ABSTRACT. This article is a follow up to a paper appearing in the Spring Issue (4) 1977 of this Journal by the same authors entitled 'Public Marketing: A Suggested Policy Paradigm for Community Development in the City'. In the earlier article a public marketing model was advanced as a device to order socioeconomic needs for planning and policy making in city government. This article provides an empirical application of the model in an actual city. The results indicate that the model is a workable and useful tool for social indicator construction and policy formulation.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION
In the Spring Issue 1977 of this Journal\(^1\) the authors advanced a planning paradigm designed to overcome the gap between social indicator development and policy implementation. We labelled our approach the Public Marketing Model. Our attempt was to wed the political and socio-economic data into the same policy planning structure. The concepts advanced were based in business management, political science, sociology and community development theory. The basic construct suggested that a marketing model was an appropriate conceptual tool to blend the divergent public and private interest into the framework of local government decision making. We advanced a concept and model that places the "basic marketing function of facilitating and consumating exchanges (with) the community as a marketing organization..."\(^2\). This model recognized the fact that a city (community) is not the sole determinant of its own destiny but is placed within the context of greater sets of federal or state policies. To illustrate the point we catalogued the range of interchanges among local government and its external environment.\(^3\) More importantly, the model provided a framework for internal interactions among local government and its external interactions among the myriad of competing and often conflicting citizen interests within a five basic component system — communication, distribution, pricing and product policy and market research.
While this model provided a systems approach to policy formulation, by itself it described only to a limited extent the uses of social indicators research. The model provided a policy paradigm, it did not show the link between policy and data. As an illustration of how these two processes might be joined we offered a skeleton outline of an ongoing action research effort in Yuba City, California. In the current article we report the data from the Yuba City effort utilizing the public marketing paradigm as a framework for determining the value of various public services offered by this city to its residents.

2. THE YUBA CITY POLICY RESEARCH EFFORT

The Yuba City research project was undertaken to demonstrate the potential for the Public Marketing Model. The project was undertaken jointly between the City government of Yuba City, California (pop. 30 000) and the University of California, Davis. The project was designed to test the capacity of local government to transform its structure and processes to meet resident needs. The details of how the project emerged and the conditions under which it was conducted are reported elsewhere. However, a few salient points need to be discussed here to provide a context for this article. First, the local City Administrator and City Council of Yuba City agreed that the marketing model provided an excellent and comprehensible base for the development of policy indicators (i.e. directions for civic goals). In essence, local officials agreed to determine what courses of action were most significant to local residents and plan to accommodate those interests as though they were vending public services. City officials were fully involved in the project from initial data gathering and analysis through the final design or redesign of local government departments to meet community needs.

3. THE POLICY RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design was composed of several related components. Each component had a series of subcomponents associated with it. The subcomponents were as follows:

3.1. Policy Structure Design Component

The lag between policy formulation and implementation is frequently caused