ED 029 588   HE 000 796

By-Pulver, Glen C.; And Others
The Role of the University in Community Development.
Adult Education Association of U.S.A., Washington, D.C.; Association of Univ. Evening Colleges, Norman, Okla.;
  National Univ. Extension Association, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pub Date 69
Note-44p.; Papers presented at annual Mid-Continent Conference of 3 regional associations, University of
  Missouri, Columbia, January 12-14, 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30
Descriptors-*Community Development, Community Involvement, Extension Agents, *Higher Education, Systems
  Approach, *Urban Areas, *Urban Extension, *Urban Universities
Identifiers-*Title I

At the Mid-Continent Conference on "The Role of the University in Community Development," 3 major papers were presented. In the first, Glen C. Pulver dealt with urban problems and used Milwaukee, Wisconsin as an example to illustrate the complexities of modern metropolitan life. Because communication among various groups in the city is necessary for finding solutions, the university needs a wide array of specialists committed to developing trust between its programs and services and those it wants to reach. The experience of University Extension's involvement in the development of Milwaukee has demonstrated the need for the urban university to engage in critical self-examination. Daniel J. Schler discusses the meaning of community development, the concept of a university's role, the problems of assuming new functions and relationships, the nature of the university itself, and the proper institutional responses to community needs. Lee J. Cary cites Title I as indicative of the shift from a project to problem focus--a move toward a comprehensive systems approach to community problems. He believes community development is an appropriate way for the university to address social needs, and the state universities have a special responsibility to serve the people of their state. Discussion of the University of Missouri's extension program indicates the need for more professionals in the field and the broad scope of possible community action. (JS)

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Glen C. Pulver

Daniel J. Schler

Lee J. Cary

Three papers presented at the Mid-Continent Conference
University of Missouri - Columbia
January 12-14, 1969

School of Social and Community Services
and the
University Extension Division
University of Missouri - Columbia

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Glen C. Pulver
Daniel J. Schler
Lee J. Cary

School of Social and Community Services
and the
University Extension Division
University of Missouri - Columbia

FOREWORD

The Mid-Continent Conference was held at the
University of Missouri - Columbia on January 12-14,
1969. This was an annual meeting of regional organi-
zations of the National University Extension Associ-
ation, the Association of University Evening Colleges,
and the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.
Theme for the Conference was "The Role of the University
in Community Development." The three major papers
were presented by Dr. Glen C. Pulver, Dean, Division
of Human Resource Development, University Extension,
University of Wisconsin; Dr. Daniel J. Schler, Director,
Bureau of Community Services, University of Colorado,
Boulder; and Dr. Lee J. Cary, Professor and Chairman,
Department of Regional and Community Affairs, University
of Missouri - Columbia. The papers are published in
this monograph for distribution to the Conference parti-
cipants and others interested in the role of the
university in community development.

                              Edwin P. Banks
                              Conference Chairman
                              University of Colorado

The Role of the University in Community Development:
An Urban Experience

Glen C. Pulver
University of Wisconsin

Today's society is filled with glaring contrasts
which have led to a crisis of contradiction. In spite
of our wealth, nearly one out of five American
families live in poverty. Expanded technology has
brought more free time than ever before and yet, there
are 20,000 suicides a year and over three million
Americans receive psychiatric care. Everyone knows
the value of education, and still 25 per cent of our
young people "drop out" before completing high school.
The country claims an excellent legal system, but the
poor and racial minorities are subjected to injustice.
Scientists can guide complicated spacecraft to the
moon and back, but can't design an economic,
political and social structure which adequately feeds
all our children.

Although obviously not restricted to urban
settings, these contradictions become more evident in
those places where people concentrate. Poverty stands
next to wealth, ignorance next to academia, air pollu-
tion next to electronic genius, and individual
freedom next to political repression.

Milwaukee shares the characteristics of most
urban settings. The most significant is the fact that
the city is composed of multiple power pyramids.
These institutions have thousands of people at the
base and a few power figures at the top. It is through
decision by these power figures that action aimed at
meeting the needs of the people does or does not take
place in the city.

The Milwaukee metropolitan complex is in actuality
the city itself plus eighteen other cities and villages
in the county. In addition there are ten other cities
and villages in four other counties. Many metro-
politan complexes have the added complication of
including more than one state. Each city, village,
and county has its own peculiar combination of
governmental structures. It is difficult for the
average citizen to know in which sewerage district,
school administration, park district, and police and
fire protection district he is located. He may travel
through several street systems each day on his way to
work. When a local public service is not performed
properly, it is hard to know where to contact the
appropriate governmental official.

In large urban complexes the distance from the
bottom to the top of most of the power pyramids is
long. There are about 744,000 people in the city of
Milwaukee itself. It is the eleventh largest city
in the United States. There are over 1,450,000
people in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. How then
can the individual citizen hope to communicate with
the mayor of his city or other elected or appointed
officials so that he can feel confident that his
views are adequately represented? In recent years
in many urban communities, there has been a reduction

2

in the number of elected representatives in the name of governmental efficiency. Although more efficient, the citizen is one step further removed from the top of the pyramid.

The political power pyramids are not the only places where the individual feels a sense of loss of individual worth and influence. All too often he or she may be little more than desk 84 in a huge office or a serial number in a factory. The employer doesn't know him nor does he know the employer.

The feeling of need for participation in the decisions which affect their lives has forced urban dwellers to organize community organizations. The growth in the number of these organizations has been phenomenal. A recent study indicated that there are approximately 600 in Milwaukee's inner city ghetto alone. These organizations are struggling mightily to gain a stronger voice in the decision making in their community.

Another critical characteristic of the great metropolitan areas of the country is the mobility of their population. The average citizen moves every five years. The city dweller is apt to move even more often. Over twenty years ago white city residents began the great migration to the suburbs. Shortly afterward, large numbers of rural residents began moving into the central cities. A large portion of these immigrants were black and from the rural South. Today there are over 90,000 black people concentrated in the inner city of Milwaukee. They have come to the city with poorer basic educations and with little understanding of the complex maze of city institutions. They have faced a strange culture which has usually been unfriendly. The institutional maze is equally

3

confusing for the some 18,000 Spanish speaking people
who have also come to Milwaukee. They bear the added
burden of a language barrier. How then do these
citizens find their way into the proper pyramid and
to the top in order to acquire proper street lighting,
trash pickup, snow removal, police protection and
dozens of other services critical in an area of high
population concentration?

The city runs on a day-to-day basis guided by a
complicated set of interrelated institutions. These
institutions may, at times, prevent the kind of action
desired by most of the people and the power structure,
but may be difficult to update. Conflicting goals,
conceptions, values, personal interests, and political
relationships, and dozens of other things make change
difficult. For example--in an effort to isolate the
Police Department from political bossism and
gangsterism, some Police Chiefs have essentially life-
time appointments. The result of this kind of struc-
ture in Milwaukee has been a city with a relatively
small amount of organized crime. On the other hand,
there have been many complaints about insensitivity
by the Police to the problems and aspirations of the
growing number of black people in Milwaukee. The
complainants feel that the insulation of the position
of Police Chief prevents resolution of this concern.

The multiple power pyramids, the lengthening
distance from bottom to the top of the pyramids, the
highly mobile population, and the accompanying com-
plexity of institutions has generated a major problem
in communication. There are growing gaps in com-
munication in the city between employers and employees,
city officials and the man on the street, white
neighbor and black neighbor, the county courthouse and

4

city hall. These gaps cause further frustration because of an absence of participation and an apparent lack of understanding. The power which exists, the Mayor for example, may try to respond to the peoples' needs but may not respond properly or be mis-interpreted in his response. The pure weight of massive bureaucracy may prevent a proper response. The elected officials' views may be clouded by the bureau-crat and vice versa.

In a real effort to demand communication, some citizens have resorted to violence. Although violence is hard to condone under any circumstance, it must be recognized as a means of communication. A communica-tion which says, "Look, you can't ignore me any longer! You've got to pay attention! I have some needs which must be met and some ideas about how to meet them! Stop shutting me out!"

Within the city, communication takes place most effectively between people of common concerns be they residence, profession, church, or employment. Communication takes place through confidences. So it is, that professionals talk to professionals, doctors to doctors, engineers to engineers, educators to educators, churchmen to churchmen, politicians to politicians, the poor to the poor.

A university which hopes to develop an effective program of community development must recognize the critical importance of existing communication patterns and confidences. There is a great need for catalytic action to stimulate communication between the many groups but this is extremely difficult without first developing sufficient confidence to be able to enter each of the groups. The city possesses a large number of comparatively narrow groups with high degree

5

of specialization. To be effective in the city, the
university then must also possess a relatively wide
array of specialists committed to outreach and con-
fidence building.

The University Extension approach to community
development in Milwaukee has been broadly based. A
few examples will provide a general idea of the
method of operation:

-- The Institute of Governmental Affairs is a
   department composed largely of Political
   Scientists. Their objective is to improve
   state and local governmental administration.
   Last year the Institute brought city and
   county government officials together in a
   course on Public Administration. This was
   the first series of common meetings by these
   officials in many years.

-- The University Extension Department of Com-
   merce through its contacts with businessmen
   in Milwaukee has run a series of educational
   programs in business management for Negro
   businessmen in the inner city.

-- The County Extension Agents have built up
   strong confidences with county government
   through a history of working contacts. The
   county officials feel that the agents are
   responsive to their needs. As a consequence,
   the agents have developed a number of educa-
   tional programs aimed at park and recrea-
   tional development, community beautification,
   and job training programs for the unemployed
   with the support of the County Public
   Welfare officials.

-- Close confidences between the University

6

Extension Department of Social Work and the
Social Development Commission resulted in a
New Careers Training Program for people in
social service agencies and an aide training
program for the aging.

-- The School for Workers has introduced
lengthy discussions of city and racial prob-
lems in education programs with labor union
leaders.

-- The City Health Department participated in a
joint program with the Department of Nursing
aimed at demonstrating the importance of
adequate pre-natal care. The demonstration
was successful and as a consequence the
Health Department has instituted a new and
significant pre-natal care program.

-- Very few institutions have built effective
confidences with the inner city poor. This
includes the university. In an effort to
open communication and develop confidence,
the Center for Community Leadership Devel-
opment employed a number of Community Repre-
sentatives at the block level. These people
were employed on a part-time basis and from
the community. This was not so that the
University might talk to the community, but
so that the people of the inner city might
express their needs and wishes to the Univer-
sity. This effort has been immensely success-
ful. Special sensitivity programs for
teachers and employers have resulted. The
public schools have assumed ongoing respon-
sibility for the training of teachers in

7

black history and other special concerns of
ghetto schools. The Center is training
trainers for private industry sensitivity
programs in cooperation with the Urban League.
A model volunteer tutor program and many
other positive programs have resulted.

These are only a few of many examples which might
be presented of University Extension's involvement in
the development of Milwaukee. The point is that all
of these educational programs have been developed
through contacts and confidences developed with many
specialized groups throughout the city; doctors with
doctors, businessmen with businessmen and the poor
with people who know and understand them. Communica-
tion barriers have been lowered.

In recent weeks arguments have been raised at the
national level against direct citizen involvement in
program development. The argument has been made that
if a person is very ill, he shouldn't try to diagnose
and resolve his own sickness. Instead he should ask
a skilled doctor to prescribe a proper cure. Thus,
the argument continues--poor people cannot know what
is best for them. They, too, should seek the answers
to their problems from the experts. This kind of
argument must be examined with great care. Advice of
the experts is absolutely necessary in dealing
positively and efficiently with urban problems, but
the people must be involved in great detail if their
needs and problems are to be honestly understood. All
too often, the doctors dealing with urban illnesses
do not consult at length with the patient before pre-
scribing a cure. Diagnosis is by observation at a
distance and prescription of panaceas by telephone.

8

Those people most directly concerned with community development must insure the continued growth of citizen involvement in program development if real change is to occur in urban areas. In simplest terms, the doctor-patient relationship must be improved.

The University Extension experience in Milwaukee has taught us many things. Most critical has been the fact that the university cannot hope to be a significant influence in an urban setting unless it is willing to examine itself critically. A series of questions are generated by this involvement. They are tough questions.

- Are we willing to accept the present "system" or will we recognize and deal with the need for institutional change?
- Are we prepared to study and understand the historical roles of protest and violence in social change? This is not a request to accept violence but to understand why it occurs.
- Are we serious about reaching the unreached in our society? Can we dialogue honestly with people holding unfamiliar value systems?
- Can we design and provide an avenue for resolution of societal conflict?
- Are we prepared to support those faculty members who risk educational involvement in community concerns?
- Are we prepared to commit the necessary financial resource support to provide a large number of university-based specialties?

9

A great challenge is placed before the modern
university. The challenge is to deal honestly and
directly with the serious conflicts of our urban
and rural society. Society is crying out for help
in resolution of today's problems through logical
thought and action rather than as a reaction to
discomforts and pressure. The challenge to the
university is to join with the community in the
development of logical yet rapid paths to the solution
of our community problems. This is the specific
challenge to all community development specialists.

The Role of the University in Community Development:
An Examination of Three Concepts

Daniel J. Schler
University of Colorado

Having been directly involved for the past year
and a half in attempting to create a framework for
both community problem-solving in a number of urban
settings, and simultaneously evolving a role for some
members of the university to play in such enterprises,
I welcome this opportunity to reflect upon the subject
of the role of the university in community development.

My only apprehension is the scope of the topic
and the elusive nature of the three concepts--
university, role and community development. Almost
anyone would be hard put to give definitive statements
of what constitutes a university, what social scientists
or laymen mean by role, and especially what community
development is all about! Only after responding to
the invitation to make some comments on the role of
the university in community development did I fully
realize how naive I was to accept such a commitment.
It did at least one thing for me, it helped me realize
how presumptuous I was to accept a job to involve a
university in community development in Colorado nearly
two years ago.

I have also been somewhat at a lost as to the
best approach to take on a topic of this kind at this

institution where for at least ten years attempts
have been made by a part of the university to play
various roles in community development, both at home
and abroad. I have wondered if my remarks should be
complimentary, friendly, polished, scholarly, gentile,
critical, insulting, or abrasive! Should an attempt
be made to gloss over issues, or in contemporary
jargon "tell it like it is." No doubt you will find
a little bit of all of this in my presentation. How-
ever, my intentions are analytical and perscriptive.
I would like to be analytical about what it means for
a university to be involved in community development,
and perscriptive from my point of view of how to
proceed.

        First of all, we could raise the question as to
the rationale, or reason for the involvement of uni-
versities in community development. This question
could be debated for many hours. I am going to
proceed with the assumption that there is a rationale,
a justification, for universities to take a role and
perform a function in community development. However,
I would call to your attention the fact that this
is not assumed by all faculty members and much inter-
pretation of why and how this is done is currently
needed. With them as with other people, one of the
best ways to be convincing is to get out and do
things, to demonstrate the how, what and why.

        My assumption that the university should be
involved in community development is built on three
primary premises which constitute the major content
of my discussion. First, community development is
preceded and accompanied by learning experiences on
the part of people who take action in the public
interest toward local system development. In other

12

words, community development is a learned phenomenon.
Second, there has been, is, and will be in the future
a need for formal, organized learning experiences
which provide individuals with the predisposition and
competence to engage in community development. Third,
the purpose of educational institutions has been to
serve the educational needs of society, with the
present urgency to give attention to the intelligent
operation and evolution of a rapidly changing social
order. In this context, community development,
appears to me to be the biggest undertaking that
educational institutions have ever been challenged to
become a part of, and sometimes I am not quite sure
if the university is up to it.

After having stated these premises, it appears
to me that some discussion of what community develop-
ment is all about is warranted in order to know what
it is that we are trying to get universities to do.
Having some first-hand experience with the literature
and the field of action, I can assure you that much
has been said and written on community development.
This ranges from abstract definitions to detailed
explanations of the real world activities of those
who say they are doing community development, and are
involved in a discrete activity, project, program,
process, or movement which they define as such. To
refresh our memory, I would like to refer to the
sociologist Irwin Sanders' diverse definitions and
perspectives on community development:

> Some social scientists think of community
> development as a process and focus upon the
> sequences through which communities (or their
> segments) go as they...change: others who are
> action, rather than research-oriented, think
> of community development as a method to be

13

used in moving toward their objectives. They
do not lose sight of the fact that processes
are involved, but they focus upon accomplish-
ments rather than upon sequences. With the
third grouping community development means
a program that has been carefully thought
through in terms of content as well as proce-
dures. The stress here is upon activities as
set forth in the program, and the program it-
self becomes the objective. A fourth view...
is that community development is a movement...
a special kind of program that holds unusual
promise and one worthy of unabashed commit-
ment...[1]

Another community sociologist, Roland Warren,
defines community development as "a deliberate and
sustained attempt to strengthen the horizontal pattern
of the community."[2] As such, Warren perceives com-
munity development as a process. It is not particu-
larly a method for reaching certain extraneous
objectives, such as a new playground, or industrial
development, nor a program emphasizing a set of
specific activities. It does carry overtones of a
social movement to establish stronger local decision-
making and action, accompanied by an assumption of
resulting intentional integration of the various
subsystems of the community.

One other definition is particularly relevant to
our discussion and that is given by an adult educator,
Jack Mezirow. He defines the community development
process as "a planned and organized effort to assist
individuals to acquire the attitudes, skills, and
concepts required for their democratic participation
in the effective solutions of as wide a range of
community improvement problems as possible in an order
of priority determined by their increasing levels of
competence."[3] From Mezirow's point of view, community
development is primarily an educational process.

14

Not without credit to all the testimonials and
literature on the subject, I have to admit that every
time I become engrossed in examining this phenomenon;
its facts, myths, and expansive philosophy, I become
bogged down in a jungle of morass. Part of this
confusion is due to an attempt to relate the often
simplistic definitions of community development to our
complex, urban, industrial society; its multitude of
structures and processes, and the changes which are
constantly occurring in them. To a great extent,
community development as it has been conceived and
developed, does not fit our present culture, and must
be refashioned and adapted if it is going to work to
any major benefit--especially in urban areas!

    We must take into account that community develop-
ment obtained its generic elements from the early
rural and small town life of this country and became
a recognized area of work, goal, and procedure in
developing countries after World War II. In those
countries the setting for activity was primarily small
rural villages. The goals were pretty clear--speed
up the processes of modernization and get slow-changing
traditional, gemeinshaft-type communities to accept
new ideas, new modes of leadership and organization,
and adopt new forms of technology. In many areas of
the world it meant replacing community isolation and
solidarity with new fragmented formal organizations
and extra community relationships. It was just the
opposite of Warren's definition...the horizontal axis
of the community was weakened (rather than strength-
ened) as a result of bureaucrats who managed the
community through vertical systems of programs and
resources extending to the national level.

    The community development movement, likewise,

contained several value bases: (1) that the technical changes which have occurred in the Western world were good, and should occur the world over; (2) that capitalism and New England town hall democracy were the economic and political forms that all men wanted and should embrace wholeheartedly; and (3) furthermore, with just a little initiative and good will, all men of the world would eventually, not only pursue, but achieve life, liberty, prosperty, and, we could add, property.

And so, for another time in history, bands of secular missionaries invaded the serene and remote villages of the world to carry on intentional diffusion and acculturation processes. Thus, there existed the grand model of both what was to be achieved, and how this was to be done. The goal was to encourage change in traditional, stable, slow-changing societies and to do this through seeking the cooperation of those to be changed with those who suggested change.

There appears to be three primary conditions which make it difficult to get a cultural fit of that brand of community development in our present urban areas. First of all, the environment is quite different from that where community development has primarily been practiced. Order is less prevalent than change, and a special concern has been expressed by the majority community for stronger police control and law and order, with or without justice. Change is particularly fragmented, immediate-oriented, and often unplanned and unpredictable. Traditional authority has been put aside without the aid of community development agents. If there are any agents in the community agitating for change, they often are agents teaching revolution and violence.

16

Thus, from one point of view, a desired end or
goal of community development has already occurred.
Our society has been opened up to change and is
changing. New and different challenges face us:
(a) how to create a concensus among diverse values,
power and interests; (b) how to create new or reform
old institutions so that people who want change and
will seek it can become a part of these systems; and
(c) how to guide the desire for change into construc-
tive channels.

The second condition making a cultural fit dif-
ficult is that the systems which would be our units
of work are much larger, more complex, and have local
and extra-community interrelationships. We are not
starting from the simple and proceeding to the complex.
We begin with the complex and the complexity increases.
It is often difficult to get a firm grasp on the unit
and its boundaries which should receive primary
attention. These units are systems of larger systems
and thus must be dealt with in relation to other sub-
systems and the larger whole of society. We have not
had the will, nor do we seem to know how to deal with
change and development in the massive urban community
in any meaningful total system or holistic fashion.

Third, we are intellectually, socially and
culturally confused regarding goals. We are somewhat
at a standstill in terms of where we want to go.
There is little concensus on: urban community values,
the solution of social problems (especially the
issues of integration or separation of minorities),
the ecological organization of urban areas, the
political organization of cities, and the technical
direction we should pursue in developing hardware in
the physical plant of the city.

17

These conditions do not leave us with a very inviting situation for involvement in urban development. One major conclusion that can be drawn is that at a time when the community is the setting for man's increased interdependence and reciprocal relations, urban human settlements appear to lack that much needed ingredient of cohesion and integration. Likewise, many areas lack the local leadership, organization, and vitality to meet the expectations of its increasing number of citizens. Without resorting to reductionism, I think it is becoming more and more obvious to students of the city that a basic problem of our time is the lack of individual, group and institutional competence to solve the most critical problems of a rapidly changing society and to plan and build integrated and well-functioning urban communities. The current urban crises issues are problems of people, their organizations, and the lack of competence to understand, plan, and act in concerted ways to maintain and constantly create viable, urban, human environments consisting of diversity, but having the need to maintain a unity of purpose and interrelated functions.

In other words, there has been a breakdown in community development. In this context, I would like to suggest an additional and one of my own definitions of community development with a behavioral-action orientation: community development is that behavior of acting units within a given localized area which increases the interaction, understanding, reciprocal relations, mutual support and the level and convenience of living among its members. It is this kind of behavior which is greatly lacking in our urban areas and it is the creating of this kind of behavior

18

which should be the primary role of universities in local settings...the stimulation, prompting, and assisting in creating the conditions which result in community development actions.

I would like to emphasize that what is often defined as community development is not such in essence. It is merely, but significantly, the staging, prompting, and conditioning which precedes and accompanies the actual behavior of acting units in society. Through teaching and preconditioning individuals, the central and primary role of universities is to do the basic work in preparing for what is the necessary behavior of community development. A second and supplementary role, often just as important, is the resources which are contributed by the university as part of society to the actual processes of change and improvement.

I would hasten to add that the difference in the situations between a rural and urban environment does not render community development irrelevant. Many of the conditions have parallels. The city is composed of numerous sub-cultures, separated not by space but by lack of communication and different values and interests. To relate to these diverse elements requires as much effort in understanding their values and organization, and in developing rapport as is necessary in an Indian, Asian or African village. In fact, much of the urban scene is a foreign culture to many people. Likewise, we still have the need for process, for staff to create linkage and build relationships for input into these various systems. And we still have the need for content specialists to relate to the various processes of urban development.

Let me briefly summarize what appears to me to

be the role of the university in community development. First of all, it is not the responsibility of the university to be the direct action system in community development. That, I believe, is the responsibility of leadership within the local setting. As such, the university is not a direct problem-solving community action system. Its role is: (1) to provide the learning experiences which will give people the predisposition and competence to engage in community development; (2) to provide people with opportunities to learn community development and to stimulate such behavior by carrying out, from time to time, demonstration projects; (3) to provide the monitoring and the evaluation of action to mirror for actors their behavior, accomplishments, successes, and failures; and (4) to provide content and research support as involved participants in specific urban and community development activities.

There are various situations in which these roles can be taken. First of all, we should not overlook the fact that much learning which leads to community development can occur right in the classroom, on the campus, or the classroom can be taken to the community. Second, we can seek out where there is some community development action and attempt to serve as an interested party and resource system to the action. Third, we can look for and become a part of our stirrings for action, or where action is taking place in unpredictable ways, attempt to transform the behavior of the actors into effective and constructive patterns. Finally, we can be the stimulus, or create the focus for action, and get other parties to join in a demonstration of how a specific issue can be intelligently explored, or a specific problem solved.

20

I would like to turn now to the concept of role.
In social science literature, as in the world of lay-
men, role has been used in a number of ways, often
without clear meaning. The two most common usages
are role as a unit of society as defined by Ralph
Linton,[4] and role-playing or role-taking as another
name for social interaction as used by George H.
Mead.[5] I see both of these definitions as relevant
to our discussion, but with the latter having the
greater significance to the dynamic relationship
between the university and society.

In the first case, role emphasizes conformity,
expectation and approval. It is the action side of
status. To put expected or prescribed rights and
duties into effect is to perform a role. Mead's use
of role, however, focuses more on the interpretive
aspects of role-making and role-taking. In his
lectures at the University of Chicago, Mead set forth
a theory in which society, the development of person-
ality, and communication are interrelated and linked
together. To be able to communicate is in Mead's
famous phrase, to be able to "take the role of the
other" toward one's own vocalizations and behavior.
The stress, from this point of view, is on role-making
and role-taking through the individual's interpretive
process of specific or generalized social situations.
Particularly the idea of role-taking shifts emphasis
away from the simple process of enacting a prescribed
role to devising a performance on the basis of an
imputed other-role. The actor is not the occupant
of a position for which there is always a neat set
of rules, but a person who must act in the perspective
supplied in part by his relationship to others whose
actions reflect roles that he must identify. In some

21

social situations where expected behavior is not properly perceived by the actor, or the actor chooses to deviate from tradition, role conflict, or societal conflict is a possibility.

This is not the whole story related to the concept of role, but it takes us far enough, I hope, to interrelate these meanings for our purpose. One dimension of our involvement in community development can be related to the status and expected performance of educational institutions in society. From this vantage point, we can operate to gain societal acceptance for our commitments and resources for our programing in those areas where we have traditional legitimation.

The educator is accepted in such roles as researcher, consultant and trainer, and often performs as such under contract to the Departments of Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare, Defense and other units of government. Extension personnel are expected to conduct credit and non-credit courses, conferences and seminars in communities for the "straining-striving" middle class. Often it is possible to move into other areas of programing by gradually expanding staff and program content.

However, we have to be sensitive to several factors on the part of some institutions. First, there may be little or no institutional tradition of public service. Second, we must take new environments into account, especially in the urban setting, and engage in role-making and role-taking relative to the specific social situation. Third, when we move into new relationships and penetrate areas where our legitimation is very thin, we must be prepared for negative responses from the establishment. Often

22

a state of confusion, distrust of educators, and the threat of resource limitation begins to develop when researchers, educators and extension personnel begin to shift their relationships and programing to new service units. My main point here is that this is predictable behavior and can be expected unless we do a great deal of "warm up" work with the parties most closely in communication with our work. Sometimes we do not have the time, the resources or the access to do this.

Often times these negative responses can serve as a mirror to indicate who and what interests we have been serving in the past. If we had traditionally been performing the role of social critic, helping the disadvantaged, using our position for social change, guided by reason and concern for humanity, and experimenting with new forms of social relationships for the common good, there is a very strong possibility that such an expectation would exist today for these kinds of roles. As we build in the future, we are challenged to make sure such a tradition develops and is maintained.

Our discussion would not be complete if we did not give some attention to what the university is today, and who it is that is to carry out the numerous roles that educational institutions can play in community development. First of all, we can no longer pretend that the university is a community of scholars, collectively pursuing knowledge in the general interest of society. S.D.S. at least has made that point, if nothing else! The university is a collection of individuals who often have little in common besides the physical buildings they use and the common enemies they must deal with; namely, students and the

23

governing board! Seriously, the university mirrors
our society. It is a fragmented, often divided
system of many parts, performing an array of functions,
some of them contradictory (for example, research and
development for defense and at the same time peace
marches by faculty and students).

Much that the university has done and is doing
is dysfunctional to community development. It ana-
lyzes, but seldom integrates or prescribes. It
teaches specialization but fails to build links of
communication between these worlds of knowledge and
action. It serves the interests of special groups
but finds little time or resources for defining the
public good and calling attention to it. A prime
example is what we have done to the small community
through agriculture technology with little concern
for economic development in rural towns and regions.
Likewise we tractored the Negro, the small farmer
and migrant off the farm without proper skills to
survive in an urban environment only to find them
less than one generation later rioting in the cities.
This is the mixed blessing which universities have
been parties to.

My main point in looking at the university is
to call attention to the need to do more in commu-
nity development than to expand the scope of
programming to communities. We need to take a close
look at our priorities, our resource commitments and
activities and ask to what extent are the universities
a part of the present problem of our specialized,
disintegrated, ill-functioning communities.

From our experiences at the University of Colorado
I would like to point to two major responses that
universities need to make to be effective in urban

24

development. First of all, there is the need to develop systems of content relevant to the present and anticipated future urban problem of our society. This is a role that is central to the tradition of the academic community. It has been neglected because of the value and organizational systems of educational institutions and the limitation of resources imposed upon them by prior commitments to our past rural-agrarian society and, recently, to defense interest of this country. We must look at this issue clearly. We must face the facts that a defense budget is in the billions, the cooperative extension service is serving less than ten percent of our population with a budget of $225 million plus, while less than $10 million in Title I of the Higher Education Act is appropriated to prime the pump of higher education to deal with community service and community development. These are the kinds of conditions under which we must operate in trying to develop those content areas and outreach systems to deal with urban problems in our society. These are resource limitations we shall have to live with and work with as we strain to move educational institutions into a more relevant position in community development.

However, while realizing these limitations, we should not be stopped by them. We should get on with the business of getting a commitment from university administrators to support us in our efforts in development. Likewise, we must build a public clientele system which is interested in community development from a holistic perspective. But most of all, we need to start demonstrating that we can do some things that are beneficial to community problem solving.

This poses the basic problems in the urban setting of
clarifying the specialized content needed and the
manner of integration of this content in the real
world situation for application.

I would like to suggest several dimensions of
present content requirements as I confront them daily
in the community. First, the hardware or technology
of an urban, mobile, interdependent convenience-
oriented, materialistic society is much needed.
Second, inter-personal and inter-group relationship
is the problem of tolerance of diversity and deviance
and that of maintaining some general framework of
values and relationships to assure the continuing and
effective functioning of such a society. Third, we
badly need to develop content that deals with the
problem of "making a living" in an urban society.
Fourth, we need a content in the area of the problem
of legal structure and the provision of change and
continuity within and between these units. Fifth,
we need content to deal with the problem of resource
allocation and intelligent use of resources now and
in the future.

A second major response of educational institu-
tions to urban needs is that of making their educa-
tional resources available for community development
in such a way that we increase the probability of
their use and assure the autonomy of both the commu-
nity and the university in such joint enterprise
undertakings. This means linking staff to those
systems we have not penetrated before. Also, it means
working cooperatively in coalitions and joint enter-
prises where we have only been observers before, and
the willingness to develop "partnerships" with our
neighbor educational institutions. Universities

26

should see it as being in their interest to work
cooperatively with other state colleges, junior
colleges, community colleges, elementary and secondary
schools. The whole educational system of a state
needs to work cooperatively on these issues and
problems. The more there are in the field, the more
likelihood for societal acceptance. Likewise, we
need all the outreach and contact points possible to
assure intentional community change by not only one
large coordinating system of university extension
service but by the many parts of the educational
community. Often the services required for community
development need to be closely related to the scene
of action, with the generalist and the specialist
working in a team relationship in a specific local
setting for long periods of time. Content people
can be found in all kinds of educational institutions,
not just at the big state college or the land grant
university.

What I have discussed here has been the philos-
ophy, content and scope of our activity in Colorado
as I have come to see it. We have had an urban
focus. We have tried to create an identification as
a unit concerned with urban problems and urban devel-
opment. We put staff out in the community to listen.
We have brought people in from the community for
faculty to listen and learn. At the same time we
have tried to help them understand their own problems
better and what the university could possibly do to
help resolve various issues and problems. We have
tried to develop urban content and resource systems.
We have attempted to demonstrate and test the methods
of outreach and, finally, we have tried to become
partners and advocates of constructive community change.

27

I would like to especially pay tribute to
Dean Mack Easton and his staff for giving us a
framework in terms of the way in which our Title I
proposals were written so that we could engage in
this kind of experiment. It was to me a fortunate
experience to have gotten to know Dean Easton, and
I am appreciative of his intelligence, and his
concern for community development which enabled us
to get a start in dealing with urban problems.

NOTES

[1]Irwin T. Sanders, "Theories of Community Development." *Rural Sociology*, 23, 1 (March, 1958), 4.

[2]Roland L. Warren, *The Community in America*. (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963), 324.

[3]J. D. Mezirow, "Community Development as an Educational Process." *Community Development*, National Training Laboratories Selected Reading Series, No. 4 (1961), 16.

[4]Ralph Linton, *The Study of Man; An Introduction*. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936).

[5]George H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Edited, with introduction, by Charles W. Morris (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934).

The Role of the University in Community Development:
A Commitment to Participation With the Community

Lee J. Cary
University of Missouri - Columbia

D. Mack Easton, at Ann Arbor in April of 1967,[1]
and Thurman J. White, at Miami Beach in July of
1968,[2] both spoke of the opportunities and challenges
to the universities in programs which effect systems,
attack community problems, and are comprehensive in
their approach. Both Easton and White had particular
reference to Title I of the Higher Education Act.
Easton felt that Title I was potentially more impor-
tant than the Smith-Lever Act although he gave full
credit to the central role of agricultural extension
in the rise of agricultural productivity since 1915
and its effect on the nation's economy. White too
saw great possibility in Title I programs yet both
saw potential failure not because of the limited
funds available through Title I, not because of the
lack of coordination at the state level, but because
they questioned whether the universities were ready
for Title I and its implications. As Easton stated,
"We need someone to lead us from project-oriented
thinking to problem-oriented thinking, from the ap-
proach by discipline or profession to the comprehen-
sive approach."[3] White pointed out, "Title I
programs must be conceived in a framework of planning

in which the community comes first. The academic
interests of professors cannot, in this context, be
the principle determinant of programs, even though
they must not be lost as a treasured resource."[4]

It is common practice to criticize, to point out
that what is being done is not enough or could be
done better. It is easy to ignore the new and inno-
vative activities presently underway in many of our
universities and focus instead on our major short-
comings. This is not quite my intent. I would like
to state quite simply three major assumptions and
then go on to support these points with an assessment
of the current situation. For examples, I will draw
on some of the experience gained at the University
of Missouri.

First, Title I of the Higher Education Act can
be viewed as one recent and important example of a
shift, a trend away from a project focus to a problem
focus, from working with individuals and their needs
to planning aimed at community problems, from campus-
centered activity to community-centered activity.
This suggests a comprehensive systems approach to
community problems.

Second, while community development is not the
sole answer or the only approach to be used by the
university it does offer distinct possibilities as a
way for the university to relate itself more realis-
tically and relevantly to the community and its
problems.

Third, while all universities have a responsi-
bility that extends well beyond the campus, state
universities carry an additional mandate to serve the
people of their state. Someone has said, "A state
university is like any other university except more

31

so." In this case, the "more so" is this additional
mandate, this responsibility to serve.

James T. Bonnen, of Michigan State University,
speaking at the University of Missouri Annual
Extension Conference in October, 1968, cautioned his
audience: "It is imperative that we recognize that
we are moving from a period in which the university
role in public affairs has been primarily one of
creating technological change to a period in which
the society is pressing increasingly for a conscious
university effort to transform the social and economic
institutions of the society. This is a very different
world for university extension."[5] He went on to
describe the breakdown in our ability to master com-
munity problem solving and decision making and pointed
out that this breakdown testified to the fact that our
ability to create technical change has outrun social
invention to manage that change. The university,
therefore, must expand its role in public affairs to
a full-scale university commitment to societal problem
solving.

Bonnen also pointed out "In research, in exten-
sion, and even in teaching, society is creating
alternatives to the university. Thus, the inability
or unwillingness of the university to do the kind of
problem solving research needed by society has
resulted in a great growth of governmental and pri-
vate (profit and non-profit) research institutes.....
The university faces the choice of taking some major
responsibility for these functions in society or see
other institutions build up around these social
needs."[6]

Some would not view this possibility with alarm,
letting others respond to societal needs. The argu-

32

ment goes something like this - the mission of the
university is to create an intellectual community
where a range of scholarly disciplines are committed
to the generation, ordering and transmission of
knowledge. Teaching and increasing knowledge through
research become the two major pursuits. The outreach
of the university, the application of knowledge to
the specific situation holds a lower priority. While
I would not strongly disagree with this view, we
should be concerned here with a matter of emphasis.
How much or how little attention is focused on re-
sponding to societal needs.

What we have is an increasing need for, and
pressure for, the involvement of the university and
the commitment of its resources to the problems and
concerns of the community. While universities alone
cannot resolve these dilemmas, nor are they expected
to do this alone, they carry an increasing responsi-
bility to become involved where the action is.

In all of this, Title I of the Higher Education
Act is seen as one effort, one attempt to relate the
university more closely to the needs and problems of
society. But in this speaker's view, Title I is only
an example of the general direction in which the
university, and particularly its extension activities,
need to move. This in no way minimizes the impor-
tance of the teaching and research functions of the
university. This in no way minimizes the importance
of the range of extension and continuing education
functions of the university. In this view, the
university has the capacity to respond and the
responsibility to apply new and accumulated knowledge
to society's needs. The only question is how do we
respond without jeopardizing our other commitments.

33

Let me move on to the second point--while community development is not the only approach to university involvement in community-centered activity it is a particularly appropriate way in which the university can address itself to the problems of society and relate its resources to society's needs. Community development is defined in many ways but I like a very simple one which appears in Roland Warren's book, The Community in America. Here community development is defined as "the deliberate attempt by community people to work together to guide the future of their communities, and the development of a corresponding set of techniques for assisting community people in such a process."[7] Some of the points of emphasis or crucial elements in the process are the direct participation of the people themselves in goal setting, their direct participation in goal implementation, use of rational methods of problem solving, an organized, coordinated approach that attempts to involve the entire community, the use of outside experts and resources only as needed, and emphasis on the intangible effects on the people and the community's interactions; the process as well as the projects.

In all of this, the involvement of the people themselves in their own decision making is paramount; it is a people-centered process. Through community development agents or university extension personnel with specialized training in community development consultation services are offered to community groups with additional specialized resources available as the specific needs arise. Group study and decision making is an educational process in itself calling for a high degree of sophistication; an ability to work with groups around goal setting and goal implementation.

34

The direction in which the community moves is up
to the community. The university responds in appro-
priate situations and as it is called upon to respond.
This is community service of the highest order. It
is not peddling a packaged program to see who will buy.
It is the people themselves deciding what they need
and then requesting specific resources from the uni-
versity. To be sure, this puts a greater strain on
the university and can lead to many requests which do
not fit within department or professional lines. It
does not mean, however, that we can or should respond
to every request. No university has that wide a range
of resources. No university can be all things to all
people. It does suggest a new delivery system. It
does suggest bringing our expertise, our abilities to
bear when they are needed and where they are needed.
This is being relevant to the needs of society. This
is in the finest tradition of university outreach.

My third point is that all universities have a
responsibility to the society of which they are a part.
While all universities should, and to varying degrees
do, recognize this responsibility, state universities
carry a more specific charge to apply their know-how
to the social and economic problems of their partic-
lar state.

In a recent long-range planning report issued by
the University of Missouri, two of the four basic
guidelines for extension and continuing education
point out first that programs will be based upon the
expressed needs of Missouri citizens and, second,
there will be increased allocations of resources to
social and community problems, with emphasis on urban
areas.[8]

In what I have said so far there is a danger in

35

interpreting my statements to mean that community
development is the major way in which the university
is related to the community. This, of course, is not
so. It is fully realized that a host of other activ-
ities, relationships and programs are going on and
will continue between individual faculty, departments,
and whole campuses on one hand and community groups,
communities, regions, and perhaps whole states on the
other hand. It is where people have not yet decided
what resources they may need or want from the univer-
sity, where communities have not had an opportunity
to come together and decide priorities, where no
mechanism for conducting joint enterprises has been
arrived at that community development can make its
major impact. Where process is stressed and program
and projects evolve from the process, where action
grows out of joint study, where involvement of people
leads to group decision and action--these are the
situations where community development makes a major
contribution.

   For illustrative pruposes, I wish to speak
briefly of the community development program at the
University of Missouri. My own association with the
University has been short enough so that most of what
I have to say reflects on the fine work and on the
foresight and determination of people who have pre-
ceded me at the University of Missouri.

   The full story on community development at
Missouri needs to be written and documented not be-
cause it is a success story as such, but it is perhaps
the most comprehensive community development program
at any American University. For this reason it needs
to be spelled out in detail. One of my greatest
hopes, and one that I share with my colleagues, is

36

that over the next year or two we can prepare and publish the story of community development at this University.

It is quite fitting that community development at Missouri started as an extension function. An increasing number of towns, cities and counties began requesting help from the University on community problems, on matters of civic improvement and community development. No specific discipline was called upon and general consultation was obviously needed. From this rather simple beginning in 1957 a very limited staff began offering community development consulting and continuing education services to communities, upon request, on a wide range of civic concerns. These consultants were not there to give answers, but they were able to help the communities in ways they themselves could go about getting answers. As needed, other university resources were called into the picture. This work with communities on the use of community development for improving community systems and providing community development training for interested citizens showed there was a tremendous demand for learning experience in community work and highlighted the fact that so few professionals were trained in this process.

The University now has twenty-six authorized community development positions as part of the university-wide extension program. Each community development agent lives and works in a three to five county area. On the Columbia campus we offer a Master of Science in Community Development through the Department of Regional and Community Affairs. This is an academic Department and part of the School of Social and Community Services. We have a faculty of fifteen,

37

with two positions open at the present time. This
faculty has the responsibility for the master's pro-
gram as well as providing initial training, in-service
training and backup services for the community devel-
opment agents in the field. At present we have some
fifty students in either the two year master's program
or in the one year diploma program for international
students. Through special urban provlem solving funds
made available by the University in July, 1968, we
have established the beginning of an urban community
development program with one community development
specialist in Kansas City and a second in the greater
St. Louis area.

The community development agents carry out a wide
range of activities based on the concerns and issues
within their particular area. The general philosophy
and process of community development are constant,
the content is variable. These agents consult with
groups on matters of organization; on leadership
identification, training and functioning; on resources
available and procedures for securing these resources;
on community study and survey procedures. They raise
important questions, encourage groups to look at
alternatives and implications. The community devel-
opment agents relate to and work closely with other
extension staff, with state personnel, with special
program people, and with many other professionals.

And what is the goal of all this community
development activity? Community improvement, commu-
nity advancement as determined by the citizens them-
selves. And community, as I use it here, may be a
town, city, county, region or any other bundle of
resources and population that makes up a viable unit.
A process too has been initiated which attempts to

38

involve as many people as possible in group decision-making and action. The process is based on certain value positions including the position that community action should be determined by the citizens of the community; that decisions made in this way tend to be supported and carried out; that through this process people gain an increasing willingness and ability to tackle other and more complex problems. The result may be a water district, a regional planning commission, a new industry, a consolidated school district, a community college or any one of a hundred other concrete accomplishments.

Broadly speaking the goal of community development is the good community. Lloyd Ohlin has listed five characteristics of the "good community:"

"1. The physical resources to maintain a healthy, satisfying and constructive life for all age groups."

"2. An integrated structure of opportunities for learning and performing social roles."

"3. Sufficient residential stability to encourage the development of strong institutions, skilled leadership, and effective networks of social interaction and decision-making."

"4. Active social and political participation by residents in those processes of decision-making which affect their interests."

"5. Exercise of responsibility and control over local institutions."[9]

In focusing on certain topics, others must be ignored or passed over lightly. In my emphasis on the extension role of the university in community development I have given almost no attention to two university roles that are particularly important in

a relatively new professional field. I am referring
here to the need for research and the development of
practice theory and the need for professional education
for those seeking a career in community development.
With these needs and the outreach possibilities the
role of the university in community development holds
great potential. No other institution is better
equipped to carry out these research, education and
extension functions. The most important task now is
to turn this potential into performance.

NOTES

[1]D. Mack Easton, "The Situation Around Title
I, Higher Education Act of 1965." Paper presented
to Community Development Division, NUEA, Ann Arbor,
Michigan, April 24, 1967. 13 pp. (Mimeographed).

[2]Thurman J. White. "Title One and Community
Development." The NUEA Spectator, 34, 1 (October-
November, 1968), 10-14.

[3]Easton, op. cit., 8.

[4]White, op. cit., 14.

[5]James T. Bonnen, "The Public Affairs Role of
the University of the Last Third of Our Century."
In a speech to the University of Missouri Annual
Extension Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, October
24, 1968. p. 9.

[6]Ibid., p. 8.

[7]Roland Warren, The Community in America.
(Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963), 20.

[8]See Long Range Planning, University of Missouri,
November, 1968.

[9]Lloyd E. Ohlin, "Urban Community Development."
Paper presented at The Conference on Socially Handi-
capped Families, Paris, France, February 10-12, 1964,
9-10.