

# PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL TRAFFIC ENGINEERING: A CASE STUDY OF LOS ANGELES

Michael Schneider, VTN Corporation, Irvine, California

This study was conducted to determine the extent and distribution of citizen participation in local traffic engineering and to determine what differences, if any, exist between citizens who participate in local government and those who do not. The Los Angeles Department of Traffic was selected as a representative agency, and its interaction with citizens in Los Angeles was examined for the fiscal years 1969-1970 and 1970-1971. The requests and petitions for traffic engineering services that the department received from citizens were investigated to determine their general origin, and this distribution was correlated with certain census data to obtain a relationship between socioeconomic status and participation rate. In addition, a home-interview survey was conducted among citizens who had requested traffic engineering services and their neighbors who had not. The results of this local survey, together with the city-wide pattern of citizen participation, are analyzed in this paper to provide some policy implications that might be applied to traffic engineering agencies and other local governmental bodies whose primary or secondary function is to provide "housekeeping" services to urban areas.

•PARTICIPATION by citizens in the affairs of government can take many different forms, depending on such factors as the level of government and the actual or perceived power of the citizen. These modes of political participation have been the subject of numerous studies to determine the characteristics of those who interact with government, whether by voting, letter writing, or other active or passive means. Most of these studies, however, have been directed toward better understanding of the factors that motivate people to participate with a particular political motive—the election of a certain candidate, the passage or defeat of a piece of legislation, or the alteration of a governmental ideology. Relatively little work has been directed at citizen participation in smaller scale, local matters that might be classed as "quasi-political" participation, i.e., the interaction between citizens and local governmental agencies regarding essentially non-political community and neighborhood services.

It is considered normal in most municipal government systems for residents of the city to submit requests for municipal services or to voice complaints and suggestions with respect to existing services. Indeed, most city departments that deal with the public have extensive institutional machinery designed specifically to handle citizen input. Yet little attention has been given to the question of the distribution of these service requests among the population of the city. While it is well known that so-called slum areas within the city require great amounts of police, welfare, and other social services, it is less well known how requests for physical services are distributed throughout the city. The study reported here attempts to address this question by analyzing the requests for service and delineating the motivational factors that play a role in service requests to a typical municipal public agency, the Los Angeles Department of Traffic.

Requests for physical services from local governmental agencies include, broadly, those types of activities that might be considered "urban housekeeping". Examples of such activities are street repairs, park and recreational facility maintenance, street

cleaning, clearing of debris from vacant land, sign posting, and other similar municipal services. Many public agencies generally rely to a large extent on public input for such services; maintenance crews are often too small or overburdened to service all areas regularly and therefore look to the public for information regarding needed services or potential problems in particular neighborhoods.

It is in this context that citizen participation in such local, essentially nonpolitical activities becomes important. It can be readily seen that, given typical time and manpower constraints on the part of public agencies, those neighborhoods or communities from which few service petitions originate will tend to be overlooked in favor of other areas from which many requests originate. Even if agency decision-makers are prepared to listen and respond with equal dispatch to all requests, those who have not requested service in the first place will, of course, not be serviced. As Verba (7) notes, citizens may choose passivity if they wish, but the opportunities to participate ought to be equalized. This includes, in Verba's terms, "equal access to motivation"; if some group—because of past experience or a special pattern of socialization—is less self-confident of its ability to influence decision-makers, it does not, in a real sense, have equal opportunity to participate.

By examining the origins and the distribution of service petitions from citizens to the Los Angeles Department of Traffic, this study will attempt to provide some answers regarding equality of opportunity for citizens to seek access to this particular agency. Further, by means of a limited survey of local residents, some inferences will be made regarding the characteristics of those who do participate. Together, these two investigations will enable certain policy implications to be put forth regarding the role of citizen input in the local traffic engineering process.

The first phase of the study was facilitated by use of Los Angeles Department of Traffic records of public requests for the fiscal years 1969-1970 and 1970-1971. Analysis of the geographic distribution of these requests was performed using the 15 council districts in the City of Los Angeles as analysis units. Census data were aggregated and attributed to each council district. In this way, knowledge of mean citizen request rates and corresponding demographic information allowed correlations to be performed that determined to what extent economic status is associated with traffic service request rates.

The second phase of the study consisted of a home-interview survey carried out in the eastern part of the San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles. This survey was undertaken to determine what differences exist between "traffic service requesters" and "nonrequesters" with respect to discrete environmental variables. The survey was designed to ascertain whether or not those who request traffic services differ significantly from others in the population. Through knowledge, then, of the gross distribution of requests among social and economic groups in the city, and through further knowledge of discrete motivational factors among individual citizens, this study will develop a series of indicators of public participation that may be useful in soliciting input from various groups who lack, in Verba's terms, equal access to motivation.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF CITIZEN INPUT

Input to the Los Angeles Department of Traffic generally is in the form of a request for some traffic engineering service. Citizens can call or write the department directly or lodge requests through the district councilman or the mayor. These requests vary in content, and hence the public input is divided into the following categories:

1. Requests for new signal installations;
2. Requests for alterations to existing signal installations (e.g., the addition of a left-turn arrow);
3. Requests dealing with the installation or removal of stop signs;
4. Requests for installation or removal of curb parking zones (e.g., loading zones or red curb);
5. Requests for installation, removal, or alteration of parking signs;
6. Requests for installation, removal, or alteration of other types of signs (e.g., "signal ahead" or "school x-ing");

7. Requests for crosswalks; and
8. Requests for street painting or striping (e.g., yellow center line or left-turn lane).

Data for this investigation are from Traffic Department files for the period July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1971, representing some 13,000 traffic service petitions over the 2-year period. About 80 percent of the petition requests come directly from the public, with the remainder from councilmen or the mayor. The breakdown for the study period is given in Table 1.

It should be noted that this study, in assessing the distribution of citizen input, is not concerned with the action taken by the Traffic Department in responding to each of these requests; it is assumed that every petition for traffic engineering service is considered in the same manner regardless of the citizen requesting the service. Rather, what is important to this analysis is the origin, and not the disposition, of traffic requests.

The requests received by the Traffic Department during the study period were aggregated according to council district of origin. Los Angeles has 15 such districts; these are shown in Figure 1. Aggregation of requests to council districts allowed comparison with corresponding socioeconomic data furnished by the Los Angeles Community Analysis Bureau.

An important premise underlies the validity of this investigation. It is reasonable to hypothesize that the number of traffic service requests received by the Traffic Department does not accurately reflect the absolute number of instances where traffic services may be required. Rather, it is the perception of the need for traffic improvements on the part of area residents that is reflected in the number of requests received. Furthermore, it is logical that, even if citizens do perceive a need for traffic services, they may not possess the motivation, knowledge, skills, or self-confidence necessary to contact the Traffic Department. Thus, the validity of this analysis is based on the premise that the actual number of requests received per council district is not an accurate indicator of the condition of the district with respect to the traffic environment.

The foregoing discussion has essentially set forth a 2-step process that is inherent in every request received by the Traffic Department. That is, the citizen must (a) perceive the need for a traffic improvement (whether the initial perception is, in fact, right or wrong according to Traffic Department standards is not within the scope of this study) and (b) possess the means and motivation to contact the Traffic Department or other agency regarding the perceived problem.

Both perception and motivation are, to a certain extent, related to the socioeconomic status of the citizen. The perception of traffic and other urban housekeeping problems must, of course, be viewed in the context of other environmental problems perceived by individuals in various socioeconomic classes. The recognition of higher order problems (e.g., housing, food, employment) may certainly overshadow the perception of the lack of a crosswalk or the need for stop signs. Similarly, the means, motivation, and self-confidence necessary to report the problem are very likely unevenly distributed among socioeconomic classes. This study, then, is based on the premise that the number of requests received by the Traffic Department is, in the long run, attributable not only to the actual existence of traffic problems but also to the socioeconomic characteristics of the population.

Using this premise as a basis for analysis, the number of requests that originated during the study period in each particular council district was compared to the average household income, the minority population percentage, and the mean number of cars per family in that council district. Since the population between districts varies greatly (because apportionment is based on voter registration rather than population), a request rate was used instead of the actual number of requests. To equalize population effects, requests per 100,000 citizens was the figure used. The results are given in Table 2, ranked in order of rate of citizen involvement. It is seen that, as the level of involvement (i.e., the traffic service request rate) increases, so does the mean family income and number of family cars, while the minority percentage decreases.



To test these apparent relationships for degree of association, a multiple-regression analysis was performed with the traffic service request rate as the dependent variable and income, percent non-white, and mean number of cars per family as independent variables. With these 3 independent variables the multiple regression coefficient was  $r = 0.95$ , indicating a strong positive correlation between traffic request propensity and socioeconomic status—at least insofar as represented by the variables chosen for analysis.

The regression equation derived from the data is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Requests per 100,000 citizens per year} = & 0.18 (\text{MFI}) - 1.709 (\text{PNW}) \\ & - 70.297 (\text{MNC}) + 184.367 \end{aligned}$$

where

MFI = mean family income ( $r = 0.88$ ),  
 PNW = percent non-white ( $r = 0.73$ ), and  
 MNC = mean number of cars per family ( $r = 0.66$ ).

This regression analysis shows that the distribution of citizen involvement in local traffic engineering among the population in Los Angeles is uneven, with significantly more involvement in the wealthier districts and in those districts lacking minority populations. Such a result may indicate several explanations:

1. The traffic environment is better (i.e., requires less service) in the districts from which few requests are received;
2. The residents of the lower class districts perceive fewer traffic problems than their counterparts in wealthier districts; or
3. Residents of poor and minority-populated districts lack the motivation, knowledge, or means to request services.

The first explanation, while perhaps the most obvious, is actually the least credible. According to data from the Los Angeles Community Analysis Bureau, those districts that show a lower request rate are not better off in terms of traffic services than other areas; in fact, they tend to be worse off due to such factors as vandalism, heavy traffic and pedestrian demands, and old and inadequate facilities. It cannot be concluded, then, that, merely because there is a lower rate of traffic requests from low-income districts, these districts have fewer relative demands for traffic improvements. This in turn implies that the lower request rate must be due to factors not specifically related to traffic, such as the socioeconomic indicators used in the regression equation and their various correlates.

Thus, the premise that citizen involvement in local traffic engineering is attributable to socioeconomic factors as well as to the existence of traffic problems is probably valid. Regardless of the causal linkages, it is quite clear that the urban poor do not seek access to the Traffic Department nearly as frequently as higher income groups in the city. This situation is not due to a lack of cases where services might be used; it is the result of a number of characteristics associated with low socioeconomic status that in effect prohibit the poor from utilizing these services. While there may be no outward governmental bias apparent, there is a societal bias rooted in economic and social factors that hinders access according to class. Although it is not within the scope of this study to determine the precise causal relationships between socioeconomic status and citizen involvement, it can be said that socioeconomic status is associated in a strong positive sense with the inclination on the part of citizens to contact public agencies.

#### HOME-INTERVIEW SURVEY

To determine characteristics associated with citizen participation in local traffic engineering, a home-interview survey in the eastern San Fernando Valley was conducted as an integral part of the research. A total of 64 citizens were interviewed; of these, 32 had requested traffic engineering services from the Department of Traffic

within the year preceding the interview. These names were drawn at random from departmental files, from a total population of about 800 who had submitted requests in the East Valley during the preceding year. The other 32 respondents had not contacted a local agency in the previous year. The people comprising the latter group were selected at random from the same block where a corresponding respondent in the first group resided. In this way, the population of respondents consisted of 32 pairs of citizens, both of whom lived on the same block and one of whom had previously contacted the Traffic Department regarding a particular neighborhood traffic problem.

Presumably, this sampling strategy ensured that each "pair" of respondents was in basically the same socioeconomic class (using housing and neighborhood as a control) and that each might be impacted in the same way by the traffic problem about which the respondent in the first group contacted the Traffic Department. The purpose, of course, was to attempt to determine what perceptual and motivational differences between the respondents could have accounted for the fact that one citizen sought access to a local public agency while the other did not.

The questionnaire used in the survey was divided conceptually into the following sections:

1. Household and demographic information;
2. Neighborhood identification and stake in the community;
3. Awareness of neighborhood problems;
4. Rating of community services;
5. Knowledge of public agency responsibilities;
6. Political activity and awareness;
7. Ability to solve neighborhood problems and affect local government; and
8. Political efficacy.

Each interview took approximately 20 minutes; the questionnaire contained a total of 75 codeable questions. It was designed in such a way that each question or response category became a variable; these are given in Table 3.

### Characteristics of the Sample Population

The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the surveyed population did not differ statistically between the group that had contact with the Traffic Department and the group that had no contact. The sampling strategy therefore ensured that demographic and socioeconomic variables alone could not be responsible for differences in responses to questions regarding perception and motivation. The following characteristics describe the total sample of 64 respondents.

The average age of the respondents was between 36 and 45, and about 70 percent were female. Almost two-thirds had at least some college, and by far the majority reported that they were housewives (or spent most of their time at home). The household heads in 90 percent of the cases were male and quite well educated. About one-third had a graduate or professional degree, and all but 25 percent had at least some college. In terms of occupation, about 40 percent of the breadwinners were professionals while less than 20 percent were engaged in skilled or unskilled labor; 10 percent were retired and the remainder filled "white collar" positions in sales or management.

The average household consisted of 3.7 people, with 1.4 children under 18 living at home. However, 40 percent of the respondents reported no children under 18. All but 7 percent of the respondent families had 2 or more drivers in the household, and the mean number of cars per family was 2.3.

Perhaps the most interesting demographic characteristic was the fact that 60 of the 64 respondents were homeowners and only 4 rented apartments. (Census data indicate that approximately 35 to 40 percent of the dwelling units in the study area are apartments or other multiple dwellings.) Of the homeowners, more than 80 percent had homes valued above \$30,000; 15 percent had homes in the over-\$75,000 range. Those few who did rent all paid more than \$200 per month rental. Family incomes were quite high: The mean household income was between \$15,000 and \$20,000, and all but

**Table 2. Council district request rates.**

Council District	No. of Requests <sup>a</sup>	Average Household Income (\$)	Percent Non-White	Mean No. of Cars per Family
5 Bel-Air, Westwood, Palms, West L.A.	470	24,800	3.5	1.9
2 Beverly Crest, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, N. Hollywood	396	16,700	1.8	1.8
11 Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Tarzana, Encino, West L.A., Venice	349	14,600	7.8	1.8
3 Woodland Hills, Canoga Park, Reseda	267	12,600	1.4	1.9
13 West Hollywood, Elysian Park, Silver Lake, Hollywood	264	7,800	14.0	0.8
4 Wilshire-West, Silver Lake, Wilshire	255	6,500	8.9	0.9
7 Sepulveda, North Hollywood, Van Nuys	253	10,400	1.9	1.5
12 Sepulveda, Granada Hills, Chatsworth, Northridge	243	12,400	1.8	2.0
14 Mt. Washington, Glassell, Griffith Park, Eagle Rock, Highland Park, Attwater	243	8,200	5.2	1.0
6 Del Rey, Palisades, Westchester, Leimert, Baldwin Hills, Mar Vista	234	10,900	25.7	1.7
1 Sun Valley, Sylmar, Sunland, Pacoima	184	10,200	9.7	1.5
9 El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, University, Westlake, Downtown	164	4,900	38.8	0.6
10 West Adams	135	5,700	63.4	1.0
15 Torrance, Gardena, Harbor City, San Pedro, Wilmington, Watts	129	7,700	42.2	0.9
8 Exposition Park, Santa Barbara	92	5,900	87.4	0.7

<sup>a</sup>Requests per 100,000 citizens per year.

**Table 3. Listing of variables.**

Code	Question	Code	Question
VAR500	Complaint status of respondent	VAR032	Respondent reads newspaper?
VAR501	Respondent head of household	VAR033	Respondent listens to TV-radio news?
VAR502	Age of respondent	VAR034	Number of letters written to state government
VAR503	Sex of respondent	VAR035	Number of letters written to federal government
VAR504	Educational attainment of respondent	VAR036	Political organizational member?
VAR505	Occupation of respondent	VAR037	Respondent's voting habits
VAR506	Age of head of household	VAR038	"Crosswalk needed"
VAR507	Sex of head of household	VAR039	"Neighbors noisy"
VAR508	Educational attainment of head	VAR040	"People drive too fast"
VAR509	Occupation of head of household	VAR041	"Imposition of new tax"
VAR510	Number in household	VAR042	"Signal doesn't stay green"
VAR511	Number of children under 18	VAR043	"Street has too many potholes"
VAR512	Number of children under 12	VAR044	"Stop sign needed"
VAR513	Number of drivers in household	VAR143	Type of living structure
VAR002	Rating of neighborhood as living place	VAR144	Respondent renter or home owner?
VAR003	Respondent feels part of neighborhood?	VAR145	Market value of home—owners only
VAR004	Acquainted with neighbors?	VAR146	Monthly rental—renters only
VAR005	Discuss neighborhood problems?	VAR147	Number of cars owned by household members
VAR006	Discuss traffic problems with neighbors?	VAR148	Length of time at present address
VAR007	Discuss traffic problems with children?	VAR149	Number of times moved in last 5 years
VAR008	Discuss traffic problems with family?	VAR150	Distance from previous address
VAR009	Perception of community traffic problems	VAR151	Miles driven by respondent in 1971
VAR010	Rating of recreational facilities	VAR152	Miles driven by all drivers in 1971
VAR011	Rating of schools	VAR153	Use of public transportation in 1971
VAR012	Rating of streets and traffic conditions	VAR156	Member of home owners' or citizens' group?
VAR013	Rating of public transportation	VAR157	Mode of children's school trips
VAR014	Rating of housing	VAR158	Hours home between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.
VAR015	Rating of police protection	VAR159	Friends, relatives in public service?
VAR016	Rating of fire protection	VAR160	Combined family income
VAR017	Rating of libraries	VAR167	"Public officials don't care"
VAR018	Rating of shopping facilities	VAR168	"Voting is only means of influence"
VAR019	Rating of parking facilities	VAR169	"People have no say in government"
VAR020	Rating of health and hospital facilities	VAR170	"Government too complicated to understand"
VAR027	Knowledge of agency responsibilities	VAR171	Composite efficacy index
VAR028	Can respondent affect city government?	VAR901	Awareness of neighborhood problems
VAR029	Municipal ordinance opposition strategy	VAR950	Overall rating of neighborhood services
VAR030	Respondent follows governmental affairs?	VAR960	Perceived ability to solve community problems
VAR031	Respondent active in political campaigns?		

15 percent of the respondent families had incomes higher than \$10,000. Cross-tabulation showed that almost all of those with incomes under \$10,000 were retired.

From this brief review of the demographic characteristics of the total sample, it can be seen that the socioeconomic status of the respondents as a group is quite high. We know, from the analysis of the city-wide request distribution, that such a group might initially be considered to have more involvement with public agencies due to the factors associated with higher class standing. In the long run, this may be true. However, of these respondents, half actually did become involved with the Traffic Department and the other half did not. Thus, by looking at the difference in responses to the questions dealing with perception and motivation, it was possible to obtain a "profile" of the locally involved citizen, controlling, in this case, for socioeconomic standing.

### Survey Results

The questionnaires were analyzed by means of the chi square 2-sample test (8) in order to determine at what level of statistical significance a difference existed between questionnaire responses from the two sample groups. Those variables that were significant at 0.1 or less were then tested for degree of association with the dependent variable (i.e., involvement with the local traffic engineering agency). Cramer's V, a nonparametric measure of association (5), was used for this purpose.

The variables that were determined to be significant were grouped in four categories. These are listed below along with the derived characteristics associated with local involvement indicated in each category in order of strength of association. These characteristics can be considered indicators of the propensity on the part of citizens to participate in local traffic affairs, specifically through the contact of public agencies.

#### Recognition of Community Traffic Problems

1. The tendency to rate the quality of neighborhood streets and traffic conditions as inferior (VAR012);
2. The tendency to perceive a large number of traffic problems and hazards in the community (VAR009);
3. The tendency to discuss community traffic problems with family and neighbors (VAR006, VAR008); and
4. The tendency to drive somewhat more than the average (VAR152).

#### Sense of Neighborhood Identification

1. The tendency to "feel a part of the neighborhood" (VAR003);
2. The tendency to frequently talk with neighbors about community problems (VAR005);
3. The tendency toward relatively stable residential living patterns (VAR148, VAR149);
4. The tendency to belong to homeowners' or citizens' groups in the community (VAR156); and
5. The tendency to be acquainted with most neighbors (VAR004).

#### Knowledge of the Functional Organization of Local Government

1. The tendency to possess good knowledge of local agency responsibilities (VAR027);
2. The tendency to have a good strategy to employ in opposing local legislation (VAR029); and
3. The tendency to have friends and/or relatives employed in public service agencies (VAR159).

#### Sense of Political Efficacy

1. The tendency to score high on the composite efficacy index (VAR171): (a) tends to feel that there are other ways besides voting to influence local governmental decisions (VAR168); (b) tends to feel that public officials "care" (VAR167); (c) tends to feel that people generally have a say in governmental decisions (VAR169);



2. The tendency to perceive a high level of personal effectiveness in influencing city government (VAR028);
3. The tendency to perceive a high level of personal effectiveness in solving neighborhood problems (VAR960);
4. The tendency to write letters to federal officials (VAR035); and
5. The tendency to be a member of a political organization (VAR036).

### CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study support several widely held theories of citizen participation and provide some new insights regarding the application of these theories to local, non-political modes of citizen involvement. In addition, certain implications in the context of local traffic engineering derive from the research findings.

Many studies in political science and psychology have dealt extensively with citizen participation and have pointed to the high degree of association between socioeconomic status and political participation (1, 2, 3, 4). Education, leisure time, financial security, skills and knowledge, organizational membership, self-confidence, efficacy, and other correlates of social and economic status have been shown to be closely aligned with levels of participation. This same type of relationship seems to hold for the nature of citizen involvement considered in this study. The indicators chosen to reflect socioeconomic status showed strong correlation with levels of public involvement, in terms of requests received by the Traffic Department from citizens in Los Angeles. Low-income groups, for a variety of different reasons, do not seek access to such local public agencies to the degree exhibited by higher income groups. Since this phenomenon cannot be readily attributable to a "better" traffic environment in low-income areas, it must instead be based at least partly on factors that operate independently of the particular service in question (i. e., traffic engineering services).

While city-wide aggregation of citizen request rates showed a definite decrease in involvement from high- to low-income areas, the home-interview survey showed that more discrete perceptual/motivational variables can be accountable for lack of participation in smaller areas when controlling for socioeconomic status. For example, cross-tabulation indicated that a significant number of respondents who tend to feel "part of the neighborhood" also knew most of their neighbors, discussed community problems frequently with neighbors and family, lived in the neighborhood a long time, and so on. Similarly, those who gave a low rating to the quality of streets and traffic conditions and perceived many traffic problems in the community also said that they frequently talked about traffic problems at home and with friends, were members of homeowners' groups, lived in the neighborhood for relatively long periods of time, and generally rated the quality of other public services quite low. The conclusion, then, seems to be that perception of community problems (in this case, traffic problems) results in citizen action when the citizen has a heightened awareness of problems in the community. This awareness is the product of a number of factors, including relationships with neighbors, length of time in the neighborhood, membership in community organizations, and other such attributes contributing to an individual's awareness of his community environment and its condition.

Further cross-tabulation showed that citizens who possessed a good knowledge of agency responsibilities also felt effective in influencing city government and opposing municipal legislation. Those who scored high on the efficacy index were essentially the same individuals who had a good knowledge of agency responsibilities and had friends or relatives employed in public service. The conclusion here seems to be that motivation to contact public agencies is strengthened by a sense of political efficacy and a general awareness of the functions and organization of local government.

The implications of the foregoing discussion for local agencies are quite complex. One immediate question arises: Is it, or should it be, the role or the responsibility of public agencies to ensure an equality of opportunity for public participation? This is not to say that the actual amount of citizen input should be equalized among various sub-groups in the city; citizens may retain the rights of apathy and non-interest. However, it might be argued that the role of government in this regard should be to attempt to equalize the opportunities for participation.

The survey has shown that people are less likely to participate—even if they observe a situation they feel needs attention—if they lack a sense of efficacy and display a lack of political knowledge. In effect, this condition creates an impairment of the opportunity for participation. Furthermore, the lack of these characteristics has been associated through much documentation with the urban poor. Thus, perhaps the role of local agencies—including those concerned with traffic—should be directed toward alleviation of inefficacy and lack of knowledge on the part of these citizens. This might be done by inexpensive public educational programs to increase awareness and strengthen self-confidence. While initial results, in terms of increased involvement, may be minimal, some action in this direction might begin to eliminate the uneven opportunities for citizen participation that have been only touched upon in this study.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was partially funded by a University Research and Training Grant to the University of California at Los Angeles by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The results and views expressed are the independent products of university research and do not necessarily represent concurrence by the Department of Transportation.

Support in the collection of data was provided by Bruce Fredrickson and Tom Montgomery of the Los Angeles Department of Traffic and Robert Mullens of the Los Angeles Community Analysis Bureau, and their assistance in this regard is acknowledged. Martin Wachs and Barclay Hudson of the School of Architecture and Urban Planning at UCLA offered many helpful comments and constructive criticisms during the various stages of this research.

#### REFERENCES

1. Barber, James D. *Citizen Politics: An Introduction to Political Behavior*. Markham Publishing Co., Chicago, 1969.
2. Bowen, Don R. *Political Behavior of the American Public*. Charles E. Merrill Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1968.
3. Lane, Robert E. *Political Life: Why People Get Involved in Politics*. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1959.
4. Milbrath, Lester W. *Political Participation*. Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1965.
5. Nie, Norman H., Bent, Dale H., and Hull, Hadlai C. *SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.
6. Schneider, Michael. *Urban Housekeeping and Citizen Participation: A Distributional Analysis of Public Requests for Traffic Services in Los Angeles*. Unpublished thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972.
7. Verba, Sidney. *Democratic Participation*. In *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 373, Sept. 1967, pp. 53-78.
8. Siegel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1956.