

centers? Perhaps it should be noted here that in most of the communities studied effective control of the centers is exercised at the CAA level.

The fourth observation presented above leads us rather directly to a fifth which deals with the center proper. In terms of organization most centers have a director, usually hired at the CAA level, a staff of professionals and non-professionals who work under him, and a neighborhood area advisory board. This last feature of center organization typically consists of local area residents, some of whom represent organizations in the area like churches, YMCA's, civil rights groups, etc., and others who represent the people at large. These advisory boards are intended to inform the center director and staff about the needs and wishes of the area residents. Parenthetically, these boards also usually send one or two representatives to sit on the CAA board of directors. This is one of the common procedures for getting representatives of the poor on the CAA governing board.

Two problems frequently arise with respect to the neighborhood advisory board. One is the problem of how adequately the poor are represented on the board. It appears that quite often the representatives of the poor are "company men." That is to say, they are cooperative participants in center programs who can be relied on to support the status quo of the center and not "rock the boat." It might also be noted here that our field researchers report almost unanimously that the participation of the poor in policy and program decisions is very ineffectual both at the local center level and at the CAA board level. This should not be surprising. If one is not very "verbal" in the first place, a formal board type meeting is hardly the setting for putting one's best foot forward. It takes experience to learn how to function in such a setting.

The second problem involves the question of power. As noted in the second observation discussed earlier, control of the poverty program is not an idle task. Such control rests in the hands of those in charge of budget allocations and hiring. Needless to say, local neighborhood advisory boards have little to say about these matters. This means that unless center programs have the approval of CAA personnel they won't be implemented regardless of local advisory board support. When this "fact of life" is finally realized by local advisory board members, it often stirs resentment, disillusionment or both.

SUMMARY

The previous paragraphs and the descriptive materials of Attachment 1 indicate the great variety of roles with which centers are involved. It must also be noted that there are incompatibilities among certain types of roles both within centers and in terms of center relationships with other organizations. The evidence indicates that it is extremely rare to find both aggressive community action and well executed service programs within the same center. The attitudes and organizational arrangements associated with aggressive community action appear to preclude effective service programs most of which involve well-established agencies. It is not surprising that these agencies find it difficult to cooperate with organizations having the mission of radical change. On the other hand, accommodations between centers and traditional agencies are noted in cases where the center goal is principally concerned with services. In these cases centers are concerned with improving services and act as a leavening influence on agencies.

The most appropriate role for centers is not suggested here. However, it is noted that there is a good deal of confusion on this subject which appears to result principally from attempting to combine the mutually incompatible roles of service and aggressive community action in one organization. Last, it is important to recognize that participation of the poor can be effectively associated with either role. One must guard against the romantic and inaccurate concept that the participation of the poor can take place only in an enlightened but drastic effort at rearrangement of the social order.

V. OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION

INTRODUCTION

The legislative mandate calling for maximum feasible participation of the poor in community action programs is the guideline for the outreach efforts of the neighborhood centers. In our examination of this outreach effort it soon became apparent that comprehensive, reliable data are not to be found for the centers studied. Accurate records are usually not kept and where there are