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Community Development in America: A Brief History

Bryan M. Phifer

ABSTRACT

This article traces community development from early self-help efforts through community organization, university, social work and government thrusts to the field as we know it today. It describes the roles of key individuals, organizations, and literature in the growth of the field. The author looks ahead to crucial issues facing community development in the future. The references cited in the article are a rich source of information for anyone interested in the history and current status of community development.

Community development in America as an organized, purposeful, self-help activity has its roots in late nineteenth century rural life. Some may argue that its roots go back to Jamestown since its very survival depended upon self-help and almost total reliance on local resources. However, Jamestown, like many early American communities, was directed in a very authoritarian manner with survival as the main objective. There was little democratic participation until the coming of the New England town meeting.

During his tour of America in the 1830s, Alexis de Tocqueville observed both democracy and a desire for self-improvement in action. In one of the most quoted passages from his book Democracy in America, he observed:
Americans of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of dispositions are forever forming associations. There are not only commercial and industrial associations in which all take part, but others of a thousand different types—religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and very limited, immensely large and very minute.

Americans combine to give fetes, found seminaries, build churches, distribute books, and send missionaries to the antipodes. Hospitals, prisons, and schools take shape in that way... In every case, at the head of any new undertaking, where in France you would find the government or in England some territorial magnate, in the United States you are sure to find an association. (Tocqueville, 1966:485)

Undoubtedly, self-help and self-reliance were mainstays of early American history. However, community development as we know it today—a purposeful attempt to improve communities through democratic participation as well as self-help—did not begin to appear until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A number of influences formed the roots of this emerging field.

**Early Roots of Community Development**

Numerous organizations and movements devoted to improving rural life emerged in the post-Civil War era. Summers (1986:348) points out that the radical agrarian mood and proposals of the Populist party “had grown increasingly ugly in response to the farm crisis that had escalated during the last quarter of the 19th century. . . . The Country Life Movement emerged as an urban-sponsored alternative to the radical economic proposals of the Populists.” The movement, along with Pres. Theodore Roosevelt’s Country Life Commission, were major forces in urging the U.S. Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges to play a more active role in the improvement of rural life.

“The report of the Commission covered thoroughly the most prominent features of rural life in America and the nature of remedies available” (Bailey, 1945:246). Its most urgent recommendation was the “establishment of a nationwide extension workforce . . . without which no college of agriculture can adequately serve its state” (Senate Document 705, 1909:56).

Of equal importance to these growing demands for extension was the pioneering farm demonstration work of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp who Bailey (1945) called the “Schoolmaster of American Agriculture” in his book about his work. Knapp successfully demonstrated the control of the cotton boll weevil which was devastating the South’s most important cash crop. His work received national acclaim and greatly influenced the Congress.
The fruition of effort by these many forces was the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. It established the Cooperative Extension Service as a joint endeavor of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and state land-grant colleges with matching federal and state funding. In submitting its bill authorizing extension work, the House Committee on Agriculture stated:

The theory of the bill is to extend this system to the entire country by providing for at least one trained demonstrator or itinerant teacher for each agricultural county, who in the very nature of things must give leadership and direction along all lines of rural activity—social, economic, and financial . . . He is to assume leadership in every movement, whatever it may be, the aim of which is better farming, better living, more happiness, more education, and better citizenship. (U.S.Congress, 1915:5)

Rural Community Organization

In its 1909 report, the Country Life Commission found that a major problem of rural people was lack of organization. Consequently, following passage of the Smith-Lever Act, several states, including Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, West Virginia and Virginia began community organization work under the direction of their Extension Services. Extension agents in the South began organizing community clubs in the early 1920s. By 1923 C.B. Smith, Director of the USDA’s States Relation Service, could state in his annual report of extension work:

The maxim that all programs of extension work should be based on an analysis of local or community needs has been given increasing support, as shown by the greater number of community programs developed throughout the United States. More than 21,000 communities . . . have local committees or clubs which join with Extension agents in developing and working out local plans of work. (True, 1928:175)

It didn’t take long for pioneering extension agents to learn that their most successful efforts were those involving local people in identifying needs and developing appropriate educational programs. True (1928:175) states:

Extension forces were also realizing that they could not reach large numbers of people effectively without the active cooperation of many local leaders. They, therefore, increased their efforts to get beyond the county organization supporting their work and to build their programs on a community basis.
Frank Farrington was one of the first writers about community development. His book *Making the Small Town a Better Place to Live and A Better Place in Which to Do Business*, published in 1915, is a handbook and guide to community organization. It emphasizes the economic aspects of community improvement, business and commercial organization, and the function and importance of service clubs. Although intended primarily for small towns, his book found a wide audience among residents of large towns.

**Educational Associations**

Educational associations have long supported community development and, in fact, were a major force in developing it into a field of study and practice. At the first conference of the National University Education Association (NUEA) in 1915, President Charles Van Hise emphasized the importance of “informal community service.” The term “community development” appeared in the association’s 1924 proceedings and in 1935 the association called for university-sponsored community development workers. During the 1940s the community development movement within universities was spearheaded by NUEA leaders Howard McClusky at the University of Michigan, Jess Ogden at the University of Virginia, and Baker Brownell at the University of Montana.

The NUEA established a community organization committee in 1948 and a division of community development in 1955. Katharine Lackey of Southern Illinois University prepared an extensive report in 1960 about community development work through member institutions of the NUEA. Her report highlighted work in thirteen universities.

The Adult Education Association has long been a strong supporter and advocate of community development. Among its various sections is one on community development. The classic 1960 *Handbook of Adult Education*, edited by Malcolm Knowles, includes a chapter on community development by pioneer practitioner and scholar Howard McClusky.

**University Efforts**

In addition to the early work through extension services of the land-grant universities, several universities have a distinguished history of community development education and service. One of the early pioneers is St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, whose program started in the 1920s. Known as the Antigonish Movement, it was started by Father M. M. Coady who helped organize the United Maritime Fishermen Cooperative. Coady later became the first director of Xavier University’s extension
department which gained international acclaim as the Antigonish Movement. The Coady International Institute, with its emphasis on grassroots training in community development, was founded in 1959.

Not all early university-based community development was practice oriented. As Cary (1980:144) points out, “teaching community development grew, in part, out of the earlier teaching in community organization in social work and rural sociology and the early training of extension workers.” He mentions the paper presented in 1919 at the first National Country Life Conference by Dwight Sanderson of Cornell University entitled “Community Organization for Extension Workers.” Cary (1980:144-45) adds that “the teaching of community organization in rural sociology placed its emphasis on the small rural community and, with some notable exceptions, focused on the study of community organization rather than the practice of it.”

Dr. William Biddle’s Program of Community Studies and Dynamics at Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana began in 1947. It combined graduate study with field experience until 1960 when the program was discontinued. Dr. Biddle became well-known from his books and articles about community development.

Baker Brownell’s work at the University of Montana in the 1940s had a profound influence upon the field of community development. Brownell conducted a study aimed at determining the potential for revitalizing dying lumber towns in the Northwest. Dr. Richard Poston’s famous book, Small Town Renaissance, published in 1950, was an outgrowth of this study and gained him a national reputation. Poston later became director of the Bureau of Community Development at the University of Washington. He and his staff worked with small communities emphasizing citizen involvement, study and analysis, town meetings, and action. In 1953 he joined Baker Brownell at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. Brownell had earlier moved there to begin an area services unit and community development program. Southern Illinois’ Community Development Institute was founded in 1959 and its Department of Community Development in 1966.

The University of Missouri’s community development program began in the 1950s as a response to requests for assistance from rural communities suffering out-migration, economic stagnation, and reduction in essential services. The program began as an extension effort utilizing both university funds and special funds provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for rural development. The Center for Community Development was established on the Columbia campus in 1960 to provide formal training and supporting services to field practitioners. In 1962 the Center became the Department of Community Development, offering a master’s degree and diploma program while maintaining its extension work. Currently, the university has 20 extension field staff
serving a multi-county area throughout the state. The department also conducts an annual Community and Rural Development Institute in which more than 800 persons from 69 countries have participated.

By 1976, some 63 colleges and universities offered majors in community development (Cary, 1976). The 1987 directory of institutions providing community development training or education lists 52 programs in U.S. and Canadian institutions plus several in other countries (Robertson, 1987). Although there appears to be a significant decline between 1976 and 1987 in the number of majors or degrees offered, the actual change, if any, is unknown. In both the 1976 and the 1987 survey, only those institutions responding to the survey were listed. Lack of a response may be attributable to the survey being sent to the wrong person and not forwarded to the right person.

Community development extension work is carried out by all land-grant universities. Some states call it community resource development, some resource development, and some rural development, depending upon its focus. The University of Wisconsin Extension Service, for example, has 40 resource development agents. The latest data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Extension Service shows approximately 949 staff-years devoted to this work nationally.

Institutionalized Community Development

As mentioned earlier, community clubs and “organized communities” became a major vehicle for rural community development in the 1920s. Prior to that, community organization was more related to sociology and social work than to community development. As early as 1887, Stanton Coit founded a settlement house in New York City. The famous Hull House was founded in Chicago in 1889 by sociologist Jane Addams and Ellen Starr (Deegan, 1988; Fritz, 1989).

Settlement houses focused their efforts primarily on helping immigrants to large cities adjust to their new culture and environment. A high priority was the Americanization of immigrants who generally could not speak English, lived in crowded and unsanitary conditions, and often worked in sweat shops. English and other adult education classes, day care, baths, recreation, and savings banks were provided through the houses which became community centers.


Addams was definitely an organizational development specialist. Within five years of the establishment of Hull House, some forty clubs were based there, eleven kinds of community activities were connected with the settlement and over 2,000 people came into the facility each
Addams’ years of work and writing in the interest of peace earned her the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931.

As important as the settlement house movement was, its focus was more on providing services for people as opposed to people providing for their own needs. Many modern-day community centers grew out of settlement houses.

A more participatory approach to community development was the “Back of the Yards” movement begun in Chicago by clinical sociologist Saul Alinsky in the 1930s (Alinsky, 1969). Its major purpose was neighborhood stabilization. Polish stockyard workers were not so much trying to keep others out, Alinsky maintained, as they were trying to keep their own in. In 1940 Alinsky started the Industrial Areas Foundation whose aim was to empower people through their own organized efforts. Known as the conflict or confrontation approach, Alinsky’s work grew beyond Chicago as he directed major projects in several large cities. His community organizing skills gained him national recognition in the turbulent sixties (Fritz, 1989:82-83). Alinsky demonstrated that major organizational work could produce power as well as local participation. Institutional barriers to change often crumbled when confronted with such power.

The first major American city to have a community development department was Kansas City, Missouri. Its Division of Community Development was established in 1943, primarily to combat juvenile delinquency. Following World War II, the division focused its work on citizen participation through community and neighborhood associations. The division remained highly active until the early 1980s when its role was diminished.

Almost all major cities and many smaller communities now have departments or divisions of community development. Their primary focus is that of generating and administering government grants such as the Community Development Block Grant program, rather than initiating locally-based community development efforts. Although citizen participation is a requirement of the federal Community Development Act, interpretation of what this means varies widely. This ranges all the way from true citizen involvement in problem identification and decision making to perfunctory public hearings and legal notices published in newspapers.

The community education movement, carried out primarily through local school systems, has played a major community development role since its inception in the mid-1940s. Greatly stimulated through grants from the Kellogg and Mott Foundations, the movement encourages communities to use their schools for a variety of after-school community functions. The National Community Education Development Act passed in 1974, which provided seed money to initiate such programs, grew out of this effort. In addition to traditional adult education and recreational roles, community education emphasizes citizen involvement in community issues.
State-Sponsored Programs

Several states have community development recognition programs. Often these programs include cash awards, recognition plaques, and achievement signs which communities erect along highways leading into their community. Most of the programs are based on achievement of prescribed goals set forth in the criteria developed for measuring local initiative, participation, and accomplishment. The Missouri program, known as Missouri Community Betterment (MCB), was started in 1963. It encompasses six classes of cities based on population, plus neighborhoods. Thus, communities of similar size compete for recognition. Judges visit communities that make it to the finalist list for recognition to evaluate their accomplishments. The Governor presents plaques and other prizes to winning communities at the annual awards program.

Almost every state has a department of community and economic development to promote the state's economy and to help local communities through technical and financial assistance. Following the federal government's lead, some states offer special incentives for development efforts in depressed areas, including tax incentives to encourage investment. Missouri's Neighborhood Assistance Program goes further by providing tax write-offs to business and industry for investment in neighborhood and community development projects regardless of location.

Community Development Literature

A distinctive body of community development literature began to emerge in the 1940s. The Ogdens published *These Things We Tried: A Five Year Experiment in Community Development* in 1947. Ruopp's *Approaches to Community Development* and Poston's *Democracy is You: A Guide to Citizen Action* were published in 1953. The United Nations published *Social Progress Through Community Development* in 1955. The International Cooperation Administration, forerunner of the Agency for International Development, began its *Community Development Bulletin* in 1956. This publication was known as the *Community Development Review* from 1957 until its last issue in 1963.

Community Development Society

The Community Development Society was organized in Columbia, Missouri in January 1969 to provide practitioners and teachers of community development their own organization devoted to study of the field, improvement of practice skills, and sharing of knowledge and experience.

The society grew out of a mid-continent conference on the role of the university in community development sponsored by the NUEA. Many of the participants were active in the community development division of the association. The division was exploring the need for a separate professional association. During the conference, seventeen participants met to further explore the value of such an organization. After considerable discussion, which revealed that other national groups were interested in community development, the group adopted the following motion:

That a small committee be established to proceed with the organization of a professional community development association, to explore the sources of funds, and to take other action as indicated toward the establishment of a professional association (Anderson, Cary, Gibson, Houde 1989:2).

In subsequent meetings the committee agreed that membership would be open to anyone interested in community development. In their history of the first 20 years of the society, Anderson, Cary, Gibson and Houde (1989:4,5) state:

In some ways it could be said that the establishment of the CDS was that of an organization waiting to be born...There is little doubt that the 1960s was one of the most active periods for community development through citizen participation both in the United States and throughout the world. Though none of the events described (in the history) led directly to the founding of the Community Development Society, they surely helped to create the climate out of which CDS emerged.

The society was chartered on October 15, 1969, four days before its first annual meeting. On October 19, 1969, nine months after the original organizational meeting, the first annual meeting of the society convened at the University of Missouri in Columbia. Meanwhile, plans for the society’s journal were formulated and Bryan Phifer of the University of Missouri’s department of community development agreed to serve as the first editor.

More than 200 persons from 30 states, Washington, D.C., and Canada attended the first meeting. In addition to addressing major issues facing community development, participants adopted a constitution and bylaws, and elected officers
and a board of directors. Dr. Lee J. Cary, chair of the department of community
development, University of Missouri, was elected first president of the society. Dr. George Abshier of Oklahoma State University was elected president-elect, and Dr. John Dunbar of Purdue University was elected secretary-treasurer. By the end of 1969, there were 442 members of the society.

As stated in Article II of its constitution adopted on October 21, 1969:

The purpose of the Society is to advance the community development profession through educational and scientific means by:

1. Providing a forum for the exchange of ideas among the members of the Society;
2. Providing media for the publication and dissemination of professional and scholarly works;
3. Advocating excellence in community development scholarship, research and practice, for the good of mankind; and
4. Providing an opportunity for the development of common interests among the members of the Society.

Since its founding, membership in the society has fluctuated between approximately 400 and 1,000 members. As of June 30, 1989, the society had 555 members in the United States and 15 other countries. The society publishes the *Journal of the Community Development Society* twice a year and its *Vanguard* magazine quarterly.

**Christian Community Development Association**

The Christian Community Development Association was organized in Chicago in October 1989. It grew out of the congress of community ministries that met there October 26–29, attended by more than 300 Christian leaders. Delegate John Perkins said:

We are not forming the CCDA to patronize the poor, organize a protest, or go over the facts of poverty again. We’re not trying to help the poor get more out of welfare, but to put an end to welfare. We want to help people break out of the welfare system—and we’re determined to do it right along beside them.

**Federal Government Thrusts**

Major federal government involvement in community development came with the Rural Development Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the mid-1950s. Special funds were authorized by the Congress for the employment of rural development agents through the extension services of the land-grant
universities. This was followed in the early 1960s by the Area Redevelopment Administration which was one of the first of many federal programs offering financial incentives for community development. President Johnson’s War on Poverty, begun in 1964, created community action agencies funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity. The remainder of the 1960s and the 1970s saw a flood of programs providing funds for local, regional, state, and multi-state development. By the time the first catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs was published in the mid 1960s, more than 1,100 federal programs were available. Many of these programs offered technical and financial assistance for community improvement projects. They came to be known as “categorical grant” programs since the grant was limited to a specific purpose, such as hospital, library, or swimming pool construction.

Categorical grant programs often tended to work counter to true community development in that:

1. Local funds which should have gone for priority needs often were used as matching funds for projects which may not have been needed.
2. They discouraged citizen participation except in a perfunctory manner to meet legal requirements.
3. They created a dependency on federal financing rather than encouraging use of local resources.
4. They discouraged a holistic view of the community and an integrated development approach based upon real community development principles and practice.

Moreover, the proliferation of federal grant programs in the 1960s nearly overwhelmed the capacity of communities to use them effectively. Consequently, it produced an explosion of so-called “planners,” who often had neither community development nor planning experience, and created a new science of “grantsmanship.”

In response to increasing demand for more local control over federal community improvement funds, President Nixon introduced his Revenue Sharing Act which the Congress passed in 1972. It lasted until 1986. Special revenue sharing and community development block grants let communities concentrate on their own priorities within broadly defined national purposes. This allowed for much greater flexibility and local control over the use of federal funds than was the case with categorical grant programs. Community development block grants also combined many of the categorical grant programs into six broad categories, thereby eliminating much paperwork and red tape.

Today there is a hodgepodge of programs under the label of community development. Most cities have departments of community development whose
primary purpose is to administer grant programs, and most states have regional planning commissions or councils of government. The range of local, state and federal development programs varies from true citizen participation and initiative to those almost wholly directed by governmental units.

Looking Ahead

Community development has indeed become an in-word, but its meaning is akin to what Humpty-Dumpty told Alice when he said, “When I use a word it means just what I want it to mean—neither more nor less” (Carroll, 1872, new edition 1946:245). Our challenge is to recapture community development as a true citizen effort emphasizing democratic participation and self-help and to make sure that it conveys this meaning. It is indeed ironic that in many totalitarian countries fresh winds of democracy and local control of people’s destinies are blowing while in the United States we have come more and more to look to the federal government to do many things for us which we would best do for and by ourselves. How well we recapture the spirit of local decision making and self-help will not only determine the future of community development but of democracy itself.
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Six Models of Community Intervention: A Dialectical Synthesis of Social Theory and Social Action

Drew Hyman

ABSTRACT

Two dominant theoretical perspectives—systems theory and conflict theory—underlie major approaches to community intervention. This paper presents a conceptual linkage between models of intervention for planning and organizing as developed by Rothman and elaborated by Stockdale and major sociological theories of society. Two additional models are presented to address issues of management and administration. The six models are integrated into a typology which integrates the conflict and consensus theories of society in relation to the six strategies. The result is a synthesis of six models for community engagement which is rooted in dialectically opposed theories of society, and which addresses the major functions of any system or organization—planning, organizing/implementation, and management.

The inquiry into community intervention models to date has been practice-driven, with theory following the emergence of models in the field rather than vice versa.\(^1\) This paper suggests that two dominant theoretical perspectives in Western

---

\(^1\) Prior to Jack Rothman's (1968) classic article, the literature and practice of community intervention were directed primarily to community-based grassroots which emphasized educational methods and self-help projects. Rothman notes that in the 1960s a "social action" approach emerged in the civil rights and welfare movements associated with Saul Alinsky and the Industrial Areas Foundation, as well as the anti-Vietnam War movement, and aspects of community action programs associated with the War on Poverty. Similarly, Perloff (1961) and Morris and Binstock
thought underlie major approaches to community intervention. Conflict theory and consensus (or systems) theory each provide a basis for specific theories of action. The paper has four objectives: (1) to create a typology which integrates models of community intervention in relation to the conflict and consensus theories of society; (2) to examine the conceptual linkage between four Rothman/Stockdale models of intervention and major sociological theories of society; (3) to present two additional models of intervention which provide a basis for including management and administration in the framework developed herein; and (4) to explore the interrelationships of the models of management and administration to both the theories of society and the other models of intervention. The resulting synthesis provides six models for change action which are rooted in dialectically opposed theories of society, and which address major functions of any organization or system: planning, organizing/implementation, and management.

Consensus and Conflict: The Theoretical Dialectic

The consensus and conflict perspectives have deep roots in human thought. In Western philosophy and science, fundamental differences between Plato and Aristotle, Rousseau and Hobbes, and Weber and Marx, can be seen to revolve around the question of whether human societies are rooted in rationality, consensus and shared values, or whether they are characterized by subjectivity, conflict and constraint. Dahrendorf (1959) identifies the dialectical characteristics of the two competing macro-views of society. According to consensus theory, social order results from a dominant set of shared values. People create communities to promote common interests and to escape from the “nasty, brutish and short” life of the pre-civilized. This perspective, in turn, leads to an integration theory of society which suggests that society is a relatively stable equilibrium based on a consensus of shared values and common patterns of interaction. Systems theory tends to be associated with this perspective. The competing approach, conflict theory, asserts that the social order is based on domination and constraint. Communities result from a survival of the fittest contest wherein the prize to the winners is the right to impose their will on others. This perspective, in turn, leads to a coercion theory of society wherein contending forces continually vie for domination and control: conflict and change are ubiquitous. The theorist points out that these theories represent “two faces of society” and should be viewed as such. Each side focuses on certain

(1966) articulate “social planning” as an approach to community intervention. Hence Rothman’s three models-locality development, social action, and social planning. In the mid-1970s, Stockdale (1976) suggested that the social planning model should be bifurcated to reflect differences between more centralized and community-wide planning and community or interest-based “advocacy planning.”
aspects of the totality to explain certain phenomena. Consensus or systems theory asks why societies hang together, and conflict theory asks why they change. Reality reflects each face from the perspective of the viewer. By being aware of both of these perspectives, we can dialectically approach the questions of change and stability with the understanding that each is but a face of the other.

The following sections explore six strategies, or models, for directing and changing community systems and human services programs. The first four models of change, which address planning and organizing, have been articulated previously by Rothman (1968, 1974) and Stockdale (1976) and are simply summarized here. The last two models are developed herein to extend the previous works to management and administration.

Two Models of Organizing and Implementation

"Locality development" and "social action" are the two models of organizing identified by the Rothman/Stockdale typology. Locality development conforms most closely to the consensus theory of society and is thus associated with traditional community development. It emphasizes self-help and concerted local action by the overall community. Implementation and change are seen as a matter of communication among leaders and citizens (and planners) to gain an understanding of what needs to be done. Thus, the practitioner serves the process of facilitation of communications and interactions among all concerned. As stated by Rothman (1974:34):

The basic change strategy involves getting a broad cross section of people involved in studying and taking action of their problems. Consensus strategies are employed, involving small-group discussion and fostering communication, among community subparts (class, ethnic, and so forth). The practitioner...is especially skilled in manipulating and guiding small-group interaction.

Locality development, therefore, assumes that the community is comprised of people who share values and orientations, and who subscribe to democratic processes of decision-making and control. President Lyndon Johnson's favorite phrase, "Come let us reason together," typifies this model. The contrasting model, social action, also emphasizes grassroots strategies, but it views the community as a hierarchy of privilege and power. The task, therefore, is to confront the community with a show of influence or force to convince the authorities that change is in order. Rothman puts it this way (1974:35):
The basic change strategy involves crystallizing issues and organizing indigenous populations to take action on their own behalf against enemy targets. Change tactics often include conflict techniques, such as confrontation and direct action—rallies, marches, boycotts (as well as “hard-nosed” bargaining). The practitioner . . . is skilled in the manipulation of mass organizations and political processes.

The overall goal of locality development is to enhance the relationship between the community power structure and its citizens. This approach assumes that all parties have, or can come to have, common interests, and any differences are reconcilable through rational discussion and interaction. The overall goal of social action, on the other hand, is to redress an imbalance of power between dominant and minority groups, and to gain allocations of resources for a segment or disadvantaged group. This model presumes that the power structure will not give up its benefits and privileges willingly. The social action model is appropriate where a community segment or disadvantaged group is involved. The fundamental difference between the models is clear: consensus versus conflict. These two faces of grassroots action present most clearly the implications of the two theories of society for community practice.

Two Models of Planning

The Rothman/Stockdale view of social planning also specifies two models which can be associated with the conflict and consensus theories of society. The two models of planning which reflect these approaches as identified by Stockdale (1976) are “traditional planning” and “advocacy planning.” Traditional planning conforms most closely to the idealist rational-comprehensive model, and thus is associated with the consensus theory of society. It emphasizes broad goals related to the overall community and seeks to address substantive social problems—health, housing, justice, nutrition, etc. A community-wide plan for recreation or health based on an overall assessment of needs and problems would be typical. Traditional planning is based on the premise that our highly complex and technological postindustrial society requires technical experts to design and to anticipate the future. The contrasting model, advocacy planning, also utilizes technical skills and leadership, but tends to focus on subgroup or subcommunity problems—neighborhoods, disadvantaged groups, and unserved or underserved segments of the community. Problem-solving is directed at reallocation of resources toward a particular segment or problem area. Fact-gathering and analysis are fundamental and are employed from an activist-advocate perspective. Advocacy planning would work for improved recreation, health care, nutrition, or community control of police, for example, in a particular neighborhood, or for a subgroup of the broader community.
Traditional planning is most closely associated with the consensus theory of society, and thus relies on the existing power structure for support and implementation. Advocacy planning, in that it addresses community subgroups or segments, is in a conflict position and requires campaign or contest tactics. The conflict theory of society provides the more appropriate perspective for the advocacy planner. It follows that traditional planners are typically part of the overall community power structure. They are part of the machinery of the authorities. Therefore, they are in a subordinant relationship with the power structure. Advocacy planners, conversely, are typically part of an organization or subsystem which sees the overall power structure as a target of action. They are in a position which requires engagement of the authorities as a target of action. Traditional planners are specialists of the power structure, and advocacy planners are specialists directed to change of the power structure. The former perspective tends to assume a variable sum game (expanding resource base), while the latter would tend to view the political process as a zero sum game where the benefits for one party are usually at the expense of another. The traditional planner assumes that if the overall system is taken care of in a carefully planned, rational manner, then the parts will be taken care of as well. The advocacy planner presumes that competing interests will contend in the arena of action, and that the disadvantaged can influence the distribution of existing (scarce) resources if they are afforded the technical skills of planning (Stockdale, 1976; Rothman, 1974).

A realistic plan will most likely have elements of both. Plans which have been incubated in a city planning department for a year or more, for example, may be completely unfamiliar to both community decision-makers and citizens. Hence, there is often a need for the traditional planner to convince others of the feasibility and viability of the proposed course of action. Likewise, advocacy planners may find it useful to present technical data on how the overall community will benefit from their proposal.

Two Models of Management

Planning and organizing are key aspects of any organization or program. They deal primarily with the identification of possible directions for an organization on the one hand, and bringing people and groups together at the grassroots level for action on the other. The 1970s, however, saw the emergence of social program administration and management as a major field for social practice. It is appropriate, therefore, to develop models of management to complement the Rothman/Stockdale typology.

Management pervades systems and organizations. It provides the direction and control without which systems would fall apart. According to Simon (1948), management is the art of “getting things done,” and “the manner in which the decisions and behavior of [production level] employees are influenced within and
by the organizations.” Gross (1964) summarizes the field as “getting things done through (or by) others.” Management thus involves the direction and control of how the units of a system are organized and how they interact. Management entails both the external and the internal relationships which are vital to the operation of a system.

Recent studies of the management of both community organizations and large corporations which experienced innovation and growth in a time of recession have led to examination of what successful managers actually do, compared to what the rationalist approach would say they ought to do (Mayer and Blake, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Hyman, 1983; and Agor, 1984). This emerging debate in the field provides an opportunity to develop ideal type models in this area to parallel those of the Rothman/Stockdale typology. One model is called the bureaucratic management, or the institutional management model, to reflect the consensus theory of society; the other is labeled innovative management, or the charismatic management model, to reflect the conflict theory of society. (“Intuitive management” is another term which is related to the ideas in our second model.) Bureaucratic management tends to occur in well-established organizations which are accepted in the community. Emphasis is on dealing with routine operations and control of ongoing activities. Budgeting, personnel administration, supply logistics, and supervision of line personnel predominate. Professionalism, efficiency, and quantity are valued. Change is seen as being incremental, e.g., 5 percent a year. Operations are based on written regulations and procedures. Administrative and management personnel have well-established roles. The line-staff distinction is clear. Established relationships with environmental organizations make for relatively “placid” interorganizational interactions.

Innovative management, or charismatic management, is most appropriate for new or changing organizations, and for situations where significant challenges from the environment occur. The organization is essentially in a conflict situation with environmental organizations and must defend, establish, or reestablish its place in the organizational domain. This scenario was most evident in the late 1970s and 1980s when the energy crisis and recession challenged businesses, and cuts in federal spending challenged public and nonprofit agencies. A survival—of—the—creative—organization situation existed. In such situations, emphasis is on reassessment of goals and the control and direction of program or system design. Tactics require acquisitive operations in order to obtain resources to develop a constituency, and to create or reestablish a working relationship in the organizational environment. Change of the organization and its place in the community is the immediate goal of this model. A more collegial, “flat” organizational structure is appropriate, and administrative, management and other roles are often blurred and/or staff is multifunctional. More interpersonal, interactive, and face-to-face relationships exist. Emphasis is on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRACTICE VARIABLES</strong></th>
<th><strong>BUREAUCRATIC MANAGEMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>MANAGEMENT OF INNOVATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL CATEGORIES OF COMMUNITY ACTION</strong></td>
<td>Routine procedures and operations: status quo. Maintenance of existing organizational resources (task goals).</td>
<td>Establishment of a place in the organizational domain, or adaptation to new environmental conditions (task and process goals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND PROBLEM CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td>Organization well established in interorganizational domain. Need to identify inefficient sub-units and problems within the organization.</td>
<td>Organization is not well established, or existence is threatened by other organizations. Need to gain a niche in the interorganizational domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC CHANGE STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>Change internal operations; systems improvement; rational-technical analysis.</td>
<td>Change the environment; systems design; interactive adjustment to environmental networking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTIC CHANGE TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td>Authoritative direction; bureaucratic control.</td>
<td>Constituency Building; campaign or contest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALIENT PRACTITIONER ROLES</strong></td>
<td>Budgeting, systems analysis, personnel management, information systems, accounting.</td>
<td>Negotiation (politician), grant and contract management, deemphasis on routine and technical aspects of administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM OF CHANGE</strong></td>
<td>Manipulation of formal organizations; rational systems analysis concerning sub-units.</td>
<td>Manipulation of community processes and formal organizations; interactional processes concerning environmental factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIENTATION TOWARD POWER STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>Instrumental—a part of power structure. Power structure as employer.</td>
<td>Contention—power structure as target for acquisition of resources and power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARY OF CONSTITUENCY OR CLIENT SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td>Total community or community sub-system, or organization as subject.</td>
<td>New or threatened organization, sub-system or segment as constituency or collaborator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING INTERESTS OF COMMUNITY SUB-PARTS</strong></td>
<td>Dominant interests are supportive. Consensus or competition perspective. Management and/or application of authority is required.</td>
<td>Conflicting interests challenge the organization from within. Need to establish space in the interorganizational domain. Conflict perspective—seeking authority, resources and power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

Two Models of Management
service to a target group, quality of the product, and perceived effectiveness. Establishment of relationships in the interorganizational domain and securing resources are major challenges. The next sections identify characteristics of the two models using categories similar to the “practice variables” identified by Rothman (1974). (See also Figure 1.)

Bureaucratic management conforms most closely to what Van Gigch (1974) calls the “system improvement” approach; and innovative management uses a “systems design” perspective. The former tends to be introspective, looking inward for problems in subunits or processes. The emphasis of bureaucratic management is on task goals and maintaining the status quo within the broader community system. Organizations characterized by this approach have difficulty in responding to rapid change. Innovative management tends to be extrospective, concerned with the role of the organization in the broader community. As such, it is open to questioning its goals and existing operations and to engaging in conflict with community organizations. This strategy is most appropriate for organizations that are faced with major challenges from the environment, and for those that desire to create change—both task and process goals are essential.

Assumptions Concerning Community Structure and Problem Conditions

Bureaucratic management is most appropriate for organizations that are well-established in the organizational domain. The challenge is to make the organization run more efficiently. The problem focus is on identifying inefficient subunits and problems within the organization. Innovative management assumes either that the organization is not well established in the interorganizational network, or that its existence is threatened by other organizations. The primary problem focus is externally directed to resource acquisition and to either establishing and protecting a place in the organizational domain or adapting to new, challenging environmental conditions.

Basic Change Strategy

The bureaucratic model emphasizes rational-technical analysis and tends to favor quantitative techniques of systems analysis, cost/benefit evaluations, performance appraisals, management by objectives, and other techniques of internal accountability and organizational fine-tuning. The innovative management model emphasizes change in environmental conditions, including both acquisitive activities and establishing legitimacy with other organizations, as well as conflict with external organizations to achieve its goals.
Change Tactics and Techniques

The bureaucratic model characteristically emphasizes internal control and efficiency. The innovative approach focuses on relationships with the environment, emphasizing constituency-building and other campaign or contest tactics as appropriate.

Salient Practitioner Roles

The bureaucratic model emphasizes rational-technical techniques of budgeting, systems analysis, personnel management, information systems and accounting. The innovating approach places major emphasis on creative program design and development (vision), negotiation with community and political elites, and networking (positioning leadership). One would seek staff skilled in analysis for bureaucratic management, and for integrative and synthesis perspectives for innovative management.

Medium of Change

The bureaucratic model relies primarily on manipulation of formal organizations. Innovative management relies on manipulation of community processes and formal organizations. The former uses rational analytic processes. The latter depends on interactional processes concerning environmental actors.

Orientation to the Power Structure

The orientation of the bureaucratic management model to the power structure is instrumental—the organization is part of the existing power structure and/or is well established in the interorganizational network. This consensus theory situation contrasts sharply with that of innovative management where a new or threatened organization is in contention with the status quo for authority, resources, market share, and/or power. In the former, we would expect dominant interests to be relatively supportive. In the latter the organization confronts its competitors and opposition in creative ways.

Boundary of Constituency or Client System

The bureaucratic model views its organization as an integral part of the total community. It serves a continuing role in the overall community and is a part of the existing systemic equilibrium. The innovative model views its organization as a subsystem in contention with the broader community or elements therein.
Assumptions Regarding Interests of Community Sub-Parts

For the bureaucratic model, dominant community interests are supportive, or at least accepting. Bureaucratic management can focus inwardly to improve its efficiency in producing products or services, hence the relationship of this model to the consensus theory of society. In the innovative management model, attention must be given to survival and change, which is essentially a conflict situation vis-a-vis the powers that be.

The two management models complete our repertoire of ideal type models of community engagement. The six models, or approaches to change, provide a basis for a conceptual understanding of the major aspects of policy making and action. The development and selection of optional courses of action and strategies provide a proactive basis on which to initiate present actions and to anticipate future decisions. Transformation of a plan from idea to action requires careful consideration of the models of engagement of both citizens and leaders in a community. Finally, the management of the process requires skill and wisdom in getting things done by, or through, others.

Situational Relativity: Mixing Strategies in the Real World

Strategies are not executed in isolation, and only rarely is the pure form appropriate in real-world situations. Rather, strategies should be “mixed and phased” as appropriate for specific scenarios. Figure 2 presents a refinement of Stockdale’s framework for analyzing change strategies at the community level (Stockdale, 1976). Interrelationships among strategies can be made on both horizontal (left-right) and vertical (up-down) dimensions. This chart allows us to compare relative similarities and differences among the strategies on the several practice variables.

![Figure 2 Strategies of Change](image)
On the horizontal dimension, the more rational-technical and task-oriented strategies appear on the left. Institutional (bureaucratic) management and the two planning strategies tend to be technical and office-bound, relying more on analyses and reports than the other approaches. Locality development, social action and innovative management place more emphasis on community processes and interactions—they can be said to be more interpersonal and community-bound. On the vertical dimension, the strategies depicted at the top of the chart tend to have a consensus-based approach to change and the strategies on the bottom are oriented to the conflict perspective. Thus, social action, advocacy planning, and innovative management generally address a community segment or subpopulation, and are most likely to use conflict and contest strategies. Locality development, traditional planning, and bureaucratic management tend to view the overall community as their constituency and, in turn, tend to rely on collaborative strategies.

Now consider the strategies in relation to the policymaking process—the political system. The strategies on the top of the chart tend to be most appropriate for use by those in power—the authorities—and those who collaborate with the power structure. The strategies on the bottom are more appropriate for those not in power but who are seeking change by the authorities, and those who are seeking a role in the power structure. The goal of these latter strategies is to make effective demands on the authorities. For example, a city planner may devise a nutrition program for the city health department. A neighborhood planner, however, in working for a specific subarea may prepare a nutrition plan which is directed at convincing the city to alter its plan to provide more or different services to the neighborhood. The former involves a process within the power structure to decide what actions to take in the overall community. The latter involves a process external to the power structure directed at creating an input to the deliberations of the city authorities. The example illustrates the differences in focus of the two models, and it raises the issue of boundaries and system levels. Note that if the city planner is preparing a plan to be presented to a higher authority-state or federal levels, for example—there is a completely different role: the perspective changes. “Where you stand depends upon where you sit.”

The chart also enables us to consider compatibilities between strategies and the possibility of shifting from one to another. Adjacent strategies, those that share a common boundary on the chart, can be seen as a continuum of possible actions. In action situations, shifting from one strategy to another may be appropriate (Stockdale, 1976). An advocacy planner, for example, if successful in convincing the authorities that a plan (for a segment) is good for the entire community, may find the plan transformed into a community-wide traditional planning document. Similarly, if a group using locality development as a strategy encounters resistance from the authorities, it may find itself in a social action situation. Understanding these interactions is important for the community practitioner, for it establishes a broad range of strategies in his or her repertoire (instead of just six). Most important,
this discussion emphasizes the interactive nature of community action and change. If strategies are not modified to reflect changing community and environmental conditions, they will rapidly become obsolete and fail.

Note, too, that the two management strategies are placed on a diagonal to the other four. This arrangement recognizes the fact that bureaucratic, or institutional, management is most generally associated with the more technical and/or total community strategies: locality development, traditional planning and advocacy planning. Recall also that innovative management is appropriate for new organizations, for those dealing with a segment, and for existing organizations which are facing an external challenge. Thus, a new organization using a locality development strategy would be likely to choose innovative management, and we would expect a shift toward bureaucratic management as the organization becomes established in the community. Similarly, a traditional planning organization using bureaucratic management, when faced with funding cuts from external authorities, could be expected to shift to an advocacy planning mode and to utilize innovative management strategies. Note, too, that social action does not share a boundary with institutional management and traditional planning, and that traditional planning does not share a boundary with innovative management and social action. These pairings tend to be unlikely, as explained below.

Another principle illustrated in Figure 2 is that nonadjacent strategies, those on a diagonal across from each other, tend to be incompatible. The most conflict-oriented strategy, social action, would tend to be incompatible with the most consensus-oriented strategies—traditional planning and bureaucratic management. While variations across all dimensions of the six models should be available as options for every action situation, it should be recognized that successful mixing and phasing of the nonadjacent approaches is less likely. Likewise, locality development, which uses group, consensus-oriented approaches to the overall community, and advocacy planning, which emphasizes rational-technical conflict approaches for a community segment, would tend to be incompatible. If environmental conditions or organizational goals change, however, and an organization using a locality development approach should find itself in a social action relationship with the authorities, then advocacy planning enters as a more likely complementary strategy.

A Hierarchical View of The Six Strategies

The six models of action have been presented as ideal types in order to categorize, analyze, and explain their characteristics. In practice, community organizations and programs use approximations or mixtures of the pure types. Furthermore, any one organization or program has a need to address all three functions: planning, organizing/implementation, and management.
Figure 3 depicts the strategies in a hierarchical manner which is suggestive of levels within organizations and the policymaking system: community, regime and authorities. *Community* is where needs and problems occur and where the outputs and impacts of policies and programs are felt. Interests are articulated and aggregated at this level, and this is where programs must be implemented. Thus, as indicated in the chart, the organizing and implementation strategies would be most dominant here. At the intermediate level, where the staff planning and administrative roles tend to occur, we find the planning strategies. The development of data to support decisions and options for dealing with problems and needs, for evaluating impact, and for designing new approaches tend to occur at this level. Finally, the authorities are responsible for the overall direction and control of the organization, program, or system.
Consider these levels in light of the principle that our world can be conceived as system within system within system. The pyramid can be seen to apply at all levels of a community system: within a specific program, the relationship of a program to the environment, and in the overall community. A neighborhood mental health clinic, for example, might well have grassroots strategies involving consultation and education for local self-help. It would nevertheless need to have planning and management functions performed in the organization. Direct line staff at the street level would tend to be at a lower organizational level than staff planners and program managers. The entire organization, however, would be at a “lower” level in the vertical hierarchy of the overall community than a city-level mental health planning agency. The latter, in turn, would be subordinant to the city manager and council. Constant attention to the boundaries of inquiry and the focal system is necessary to avoid misdirection and misunderstanding. A principle of “situational relativity” could be said to apply to this phenomenon: the type of strategy which is most important changes according to whether there is a conflict or consensus relationship with the community-organizational hierarchy.

Note, too, that the strategies are arranged to suggest a continuum at each level. Grassroots organizing and implementation strategies range from locality development to pure social action. Planning strategies vary from idealized traditional planning to advocacy planning. Management strategies span a continuum from an ideal-type bureaucratic management to innovative management. Any organization has a full range of strategies on which to draw in order to pursue its goals and to respond to changing environmental conditions. Consider the situation of a neighborhood group which has the support of some but not all of the authorities for a community-wide transportation program for the aged. The group could be considered to be in a situation calling for a locality development strategy based on the community-wide character of the issue. On the other hand, there are two segmental characteristics to the constituency (a neighborhood and an elderly quasi-group) which would suggest a social action approach. The organization would be wise to use different tactics in working with neighborhood citizens and proponents of the aged throughout the community than with the opposing authorities and their supporters. The choice of planning and management strategies would be crucial as well. Expenditure of considerable resources for technical planning documents and analytical approaches to management would most likely not be well received by neighborhood residents and the aged who would rather see more action and less bureaucratic obfuscation. City authorities, however, would expect professional presentations and carefully completed documentation. Finding the correct balance among the six strategies is a task for which successful leaders are recognized.

A comparable “mixed strategy” situation would exist in a scenario in which traditional planners in a justice agency find opposition in management circles or
among community residents. It would be appropriate to consider some advocacy planning practices in order to work with community groups and to convince the authorities of the validity of the plans. At the highest level, an established organization using a bureaucratic management model might be confronted with opposition in the community or budget cuts from external funding sources; the need to revise its strategy to use some innovative management, and perhaps a bit of advocacy planning is apparent. Mayer and Blake’s (1981) study of neighborhood development organizations found that managers who focused inwardly and favored the more technical processes were not as effective in establishing and managing neighborhood organizations where there was intense interorganizational competition for resources. Rather, those managers who employed interpersonal skills and more collegial staff relations, as with the innovative management model, tended to be more successful.

Finally, note that the two sides of the pyramid conform generally to the primary theories of society. The strategies on the left side tend to be consonant with the consensus theory and the strategies on the right side conform to the principles of the conflict theory.

This brings us full circle. We have explored approaches which allow the interrelation of the fundamental paradigms of Western philosophy and social theory to models of action for planning, organizing/implementation, and management. These concepts, processes and models occur in community systems; they are essential to the formulation and implementation of policies to establish, direct, and regulate community systems and human services. Continued development of analytical knowledge of the application of the models in community settings will provide a basis for synthesis of more complete theories and strategies of community and change.
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