16^	.18
—Community-Regardingness of Demands "DEMANDX"	.15^	.01	.12	-.03	.17^	.05
—Militancy (Q21)	.07	.04	.03	-.07	.01	.00
—Leftwardness (Q20)	-.13^	.06	.06	-.14	-.14	.01
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS						
—Minority Composition (Q3)	-.13^	.02	-.04	-.11	-.10	.11
—Female Composition (Q4)	.14^	.28^	.07	.02	.08	.22^
R^2 =	.24	.28	.24	.15	.15	.19

^ - indicates a significance of .01 or better.
Test statistics are beta-weights.

TABLE 4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE URBAN POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT
AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY PENETRATION

	Group Influence (INFLINDX)		Agency Dependency (DEPENDX)		Review Board Representation (Q22)	
	r	B	r	B	r	B
Agency Characteristics						
—Personnel with professional degrees (Q23)	.01	—	.11	—	.12^	—
—Personnel union affiliation (Q24)	.03	—	.01	—	-.14^	—
—Personnel native to jurisdiction (Q25)	.11^	—	-.12^	—	-.05	—
—Primary source of funding (Q26)	.00	—	-.13^	—	.06	—
—Means of selecting executive personnel (Q27)	-.04	—	-.03	—	-.05	—
—Ombudsman (Q28)	-.06	—	-.05	—	.10	—
—Sub-municipal branches (Q29)	.07	.09	.21^	.19^	.00	-.05
—Advisory/oversight boards (Q30)	.00	—	.04	—	.00	—
—Means of selecting board members (Q31)	.04	-.03	-.11^	-.14^	.00	.07
Form of Government (X4)	0.08	-.06	-.03	-.03	-.06	-.06
Fiscal Stress	.00	.09	.10	.08	.13	-.11

^ - indicates a significance of .01 or better

REFERENCES

Backrach, Peter C. and Morton C. Baratz.   "The Two Faces of Power"

 American Political Science Review 56:4 (1962) pp. 947-952.

Boyte, Harry.   The Backyard Revolution.   Philadelphia: Temple University

 Press, 1980.

Bredemeier, Harry.   "Exchange Theory" in A History of Sociological

 Analysis (Tom Bottomore and Robert Nisbet, eds.)   New York: Basic

 Books, 1978.

Browning, Rufus P., Dale Rogers Marshall and David H. Tabb.   Protest is

 Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in

 Urban Poitics.   Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Burchell, Robert W., et al.   The New Reality of Municipal Fianance: The

 Rise and Fall of the Intergovernmental City.   New Brunswick, NJ:

 Center for Urban Poicy and Research, 1984.

Clark, Terry N. and Lorna Ferguson.   City Money.   New York: Columbia

 University Press, 1983.

Clark, Terry N., Lorna C. Ferguson and Robert Y. Shapiro.   "Functional

 Performance Analysis: A New Approach to the Study of Municipal

 Expenditures and Debt" Political Methodology 8:2 (1979) pp. 87-123.

Elazar, Daniel.   Cities of the Prairies: The Metropolitan Frontier and

 American Politics.   New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Fainstein, S., et al.   Restructuring the City: The Political Economy of

 Urban Development.   New York: Longman, 1983.

Feiock, Richard.   Urban Economic Development.   (Unpublished PhD

 Dissertation) University of Kansas, 1985.

Friedland, Roger, Frances Fox Piven, and Robert R. Alford.   "Political

 Confliect, Urban Structure, and the Fiscal Crisis" in Marxism and

 the Metropolis (William K. Tabb and Larry Sawers, eds.)   New York:

Oxford University Press, 1984.

Gelb, Joyce and Marilyn Gittell.   "Seeking Equality: The Role of
    Activist Women in Cities" in The Egalitarian City: Issues of
    Rights, Distribution, Access and Power (Janet K. Boles, editor) New
    York: Praeger 1986.

Jones, Bryan D.   Service Delivery in the City New York: Longman Press,
    1980.

Lineberry, Robert L. and Edmund P. Powler.   "Reformism and Public
    Policies in American Cities" American Political Science Review 61:3
    (1967) pp. 701-716.

Lineberry, Robert L.   Equality and Urban Policy Beverly Hills: Sage
    1977.

Lowi, Theodore.   The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy and the Crisis
    of Authority.   New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

Lyford, Joseph.   The Berkeley Archipelago.   Chicago: Regnery Gateway,
    1982.

Lyon, Larry and Charles M. Bonjean.   "Community Power and Policy
    Outputs: The Routines of Local Politics" Urban Affairs Quarterly
    17:1 (1981) pp. 3-22.

Moe, Terry.   "A Calculus of Group Membership" American Journal of
    Political science 24:4 (1980) pp. 593-632.

Mollenkopf, John.   The Contested City.   Princeton: Princeton University
    Press, 1980.

Northrup, Alana and William H. Dutton.   "Municipal Reform and Group
    Influence" American Journal of Political Science 22:3 (1978) pp.
    691-711.

O'Connor, James.   Fiscal Crisis of the State.   New York: St. Martin's
    Press, 1973.

Olson, Mancur.   The Logic of Collective Action.   New Haven: Yale
    University Press, 1963.

Rubin, Herbert J. "Local Economic Development Organizations and the
    Activities of Small Cities in Encouraging Economic Growth" Policy
    Studies Journal 14:3 (1986).

Salisbury, Robert.   "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups" Midwest
    Journal of Political Science 13:1 (1969) pp. 1-32.

Schumaker, Paul and David Billeaux.   "Group Representation in Local
    Bureaucracies"   Administration and Society 10:3 (1978) pp. 285-313.

Stone, Clarence.   "Systemic Power in Community Decision Making"
    American Political Science Review 74:4 (1980) pp. 978-990.

Agency-Citizen Contact Questionnaire

PART I

Use the following scale for questions 1 and 2:

1 - never
2 - rarely (one or twice a year)
3 - once a month
4 - more than once a month
5 - almost daily

1. Estimate the frequency with which you or others in your agency are contacted by

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations; _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other (_____)

2. How frequently does your agency contact the following groups?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations; _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other (_____)

Use the following scale to answer question 3:

1 - 0-5%
2 - 6-20%
3 - 21-50%
4 - 51-75%
5 - 76-100%

3. Estimate the percentage of black or hispanic membership in each of the following groups

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations; _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other (_____)

Use the following scale to answer question 4:

1 - 0-5%
2 - 6-20%
3 - 21-50%
4 - 51-75%
5 - 76-100%

Estimate the percentage of women who are members of the following groups:

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations; _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other (_____)

Use the following scale to answer question 5:

1 - never
2 - rarely
3 - occasionally
4 - frequently
5 - always

5. To what extent would you say that the members of each of the following groups vote as a single bloc in municipal elections?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (league of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other ( ) ___

Use the following scale to answer question 6:

1 - the group is usually divided regarding basic goals
2 - the group is frequently divided regarding group goals
3 - the group is divided about half the time regarding group goals
4 - the group is only occasionally divided concerning group goals
5 - the group is almost never divided concerning group goals

6. On the basis of your communications from various group spokesmen, how would you characterize each group in terms of its unity?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (league of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other ( ) ___

Use the following scale to answer question 7:

1 - the group seeks goals that benefit only its members
2 - the group seeks goals that benefit only its members and those with similar interests and conditions
3 - the group seeks goals that benefit mostly its members, those with similar interests and conditions and those with dissimilar conditions and interests, but who are politically allied
4 - the group seeks goals that benefit its members and others in the community regardless of their interests and conditions or political relationship to the group
5 - the group seeks goals that primarily benefit persons who are not members

7. Which of the following best describes the nature of the goals of each group?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (league of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other ( ) ___

Use the following scale for question 8:

1 - the group seeks goals which would have few, if any, costs, for others
2 - the group seeks goals which would have minor costs for others
3 - the group seeks goals which would have relatively moderate costs for others
4 - the group seeks goals which would have major costs for others in the community
5 - the group seeks goals which would have unreasonable costs for others in the community

8. Which of the following best describes the extent to which the goals of each group would burden the community, if implemented?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (league of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic)

G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ____
H. neighborhood groups ____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ____
J. environmental ____
K. women's political groups ____
L. gay and lesbian political groups ____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ____
N. other (____) ____

Use the following scale to answer question 9:

1 - the group puts much more into the community than it gets out of it
2 - the group puts somewhat more into the community than it gets out of it
3 - the problems the group poses in the community balance out its contributions
4 - the group puts in somewhat less than it gets out of the community
5 - the group puts in much less than it gets out of the community

9. In your judgement, which of the following statements best describes the contribution of each group and its leaders to the community?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ____
C. political parties ____
D. labor unions ____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ____
H. neighborhood groups ____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ____
J. environmental ____
K. women's political groups ____
L. gay and lesbian political groups ____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ____
N. other (____) ____

Use the following scales to answer question 10:

1 - it receives much more opposition than support
2 - it receives somewhat more opposition than support
3 - it receives an even amount of opposition and support
4 - it receives somewhat more support than opposition
5 - it receives much more support than opposition

10. About how much support or opposition for its goals does each of the following groups receive from other important groups or political actors in your community?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;

B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ____
C. political parties ____
D. labor unions ____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ____
H. neighborhood groups ____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ____
J. environmental ____
K. women's political groups ____
L. gay and lesbian political groups ____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ____
N. other (____) ____

Use the following scale to answer question 11:

1 - not at all important
2 - occasionally influential (once in a while)
3 - slightly important (considered in all relevant decisions)
4 - usually important
5 - always important

11. About how important is the support of the following groups to your agency in implementing its policies?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ____
C. political parties ____
D. labor unions ____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ____
H. neighborhood groups ____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ____
J. environmental ____
K. women's political groups ____
L. gay and lesbian political groups ____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ____
N. other (____) ____

Use the following scale to answer question 12:

1 - very unlikely
2 - somewhat unlikely
3 - likely about half of the time
4 - rather likely
5 - very likely

12. About how likely is it that your agency could successfully implement its policies if opposed by the following groups?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ____

C. political parties ___
D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (___)

Use the following scale to answer question 13:

1 - has almost no influence
2 - has little influence
3 - has some influence in certain situations (in coordination with other groups, etc.)
4 - has a lot of influence
5 - one of the most influential groups in the community

13. In your judgement, how influential at present is each of the following groups in the politics of your community?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs)
C. political parties
D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (___)

Use the following scale to answer question 14:

1 - this group has become much more influential
2 - this group has become somewhat more influential
3 - this group has not changed significantly in influence
4 - this group has become somewhat less influential
5 - this group has become much less influential

14. In your judgement, which of the following statements best describes how the influence of each group has changes in the past 10 years?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;

B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (___)

Use the following scale to answer question 15:

1 - temporary or permanent, no identifiable issue or purpose
2 - temporary, issue-specific
3 - temporary, general purpose
4 - permanent, issue-specific
5 - permanent, general purpose

15. How would you characterize the stability and breadth of purpose of each of the following types of groups?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions ___
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups ___
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) ___
J. environmental ___
K. women's political groups ___
L. gay and lesbian political groups ___
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (___)

Use the following scale to answer question 16:

1 - very poorly organized
2 - poorly organized
3 - fairly organized
4 - well organized
5 - very well organized

16. In general, how well organized are the following types of groups in your community?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___

C. political parties ___
D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education)
J. environmental
K. women's political groups
L. gay and lesbian political groups
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (

Use the following scale to answer question 17:

1 - 25 or less
2 - 26 to 100
3 - 101 to 500
4 - 501 to 1000
5 - more than 1000

17. Estimate the number of citizens in your community who are participants in the following groups:

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education)
J. environmental
K. women's political groups
L. gay and lesbian political groups
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (

Use the following scale to answer question 18:

1 - 5 or less
2 - 6 to 10
3 - 11 to 25
4 - 26 to 50
5 - more than 51

18. Estimate the number of members of the following types of groups which have made contact with your agency in the past year:

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___

D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education)
J. environmental
K. women's political groups
L. gay and lesbian political groups
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (

Use the following scale to answer question 19:

1 - of no consequence whatsoever
2 - of little consequence
3 - occasionally of consequence
4 - usually of consequence
5 - almost always consequential

19. How consequential are contacts between members of the following types of groups and your agency, i.e. do they amount to changes in policy or service?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___
D. labor unions
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) ___
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) ___
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) ___
H. neighborhood groups
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education)
J. environmental
K. women's political groups
L. gay and lesbian political groups
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) ___
N. other (

Use the following scale to answer question 20:

1 - very conservative
2 - moderately conservative
3 - moderately liberal
4 - extremely liberal
5 - radical

20. In general, how would you classify the philosophy of each of the following types of groups:

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations;
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) ___
C. political parties ___

D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other ( ) _____

Use the following scale to answer question 21:

1 - never
2 - very rarely
3 - occasionally
4 - regularly
5 - frequently

21. How often do the following types of groups engage in militant action (e.g. threats of violence against persons or property, boycotts, sit-ins, picketing) in support of their goals?

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations) _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other ( ) _____

PART II

22. About what percentage of all persons in your agency hold professional academic degrees?

_____ 0-10%
_____ 11-25%
_____ 26-50%
_____ 51-75%
_____ 76-100%

23. Are the staff members in your agency affiliated with a labor union?

_____ yes   _____ no

24. About what percentage of all persons in your agency are native to the community in which your agency is located?

_____ 0-10%
_____ 11-25%
_____ 26-50%
_____ 51-75%
_____ 76-100%

25. What percentages of revenue used by your agency come from the following governments:

_____ county government
_____ municipal government
_____ state government
_____ federal government

26. Are executives and/or heads of agency selected by elected officials (e.g. mayors, county executives) or through civil service examination?

_____ by elected officials
_____ through examination

27. Does your agency contain an office or an individual to handle public complaints and inquiries full time?

_____ yes   _____ no

PART III

28. Does your agency have branches in sub-municipal districts (neighborhoods, districts, etc.)?

_____ yes   _____ no

29. Do neighborhood or district boards exist where citizens advise or review matters under your jurisdiction?

_____ yes _____ no

30. Do city-wide boards exist where citizens advise or review matters under your jurisdiction?

_____ yes _____ no

31. Are these boards voluntary or appointive?

_____ voluntary _____ appointive _____ inappropriate

32. Do members of the following types of groups participate on such advisory or review boards? (yes or no)

A. business-oriented groups (chambers of commerce, businessmens' associations; _____
B. civic groups (League of Women Voters, service clubs) _____
C. political parties _____
D. labor unions _____
E. professional organizations (bar association, etc.) _____
F. ethnic groups (non-black or hispanic) _____
G. civil rights groups (NAACP, Urban League, etc.) _____
H. neighborhood groups _____
I. city service groups (transit, health, housing, education) _____
J. environmental _____
K. women's political groups _____
L. gay and lesbian political groups _____
M. Ideological, non-party groups (Moral Majority, ACLU, etc.) _____
N. other (_____)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

No. _____

I would like to receive a copy of the survey results.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

POSITION _____