THE CASCADE COUNTY, MONTANA, COMMUNITY YOUTH JUSTICE COUNCIL
PROGRAM: A NEW CITIZENSHIP MODEL

BY

LANE A. RAFFRAY

AN APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT (POLITICAL SCIENCE 5397)
SUBMITTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
FOR THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

(FALL 1997)

FACULTY APPROVAL:

This work is dedicated with much Love and Respect to my family:
Barry, Valerie, Kent, and Todd.

They are my Heart, my Soul, and my Pride.

Acknowledgments

First, I should thank my two favorite sisters, Dr. Patricia M. Shields and the Honorable Peggy S. Beltrone, without whom this research never would have been possible. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Shields, who first came to me with the idea of going to Montana (of all places!) for my internship, and then, upon my return to San Marcos, spent hours with me in an effort to transform my internship experience into a workable Applied Research Project. Whenever I was in a bind, she always came through for me. There's nobody better in the clutch than Dr. Shields.

Second, I would like to thank my father, Barry Raffray for his support (both moral AND financial) during the last two and a half years. I couldn't have done it without him.

Third, I'd like to thank all of the MPA faculty for making my years SWT as enjoyable and educational as humanly possible. I would particularly like to thank Drs. Weinberger and Tajali for all the help and advice over the course of putting this ARP together.

I have to thank Dokpe Ogunsanya for being a really good friend, even though she NEVER brought me any of those "chin-chins" and Reinato Olivas for all the support (and for helping me with my Public Finance!!). Such good friends are invaluable in times like this.

Lastly, but certainly not least, I am indebted to all the men and women of Cascade County, Montana who care enough to volunteer considerable amounts of their time and effort in the hopes of making a positive impact on the lives of others in their community. Their dedication to the CYJC Program, and to each other, is inspiring.

Table of Contents

Chapter four: Methodology (Continued)

Chapter five: Results

Chapter six: Summary and Conclusions

Appendices

Table of Contents: Tables

Chapter I

Cynical Citizens: The Chasm between Citizens and Government

Introduction

Citizen disenchantment with government is a common theme in recent public administration literature. Cynicism, alienation, and pessimism among citizens seems to be widespread, and some researchers believe that the relationship between citizens and their governments has degenerated from a lack of confidence to contempt (Frisby & Bowman, 1996: 13). Daniel Yankelovich underscored the problem perfectly saying, "[P]eople are frustrated and angry, anxious and off balance, pessimistic about the future, and cynical about all forms of leadership in government" (Yankelovich, 1994: 389).

Citizens become cynical when they think that local government is either not helping them, or is taking advantage of them; when they do not feel like part of local government or feel ignored; or when they find local government services or policies are ineffective (Berman, 1997: 106). According to Johnson (1993), this cynicism may be expressed as deep-rooted beliefs that public officials and policies are corrupt, ineffective, or take advantage of citizens (As quoted in Berman, 1997: 107).

These assertions are supported by the focus-group research of Daniel Yankelovich, chairman of DYG, Inc., a New York based consulting firm. According to this study, citizens feel alienated, because, 1) they are denied access to the political

1

process, 2) have no connection to political issues, and 3) are frustrated by "politics as usual". Citizens also express feeling powerless. Respondents report not knowing how to participate in government, that the political process is out of their control, and that their trust in government is shaken. Citizens believe that "elites" such as lobbyists and special interest groups control political discourse while their needs are being ignored. There is a pervasive feeling among the participants in Yankelovich's study, that the relationship between citizens and government has been severed (Frisby & Bowman, 1996: 12-3).

Additional research further illustrates the separation between citizens and government by illuminating the differing perceptions between local government officials and their constituents. The results of a 1995 ICMA study show that local government officials and citizens disagree regarding available opportunities for citizen participation in government. Fewer than half of citizens responding think that their local government leaders are willing to share leadership and decision-making with them. Just over half of the citizen respondents report perceiving the local government decision-making as open to them (Frisby & Bowman, 1996: 13.)

In a recent study, Evan Berman found a stark difference in the perceptions of local government officials, in this case city managers, and citizens. Most city managers surveyed assert that local government services meet citizens' needs (69.7%), local government treats citizens fairly (63%), and does not take

2

advantage of citizens (59.8%). Citizens are much less optimistic about government however. Less than half of citizens responding believe that government is honest (46.3%), delivers on promises (43%), is understanding of citizen needs (41.6%), and perhaps most importantly, *only 41.5 percent believe that government is trustworthy* (Berman, 1997: 107).

The recent public administration literature depicts a great chasm between citizens and government that seems to be growing. According to Berman (1997: 105), "[Citizen] disillusionment causes alienation and disengagement and is therefore of key interest to public administration and the processes of democratic governance." This phenomenon of citizen cynicism toward government begs the question, "How can this gap be bridged?"

It is within this context of cynicism that competing models of citizenship have emerged or have been re-examined. Recent literature in public administration has focused on two such models: the "citizen-as-customer" model promoted by Osborne and Geabler's (1992) *Reinventing Government*, and the progressive era "citizen-as-customer" model of "efficient citizenship" promoted by William Allen (1917), Henry Bruere (1913), Frederick Cleveland (1913), and recently re-examined by Schacter (1995). Implicit in both of these models is the idea that increasing citizen participation will, in effect, bring people closer to their governments. Both of these models of citizenship stress increased citizen participation in government as a way of improving

government's efficiency, but omit one potentially important aspect of citizenship: decision-making which gives citizens the power to directly effect their communities.

This important, if overlooked aspect of citizen participation is central to the Community Youth Justice Council (CYJC) Program used in Cascade County, Montana. The CYJCs are sentencing panels for first-time juvenile offenders wherein adult citizen volunteers from the community hear the cases and decide the punishment appropriate to the youth for the offense committed. The purpose behind the CYJCs is to empower the community, giving citizens a voice in holding youth accountable to the community for the offenses they commit. Citizen empowerment is a central theme in the citizenship models in the public administration literature, yet the two models mentioned previously stop short of giving citizens direct decision-making power like that found in the CYJC model.

Research Purpose

The purposes of this research are several. First, the CYJC Program is explored as an example of a "citizen-as-decision-maker" model of citizenship. Second, this research describes citizen attitudes toward the perceived effect of CYJC participation on their attitudes toward participation in government, their perceptions of government, the effectiveness of government, and the effectiveness of the CYJC Program. Lastly, a "How To" guide to CYJC implementation is proposed for those

4

wishing to create a CYJC Program in other communities.

Summary

The recent literature in public administration illuminates
the problem of widespread cynicism and a seemingly growing chasm
between citizens and the governments that serve them. Bridging
this gap involves an increased commitment to citizenship and
citizen participation in government on the part of both
government and citizens. Hence, this work examines the Community
Youth Justice Council Program of Cascade County, Montana, as a
"citizen-as-decision-maker" model of citizenship, and describes
the perceived effect of CYJC participation on participant's
attitudes.

Chapter two examines citizen participation in government
including goals and functions of participation, participation
techniques, and the use of citizen participation techniques. This
chapter also examines competing models of citizenship, focusing
on the "citizen-as-customer" model and the "citizen-as-owner"
model, and underscores the need for a new citizenship model.

Chapter three examines the Community Youth Justice Council
Program of Cascade County, Montana. This chapter discusses the
circumstances surrounding the creation of the CYJC Program and
describes the CYJC Program and how it works, emphasizing the
citizen participation aspect. The differences between the CYJC
Program and the other citizenship models mentioned above are
highlighted here. Also included in this chapter, are the

5

descriptive categories and working hypotheses employed in this study.

Chapter four discusses the methodology used in this work. Survey research is discussed, including its strengths, weaknesses, and applicability to this study. A discussion of the survey population, survey instrument, and pre-testing is included.

Chapter five contains the presentation and analysis of the results of the survey research. Results are presented in narrative and tabular form, and grouped to address the working hypotheses according to their descriptive category.

Chapter six provides a summary of the results. This chapter discusses whether or not the findings of the research support the working hypotheses. This chapter contains conclusions about the interpretation of the research and possible topics for additional research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Introduction

The recent public administration literature depicts a great chasm between citizens and government that seems to be growing. According to Berman (1997: 105); "[Citizen] disillusionment causes alienation and disengagement and is therefore of key interest to public administration and processes of democratic governance". This phenomenon of citizens' cynicism toward government begs the question, "How can this gap be bridged?"

Bridging this chasm involves a commitment by government to increasing citizen participation in government. The purposes of this chapter then are to review the literature on citizen participation in government, present two competing models of citizenship discussed in the recent public administration literature: the "citizen-as-customer" model, and the "citizen-as-owner" model[1], and to show reasons why a third "citizen-as-

---

[1] Smith & Huntsman (1997), present a third model of citizenship not discussed above, a "value-centered" model. Central to this model is the idea that government and citizens are "co-investors and shareholders in the public trust and common wealth of the community" (p.313). In this model of citizenship, the role of government is to increase the value of government to citizens by creating wealth and delivering services desired by citizens. Citizens, then, co-invest with each other to create wealth "consistent with citizen needs" and to advance the collective goals of the community (p.312) The principal tenant of this model is that "citizens interact with government because they are fundamentally motivated to create value for themselves

7

decision-maker" model has merit.

A Brief Overview of Citizen Participation

At the heart of the two citizenship models developed later in
this chapter is an emphasis on citizen participation in
government. Therefore, it is both helpful and necessary to review
the pertinent literature on citizen participation.

It is generally accepted that citizen participation is an
essential part of democratic self-government. Questions remain,
however, as to what constitutes effective citizen participation.
There are several definitions of what citizen participation
actually is (Foutz, 1993: 16); and citizen participation may have
many different goals and/or functions (Rosener, 1975: 17; Foutz,
1993: 27-8). In addition, effective citizen participation must
overcome several potential problems.

Effective Participation

Ken Thomson (1987) identifies four criteria needed to

---

and for the community" (p.316).
    The "value-centered" model is unique in that its conceptual
origins are derived from economic theory and the marginalist
theory of value (p.312). The model is similar to the "customer"
and "owner" models in that it is concerned with "citizen
empowerment" (p.311), and government "effectiveness" (p.317). In
fact, the "value-centered" model finds its niche in between the
"customer" and "owner" models, choosing to incorporate elements
of both (p.313).
    Like the "customer" and "owner" models discussed above, this
model ignores the possibility of citizens becoming "decision-
makers", underscoring the need to examine such a model.

maximize the effectiveness of citizen participation in government. First, a large number of community members must be given the opportunity to participate. Second, participation opportunities must be open to all members of the community equally. Third, citizens must be given the opportunity to influence policy outcomes significantly through their participation. Fourth, citizen participation must address a specific program or policy issue at the appropriate level of government (Thomson, 1987: 200-01).

Given that citizen participation is a central tenet to the three models of citizenship discussed in this chapter, it is interesting to note that these four criterion for participation are not universally applicable to all three models. As will be discussed later in this chapter, the "citizen-as owner" model is criticized for its bias toward the upper- and middle- classes. At the same time, the "citizen-as-customer" model is criticized as too passive; it relies upon government-initiated action, and does not necessarily give citizens the ability to substantially influence policy outcomes. The Community Youth Justice Council Program in contrast, specifically includes a large number of citizens, selected as a representative cross-section of community members, and gives them decision-making power to, in a sense, make policy regarding how juvenile offenders are punished. The council-members are empowered to directly affect the problem of juvenile crime in their communities by working with government officials (i.e. Juvenile Probation Officers) at the county level.

By these criteria, the CYJC Program represents a better model for effective citizen participation in government.

Definitions of Citizen Participation

According to the literature, there is no agreed upon definition of citizen participation. Falkson (1974: 5), defines participation as a means by which citizen input is integrated into local decision-making regarding operations and service delivery. On the other hand, Strange (1972: 461), mentions participation as a means by which citizens organize themselves for the purposes of lobbying, pressuring government, or altering existing or proposed programs. In Arnstein's (1969: 216) definition, citizen participation is defined in terms of citizen power. She maintains that citizen participation requires a re-distribution of power so that the "have-not citizens", who are excluded from participation today, may be included in the future.

Conspicuously absent from the literature discussing definitions of citizen participation, is the mention of citizen "decision-making" as a form of participation. The above mentioned definitions of participation are seemingly applicable to the "citizen-as-customer" and "citizen-as-owner" models of citizenship. The literature, however, seems to ignore the possibility that citizens may participate in government through assuming the role of "decision-maker". Such participation is central to viewing the Community Youth Justice Council Program as

a model of citizenship.

Goals and Functions of Citizen Participation

There are several goals and functions of citizen participation. Participation may be employed by government to satisfy federal requirements, improve citizen relations, and/or to change citizen attitudes (Foutz, 1993: 25). According to Falkson (1974: 15), citizen participation can lead to citizen input, which may alter the decision-making process, affect program performance, efficiency, and effectiveness, and/or change citizen attitudes. According to Rosner (1978: 458), citizen participation may be seen as a method by which government shares the power of decision-making. Citizen participation may also result in citizens having greater understanding and trust in government by making them aware of the complexities of government decision-making (Kweit & Kweit, 1987: 195).

Of the many goals and functions of citizen participation mentioned above, several are implicit in the citizenship models discussed later in this chapter. Improving citizen/government relations, changing citizen attitudes, influencing the decision-making process, and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government are all implied benefits of participation assumed by the proponents of both the "citizen-as-customer" model and the "citizen-as-owner" model. These assumed goals and functions of participation are, to some degree, tested in this study.

Rosner (1975) and Foutz (1993)

In 1975, Judith Rosner developed a matrix composed of 39
citizen participation techniques and 14 functions/goals of
citizen participation (Rosner, 1975: 17). Her research
illuminated the relationship between the several citizen
participation techniques and the goals and functions each served.
The citizen participation techniques included: arbitration and
mediation planning; charrette[2]; citizen advisory committees;
citizen employment; citizen honoraria; citizen referenda; citizen
representation on public policy making bodies; citizen review
boards; citizen surveys of attitudes and opinions; citizen
training; community technical assistance; computer based
techniques; coordinator or coordinator-catalyst; design-in; drop-
in centers; fishbowl planning; focused group interviews; game
simulations; group dynamics; hotline; interactive cable tv-based
participation; media-based issue balloting; community sponsored
meetings; neighborhood meetings; neighborhood planning councils;
ombudsmen; open door policy; planning balance sheets; policy
capturing; policy delphi[3]; priority-setting committees; public
fora; public hearings; public information programs; random
selected participation groups; short conferences; task forces;
value analyses; and workshops (Rosner, 1975: 17).

The goals and functions of these techniques included:
Identify attitudes and opinions; identify impacted groups;

2 For definition, see Appendix A.

3 For definition, see Appendix A.

solicit impacted groups; facilitate participation; clarify
planning process; answer citizen questions; disseminate
information; generate new ideas and alternatives; facilitate
advocacy; promote interaction between interest groups; resolve
conflict; plan, program, and policy review; change attitudes
toward government; and, develop support/minimize opposition
(Rosner, 1975: 18). (See Appendix A for matrix and definitions)

In 1993, Kim Ressig-Foutz utilized this matrix by classifying
its participation techniques, along with those of other
researchers, into four categories: citizen involvement, citizen
action, electoral participation, and obligatory participation.
She then narrowed the matrix to include only the 21 "citizen
involvement techniques" (see Appendix B), and collapsed the goals
of participation into eight categories as follows: 1) identify
attitudes, opinions, priorities; 2) solicit impacted groups and
invite them to participate; 3) generate new ideas and
alternatives; 4) resolve conflicts/dissolve poor relations; 5)
plan, program, and policy review; 6) develop support or minimize
opposition for programs; 7) answer citizen questions/disseminate
information; 8) meeting state, federal, local requirements
(Foutz, 1993: 37). She then surveyed mayors and city managers of
Texas cities with populations of 10,000 or more to see which
techniques were being used to accomplish which goals.

The results of her research show that use of citizen
involvement techniques ranged from a high of 92.7% for "citizen
advisory committee" to a low of 2.1% for "policy delphi".

13

Further, 9 of the 21 techniques were used by a majority of localities; they were: citizen advisory committees (92.7%); public fora (89.6%); neighborhood meetings (79.2%); task forces (78.1%); workshops (70.8%); citizen surveys (68.8%); public information programs (64.0%); priority-setting committees (54.2%); and citizen review boards (50%) (Foutz, 1993: 45).

Foutz's result also included data illuminating the stated relationship between the localities' use of the participation technique and the goals or functions associated with each (See Appendix B for a summary of her results). For the purposes of this chapter, the data regarding the functions of "meeting federal, state, and local requirements", and "dissolving poor relations" are of key interest. This data is presented in Table 2.1. It is interesting to note that satisfying requirements is not a primary factor in local governments utilizing participation techniques. Citizen review boards score the highest in this category, with 58% utilizing this technique to satisfy requirements. Of the remaining 20 techniques, only two, the citizen's advisory committee (38%) and the coordinator/coordinator catalyst (32%) score above 30% as used to satisfy requirements (Foutz, 1993: 47).

It is interesting to note that of the fifty percent of the localities in the study using the "citizen review board", fifty-four percent of the respondents said this technique was used to "dissolve poor relations". To put this in perspective, nine other techniques were favored as methods of dissolving poor relations.

Table 2.1

Use of Citizen Participation Techniques and Corresponding Goals
(Summarized from Foutz, 1993)

			Percent Using Each Technique to Achieve Each Goal	
Technique	Total N = 96	Percent Using Technique	Resolve Conflict/ Dissolve Poor Relations	Meet Federal, State, and Local Requirements
Citizen Advisory Comm.	N = 89	92.7%	42.0%	38.0%
Meetings: Public Forum	N = 86	89.6%	59.0%	44.0%
Meetings: Neighborhood	N = 76	79.2%	74.0%	25.0%
Task Force	N = 75	78.1%	59.0%	13.0%
Workshops	N = 68	70.8%	56.0%	22.0%
Citizen Survey	N = 66	68.8%	23.0%	14.0%
Public Information Program	N = 64	64.0%	41.0%	16.0%
Priority-Setting Comm.	N = 52	54.2%	39.0%	17.0%
Citizen Review Board	**N = 48**	**50.0%**	**54.0%**	**58.0%**
Coordinator/Coordinator Catalyst	N = 44	45.8%	71.0%	32.0%
Citizen Training	N = 38	39.6%	42.0%	8.0%
Fishbowl Planning	N = 32	33.3%	63.0%	25.0%
Hotline	N = 26	27.1%	42.0%	4.0%
Community Technical Assist.	N = 24	25.0%	38.0%	25.0%
Design-In	N = 23	24.0%	30.0%	26.0%
Random Selected Partic. Group	N = 24	24.0%	25.0%	13.0%
Neighborhood Planning Council	N = 17	17.7%	59.0%	6.0%
Drop-In Center	N = 16	16.7%	44.0%	19.0%
Focus Group Interview	N = 14	14.6%	29.0%	14.0%
Ombudsman	N = 8	8.3%	88.0%	13.0%
Policy Delphi	N = 2	2.1%	100.0%	0.0%

Those used most often are: neighborhood meetings, task forces, and public forum meetings (Foutz, 1993: 47). The important point is this: the citizen review board represents the technique that most resembles a "citizen-as-decision-maker" technique, and more localities used it to satisfied legal requirements (58%) than used it to improve citizen/government relations. Implicit in giving citizens decision-making power is the idea that it will improve attitudes towards government, yet local governments in Texas seem more willing to try other techniques to improve citizen/government relations. The data seem to suggest that municipal governments in Texas are reluctant to give their citizens direct power over decision-making processes.

The Problems of Citizen Participation

There are several concerns surrounding citizen participation. "Participation techniques differ in their ability to be inclusive of the entire population" (Foutz, 1993: 31). Therefore, the most common concern surrounding citizen participation is representativeness. Kweit & Kweit (1987: 194), point out that citizen participation is dominated by the middle- and upper-classes because of the uneven resource distribution in American society. Stuart Langton (1987: 227) purports that special efforts to include the poor need to be made in order to prevent the domination of citizen participation by the wealthy and well-educated.

A second problem surrounding citizen participation is that of

influence over local government decision-making. Governments differ in the degree to which they empower citizens to participate in government. Citizens are most often given the chance to participate after government action has taken place, i.e., a policy or program has already been proposed (Foutz, 1993: 32). Another problem influencing citizen participation is a lack of clearly defined goals of participation. Poorly defined goals may lead to yet another problem, that of increased citizen distrust and disenchantment with government. Citizens who are unclear about the goals of participation may have unrealistic expectations and may be disappointed and lose trust in their government (Foutz, 1993: 33). Lastly, citizens form their attitudes about government based on a lifetime of political socialization, and therefore limited experience with participation in government is not likely to change an individual's attitude towards government (Kweit & Kweit, 1987: 196).

The potential pitfalls of citizen participation in government discussed above are of critical importance. Failure to address these pitfalls can result in ineffective participation, further exacerbating the problem of citizen cynicism toward government. It should be noted too, that to some extent, these problems affect the viability of both the "citizen-as-customer" and "citizen-as-owner" models of citizenship. The problems inhibiting these two models are discussed in greater detail in later sections of this chapter. First, a few similarities between the

two models are highlighted, followed by sections covering each
model, including descriptions of each, brief histories, and
concluding with a critique of each model.

A Few Similarities Between the Two Models

Though the two models may be thought of as competing, they do
share a few similarities. First, both models assume the purpose
of government is to serve its citizens. In forwarding the
"citizen-as-customer" model, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler
remark, "Democratic governments exist to serve their citizens"
(Osborne & Gaebler, 1992: 166). The chief proponent of the
"citizen-as-owner" model, William H. Allen echoes that citizens
must remember that the government "has no reason for existence
except to serve" (Allen, 1917: 193).

Second, both models stress the possible benefits of
participation. Osborne and Gaebler quote a community activist as
saying, "We expect that the people who serve on councils will
probably get involved in other issues, like housing, economic
development, and adult education. ..." (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992:
54-55). William Allen (1917: 131), sees citizen participation
similarly. Allen thinks that leadership and involvement make
citizens aware of both higher goals and other opportunities to
participate in government. In addition, participation increases
citizen's desire to get involved in government.

Each of the models are discussed more fully below. It is
interesting to note that proponents of each model use similar

18

rhetoric, but the focus of each model differs greatly.

The Citizen-as-Customer Model

The "citizen-as-customer" model forwarded by Osborne and
Gaebler places its focus on government acting to improve its
relationship with citizens. This model seeks to improve the
relationship between government and citizens through two
principal methods: empowering citizens to act, and giving
government a "customer service" focus like that of the private
sector. This model employs goals and rhetoric that are
contradictory.

In promoting a theme of citizen empowerment, Osborne and
Gaebler identify part of the problem as a society that no longer
relies on communities and families to solve local problems.
Rather, too much power is given to "professionals"(Osborne &
Gaebler, 1992: 51). Osborne and Gaebler (1992: 56), see this
problem as a negative consequence of Progressive era reforms
designed to make government non-partisan, efficient, and more
professional, and believe that the Progressive's focus on these
reforms was misguided, because the reformers did not take into
account the consequences of diminishing the control of families
and communities.

On the one hand, Osborne and Gaebler (1992: 52) promote
empowerment of citizens and support this by underscoring the
difference between "clients" and "citizens". Clients are passive,
they are controlled by those who serve and lead them. Citizens in

19

contrast, are thought to understand their own problems and understand that they have the capacity to address those problems.

On the other hand, Osborne and Gaebler (1992: 167), also promote the private-sector understanding of the "customer" in their model. They justify this aspect of their model by describing how the "customers" of government services are held captive in that they cannot get better public services unless they move, and because of this, public managers are free to ignore their "customers" and cater to organized special interests. Business is thought to cater to "customers", while governments are believed to cater to "interest groups".

In applying the concept of citizens as "customers" of government, Osborne and Gaebler extol the virtue of such business reform practices as Total Quality Management, saying, "Deming urges organizations constantly to ask what their customers want, then to shape their entire service and production process to produce it" (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992: 172). They advocate this kind of customer orientation in government as well. To underscore this idea, they advocate a number of ways governments can keep in contact with "customers", among them: customer surveys, customer follow-up, customer contact, customer councils, and customer interviews (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992: 177-78).

A Critique of the Citizen-As-Customer Model

The "citizen-as-customer" model is criticized largely on three main points: 1) the citizen's role is too passive, 2) it is

seen as having contradictory goals, and 3) the "customer" focus may not be applicable to government.

> A customer oriented model puts citizens in a reactive role limited to liking or disliking services and hoping that administrators will change delivery if enough customers object. Owner's play a proactive role; they decide what the government's agenda will be (Schachter, 1995: 530).

In addition, others believe that citizens need to recognize the fact that they are the owners of government (Frederickson, 1994: 9; Stivers, 1990: 96).

Several examples serve to illustrate the contradictory goals of the "citizen-as-customer" model. Charles Goodsell (1993: 86), points out that entrepreneurial leadership is called for, in terms of spending money more freely, preventing problems, motivating the organization, and developing an organizational culture. At the same time, however, the model stresses taking power out of the hands of organizational leaders, decentralizing control, empowering clients, and introducing competition. In addition, while the model seeks to empower communities through its customer focus, it should be noted that in the private sector, "customers" are concerned with their own needs. Community motivations are a non-factor (Schacter, 1995: 535).

There are several problems with the "customer" orientation of this model. First, many public agency clients would prefer to have no contact with the bureaucracy. Clients in the criminal-justice area are an excellent example. Second, there can be a conflict of interest between those working with the agency. Different groups have different goals, and it is difficult to

know who government's "customers" are and how best to serve them. Third, the customer model assumes that all businesses, large and small, treat their customers similarly. This model assumes that businesses conduct themselves more efficiently than government across the board, but this point of view overlooks the fact that large businesses are plagued by red tape as is government (Schachter, 1995: 534).

The many problems that surround applying the "citizen-as-customer" model to government have led to renewed interest in exploring other models of citizenship. One such model is the Progressive era, "citizen-as-owner" model of "efficient citizenship".

The "Citizen-as-Owner" Model of "Efficient Citizenship"

The "efficient citizenship" model reflects an attempt by reformers to improve the workings of government by focusing on educating citizens, providing needed information, and thus increasing citizen participation. "Comparing the currently much-debated customer model with the bureau's idea of citizens as owners shows that the earlier concept provided a more expansive public role and intensifies strategies for producing citizens who want to act like owners" (Schacter, 1995: 531).

A Brief History of the Citizen-as-Owner Model

The citizen-as-owner model emerged through the effects of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research (NYBMR). The NYBMR was

22

established in 1907 as a progressive reform effort to attack the inefficiency, partisanship, and corruption of the machine-controlled politicians of the era. The particularly inefficient and corrupted administration of Tammany Hall mayor Robert Van Wych (1897-1901) closely preceded the establishment of the NYBMR (Schiesl, 1977: 77).[4]

Once established, the NYBMR concerned itself with questions of bureaucratic efficiency and innovative administration. Allen, et al focused on achieving public disclosure of local government activities, increased use of "scientific methods" of accounting and reporting, and use of the "scientific management" principals of Frederick Taylor including specialization, planning, quantitative measurement, and standardization, with the goal of improving the efficiency of local government administration (Schiesl, 1977:115-6, 113).

As is further illustrated later, the NYBMR represented not only an organization devoted to efficiency, but one devoted to democracy and increased participation as well. Additionally the NYBMR's concern with non-biased collection and dissemination of data and the principals of "scientific management", showed the organization to be more pragmatic in its approach then partisan.

Embedded in the "efficient citizenship" model is a pragmatic

---

[4] The NYBMR represented the fusion of the New York Bureau of City Betterment, headed by Henry Bruere, and New York mayor McClellan's Commission of Fiscal Administration and Accounting, headed by Frederick A. Cleveland. The idea for the synergy was Cleveland's, and was promoted by William H. Allen who convinced Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, among others to pledge financial support (Schiesl, 1977: 113).

approach to influencing government. ". . .[P] ragmatism is a method of learning that focuses on process. It posits that individual learning evolves through experience" (Shields, 1996: 396). Further, "[p] ublic policy is shaped by events, theories, values, and actions. It is also shaped by groups of professionals" (Shields, 1996: 390). These two truths about pragmatism are at the heart of the "efficient citizenship" model.

The "efficient citizenship" model reflects a pragmatic approach in the following manner. The model centers around the importance of community organizations (i.e. pragmatism's "professionals"), which provide citizens with unbiased information regarding the needs of the community (based on "theories" about community needs); citizens then, armed with this information, attempt to influence elected officials and administrators (action); this action on the part of citizens results in consequences (experience), which in turn affect (through the process of learning) the community organizations (professionals) and the citizens. Based on this experience ("learning"), the community organizations alter their ideas ("theories") about community needs, collect new information, disseminate it to citizens, who's actions yield consequences..... and the cycle begins again.

"Pragmatism does not guarantee that the method taken (the working hypothesis) will work. It calls for action and then reflection about that action" (Shields, 1996: 403). The "citizen-as-owner" model takes this statement to heart, viewing

"efficient citizenship" as a process. As citizens are educated, informed, and involved, they become "efficient", and thus, better able to influence the actions of local government.

The idea of an active, informed citizenry working to influence government is the central tenet to the "citizen-owner" model. According to William Allen (1917: 127), "The whole theory of democratic organization is that initiative shall remain with the general membership and that execution shall devolve upon officers". This model assumes that citizens, as the owners of government, have a duty to assume an active responsibility in improving government, and the right to inquire about the affairs of public administrators at any time (Schacter, 1995: 532).

The proponents of this model assert that it should be all-inclusive, without dividing citizens on the basis of class or socio-economic status. Every citizen can and should be included in citizenship education, regardless of personal wealth or the ability to pay for such training. Allen, et al believe that to achieve the progressive goal of collective action requires that everyone in the community be included (Allen, 1917: 34-35). One of the "collective" goals of the model was to create a "city-wide, community-planned and community-executed program of city betterment" (Bruere, 1913: 102).

Education

To underscore the importance of education in this model, both Allen and Bruere insisted that schools must teach children to be

25

"efficient citizens" (Schacter, 1995: 532). Additionally, Allen thinks that citizenship education is one of the basic fundamentals of education and should be incorporated into school systems as a "minimum essential". Additionally, citizen education should be stressed in high schools and colleges, in order to better prepare future community leaders (Allen, 1917: 36, 133). Allen (1917, 184-85), further stressed education in this model by forwarding methods by which leaders could be trained once they were in service, they included: self-study, "school by correspondence", and attending conferences.

Other researchers also realize the importance of citizen education. Education is a necessary pre-requisite to popular government. To participate in government, citizens must be able to understand public problems, comprehend the various solutions, and understand different criterion by which these solutions may be judged (McGregor, 1984: 126). Further, "civic literacy" is also dependent on education to provide needed information regarding basic issues and political structures (Chesney & Feinstein, 1993: 535). Though this model doesn't expressly mention "civic literacy" as a goal, it is implied due to the focus on citizen participation in government.

Information Exchange

Information exchange between citizens and their government is the second important component of the "citizen-as-owner" model of "efficient citizenship". This model begins with the focus of

providing information regarding civic affairs and community needs to citizens. Efficiency in local government is seen as dependant on information exchange (Bruere, 1913: 102). Information exchange bridges the gap between citizens and government and gives citizens the means to act as owners (Bruere, 1913: 122). Frederick Cleveland summed up the importance of education in "efficient citizenship" when he said, "Citizenship without accurate knowledge cannot intelligently exercise the powers of sovereignty" (Cleveland, 1913: 127).

At the heart of the information exchange between citizens and government are community organizations. In the eyes of "efficient citizenship" proponents, every city that wants to be efficient needs a citizen-supported fact center through which community organizations may obtain information and work to influence government (Bruere, 1913: 123).

Participation in Government

The final component of the "efficient citizenship", "citizen-as-owner" model is participation. "Clearly no city government, no citizen agency, no community can achieve efficiency merely by bringing about precision, orderliness, and economy in the performance of existing tasks". There must be citizen participation in the community. (Bruere, 1913: 112). It was the hope of "efficient citizenship" proponents that an active, educated, and trained citizenry would teach their governments how best to serve them (Allen, 1917: 198).

27

Also, it was most important to proponents that as many citizens participate as possible, even if in so doing, the result was a less efficient government at the outset. Allen, et al. believed that it was better for citizens to assume their rightful duties as the owners of government, even if it meant less efficient government, rather than to sit idle abdicating their responsibility (Allen, 1917: 130-31). To stress the training of leaders and maximize citizen participation, the proponents of this model encouraged rotational assignments, and even term limits in government (Allen, 1917: 126).

According to the literature, citizens become involved because of "enlightened self interest". It was Henry Bruere's belief that if citizens wanted efficiency in government, they should be willing to work for it by being involved in the community (Bruere, 1913: 123).

The research of Chesney & Feinstein (1993: 537), shows that citizen education and involvement increase the perceived likelihood of future participation. This supports the theory behind the "efficient citizenship" model. It is through citizen participation in the community that "[l] eadership may exist without professionalism" (Allen, 1917: 126).

Critique of the "Citizen-as-Owner" Model

According to the literature, the "citizen -as-owner" model is criticized on three different points: 1) the model tried and failed to eliminate partisanship and politics from city

government, 2) the belief that this model hurt the poor, and 3) this model failed to understand the structure of local government.

> In pressing for efficient government, the structural reformers rejected group struggle as a central feature of municipal politics and sought to reduce the impact of partisan and socio-economic cleavages upon formal decision- making (Schiesl, 1977: 189-90).

Too, progressive reformers had the opposite effect than that which was intended. Partisanship increased rather than decreased, and the organizations responsible for promoting "efficient citizenship" (e.g. research bureaus and civic organizations) actually became part of the new partisan administrator's power base (Schiesl, 1997: 191).

This is perhaps the most important criticism of the model. Efficient citizenship relied on non-partisan and objective information being supplied to citizens and government via the research bureaus and community organizations. The fact that these organizations became hotbeds of partisanship shows the ultimate failure of the "efficient citizenship", "citizen-owner" model.

As mentioned above, this model was criticized for hurting lower income citizens. The re-organization of government that took place during the Progressive era also changed with it the access some citizens had to policy-making and administration. This raises questions about which is more important representativeness of government, accountability and responsiveness, or the efficiency of government operations

(Schiesl, 1977: 197).

Here, again Schiesl seems to be pointing out that the changes made by those espousing efficient citizenship benefited upper-class people more so than the poor. By virtue of these changes then, the average citizen's ability to affect government would be lessened, and therefore of greater concern to them than government effectiveness would be. This fact leads to doubt about whether or not Progressives had faith in mass democracy and popular government (Schiesl, 1977: 192).

A third area of criticism of this model centers around the apparent failure of the model to correctly understand the structure of local government. "The Progressive theorists saw municipal politics essentially as a static and formalistic process, and there is little evidence to suggest this model ever reflected reality in this regard" (Schiesl, 1977: 190).

> What structuralists failed to comprehend was the complex nature of responsibility within an administrative organization. They depicted bureaucracy as a rational, , monocratic system of firmly arranged levels of hierarchical authority flowing from superior to inferior roles. In practice, however, there were a number of functions and positions which brought professional experts and less specialized employees into various interdependent relationships... Such non-hierarchial activity led to continual competition for the control over the allocation of departmental resources (Schiesl, 1997: 190-91).

The point here is that the efficient citizenship model is based on a structure of local government that, according to Schiesl does not exist in reality. Additionally, Progressives thought that public policy making was the result of rational

administration and centralized power. Their orientation toward
rationality led them to incorrectly assume that the policy goals
of administration were agreed upon (Schiesl, 1977: 191).

This model assumed that government was rational and
centralized, and that citizens could influence policy through the
influence of only a few people. But, Schiesl makes the point that
local government is decentralized and that administrators may
have conflicting goals. Too, sometimes jurisdiction and
responsibility for problems are difficult to determine. Also the
process of incremental decision-making resulted in "routine"
responses being given to cope with many different problems and
thus, the delivery of service to citizens was slowed. These are
problems in administration not confronted or anticipated by
Progressive reformers (Schiesl, 1977: 194-95).

Conclusion

The above literature review, though by no means exhaustive
has attempted to illustrate the current problem of citizen
cynicism and alienation from government. Additionally, the two
models of citizenship reviewed here, though they both have merit,
seem to suffer from fatal flaws that prohibit either from being
able to fully address this problem.

The "citizen-as-customer" model is inadequate due to
structural problems in government that limit its implementation,
and because its passive view of citizens is not conducive to the
true citizen empowerment that is needed to spur increased citizen

involvement and change attitudes toward government.

By the same token, the "citizen-as-owner" model of "efficient citizenship" is hampered by its reliance on non-partisan, non-biased community organizations to supply information to citizens and to government, as this kind of neutrality may be impossible to achieve. Also, there is doubt as to whether or not this model is beneficial to all members of a community. As was mentioned previously, this model is criticized for its impact on low income individuals.

So, the problem of citizen cynicism and alienation from government remains and the chasm between citizens and their government remains wide. The question also remains: "How can this gap be bridged"? As previously mentioned, citizen participation is essential to this end. According to the literature however, participation strategies are widely used. Citizen participation in government through public hearings and open meeting policies is widespread (respectively 97.5 percent and 94.7 percent), because often, such participation is mandated by law (Berman, 1997: 107).

Such high levels of participation, and at the same time, such high levels of cynicism, seem to suggest the need for a new approach to citizen participation. Given the scope of the problem, and the perceived failure of the above mentioned models of citizenship, perhaps what is needed is a model of direct citizen decision-making, wherein citizens have the power to make important decisions that affect their communities.

According to Evan Berman, "To restore trust, citizens must come to increase their commitment to the purpose of government. Specifically, they must believe that government serves their needs, that they can effect decision-making, and that government is able to deliver" (Berman, 1997: 110). Perhaps are more direct model of citizenship would address Berman's concerns of trust building, providing an affiliation with government, and increasing citizen satisfaction with government, and in so doing, bridge the chasm between citizens and their government.

Chapter three then, presents the Cascade County, Montana, Community Youth Justice Council Program. It is suggested that this program may be appropriately viewed as an alternative model of citizenship; one offering citizens direct participation in government as "decision-makers".

Chapter III

The Cascade County Community Youth Justice Council Program

Introduction

This chapter discusses the Community Youth Justice Council (CYJC) Program operating in Cascade County, Montana. A brief history of this type of program is presented, followed by a discussion of events leading to adoption of the CYJC Program in Cascade County and a description of the program and how it works. A brief review of the literature on program effectiveness is included here because, to be considered a as a possible model of citizenship, the CYJC Program must be shown to be an effective program, and thus, and effective use of citizen participation. Lastly, this chapter includes the conceptual framework upon which the empirical element of this research is based.

History

The Community Youth Justice Council concept, in various forms and under various names, has existed for decades. The first such program began in New Jersey in 1954 and was quickly followed by a similar program in Seattle, Washington in 1957. While it is impossible to note the extent to which the use of community youth justice programs is widespread, programs of this form and function exist in Keene, New Hampshire, as well as other cities

34

and counties across the United States.[6]

The concept of community youth justice came to Montana in 1979, when a variation of the Seattle, Washington program was initiated in the city of Billings. The Billings program, referred to as the "Youth Conference Committee" program, serves Yellowstone County and the surrounding area. The Billings program is much smaller than its hybrid adapted in Cascade County, involving 30 community members divided into six committees. Interestingly, over its eighteen year history, the Billings program has changed very little.[7] As will be illustrated further below, this is in sharp contrast to the CYJC Program in Cascade County. Still, the Billings program was successful enough to be brought to Cascade County.

Factors Contributing to the CYJC Coming to Cascade County

Peggy Beltrone, a Cascade County Commissioner since 1994, was perhaps the one person most responsible for bringing the community youth justice concept to Great Falls. She spear-headed

---

6 These community youth justice programs are as unique as the communities they serve, as each locality adapts the program to meet the needs of their community. For example, the program in Keene, NH only deals with first-time offenders; the Billings, MT program handles multiple offenders, but does not include follow-up visits for the youths; while the program in Cascade County, MT includes multiple offenders AND follow-up visits for youths.

[7] At its outset, the Youth Conference Committee Program did not include a single woman among its 30 community volunteers! This was said to be the case because, as the program began, there were very few female juvenile offenders. Since 1979, there has been an increase in the number of female juvenile offenders, and an increase in the number of women on the Conference Committees. Score one for gender equity!

the movement to adopt a version of the Billings program in Great
Falls in July of 1995. Her efforts to initiate the CYJC Program
in Great Falls were the result of an eye-opening sequence of
events in 1995, not the least of which was the investigation of
the juvenile detention facility in Great Falls and increased
media attention to the problem of juvenile crime.

According to Commissioner Beltrone, she was "challenged" by a
member of the Montana Board of Crime Control to think up a new
way to handle juvenile offenders, she recalls:

> At a meeting where we discussed the possibility of doubling
> (from 8 to 16 beds) the size of our juvenile detention
> center, she said, 'You people in Great Falls just don't get
> it. You can build one hundred cells and still fill them and
> not have addressed the real problems in your community.
> People [in Great Falls] just don't care about your kids!'
> She said that other Montana communities take ownership of
> their problems. I asked her to give me an example and she
> said that Billings had community volunteers intervening
> with first-time offenders (Beltrone, 1997)[8].

Shortly afterwards, Commissioner Beltrone invited 100
community members to hear a presentation of the Billings program
by the Chief Probation Officer of Yellowstone County. In advance
of the meeting she secured the support of Cascade County Chief
Probation Officer Dick Boutiler and asked a non-profit community
organization, Alliance for Youth, Inc. to oversee the CYJC
program. Alliance for Youth, Inc. agreed to take on the program,
the presentation was a success, and the Community Youth Justice
Council program was born.

---

[8] For the complete text of this interview, see Appendix C.

A Description of the CYJC Program

In Cascade County, Montana, first-time juvenile offenders are handled by Probation Officers rather than being sent to Youth Court. However, because of the overwhelming caseload of repeat offenders, these Probation Officers cannot adequately deal with the first-time offenders to ensure that they do not offend again. To address this problem, the Community Youth Justice Council Program was created as an agency of the Youth Court. The Councils are able to spend more time with the youth and his/her family (an hour or more if necessary), allowing the Councils to closely scrutinize the attitude and behavior of the youth, as well as to explore concerns within the family that may be contributing to the youth's delinquent behavior. Such thorough interaction with the youth and his/her family is impossible in the traditional Youth Court/Probation setting and is one of the strengths of the CYJC Program.

The CYJC Program puts the community back into the juvenile justice process, empowering over 100 adult volunteers to positively affect the lives of youths and families within their community. Each volunteer receives 16 hours of training prior to being sworn in as an agent of the Youth Court and placed on a council[9]. At its inception, in May 1996, the CYJC Program involved 12 councils dealing with criminal offenses and one

---

[9] The fact council-members are officers of the Youth Court is the key to viewing them as "decision-makers" in government. Once sworn in, council members are, in a sense, government officials. The decisions they make regarding the youth before them carry the force of law, enforced by the Youth Court Judge.

council dealing with school truancies. Due to the initial success of the program, it has expanded to include three truancy councils, and will soon add three more councils dealing with criminal cases.

The mission of the CYJC Program is to offer first-time juvenile offenders an alternative to the formal court system by diverting youth to the community for assistance. In conjunction with this mission, the CYJC Program has several objectives:

1) To hold the youth accountable for his/her behavior.
2) To stimulate and maximize the opportunity for citizen participation.
3) To impress upon the youth that the community is concerned about his/her actions.
4) To increase the youth's awareness of how his/her actions impact others.

How the Program Works

The following offenses may be referred to the CYJC:

Arson (no injury to person)   Theft (less than $500)
Misdemeanor Assault   Trespass to property
Disorderly Conduct   Trespass to vehicle
Domestic Abuse   Unauthorized use of Motor Vehicle

Felony Mischief may also be referred to the CYJC if the youth is a first-time offender and the youth and parent(s) are cooperative and willing to make restitution to the victim.

In cases involving these offenses, the youth may be referred to the CYJC. All youths are referred by the Intake Division of Youth Court Services. The Intake officer may, at his/her discretion, offer the CYJC Program as an alternative to an appearance before the Youth Court Judge.

To participate in the CYJC Program, the youth must admit to

38

the offense, the youth and his/her parent(s) must sign a waiver agreeing to meet with the Council, the youth and parent(s) must sign "release of information" forms so that the case may be referred to one of the councils. The Intake Officer then assigns the case to one of the councils and establishes a date for the meeting.

The CYJC meetings follow several steps:

1) The Council discusses the offense with the youth in the absence of his/her parent(s).

2) The Council discusses the offense and family situation with the parent(s) in the absence of the youth.

3) After hearing from both the youth and parent(s), the council discusses the case amongst themselves and reaches agreement regarding a sentence for the offense.

4) Both the youth and parent(s) are brought in to witness the sentencing and admonishment of the youth.

5) The Council sets up a "follow-up" appointment for the youth and parent(s) so that the council can ensure that all conditions of the sentence have been fulfilled.

6) The youth and parent(s) sign agreements to abide by and complete the sentencing handed down by the Council.

7) At the conclusion of the "follow-up", if the case is closed and no further action required of the youth, the youth and parent(s) are asked to complete program evaluation forms.

The Council may order the youth to write essays, improve his/her grades, observe a curfew, perform community service, and/or attend group counseling. The Councils are given great flexibility in decision-making regarding sentencing, and a Juvenile Probation Officer is assigned to each Council to assist in this process.

A Brief Review of the Literature on Program Effectiveness

In order for the CYJC Program to be viewed as a "citizen-as-decision-maker" model of citizenship, the program must be shown to be effective.[10] An ineffective program (one that does not accomplish its goals) necessarily discounts the value of the citizen participation it is supposed to encourage. After all, what is the point of citizen participation in a program that does not accomplish anything?

Richard Bingham and Claire Felbinger (1989) discuss program evaluation as a method to ascertain the effectiveness of a program or policy. Of the several types of evaluation discussed, impact evaluations are the most commonly used. "Impact evaluations focus on the end results of a program", and one type of impact evaluation, enumerating outcomes, focuses on whether a program's goals have been achieved (Bingham and Felbinger, 1989: 5). As will be shown later in this chapter, this type of impact evaluation is a component of this research.

Good evaluations involve collecting empirical data to test hypotheses guided by a program or policy's intent. These hypotheses are assertions about the impact of the program on participants (Bingham & Felbinger, 1989: 3). To test the

[10] As an intern with Cascade County in the Summer of 1997, I complied an analysis of the follow-up surveys completed by both parent and youth participants in the CYJC. The results indicated participants had high levels of satisfaction regarding the program. This analysis provided support for the assertion that the CYJC would be effective in achieving it's goals, and thus be a model of effective citizen participation in government. For complete results, see Appendix D.

40

effectiveness of the CYJC Program then, empirical data should be collected to test hypotheses regarding how well the program achieves it's goals. Such hypotheses are included in the conceptual framework for this research discussed below.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this research is linked to the research purpose. The purpose of this research is both exploratory and descriptive. It is exploratory in that it seeks to investigate the relationship between participation in the Community Youth Justice Council Program and participant attitudes. It is descriptive in that it seeks to describe what the participant's attitudes are regarding the effectiveness of the CYJC Program, their future participation in government, their perceptions of government, and the effectiveness of government. Therefore the conceptual framework utilized consists of both working hypotheses and descriptive categories. The conceptual framework for this research consists of working hypotheses relating to several descriptive categories, as follows:

Effectiveness of the CYJC Program

WH1: **Stakeholders and participants** in the CYJC Program will self- report the perception that the CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

WH1a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

WH1b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

WH1c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

Perceptions of Government

WH2: **Stakeholders and participants** in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

WH2a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

WH2b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

WH2c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

Effectiveness of Government

WH3: **Stakeholder and participants** in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government**.

WH3a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government**.

WH3b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perceptions of the **effectiveness of government**.

WH3c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perceptions of the **effectiveness of government**.

WH4: **Stakeholders and participants** in the CYJC Program will
      self- report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected
      behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

WH4a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-
      report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected
      behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

WH4b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an
      improvement in their **attitude and expected behavior**
regarding **future participation** in government.

WH4c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an
      improvement in their **attitude and expected behavior**
regarding **future participation** in government.

    The next chapter, chapter four, will discuss the methodology
used to test the above working hypotheses.

Chapter IV

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses survey research, the methodology chosen for this study. A discussion of the survey instrument and survey response, pre-testing, unit of analysis, the population and corresponding sample, and possible sources of bias are also included here. Lastly, this chapter includes the operationalization of the several working hypotheses tested in this research.

A Discussion of Survey Research

This study utilizes survey research as the methodology to test the working hypotheses relating to the several descriptive categories presented at the end of chapter three. Specific survey questions test each working hypothesis. Survey research is appropriate for this study for several reasons. First, survey research may be used when the research purpose in descriptive and/or exploratory and where the individual is the unit of analysis (Babbie, 1995: 257). Secondly, survey research is also appropriate for measuring the attitudes of a large population (Babbie, 1995: 257), and in this case the survey population exceeds 650 individuals.

Survey research has several advantages and disadvantages that

44

must be taken into account. The advantages of survey research include: flexibility in asking question, and thus, flexibility in analysis; the ability to obtain data from a large number of respondents; and standardized responses (Babbie, 1995: 273). The disadvantages include: the topic may not be favorable to survey research; survey research cannot address the social context of the individuals; and the act of using a survey may impact responses (Babbie, 1995: 273-74).

Of the disadvantages mentioned above, the most important in terms of possible impact on this study may be the possibility of responses being influenced by the survey questions themselves. With regard to this research, many respondents may not have previously thought of the impact of their participation in the CYJC on their attitudes towards government effectiveness and other topics. Asking them such questions will result in an "off the cuff" response more so than one that is an accurate reflection of personally held beliefs. In addition, it is possible that this research is affected by the inability to address the social context of the individuals. It is possible, particularly when dealing with subjects such as "government", that there is some occurrence outside of the scope of the survey (i.e. participation in the CYJC Program) that influences the respondent's attitudes toward that subject. That is to say, respondent's may report that their participation in the CYJC Program had a certain perceived effect, when in reality, their attitude on the subject was influenced by an occurrence outside

45

of their participation in the CYJC Program.

Unit of Analysis

In this study, the unit of analysis is the individual
respondent. Each individual in the sample completes a survey
regarding his or her own attitudes and perceptions. In this
study, the data is collected at the individual level.

The Population

The population for this research consists of all members of
the three CYJC Program participant groups: council-members,
youth, and parents. The sampling frame is the list of all
council-members in the CYJC Program, and the list of all youth
who have completed the program, as of July 18, 1997. Probation
officers, who serve to guide the councils, have been omitted from
the population because they are not volunteers.

The population includes: 111 council-members, 270 youth, and
at least 270 parents, since one parent is required to
participate. The number of parents is known to be higher, as in
some cases, both parents participated in the CYJC. The exact
number, however, is impossible to determine given that no
sampling frame for parents exists. The total population exceeds
650 individuals.

.

Using the sampling frames mentioned above, a non-probability sample of the population was extracted, yielding a sample of at least 381 individuals[12]. The sampling methods used are described below.

For council-members, no sampling technique was used, as the entire population was surveyed. This was done because, 1) the population of council-members is comparatively small, and 2) the council-members are the group most resembling "decision-makers" in this model. Including the population of council-members is justified as their opinions are most useful in describing the CYJC as a "citizen-as-decision-maker" model of citizenship.

Youth were selected using a non-probability, non-random, systematic sampling method. Beginning with the first element in an alphabetized sampling frame, every other youth was selected for inclusion into the sample. Here, the sampling interval is two, and the sampling ratio is 1/2.

While there are disadvantages to this sampling method, as are

---

11 Initially, I did not intend to sample the research population, as the entire population was to be surveyed. My ambitious research goal was abandoned when funding from "interested parties" was withdrawn two days before the surveys were to be mailed! Due to my own extreme poverty, I did not have the funds needed to survey such a large population, and thus, a last-minute sample had to be selected. Because of the time constraint involved, the quickest and easiest sampling method was used, much to the detriment of the scientific rigor of this research.

12 The sample is composed of 111 council-members; 135 youth; and at least 135 parents.

discussed below, there is one important advantage. Many families have more than one youth participating in the CYJC Program. Selecting youth via this method eliminated the possibility of siblings being included in the sample. This is important because including siblings would mean including the same parent(s) twice within the sample, because parents would receive surveys for each youth participating in the CYJC Program. In effect, the responses of these parents would be counted twice, skewing the data.[13]

Parents were included in the sample via a non-probability method called "reliance on available subjects" (Babbie, 1995: 226). This method is used because, as previously mentioned, no sampling frame for parents exists. One parent is required to attend the CYJC with their youth, while both parents are encouraged to attend. As will be discussed in a later section, the survey was distributed in such a way as to include as many parents in the sample as possible.

Problems Associated with the Sampling Method

The sampling method chosen for this research yielded a non-random, non-probability, systematic sample[14]. While this method

---

13 Of the total population of 271 youth, there are at least 10 pairs of siblings. Using random-sampling techniques, the possibility existed for all 20 siblings (and their parents) to be included in the sample. Had this been the case, the responses of as many as 20 parents would have been, in effect, double-counted.

14 Though random samples are thought to be ideal for survey research, Fox & Miller (1997) pose a counter-arguement of sorts. They argue that random selection assumes that apathetic individuals will be included in the survey sample. According to Fox & Miller (1997: 137), "Random

48

is less time consuming and more cost-effective than random sampling methods, it does have disadvantages.

The principal disadvantage of the sampling method used here is that it does not assure the representativeness of the sample. A sample is representative of the population if the "aggregate characteristics" of the sample are the same within the population (Babbie, 1995: 192). The sampling method chosen in this research cannot ensure the representativeness of the sample with regard to age, gender, or race. Though the characteristics of age, gender, and race are not of specific interest in this research, nonetheless, the potential source of bias should be recognized.

The lack of representativeness negatively affects the generalizability of the research findings. If the sample is not representative of the population, the results cannot be said to be generalizable to the population as a whole. It important to note however, that while this problem impacts both the youth and therefore, the parent samples, it does not impact the most important sample group- the council-members. The entire population of council-members was surveyed, eliminating any concerns over representativeness and generalizablity.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument is in a standardized format consisting

---

selection creates circumstances that maximize the likelihood that hose who do not care about the issues...will be chosen to provide input. Under no other selection criteria would the chances of participation be better for those who do not care". This critique downplays the importance of random sampling.

of 20 close-ended questions. Every individual in the sample received the same survey.

Pre-testing

The survey instrument was pre-tested by 2 members of Alliance For Youth, Inc., the non-profit organization that supervises the CYJC Program, the Chairperson of the CYJC Executive Committee, and the Cascade County Commissioner who spear-headed the effort to create the CYJC Program.

Sources of Bias

Besides those previously mentioned, there are several potential sources of bias or error within this study. First, the respondents may misunderstand the questions. Second, especially with parents and youths, the respondents answers may be influenced by one another. Third, the respondents, especially the parents and youth may feel reluctant to answer truthfully. Fourth, care must be taken so that the survey items do not influence the responses of those surveyed.

Distribution of the Survey

Surveys were mailed to council-members on September 19, 1997, and to parents, and youth on September 20, 1997. The specified return deadline was October 3, 1997. Surveys were mailed to council-members individually, while parent and youth surveys were

sent together since it was presumed that both the youth and the parent attending the CYJC Program were members of the same household. Two copies of the 'Parent' survey were mailed with each 'Youth' survey so that, in cases where both parents attended the CYJCs, both parents could participate in this research study.

An explanatory cover letter describing the purpose of the research was mailed with the survey(s), along with a stamped return envelope. One copy of the letter was included with each mailing, regardless of how many surveys were included. This was done to eliminate duplication and limit costs as much as possible.

In an effort to increase the return rate for the council-member surveys, several of the council chair-persons were contacted by phone and asked to remind the members of their councils to return the surveys.

Survey Response

Since the survey population includes three participant groups, three different response rates can be calculated. For council-members, 64 surveys of the 111 sent were returned, for a return rate of 57.7%. For the youth 11 of 135 surveys were returned, an 8.1% return rate. For parents 16 responses were returned. Because the exact number of parents in the sample is unknown, the exact return rate is impossible to calculate, but it is between 5.9% and 11.9%.

The response rates were unexpectedly poor on all accounts.

While the 57.7% return rate for the council-members would not be considered poor under usual circumstances, the researcher expected a higher return rate because of his personal acquaintance with many of the respondents. There are, however, several reasons that may explain the lower than expected return rates. First, some of the respondents changed addresses in the months in between the time the sampling frame was produced and the time the surveys were mailed. Second, many respondents, particularly parents and youth may have been skeptical of the survey due to the confidentiality issue. Third, it is likely that many respondents simply did not understand the survey or what it was designed to measure.

Operationalization of Hypotheses

Below is Table 4.1 which identifies the working hypotheses utilized in this research and links them to the questionnaire items designed to test each. The important concepts are bolded in both the working hypotheses and the questionnaire items.[15]

---

15 The same key terms are bolded on the survey itself. See Appendix E for an example of the complete survey.

Table 4.1: Operationalization of Working Hypotheses

Working Hypotheses	Questionnaire Items
WH1a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals** WH1b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**. WH1c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.	Q1. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **getting the community involved** in the juvenile justice process? Q2. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **getting families involved** in the juvenile justice process? Q3. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **holding youth accountable** for their offense? Q4. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **showing that the community cares** about its youth? Q5. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its goal of making youth aware of how their actions affect others in the community?
WH2a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**. WH2b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**. WH2c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.	Q6. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your attitude about **Cascade County Government**? Q7. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your attitude about the **Court System**? Q8. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your attitude about the **Youth Court Services Bureaucracy** (Ex. Intake Officers and Probation Officers)? Q9. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your attitude about the **County Commissioners**? Q10. How would you describe your **relationship** with your **county government**?

WH3a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government**.	Q11. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, your **attitude** about **how well government works** has...?
WH3b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government**.	Q12. How **effective** is Cascade County government?
WH3c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perceptions of the **effectiveness of government**.	Q13. How well do you think Cascade County government **achieves its goals**?
	Q14. How **confident** are you that Cascade County **government** can **make life** in your community **better**?
	Q15. Letting **citizens become "decision-makers"** and directly impact their communities can make Cascade County **government more effective**.
WH4a: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior regarding future participation** in government.	Q16. How do you **feel** about **participating in government** through community-based programs like the CYJC?
WH4b: **Parent** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior regarding future participation** in government.	Q17. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, your **attitude** about citizen **participation in government** through community-based programs has...?
WH4c: **Youth** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior regarding future participation** in government.	Q18. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, the **likelihood** that you will **participate in government** through community-based programs in the **future** has....?
	Q19. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, how **likely** are you to **participate in government** through community-based programs in the **future**?
	Q20. Would you **participate** in other community-based programs that involved **community members making the decisions** instead of government officials?

Chapter five presents the results of this survey research and provides analysis of the results. Only council-member data is discussed in the following chapter. This is due, in part, because the council-members are the most important participant sub-group, and in part, because of the poor response rates for both the parents and youth. Each working hypothesis will be discussed separately.

Chapter V

Results

This chapter discusses the results of a survey distributed to council-member, parent, and youth participants in the Community Youth Justice Council Program of Cascade County, Montana. This chapter only deals specifically with the results of the council-member surveys since they are the participants who mostly resemble the citizen decision-makers in this model. The results for the program as a whole, the parents, and the youth are included as appendices[16]. The results for each working hypothesis will be presented and discussed separately.

WH1: Effectiveness of the CYJC Program

As discussed in Chapter 3, an effective program (one that accomplishes its goals), is a prerequisite for effective citizenship. The data indicates council-members feel very strongly that the CYJC Program accomplishes its goals. For the questions concerning the goals of the CYJC, in all cases over 80% of council-members responded positively that the Program accomplished its goals. The range was from 80.9% for involving families in the juvenile justice process, to 87.3% for showing

---

[16] For data and summary findings for the sample as a whole, see Appendix F. For data and summary findings for parents, see Appendix G. For data and summary findings for youth, see Appendix H.

that the community cares about youth.

Table 5.1 also displays the means for each response relating
to WH1. The means range from a low of 1.00 for the CYJC goal
"getting families involved" to 1.22 for "showing the community
cares". The fact that, in all cases, the population means are
over 1.00 illustrates a strong perception of goal achievement for
the CYJC on the part of council-members, as a mean above one
corresponds with a "Good" to "Very Good" survey response.

In addition, it is important to note the significance level
of the data in Table 5.1. The t-test significance data
illustrates that, for all questions relating to WH1, Council-
member's responses are significantly different from the neutral
response at the 99% confidence level.

Simply put, the extremely low t-test significance figures
means that there is very little chance that the true population
mean is neutral and that the data accumulated was the result of
error.

WH1: **Council-members** will self-report the perception that the
CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

Table 5.1: Percentage Distributions, Means, and T-test
Significance for Responses(Questions 1-5).

Goals	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral.	% Neg.	Mean
Community Involvement	63	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	1.19*
Family Involvement	63	80.9%	17.5%	1.6%	1.00*
Making Youth Accountable	63	84.1%	12.7%	3.2%	1.13*
Showing Community Cares	63	87.3%	12.7%	0.0%	1.22*
Youth Aware	62	82.3%	16.1%	1.6%	1.03*

* Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
All responses on a +2 to -2 scale.

A Discussion of Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Test for WH1

The Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance is a non-parametric and less rigorous substitute for the One-Way ANOVA analysis of variance. It is used for this study due to the large discrepancy is sample sizes between sample sub-groups. The council-member sub-group is three to six times as large as the parent and youth sub-groups, making the use of the One-Way ANOVA impossible. Kruskal-Wallis is used to test whether there is a significant difference between the mean responses of the sample sub-groups. Stated more simply, the purpose behind Kruskal-Wallis is to determine whether respondents' perceptions differ significantly by sub-group.

Table 5.1a below displays the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test for WH1. This table shows that, with regard to "family involvement", the perceptions of the different sub-groups differ

significantly at the .05 level. Taken as a whole however, the data for WH1 imply that perceptions do not differ significantly by sub-group.

Table 5.1a: Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results: WH1

Goals	Community-Member Mean (N)	Parent Mean (N)	Youth Mean (N)	Significance
Community Involvement	46.33 (63)	52.47 (16)	30.59 (11)	> .05
Family Involvement	44.70 (63)	57.27 (15)	30.00 (11)	< .05
Youth Accountable	45.40 (63)	52.16 (16)	36.41 (11)	> .05
Community Cares	45.87 (63)	47.10 (15)	32.00 (10)	> .05
Making Youth Aware	43.84 (62)	56.50 (16)	34.82 (11)	> .05

WH 2: **Perceptions of Government**

This idea is based in the literature on citizen participation which purports that effective citizen participation can improve attitudes towards government. It is also implicit in the other citizenship models discussed in chapter two.

To test this working hypothesis, a general question was asked about council-members' perceptions of Cascade County government, followed by specific questions about different agencies of government within the community. The results show that, in

general, respondents perceive a positive change in their attitudes towards government as a result of their participation in the CYJC Program. 57.1% said that their attitude towards Cascade County government in general improved, 50.8% said their attitudes towards the Youth Court Services bureaucracy improved, and 46% said that their attitudes towards the court system improved as a result of CYJC participation. Only 39.7% said their attitude toward the County Commissioners changed for the better, while 54% reported that their attitude toward the County Commissioners remained unchanged. This seems to show that most council-members do not identify the County Commissioners as being involved with the CYJC Program, though the program is funded by the County upon approval of the Commissioners.

The means for each response relating to WH2 are shown in Table 5.2. Here again, all means for the corresponding questions are positive. It should be noted however, that the responses for questions 6 through nine are scaled differently than that of question ten. Therefore, the means must be considered in light of the differing response scales. For each question 6 through 9, the means are positive. The range is from .30 for an improved attitude towards the "Court System" to .56 for an improved attitude toward "Cascade County" government in general.

Interestingly, these means suggest that council-members perceive an improvement in their attitudes towards County government in general, even more so than they perceive an

60

improvement regarding the "component parts" of government: the Court system, the Youth Court bureaucracy, and the County Commissioners. This is interesting because council-members interact directly with the Court system and with the Youth Court bureaucracy, and to some degree the County Commissioners. One might think that, given effective participation, such direct interaction would improve attitudes towards those agencies of government specifically, culminating in an improvement of participant attitudes towards government generally. In this case, however, it seems that council-members perceive an improvement of government as a whole, more so than they do the sum of its parts.

Lastly, a question was asked pertaining to the council-members' perception of his/her relationship with Cascade County government. The data suggest that, generally speaking, council-members feel slightly positively about their relationship with government. The mean response in this case falls between "neutral" and "somewhat positive", skewed more toward the positive response than the neutral.

As was the case previously, the t-test data show a significant difference from the neutral response for the means of the responses associated with WH2.

WH2: **Council-members** will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

.

Table 5.2: Percentage Distributions, Means, and T-test
Significance for Responses (Questions 6-10)

Perception of	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Cascade County	63	57.1%	41.3%	1.6%	.56[*][b]
Court System	63	46%	38.1%	15.9%	.30[b]
Youth Court Bureaucracy	63	50.8%	41.3%	7.9%	.43[*][b]
County Commissioners	63	39.7%	54%	6.3%	.33[*][b]
Relationship with Government	63	66.6%	27%	6.4%	.79[*][a]

* Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.
b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

Discussion of Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results for WH2

The Kruskal-Wallis results for WH2 are presented in Table
5.2a. These results show that, for three of the five questions
testing WH2, there is a significant difference in perceptions of
government among respondents of different sub-groups. Perceptions
of "Cascade County" government, the "Court system", and the
respondents' perception of their "relationship with government"
all differ significantly by sub-group. It makes sense that this
would be the case. Council-members are likely to perceive
government more positively given their active involvement in the
CYJC. Because parents and youth are less active, and to a certain
degree, less willing to participate in the CYJC, it is
understandable that their perceptions are different based on
their involvement.

Table 5.2a: Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results: WH2

Attitude Towards	Community-Member Mean (N)	Parent Mean (N)	Youth Mean (N)	Significance
Cascade County	49.43 (63)	37.38 (16)	34.82 (11)	$< .05$
Court System	46.44 (63)	52.78 (16)	29.50 (11)	$< .05$
Youth Court Bureaucracy	46.96 (63)	49.59 (16)	31.18 (11)	$> .05$
County Commissioners	47.73 (63)	37.47 (16)	39.85 (10)	$> .05$
Relationship w/ Government	49.54 (63)	37.75 (16)	28.00 (10)	$< .05$

WH3: Effectiveness of Government

This hypothesis is implicit in the literature on both the "citizen as customer" and "citizen as owner" models. Citizen participation in government, especially that which gives substantive decision-making power to citizens, should result in those citizens perceiving an improvement in the effectiveness of government.

Questions 11 through 14 are designed to test this hypothesis by operationalizing the concept of government effectiveness in different ways. The results are mixed at best. 71.4% of council-members responded that their perception of "how well government works" stayed the same despite their involvement with the CYJC Program. At the same time, 66.6% of council-members perceived

63

Cascade County government as being effective, and 50.8% reported that Cascade County government could improve the quality of life in their community.

Council-members were asked if empowering citizens as decision-makers could improve the effectiveness of Cascade County government. An incredibly high 93.7% of respondents perceived that it could.

The means presented in table 5.3 suggest the impact of CYJC participation on the perception of government effectiveness is somewhat ambiguous. A mean of .19 suggests that council-members' perception of "how well government works", a measure of government effectiveness, changed very little (although positively) as a result of their participation in the CYJC. Additionally, the mean of .68 for "effectiveness of government" suggests that, even though 67% of council-members positively perceive the effectiveness of County government, most perceive Cascade County government "effectiveness" only to a limited degree.

The data seem to suggest that council-members do not recognize "goal achievement" and "improving the quality of life" as being analogous to "effective government". The questions regarding these concepts have very low means of .39 and .48, respectively. One would expect that if council-members associated "goal achievement" and "improving the quality of life" with the concept of "effective government", the means would have more

64

closely resembled the .68 mean for the question specifically dealing with the "effectiveness of government". Further, the data would suggest that council-members may have had a reasonably positive view of government effectiveness without CYJC participation. As mentioned above, council-members perception of government effectiveness seemingly didn't change much, but at the same time the perception that government is "effective" is present albeit to a limited degree, being only slightly skewed toward a positive response.

Lastly, the "citizen as decision-maker" item shows a positive skew, with a mean of 1.1746. This mean suggests that though 93.7% of council-members believe empowering citizens as decision-makers can improve the effectiveness of County government, relatively few "strongly agree" with the suggestion. Taken as a whole, the data regarding council-member's perception of government effectiveness suggests that while Cascade County government is seen as slightly effective, empowering citizens as "decision-makers" would further improve the perceived effectiveness of County government.

Like tables 5.1 and 5.2 above, Table 5.3 shows the t-test significance as significantly different than neutral at the 99% confidence level.

WH3: Council-member participants will self-report an improvement in their perception of the **effectiveness of government**.

Table 5.3:   Percentage Distributions, Means, and T-test
              Significance for Responses (Questions 11-15)

Effectiveness	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
How well Government Works	63	23.8%	71.4%	4.8%	.19 [**b]
Effectiveness of Government	63	66.6%	28.6%	4.8%	.68 [*a]
Achieve Goals	61	42.6%	54.1%	3.2%	.39 [*a]
Improve QoL	63	50.8%	39.7%	9.5%	.48 [*a]
Citizens as Decision- Makers	63	93.7%	3.2%	3.2%	1.17 [*a]

* Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
** Significantly different from neutral at the .005 level..
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.   b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

Discussion of Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results for WH3

The data presented in Table 5.3a show that, for the most part,
the sample sub-groups do not differ significantly in their
perceptions of the "effectiveness of government". This fact
underscores the point that many participants, regardless of their
sub-group do not directly associate the CYJC Program with
"government". Therefore, belonging to one or another sub-grouping
does not have a significant impact on respondents' perception of
government effectiveness.

Interestingly, however, there is a significant difference
among respondents of the different sub-groups with regard as to
whether empowering citizens as "decision-makers" can improve
government effectiveness. Council-members are overwhelmingly

66

positive on this question, most likely because they are, in fact, the decision-makers. It stands to reason that they would have a more positive attitude given their pro-active role in the program. Because parents and youths are less active in the decision-making process of the CYJC, it would stand to reason that they would be less inclined to perceive citizen decision-making as a way to improve the "efficiency" of government.

Table 5.3a: Kruskal-Wallis Results: WH3

Effectiveness of Government	Community-Member Mean (N)	Parent Mean (N)	Youth Mean (N)	Significance
How Well Government Works	47.19 (63)	44.56 (16)	31.90 (10)	> .05
Effectiveness of Government	47.84 (63)	40.16 (16)	28.83 (09)	> .05
How Gov't Achieves Goals	43.43 (61)	48.90 (15)	30.28 (09)	> .05
Improve QoL	47.17 (63)	39.78 (16)	34.22 (09)	> .05
Citizen as decision-maker	46.83 (63)	46.09 (16)	25.33 (09)	< .05

WH 4: **Participation in Government**

The rationale from this hypothesis comes from the literature dealing with both the "citizen as customer" and "citizen as owner" models of citizenship. Both models purport that giving citizens the opportunity for effective participation in government will increase their desire to participate in the future.

When asked about their attitudes toward citizen participation in government through programs like the CYJC, an overwhelming majority (96.7%) of council-members expressed a positive attitude. Also, 82.3% of council-members said their attitudes toward participation improved as a result of their CYJC participation. Further, 75.8% responded that their likelihood of future participation increased, and 74.2% responded that they were more likely to participate in the future. In addition, 96.8% of council-members reported that they were willing to participate in other programs wherein citizens were the "decision-makers" instead of government officials.

The means presented in Table 5.4 suggest that overall, CYJC participation does improve perceptions of citizen participation and increase the likelihood of future participation. Question 16 regarding participants attitudes towards participation in government through community-based programs, has a mean of 1.60. Such a high mean value indicates "very positive" perceptions of participation on the part of most of the council-members. In

addition, the question asking whether council-members' attitudes towards participation changed as a result of CYJC participation has a mean of .8065 on a -1 to 1 scale. This data suggests an overwhelming improvement in respondent's perceptions as a result of CYJC participation. Also, the question dealing with the likelihood of future participation, shows an strong positive perception of an increased likelihood of participation. Further, with a mean of 1.23, question 19 depicts a strong increase in the expected future participation on the part of council-members. Lastly, respondents were asked if they were "willing to participate" in future programs that offered citizens decision-making power. In this case, a chi-square test of significance is most appropriate, as it is not possible to test against a `neutral' response for this item. The high chi-square value of 54.26 illustrates a strong desire by council-members to participate in programs similar in form to the CYJC.

Here again, as with all of the other questionnaire items, the means are shown to be significantly different from neutral at a 99% confidence level.

WH4: **Council-member** participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

Table 5.4: Percentage Distributions, Means, T-test Significance, and Chi-Square for Responses (Questions 16-20)

Participation in Government	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Attitude Toward Participation	62	96.7%	0.0%	3.2%	1.60[*][a]
Change in Attitude Toward Participation	62	82.3%	16.1%	1.6%	.81[*][b]
Likelihood of Future Participation	62	75.8%	22.6%	1.6%	.74[*][b]
Expected Future Participation.	62	74.2%	22.6%	3.2%	1.23[*][a]
Willingness to Participate	62	96.8%	0.0%	3.2%	54.26[*][c]

* Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale   b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.
c Chi-square was used here as the appropriate measure of significance.

Discussion of Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results for WH4

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test presented in Table 5.4a illustrate that the sample sub-grouping does has a significant impact on respondents' perceptions of their attitudes towards participation in government. In all cases, for the five questions pertaining to WH4, there is a significant difference in the perceptions of the different sample sub-groups.

In light of the above data in Table 5.4 this result is not surprising. Council-members, are the most active sub-group, acting as "decision-makers" in this model. It stands to reason then, that this sub-group would have much more positive

perceptions regarding "attitude towards participation" in government, "expected participation", and the "willingness to participate". As previously stated, parents and youths, because they are less active, and perhaps less willing to participate would seemingly be less positive in their perceptions of participation in government.

Table 5.4a.: Kruskal-Wallis Results: WH4

Participation in Government	Community-Member Mean (N)	Parent Mean (N)	Youth Mean (N)	Significance
Attitude towards Participation	49.70 (62)	31.64 (14)	14.50 (10)	< .05
Change Attitude towards Participation	47.94 (62)	35.33 (15)	26.50 (09)	< .05
Likelihood of Future Participation	48.71 (62)	35.83 (15)	20.39 (09)	< .05
Expected Future Participation	49.30 (62)	36.23 (15)	15.67 (09)	< .05
Willingness to Participate	47.61 (62)	37.53 (15)	25.11 (09)	< .05

Chapter six will present a summary of these results and offer insight as to their interpretation.

Chapter VI

Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

These findings suggest that, as a whole, the Community Youth Justice Council Program in Cascade County, Montana could be described as a "new" "citizen as decision-maker" model of citizenship. As Table 6.1 shows, three of the four working hypotheses discussed previously were either "supported" or "strongly supported" by the survey data collected. The data pertaining to the fourth working hypothesis produced mixed results. This chapter summarizes the results pertaining to each working hypothesis, discusses the CYJC Program as a model of citizenship, and identifies possible issues for additional research.

Working Hypothesis 1

As expected, the data show that council-member participants perceive the CYJC Program as being effective in accomplishing its goals. This is not surprising, as the council-members are, for the most part, responsible for ensuring that the program achieves its goals. As the "decision-makers" in this model they shoulder this responsibility.

Working Hypothesis 2

Also supported, though not as strongly, was the hypothesis

Table 6.1: Summary Findings: Council-members

Hypothesis	Evidence
Hypothesis 1: CYJC Effectiveness CYJC effective in achieving its goals	Strongly Supports
Hypothesis 2: Perceptions of Government Improved attitude towards government	Supports
Hypothesis 3: Effectiveness of government	Mixed
Hypothesis 4: participation Improved attitude towards participation Increased expected participation	 Strongly supports Strongly Supports

that citizen participation would improve attitudes towards government. This improvement in attitude may reflect the cooperation between the council-members, the Youth Court Services bureaucracy, and the Youth Court Judge, that is essential to ensure the program's success. The literature on citizen participation points out that though government is often maligned, individual's responses to government are generally positive. Perhaps this assertion is born out by the data.

Working Hypothesis 3

The results of hypothesis three are mixed at best. In theory, citizen participation should increase perceptions of government effectiveness, particularly if the participants are the "decision-makers" as is the case with the CYJC. In fact, council-members perceive that government would be made more effective if citizens were given the opportunity to make decisions instead of government officials. When asked how CYJC participation changed their attitude toward "how well government works", however, council-members were decidedly neutral. Council-members were slightly positive when asked about the effectiveness of government, but neutral when asked how well government achieves its goals. Perhaps this is the result of council-members failing to recognize goal achievement as a measure of effectiveness.

Working Hypothesis 4

Again, as expected the data showed an improvement in the

council-members perceived attitude toward participation, as well as an increase in the likelihood of future participation. This is logical in light of the positive data regarding the other hypotheses. If participants believe their program achieves its goals, and if participation improves their attitudes toward government, then it would follow that they would be likely to view participation, and future participation, favorably.

The CYJC Program as a New Model of Citizenship

As discussed in chapter two, the CYJC Program compares favorably to the citizenship models found in the recent public administration literature such as the "citizen as customer" model forwarded by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) and the "efficient citizenship", "citizen as owner" model espoused by Allen, et al., and recently re-examined by Schachter(1995). In terms of Thomson's (1987) criterion for maximizing effective citizen participation, a necessary condition for a model of citizenship, the CYJC Program is seemingly a superior model.

According to Thomson's (1987) criteria, citizen participation must encompass many people, be all-inclusive, offer the opportunity for significant impact, and address a specific program or policy issue at the appropriate level (200-01). The CYJC Program meets all of these criterion. It includes over 110 community members specifically chosen to represent a cross-section of the community. Council-members in the CYJC Program are the group that most resembles "decision-makers" through their

participation, although parents and even the youth are offered a chance to influence the outcome of the council. The decisions handed down by the council-members directly affect the lives of the youths and families who participate in the program. Lastly, the CYJC gives citizens decision-making power to impact the problem of juvenile crime in their communities by working with government officials at the county level, the appropriate level of government.

In addition to the CYJC representing an example of effective citizen participation, the empirical survey data show the CYJC Program to have a similar perceived effect on council-member participants as that which is *implied* in the other models. The data clearly supports the assertions that participation improves attitudes towards government and attitudes and expected behavior regarding participation, though the data on improving the effectiveness of government is mixed. However, what is perhaps most important here is the overwhelmingly positive perception that empowering citizens as decision-makers will improve the effectiveness of government.

Areas for Future Research

Though the data presented in this research confirm implicit assumptions found in the citizenship model literature, it also serves to raise a few interesting questions for future research. First, several localities have programs like the CYJC Program,

including three communities in Montana alone: Billings, Great Falls, and Helena. It would be interesting to see a meta-analysis of all three programs to see if the findings of this research hold true for the other programs as well. Second, it would be interesting to replicate this research at a later date to see if the longevity of the program would have an impact of the results. Lastly, in light of these research findings, perhaps it would be helpful to explore the possible relationship between CYJC participation citizen trust. Though exploring citizen trust in government is beyond the scope of this study, it is seemingly tangential. Increasing citizen trust in government is a benefit implied in the CYJC Program, as well as the other citizenship models explored in this study. Effective citizen participation in the form of direct decision-making, leads to improved attitudes toward, and increased expectations of, future participation in government. At the same time such participation may improve citizen's attitudes towards government. It is reasonable then to assert that, in such a context, citizen's levels of trust in government would also increase.

Conclusion

All things considered, the Community Youth Justice Council Program in Cascade County, Montana merits being considered as a "new" model of citizenship within public administration even though the concepts embedded in the program have been practiced since the 1950s. The CYJC Program seems, in many ways, to be a

superior model to those discussed more prevalently in the recent public administration literature. In addition, given that this research shows participation can result in an improved perception of government and the perception that empowering citizens can make government more effective, this research offers a possible answer to the question: "How do we bridge the gap between citizens and government?" While more research needs to be done, such as that suggested above, empowering citizens as decision-makers within their own communities seems to be an excellent first step.

APPENDIX A

TECHNIQUE	Identify Attitudes and Opinions	Identify Impacted Groups	Solicit Impacted Groups	Facilitate Participation	Clarify Planning Process	Answer Citizen Questions	Disseminate Information	Generate New Ideas and Alternatives	Facilitate Advocacy	Promote Interaction Between Interest Grps.	Resolve Conflict	Plan Program and Policy Review	Change Attitudes Toward Government	Develop Support/ Minimize Opposition
Arbitration and Mediation Planning	X							X		X	X			
Charrette	X			X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Citizen's Advisory Committee	X			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Citizen Employment	X		X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Citizen Honoraria			X	X	X							X	X	X
Citizen Referendum	X			X							X	X	X	
Citizen Representatives on Policy-Making Bodies	X			X	X			X					X	X
Citizen Review Board				X								X		X
Citizen Surveys	X		X											
Citizen Training				X	X				X				X	
Community Technical Assistance	X			X	X			X	X					
Computer-based Techniques	depends on specific technique chosen													
Coordinator or Coordinator-Catalyst				X	X	X				X	X		X	X
Design-In	X	X		X	X	X		X				X		X
Drop-In Centers		X		X	X	X						X	X	X
Fishbowl Planning				X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Focused Group Interview	X		X	X		X				X				
Game Simulations					X					X		X		X
Group Dynamics										X	X		X	
Hotline		X		X		X								
Interactive Cable TV	X	X	X	X			X	X				X		
Media-based Issue Balloting	X			X		X	X					X		
Meetings—Community-Sponsored	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X
Meetings—Neighborhood	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X
Meetings—Open Informational			X		X	X	X					X		
Neighborhood Planning Council	X			X				X	X			X		
Ombudsman		X			X	X	X					X	X	
Open Door Policy		X		X	X	X	X					X	X	
Planning Balance Sheet	X											X		
Policy Capturing	X													X
Policy Delphi	X							X						
Priority-Setting Committee	X			X								X	X	
Public Hearing		X	X	X		X	X					X		
Public Information Programs					X		X					X	X	
Random Selected Participation Groups	X		X	X				X	X			X		
Short Conference	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X
Task Forces			X					X				X	X	X
Value Analysis	X			X								X		X
Workshops	X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X

Description of Functions

Identify Attitudes and Opinions: determine community and/or interest group feelings and priorities.

Identify Impacted Groups: determine which groups will be directly or indirectly affected by policy and planning decisions.

Solicit Impacted Groups: invite the individuals and groups thought to be impacted by the program to participate in the planning process.

Facilitate Participation: make it easy for individuals and groups to participate.

Clarify Planning Process: explain or otherwise inform the public on planning, policies, projects, or processes.

Answer Citizen Questions: provide the opportunity for citizen or group representatives to ask questions.

Disseminate Information: transmit information to the public; includes techniques which provide access to information.

Generate New Ideas and Alternatives: provide the opportunity for citizens or group representatives to suggest alternatives or new ideas.

Facilitate Advocacy: provide assistance in developing and presenting a particular point of view or alternative.

Promote Interaction between Interest Groups: bring interest group representatives together for exchange of views.

Resolve Conflict: mediate and resolve interest group differences.

Plan, Program, and Policy Review: provide an opportunity for policies to be reviewed.

Change Attitudes toward Government: makes individuals or groups view government differently.

Develop Support/Minimize Opposition: explain the costs, benefits, and tradeoffs to the public, thereby defusing possible opposition and building support.

Participation Techniques

Arbitration and Mediation Planning:
Utilization of labor-management mediation and arbitration techniques to settle disputes between interest groups in the planning process.

Charrette:
Process which convenes interest groups (governmental and non-governmental) in intensive interactive meetings lasting from several days to several weeks.

Citizen Advisory Committees:
A generic term used to denote any of several techniques in which citizens are called together to represent the ideas and attitudes of various groups and/or communities.

Citizen Employment:
Concept involves the direct employment of *client* representatives; results in continuous input of clients' values and interests to the policy and planning process.

Citizen Honoraria:
Originally devised as an incentive for participation of low-income citizens. Honoraria differs from reimbursement for expenses in that it dignifies the status of the citizen and places a value on his/her participation.

Citizen Referendum:
A statutory technique whereby proposed public measur or policies may be placed before the citizens by a ballo procedure for approval/disapproval or selection of one of several alternatives.

Citizen Representation on Public Policy-Making Bodies
Refers to the composition of public policy-making boar either partially or wholly of appointed or elected citize representatives.

Citizen Review Board:
Technique in which decision-making authority is delegated to citizen representatives who are either elected or appointed to sit on a review board with the authorit to review alternative plans and decide which plan shou be implemented.

Citizen Surveys of Attitudes and Opinions:
Only technique other than talking with every citizen th: is statistically representative of all citizens; allows for n interaction between citizens and planners.

Citizen Training:
Technique facilitates participation through providing citizens with information and planning and/or leadershi training, e.g., game simulation, lecture, workshops, etc.

Community Technical Assistance:
A generic term covering several techniques under whic interest groups are given professional assistance in developing and articulating alternative plans or objections to agency proposed plans and policies. Some specific techniques are:

- *Advocacy Planning*
Process whereby affected groups employ professional assistance directly with private funds and consequently have a client-professional relationship.

- *Community Planning Center*
Groups independently plan for their community using technical assistance employed by and responsible to a community-based citizens group.

- *Direct Funding to Community Groups*
Similar process to Advocacy Planning, however, funding comes from a government entity.

- *Plural Planning*
Technique whereby each interest group has its own planner (or group of planners) with which to develop a proposed plan based on the group's goals and objectives.

Computer-based Techniques:
A generic term describing a variety of experimental techniques which utilize computer technology to enhance citizen participation.

Coordinator or Coordinator-Catalyst:
Technique vests responsibility for providing a focal poir for citizen participation in a project with a single individual. Coordinator remains in contact with all parties and channels feedback into the planning proces:

Design-In:
Refers to a variety of planning techniques in which citizens work with maps, scale representations, and photographs to provide a better idea of the effect on their community of proposed plans and projects.

Drop-In Centers:
Manned information distribution points where a citizen can stop in to ask questions, review literature, or look at displays concerning a project affecting the area in which the center is located.

80

Fishbowl Planning: _____
A planning process in which all parties can express their support or opposition to an alternative before it is adopted, thereby bringing about a restructuring of the plan to the point where it is acceptable to all. Involves use of several participatory techniques—public meetings, public brochures, workshops, and a citizen's committee.

Focused Group Interviews:
Guided interview of six to 10 citizens in which individuals are exposed to others' ideas and can react to them; based on the premise that more information is available from a group than from members individually.

Game Simulations:
Primary focus is on experimentation in a risk-free environment with various alternatives (policies, programs, plans) to determine their impacts in a simulated environment where there is no actual capital investment and no real consequences at stake.

Group Dynamics:
A generic term referring to either interpersonal techniques and exercises to facilitate group interaction, or problem-solving techniques designed to highlight substantive issues.

Hotline:
Used to denote any publicized phone answering system connected with the planning process. Hotlines serve two general purposes: 1) as an avenue for citizens to phone in questions on a particular project or policy and receive either a direct answer or an answer by return call; or 2) as a system whereby the citizen can phone and receive a recorded message.

Interactive Cable TV-based Participation:
An experimental technique utilizing two-way coaxial cable TV to solicit immediate citizen reaction; this technique is only now in the initial stages of experimentation on a community level.

Media-based Issue Balloting:
Technique whereby citizens are informed of the existence and scope of a public problem, alternatives are decribed, and then citizens are asked to indicate their views and opinions.

Meetings—Community-sponsored:
Organized by a citizen group or organization; these meetings focus upon a particular plan or project with the objective to provide a forum for discussion of various interest group perspectives.

Meetings—Neighborhood:
Held for the residents of a specific neighborhood that has been, or will be, affected by a specific plan or project, and usually are held either very early in the planning process or when the plans have been developed.

Meetings—Open Informational (also "Public Forum"):
Meetings which are held voluntarily by an agency to present detailed information on a particular plan or project at any time during the process.

Neighborhood Planning Council:
A technique for obtaining participation on issues which affect a specific geographic area; council serves as an advisory body to the public agency in identifying neighborhood problems, formulating goals and priorities, and evaluating and reacting to the agency's proposed plans.

Ombudsman:
An independent, impartial administrative officer who serves as a mediator between citizen and government to seek redress for complaints, to further understanding of each other's position, or to expedite requests.

Open Door Policy:
Technique involves encouragement of citizens to visit a local project office at any time on a "walk in" basis; facilitates direct communication.

Planning Balance Sheet:
Application of an evaluation methodology that provides for the assessment and rating of project alternatives according to the weighted objectives of local interest groups, as determined by the groups themselves.

Policy Capturing:
A highly sophisticated, experimental technique involving mathematical models of policy positions of parties-at-interest. Attempts to make explicit the weighting and trading-off patterns of an individual or group.

Policy Delphi:
A technique for developing and expressing the views of a panel of individuals on a particular subject. Initiated with the solicitation of written views on a subject, successive rounds of presented arguments and counter-arguments work toward consensus of opinion, or clearly established positions and supporting arguments.

Priority-setting Committees:
Narrow-scope citizen group appointed to advise a public agency of community priorities in community development projects.

Public Hearings:
Usually required when some major governmental program is about to be implemented or prior to passage of legislation; characterized by procedural formalities, an official transcript or record of the meeting, and its being open to participation by an individual or representative of a group.

Public Information Program:
A general term covering any of several techniques utilized to provide information to the public on a specific program or proposal, usually over a long period of time.

Random Selected Participation Groups:
Random selection within a statistical cross-section of groups such as typical families or transit-dependent individuals which meet on a regular basis and provide local input to a study or project.

Short Conference:
Technique typically involves intensive meetings organized around a detailed agenda of problems, issues, and alternatives with the objective of obtaining a complete analysis from a balanced group of community representatives.

Task Force:
An ad hoc citizen committee sponsored by an agency in which the parties are involved in a clearly-defined task in the planning process. Typical characteristics are small size (8-20), vigorous interaction between task force and agency, weak accountability to the general public, and specific time for accomplishment of its tasks.

Value Analysis:
Technique which involves various interest groups in the process of subjectively ranking consequences of proposals and alternatives.

Workshops:
Working sessions which provide a structure for parties to discuss thoroughly a technical issue or idea and try to reach an understanding concerning its role, nature, and/or importance in the planning process.

81

Citizen Participation: 21 "Citizen Involvement" Techniques

Presented in Foutz (1993) "Local Government Use of Citizen
Participation: The Impact of Form of Government and Population
Size"

Citizen Advisory Committees:
Citizens charged with representing the ideas and attitudes of
their respective groups and/or communities (Rosener, 1975: 18;
Sario and Langton, 1987: 217).

Citizen Review Board:
"Technique in which decison-making authority is delegated to
citizen representatives who are either elected or appointed to
sit on a review board with the authority to review alternative
plans and decide which plan should be implemented" (Rosener,
1975: 18).

Citizen Surveys of Attitudes and Opinions:
"Only technique other than talking with every citizen that is
statistically representative of all citizens; allows for no
interaction between citizens and planners" (Rosner, 1975: 18).
Surveys can be used to gahter factual information (statistics);
information on citizen needs and preferences;p and information on
citizen satisfaction levels (Stipak, 1980: 521).

Citizen Training:
Consists of providing citizens with information and leadership
training. Examples include game simulation, lecture, workshops,
etc. (Rosener, 1975: 18).

Community Technical; Assisstance:
Interest groups are gathered and given professional assisstance
in developing, articulating, or objecting to proposed plans and
policies (Rosener, 1975: 18).

Coordinator or Coordinator Catalyst:
"Technique vests responsibility for providing a focal point for
citizen participation in a project with a single individual.
Coordinator remains in contact with all parties and channels
feedback into the planning process" (Rosener, 1975: 18).

Design-In:
Citizens p[lanning groups are gioven maps, scale representations
and photographs to analyze proposed community plans and projects
(Rosener, 1975: 18).

Drop-in Centers:
Located in a proposed project area, manned information
distribution centers which provide project/program literature or
displays and allow citizens to directly ask project related
questions (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Fishbowl Planning:
Planning process in which all parties are given the opportunity
to support or oppose an alternative before it is adopted, thereby
allowing the plan to be re-designed to meet all expressed
concerns. May include use of public meetings, public brochures,
workshops, or citizen committees (Rosenere, 1975: 19).

Focused Group Interview:
Guided interview or discussion in which participants are exposed
to other participants' ideas and are encouraged to react to
information/comments derived from other group members (Rosener,
1975: 19).

Hotline:
Utilization of a phone answering system for input and information
to a planning process" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Meetings-Neighborhood:
Government organized meetings of residents of a neighborhood
which will or may be impacted by a specific plan or project
(Rosener, 1975: 19; Sario and Langton, 1987: 217).

Meetings-Open Informational (Public Forum):
Governments voluntarily hold public meetings to present detailed
information on a proposed plan or project (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Neighborhood Planning Council:
"A technique for obtaining participation on issues which affect a
specific geographic area; council serves as an advisory body to
the public agency in identifying neighborhhod problems,
formulating goals and priorities, and evaluating and reacting to
the agency's proposed plans" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Ombudsman:
Utilization of "an independent, impartial administrative officer
who serves as a mediator between citizen and government to seek
redress for complaints to further understanding of each other's
position, or ro expedite requests" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Policy Delphi:
"A technique for developing and expressing the view of a panel of
individuals on a particular subject. Initiated with the
spolicitation of written views on a subject, successive rounds of
presented arguements and counter-arguments toward consensus of

opinon, or clearly established positions and supporting
arguemnts" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Priority-Setting Committees:
Citizen group appointed by city councils to provide advice on
community prioriites in commiunity development projects (Rosener,
1975: 19).

Public Information Program:
Programsd specifically designed to provide the public with
information on a specific program or proposal (Rosener, 1975:
19).

Random Selected Participation Groups:
"Random selection with a statistical cross-section of groups such
as typical families or transit dependent individuals which
meeting on a regular basis and provide local input to a study or
project" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Task Force:
Government initiated planning process, in which ad hoc citizen
committee members are asked to address a clearly-defined task.
Task forces usually consist of 8 to 20 memebers and are given a
specific time frame to accomplish its task (Rosener, 1975: 19).

Workshops:
"Working sessions which provide a structure for parties to
discuss thoroughly technique issue or idea and try to reach an
understanding concerning its role, nature, and/or importance in
the planning process" (Rosener, 1975: 19).

TABLE 5.2

USE OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES

96 Survey Responses Received, 56.1% Rate of Return

Technique	Number Using Technique*	Percent Using Technique
Citizen Advisory Comm.	89	92.7%
Citizen Review Board	48	50.0%
Citizen Survey	66	68.8%
Citizen Training	38	39.6%
Community Technical Assist.	24	25.0%
Coordinator/Coor. Catalyst	44	45.8%
Design-In	23	24.0%
Drop-In Center	16	16.7%
Fishbowl Planning	32	33.3%
Focused Group Interview	14	14.6%
Hotline	26	27.1%
Meetings-Neighborhood	76	79.2%
Meetings-Public Forum	86	89.6%
Neighbor. Planning Council	17	17.7%
Ombudsman	8	8.3%
Policy Delphi	2	2.1%
Priority-Setting Committees	52	54.2%
Public Information Program	64	64.0%
Random Selected Partic. Grp	24	24.0%
Task Force	75	78.1%
Workshops	68	70.8%

*Respondents indicated the technique is often or sometimes used

TABLE 5.3

USE OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES AND THE GOALS THEY ARE INTENDED TO SERVE

Rosener's Associated Goals are Indicated by Light Shading, Significant Goals/Technique Deviations are Indicated by Dark Shading

Technique	Number Using Technique N=96	Percent Using Technique	Identify attitudes, opinions, priorities	Solicit impacted groups & invite them to partici.	Generate new ideas and alternatives	Resolve conflicts/ dissolve poor relations	Meet federal/ state/local require-ments	Plan, program, and policy review	Develop support or minimize opposition for programs	Answer citizen question: dissem-inate informa.
Citizen Advisory Comm.	89	92.7%	83%	53%	76%	42%	38%	76%	60%	61%
Citizen Review Board	48	50.0%	52%	46%	44%	54%	58%	71%	33%	56%
Citizen Survey	66	68.8%	94%	35%	53%	23%	14%	46%	39%	36%
Citizen Training	38	39.6%	29%	45%	26%	42%	8%	24%	47%	71%
Community Technical Assist.	24	25.0%	33%	67%	50%	38%	25%	25%	38%	50%
Coordinator/Coor. Catalyst	44	45.8%	68%	59%	59%	71%	32%	59%	64%	73%
Design-In	23	24.0%	61%	61%	70%	30%	26%	57%	74%	57%
Drop-In Center	16	16.7%	56%	38%	31%	44%	19%	13%	38%	81%
Fishbowl Planning	32	33.3%	81%	81%	59%	63%	25%	47%	66%	72%
Focused Group Interview	14	14.6%	71%	71%	71%	29%	14%	21%	43%	57%
Hotline	26	27.1%	54%	42%	46%	42%	4%	15%	15%	77%
Meetings-Neighborhood	76	79.2%	79%	79%	63%	74%	25%	38%	75%	93%
Meetings-Public Forum	86	89.6%	86%	71%	58%	59%	44%	43%	69%	92%
Neighbor. Planning Council	17	17.7%	65%	59%	59%	59%	6%	35%	59%	53%
Ombudsman	8	8.3%	50%	25%	25%	88%	13%	25%	38%	50%
Policy Delphi	2	2.1%	100%	50%	100%	100%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Priority-Setting Committees	52	54.2%	85%	67%	75%	39%	17%	67%	56%	56%
Public Information Program	64	64.0%	33%	31%	27%	41%	16%	20%	69%	92%
Random Selected Partic. Group	24	24.0%	63%	63%	50%	25%	13%	46%	54%	46%
Task Force	75	75.0%	73%	68%	80%	59%	13%	67%	86%	59%
Workshops	68	68.0%	74%	66%	75%	56%	22%	72%	53%	66%

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 15:12:03 -0600 (MDT)
From: Peggy Beltrone <cascade@mcn.net>
Subject: Answers
To: LR26599@swt.edu
Cc: PS07@academia.swt.edu

Lane,
So sorry about the delay. I'll try to get Judge Johnson moving

Q1: How did you become involved in the CYJC Program? What led to the
Program coming to   Cascade County?

I was challenged to think about caring for the kids in our county by the
Juvenile Justice specialist of the Board of Crime Control in July of 1995.
At a meeting where we discussed the possibility of doubling (from 8 to 16
beds) the size of our juvenile detention center, she said, "You people in
Great Falls just don't get it. You can build one hundred cells and still
fill them and not have addressed the real problems in your community.
People here just don't care about your kids!" She said that other Montana
communities take ownership of their problems. I asked her to give me an
example and she said that Billings had community volunteers intervening
with first time offenders. Shortly afterwards we invited the Chief
probation officer from Yellowstone County to give a presentation. I invited
about 100 community leaders to the presentation. In advance our CPO said he
wouldn't be interested in the project if a community group (and not his
agency) sponsored it. So before the presentation we met with the Alliance
for Youth board and asked them to take it on as an umbrella organization.

Q2: As a County Commissioners, what is your role in the CYJC Program?

My role has been part cheerleader and part instigator. I oversaw the
initial strategy to launch the program and then stepped back and added
moral support to the various phases. I still keep close watch on the
project and run interference for Alliance For youth in dealing with the
Government component s of the program. I sit on the e-board.

Q3: What are your impressions of the Program so far? Positives?
Negatives?

I have highly favorable impressions of the program. It has released a
synergistic power to citizens that is continually unfolding. We have
developed a program unique to our community and paved the way for more

involvement. I am constantly amazed at the number of time the CYJC is referred to as a success story which other programs hope to match. This for a program that is just two years old is amazing. It is a bright light on the wartorn landscape of juvenile justice in Cascade County. It has given citizens and government officials a sense of what can be accomplished together.

Negative impressions are centralized in the mechanics of the program. It is a challenge to communicate with so many council members. Our councils are limited by the number of probation officers because they bring the arrest reports and other documentation and return it to Youth Court. We are now (starting November) going to run two councils (at the Hospital) at on the same night. This way one PO can bring both sets of reports to the councils. We anticipate this will be a big help as we are already booked through November with October kids.

Q4: With regard to the "How To' evaluation, what do you feel are the most important   aspects of putting together a CYJC Program?

Community leadership is important.
Key players
Youth Judge
CPO
Umbrella Non-profit (so that burdened Youth Court Services doesn't feel like they will be swamped for taking on the innovation)
A government officials outside of courts that can whine effectively without feeling like it is just the government covering itself. Also this person must be willing to budget some funds for the program. I think this is an important function because when it is a decision to take government funds, and not just a grant from an outside source you have the buy in.

Q5: If you were talking to a Commissioner from another County who was skeptical of   adopting a CYJC Program, what would you say to convince them?

This is a political win-win. The public is constantly complaining that the government is screwing up on decisions. This is a chance to give that power (and responsibility) back to the public.

Q6: Where do you see the CYJC program going now? Are you, as a County Commissioner,   satisfied with the Program thus far?

I think there are limitless possibilities for the CYJC. It could mutate into a meaningful community service provider. mentoring, fill in more gaps in the treatment continum. Already we have set up a continuing education program for council members and our Juvenile Detention center director has

asked that her staff be allowed to attend the training. We are looking at an after school program at the Juvenile Detention center that CYJC kids could be referred too.

Q7: Lastly, I'd like your impressions of my research hypotheses. Simply stated, I   anticipate that participation in the CYJC Program by council-members, parents, and   youths, will improve their perceptions of government, their attitude toward   participation in government, and their attitude toward the effectiveness of government.
LOVE IT
    What do you think? Can CYJC participation improve people's attitudes towards   government?

Peggy

CYJC Parent/Youth Evaluations: Analysis

The following data are a numeric analysis of the responses given by parents and youth on the CYJC Evaluation forms. To do this I assigned each response (Questions 1-5 only) with a corresponding value, as follows:

For questions 1 and 4: "Very Dissatisfied", (-2); "Dissatisfied", (-1); "Indifferent",(0); "Satisfied", (+1); and "Very Satisfied", (+2).

For questions 2,3, and 5: "Not at all",(-2);"Very Little", (-1); "Some", (0); "Mostly" (+1); "Very Satisfied", (+2).

Assigning survey responses a corresponding value allows a basis for ranking councils. Councils may be ranked by average scores for each item, for all items, by parent response, or by youth response. Parent scores and youth scores could also be compared to one another. Further, these scores are interpretable and useful in identifying the problem areas of each council, or even the Program as a whole.

Council averages will be between -2 and +2. A high council average implies better performance, a lower average implies weaker performance. Averages for each individual item can be examined to pinpoint which questions are receiving less positive responses from parents and youth.

This scale does not apply to question 6 because it is not on a 5-item scale. To utilize this evaluation method, the responses to question 6 need to be revised to fit the above scale.

Question 1:Were you satisfied with the fairness of the decision by the YJC regarding your offense?

Question 2:Do you think the YJC listened and understood you?

Question 3:Do you think the decision of the YJC helped you in any way?

Question 4:Were you satisfied with the overall process of the YJC?

Question 5:Do you feel the process was explained adequately prior to your appearing before the YJC?

These results are AVERAGE SCORES for the data specified

Program as a whole:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(ALL responses)	1.405	1.367	1.386	1.330	0.990
(106 Responses)					

Program as a whole:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents only)	1.490	1.584	1.396	1.509	1.094
(53 Responses)					

Program as a whole:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Youth only)	1.320	1.150	1.728	1.150	0.886
(53 Responses)					

Council M1:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents only)	2	2	2	2	2
(2 responses)					

(Youth only)	2	2	2	2	2
(2 Responses)					

Council M2:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents)	1.5	2	2	2	1.25
(4 Responses)					

(Youth)	1.75	2	2	1.5	1.25
(4 Responses)					

Council M3:					
(Parents)	1.333	1.333	1.167	1.167	0.333
(6 Responses)					

(Youth)	0.833	0.333	0.666	0.333	0.333
(6 Responses)					

Council T1:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents)	1.666	1.333	1.666	1.666	1
(3 Responses)					

(Youth)	1.333	1.666	1.666	1.666	-.333
(3 Responses)					

Council T2:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents)	2	2	1	2	2
(1 Response)					

(Youth) (3 Responses)	2	1	2	1.666	0

Council T3:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents) (1 Response)	2	2	1	2	2
(Youth) (1 Response)	2	2	1	1	2

Council T4:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents) (1 Response)	2	2	0	1	-1
(Youth) (1 Response)	1	2	0	2	1

Council W1:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents) (1 Response)	1	2	0	1	0
(Youth)	No Responses				

Council W2:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents) (12 Responses)	1.916	1.75	1.75	1.666	1
(Youth) (13 Responses)	1.461	1.461	1.692	1.307	1.153

Council W3:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parents) (7 Responses)	1.285	1.428	1.142	1.428	1.42
(Youth) (5 Responses)	1.4	1	1.8	1.2	1.8

Council TR1: **No Responses EITHER Parent or Youth**

Council TR2: Q5	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
(Parent) (1 Response)	2	2	2	2	2
(Youth)	0	0.5	0	0	0.5

(2 Responses)

Council TR3: Q5	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
(Parents) (3 Responses)	0.666	0	0.666	0.333	0
(Youth) (3 responses)	1	0	1	0.333	0

Council ?:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
(Parent) (11 Responses)	1.181	1.727	1.363	1.545	1.272
(Youth) (10 Responses)	1.2	1	1.2	1.2	1

PARENT SURVEY: APPENDIX E

For each question, please circle the ONE answer that best describes your attitude.

1. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of getting the **community involved** in the juvenile justice process?

   Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
   Poor

2. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of getting **families involved** in the juvenile justice process?

   Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
   Poor

3. How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **holding youth accountable** for their offenses?

   Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
   Poor

4.   How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of showing that the **community cares** about its youth.

   Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
   Poor

5.   How well does the CYJC Program achieve its **goal** of **making youth aware** of how their actions affect others in the community.

   Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
   Poor

6. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your **attitude** about **Cascade County** government?

      Gotten worse   Stayed the same   Improved

7. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your **attitude** about the **Court system**?

      Gotten worse   Stayed the same   Improved

8. How has **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your **attitude** about the **Youth Court Services bureaucracy** (Ex. Intake Officers and Probation Officers)?

    Gotten worse   Stayed the same   Improved

9. How has your **participation** in the CYJC Program **changed** your **attitude** about the **County Commissioners**?

    Gotten worse   Stayed the same   Improved

10. How would you **describe** your **relationship** with your county **government**?

    Very   Somewhat   Neutral   Somewhat   Very
    Negative   Negative   Positive   Positive

11. Since your **participation** in the CYJC Program, your **attitude** about how well government works has...

    Gotten worse   Stayed the same   Improved

12. How **effective** is Cascade County **government**?

    Very   Somewhat   Neutral   Somewhat   Very
    Ineffective   Ineffective   Effective   Effective

13. How well do you think **Cascade County** government achieves its goals?

    Very   Poor   Fair   Good   Excellent
    Poor

14. How confident are you that Cascade County government can make life in your community better?

  Not   Lacking   Neutral   Confident   Very
  Confident   Confidence   Confident

15. **Letting citizens** become "decison-makers" and directly impact their communities can make Cascade County government more effective.

    Strongly   Disagree   Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

16. How do feel about **participating** in government through community-based programs (like the CYJC)?

| Very | Somewhat | Indifferent | Somewhat | Very |
| Negative | Negative | | Positive | Positive |

17. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, your **attitude** about **citizen participation** in government through community-based programs has.....

Gotten worse   Stayed the Same   Improved

18. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, the **likelihood** that you will **participate** in government through community-based programs **in the future** has.....

Decreased   Stayed the same   Increased

19. Since your participation in the CYJC Program, how **likely** are you to **participate** in government through community-based programs **in the future**?

| Much less | Somewhat | Just as | Somewhat | Much |
| Likely | less likely | Likely | **More** likely | more likely |

20. Would you **participate** in other **community-based programs** that involved community members making the decisons instead of government officals?

Yes   No

WH1: **Program Effectiveness**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

Goals	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Negative	Mean
Community Involvement	90	81.4	14.3	3.3	1.11**
Family Involvement	89	78	14.3	5.5	.96**
Holding Youth Accountable	90	81.4	12.1	5.5	1.08**
Community Cares	88	81.4	13.2	2.2	1.14**
Making Youth Aware	89	77	15.4	5.5	1.00**

** Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.

WH2: **Perceptions of Government**

Stakeholders and Participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

Attitude	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Cascade County	90	49.5	44	5.5	.44**b
Court System	90	42.9	40.7	15.4	.28**b
Youth Court Bureaucracy	90	47.3	42.9	8.8	.39**b
County Commissioners	89	34.1	54.9	8.8	.26**b
Relationship	89	57.2	29.7	11	.61**a

** Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale. b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

APPENDIX F: Results for ALL Respondents (Con't.)

WH3: Effectiveness of Government

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government.**

Effectiveness of Government	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
How well Government Works	89	19.8	71.4	6.6	.13[**b]
Effectiveness of Government	88	58.2	30.8	7.7	.56[**a]
How Well Government Achieves Goals	85	40.7	46.2	6.6	.35[**a]
Improve QoL	88	44	42.9	9.9	.38[**a]
Citizen as Decision-Maker	88	83.5	7.7	5.5	1.06[**a]

** Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.   b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

WH4: Participation in Government

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

Participation	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Attitude toward participation	85	82.4	5.5	5.5	1.33[**a]
Change in Attitude toward Participation	86	68.1	23.1	3.3	.69[**b]
Likelihood of future participation	86	60.4	30.8	3.3	.60[**b]
Expected future participation	86	62.7	23.1	8.8	.93[**a]
Willing to Participate	86	82.4	0.0	12.1	47.62[**cx]

** Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.   c Responses on a 0 to 1 scale.
b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.   x The value listed here is a Chi-square value, not a mean.

APPENDIX F: Summary of Findings for ALL Respondents

Hypothesis	Evidence
WH1: Program Effectiveness CYJC Achieves its Goals	Strongly supports
WH2: Perception of Government Improved Attitude Towards Government	Supports
WH3: Effectiveness of Government Improve Effectiveness of Government.	Mixed
WH4: Participation in Government Improved Attitude towards Participation in Government. Increased Expected Participation in Government.	Strongly supports Strongly supports

WH1: **Program Effectiveness**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

Goals	N=	% Pos.	% Neutral	%Neg.	Mean
Community Involvement	16	87.5	6.3	6.3	1.25**
Family Involvement	15	93.4	0	6.7	1.26**
Making Youth Accountable	16	87.5	6.3	6.3	1.25**
Showing Community Cares	15	86.7	6.7	6.7	1.13**
Making Youth Aware	16	81.3	12.5	6.3	1.31**

** Significantly different from neutral at the .001 level.

WH2: **Perceptions of Government**

Stakeholders and Participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

Attitude	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Cascade County	16	31.3	62.5	6.3	.25[b]
Court System	16	56.3	37.5	6.3	.50*[b]
Youth Court Bureaucracy	16	56.3	37.5	6.3	.50*[b]
County Commissioners	16	18.8	68.8	12.5	.06[b]
Relationship	16	43.8	37.5	18.8	.31[a]

* Significantly different from neutral at the .01 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale. b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

WH3: **Effectiveness of Government**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government.**

Effectiveness of Government	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
How well Gov't. Works	16	18.8	75.0	6.3	.13[b]
Effectiveness of Government	16	56.3	31.3	12.6	.38[a]
Achieves Goals	15	60.0	33.3	6.7	.47*[a]
Improve QoL	16	37.5	50	12.6	.19[a]
Citizen D-M	16	81.3	6.3	12.6	1.00**[a]

* Significantly different from neutral at the .05 level. a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.
** Significantly different from neutral at the .005 level. b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

WH4: **Participation in Government**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

Participation	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Attitude toward participation	14	78.6	14.3	7.1	.93*[a]
Change in Attitude toward Participation	15	53.3	40.0	6.7	.47**[b]
Likelihood of future participation	15	46.7	46.7	6.7	.40**[b]
Expected future participation	15	60.0	33.3	6.7	.67**[a]
Willing to Participate	15	73.3	---	26.7	3.266 [cx]

* Significant at the .01 level a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale. c Responses on a 0 to 1 scale.
** Significant at the .05 level b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.
x The value listed is a Chi-square test rather than a mean.

APPENDIX G: Summary of Findings for Parents

Hypothesis	Evidence
WH1: Program Effectiveness CYJC Achieves its Goals	Supports
WH2: Perception of Government Improved Attitude Towards Government.	Not Supported
WH3: Effectiveness of Government Improve Effectiveness of Government.	Not Supported
WH4: Participation in Government Improved Attitude towards Participation in Government. Increased Expected Participation in Government.	Supports Mixed

APPENDIX H: Results for Youth

WH1: **Program Effectiveness**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report the perception that the CYJC Program is **effective** in accomplishing its **goals**.

Goals	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Community Involvement	11	54.6	27.3	18.2	.45
Family Involvement	11	54.6	18.2	27.3	.27
Making Youth Accountable	11	63.7	18.2	18.2	.55
Showing Community Cares	10	60.0	30	10.0	.60
Making Youth Aware	11	54.6	18.2	27.3	.36

No results significantly different from neutral at the .05 level.

WH2: **Perceptions of Government**

Stakeholders and Participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their **perceptions of government**.

Attitude	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Cascade County	11	36.4	36.4	27.3	.09[b]
Court System	11	9.1	63.6	27.3	-.18[b]
Youth Court Bureaucracy	11	18.2	63.6	18.2	.00[b]
County Commissioner	10	30.0	50.0	20.0	.10[b]
Relationship with Government	10	30.0	40.0	30.0	-.10[a]

No results significantly different from neutral at the .05 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.
b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

WH3: **Effectiveness of Government**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self-report an **improvement** in their perception of the **effectiveness of government.**

Effectiveness of Government	N=	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
How well Government Works	10	---	80.0	20.0	$-.20^b$
Effectiveness of Government	9	22.2	55.6	22.2	$.00^a$
How Well Government Achieves Goals	9	22.2	44.4	33.3	$-.11^a$
Improve QoL	9	22.2	66.7	11.1	$.00^a$
Citizen as Decision-Maker	9	44.4	44.4	11.1	$.33^a$

No results significant at the .05 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale. b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.

WH4: **Participation in Government**

Stakeholders and participants in the CYJC Program will self- report an **improvement** in their **attitude and expected behavior** regarding **future participation** in government.

Participation	N =	% Pos.	% Neutral	% Neg.	Mean
Attitude toward Participation	9	44.4	33.3	22.2	$.11^a$
Change in Attitude toward Participation	9	33.3	55.6	11.1	$.22^b$
Likelihood of Future Participation	9	11.1	77.8	11.1	$.00^b$
Expected Future Participation	9	22.2	22.2	55.5	$-.67^a$
Willingness to Participate	9	44.4	---	55.6	$.11^{cx}$

* Significantly different from neutral at the .05 level.
a Responses on a +2 to -2 scale.   b Responses on a +1 to -1 scale.
c Responses on a 0 to 1 scale.   x The value listed here is a Chi-square value, not a mean.

APPENDIX H: Summary of Findings for Youth

Hypothesis	Evidence
WH1: Program Effectiveness CYJC Achieves its Goals	Supports
WH2: Perception of Government Improved Attitude Towards Government	Not Supported
WH3: Effectiveness of Government Improve Effectiveness of Government.	Not Supported
WH4: Participation in Government Improved Attitude towards Participation in Government. Increased Expected Participation in Government.	Not Supported Not Supported

Works Cited

Allen, W. H. (1917). *Universal Training for Citizenship and Public Service*. New York: Macmillan.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). "A Ladder of Citizen Participation". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. July 35: 216-224.

Beltrone, P. S. (1997), Cascade County Commissioner. Interview With the Researcher.

Berman, E. M. (1997). "Dealing With Cynical Citizens". *PAR*. March/April 55: 105-112.

Bingham, R. D. & C. L. Felbinger (1989). *Evaluation in Practice*. New York: Longman.

Bruere, H. (1913). *The New City Government*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Chesney, J.D. & O. Feinstein (1993). "Making Political Activity a Requirement in Introductory Political Science Courses". *PS: Political Science and Politics*. September. *26* (3): 535-538.

Cleveland, F. A. (1913). *Organized Democracy*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Falkson, J. L. (1974). *An Evaluation of Policy Related Research on Citizen Participation in Municipal Service Systems: Overview and Summary*. Washington, DC: TARP Institute.

Frisby, M. & M. Bowman (1996). "What We Have Here Is a Failure To Communicate". *PA Times*. *19* (9):12-13.

Foutz, K. R. (1993). "Local Government use of Citizen Participation: The Impact of Form of Government and Population Size". An Applied Research Project. Southwest Texas State University.

Fox, C. S. & H. T. Miller (1997). *Postmodern Public Administration: Towards Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Frederickson, H. G. (1994). "The Seven Principals of Total Quality Politics..." PA Times. 17 (1), 9.

Works Cited

Kweit, M. G. & R. W. Kweit (1987). "Citizen Participation: Enduring Issues for the Next Century". *National Civic Review* 76, (3). May/June: 191-197.

Langton, S. (1987). "Strengthening Citizen Participation and the Renewal of Community". *National Civic Review* 76, (3). May/June: 224-229.

McGregor, E. B. (1984). "The Great Paradox of Democratic Citizenship and Public Personnel Administration" *PAR* March (Special Issue): 126-132.

Osborne, D. & T. Gaebler (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepernurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* New York: Plume.

Rosener, J. B. (1978). "Citizen Participation: Can We Measure It's Effectiveness?" *PAR* Sept./Oct. *38*: 457-462.

Rosener, J. B. (1975). "A Cafeteria of Techniques and Critiques". *Public Management*, (Dec.) 16-19.

Schachter, H. L. (1995). "Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves: Two Models for Improving Government Performance" *PAR* Nov./Dec. *55*: 530-537.

Schiesl, M. J. (1977). *The Politics of Efficiency*. Berkeley: Univ. of California.

Shields, P. M. (1996). "Pragmatism: Exploring Public Administration's Policy Imprint". *Administration & Society. 28* (3): 390-411.

Smith, G.E. & C.A. Huntsman (1997). "Reframing the Metaphor of the Citizen-Government Relationship: A Value-Centered Perspective" *PAR* July/Aug. *57*: 309-318.

Stivers, C. (1990). "The Public Agency as Polis: Active Citizenship in the Administrative State". *Administration & Society. 22* (1): 86-105.

Strange, J. H. (1972) "The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration" *PAR* (Sept. Special Issue) *32*: 457-467.

Works Cited

Thomson, K. (1987). "Directions for Democracy". *National Civic Review.* 76 (3): 199-207.

Yankelovich, D. (1994). "A Conversation About Our Public Priorities". *National Civic Review.* 83 (4): 389-399.