DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 011 RC 008 480

AUTHOR Austin, J. Keith
TITLE Initial Contact Approaches for Community Resource Development with Small Rural Communities.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 64p.; Specialist in Education Thesis, New Mexico State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Community Development; *Community Leaders; Community Resources; Consultants; Field Studies; Interaction; Literature Reviews; *Relationship; *Rural Areas; *Specialists
IDENTIFIERS *Community Resource Development; CRD; New Mexico

ABSTRACT

A field study was conducted to ascertain how leaders in 3 small rural New Mexico communities viewed the approaches of a community resource development (CRD) specialist during the critical initial phase of the CRD process. A log of approaches was kept by the specialist to record the significant approaches employed and the leader contacts made. Thirty-eight leaders were interviewed to determine opinions about various approaches. Twenty-five leaders approved of a CRD specialist working in the community; 1 did not; and 10 were undecided. Thirty-five leaders stated that the best way for a specialist to meet community leaders was via a face-to-face visit at their place of business. Eighteen wanted the specialist to work with them, while 14 wanted him to serve as an advisor only Twenty-nine thought that the best way for a specialist to get started was to carefully study the community before taking action. While 19 thought a specialist should live in the community, 30 recommended he work from 2 to 4 days a week in the community. It was recommended, therefore, that a new CRD specialist approach community leaders face-to-face; have a pre-talk prepared for the visitation; carefully study the community before attacking a project; and either live in the community or work there several days a week. (Author/JC)

INITIAL CONTACT APPROACHES FOR COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT WITH SMALL RURAL COMMUNITIES

BY

J. KEITH AUSTIN, B.S., M.A.

A Thesis submitted to the Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Specialist in Education

Major Subject: Educational Administration

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico
May, 1975

"Initial Contact Approaches for Community Resource Development with Small Rural Communities," a thesis prepared by J. Keith Austin in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Specialist in Education, has been approved and accepted by the following:

Dean of the Graduate School

Chairman of the Examining Committee

Date

Committee in Charge:

Dr. Lloyd G. Cooper, Chairman

Dr. Timothy J. Pettibone

Dr. Richard R. DeBlassie

Dr. Everett D. Edington

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This writer expresses his sincerest thanks to his adviser, Dr. Lloyd Cooper, for his guidance and support in conducting this study. Thanks also go to the examining committee: Dr. Timothy J. Pettibone, Dr. Richard R. DeBlassie, and Dr. Everett D. Edington, and to Bealquin Gomez, Allen Beck, and Ralph Dunlap.

A special thanks to Beth Shannon for her patience in editing and typing the manuscript.

And to his family, to Eugene Ross, and Jacob Tejada, this writer expresses his gratitude for their encouragement and continuing support.

VITA

J. Keith Austin is a native of New Mexico. He was reared in Taos, is married, and has three children. He earned his Bachelor of Science Degree in Agricultural Education in 1957, and his Master of Arts in Education in 1967.

His experience includes:

1957-1962	Self-employed: Chile Products and Insurance Business
1963-1967	Instructor and Extension Rural Defense Leader, NMSU
1967-1968	Asst. Professor & Extension Area-Supervisor Programs, NMSU
1968-1972	Asst. Professor & Extension Organization Specialist, NMSU
1972-Pres.	Associate Professor & Extension State Program Leader, Community Resource Development, NMSU

His major accomplishments include:

1970	Originated the Group-O-Tunity Leadership Workshop Series
1971	Originated the NM Environmental Seminar Series
1971	Originated the NM Environmental Quality Newsletter
1973	Originated the NM Elected Officials Education Project
1974	Originated the NM Rural Economic Development Education Project

State Coordinator for the Land-Use Planning Symposia
Co-founder of the New Mexico Environmental Institute
Co-producer with Chet Huntley of the film on Rural Economic Development entitled, "What do you Want?"
Executive Director, REERIO (Regional Environmental, Education, Research and Improvement Organization)

His professional societies include:

The Community Development Society, and
Epsilon Sigma Phi, the National Honorary Extension Fraternity

ABSTRACT

INITIAL CONTACT APPROACHES FOR COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT WITH SMALL RURAL COMMUNITIES

BY

J. KEITH AUSTIN, B.S., M.A.

Specialist in Education in Educational Administration

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico, 1975

Dr. Lloyd G. Cooper, Chairman

Purpose. This field study was to find out how the leaders in three small rural New Mexico Communities viewed the approaches of a community resource development (CRD) specialist during the critical initial contact phase of the CRD process.

Procedures. A log of approaches was kept by the specialist to record the significant approaches employed and the leader contacts made. Leader interviews were conducted by the investigator to determine opinions about the various approaches.

Leader Interview Responses. Thirty-eight leaders were interviewed. Twenty-five approved of a CRD specialist working in their community; one disapproved, and ten were undecided. Twenty-eight were encouraged to do some additional CRD work because of the specialist, and twenty-nine believed other citizens would be encouraged. Thirty-five said that the best way for a new specialist to meet community leaders was through a face-to-face visit at their place of business. Eighteen wanted the specialist to work with them, and fourteen wanted

him to serve as an adviser or consultant only. Twenty-nine thought the best way for a specialist to get started was to carefully study the community before taking action. Nineteen thought a specialist should live in the community and thirty recommended work from two to four days a week in the community. Thirty-four thought a CRD specialist would be important to the future of their community.

Recommendations. A new CRD specialist should: approach community leaders face-to-face; have a pre-talk prepared for the visitation; carefully study the community before going to work on any major project or problem, and live in the community or, at least, work in the community several days a week.

A program manager should provide regular training and evaluation for new CRD specialists; assign specialists to a limited number of communities; evaluate the projects beginning in each community, and include client and co-worker inputs in the specialist's performance evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (1967) defined community resource development (CRD) as a process whereby those in the community arrived at group decisions and took action to enhance the social and economic well-being of the community. A community was one or more groups of people interacting toward the attainment of goals in which they share a common interest. A community usually had a geographic definition, but it was not necessarily fixed to any one town county, or other geographic area. It changed with the definition of the problem.

Resources were the physical and social inputs which supported or had the potential to support individual and community actions. They were the natural, human, and man-made resources available for attaining goals.

Development was a process of progressive change in attaining individual and community goals through an expanded, intensified, or adjusted use of available resources.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this field study was to find how the leaders in three small rural New Mexico communities viewed the approaches of a CRD specialist during the critical initial contact phase of the CRD process. The study covered a four-month period from November 15, 1974, to March 15, 1975.

Relation to On-going Project

This study was conducted in conjunction with a pilot research-

extension project entitled, "Improving the Economic Viability of Selected Rural Communities in New Mexico," hereafter referred to as the Title V Project.

The Title V Project was funded on July 1, 1974, for three years under Title V of the Rural Development Act, 1972. The aim of the Title V Project was to assist community leaders, elected officials, and other citizens in planning and implementing orderly growth and development by concentrating the efforts of a CRD specialist in not more than three communities (N. M. CES Plan of Work, 1974, p 1).

This was the first attempt for the New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Service to establish a joint research-extension project in community resource development. It was also the first time a CRD specialist had been assigned to a limited number of communities. Traditionally, specialists were assigned to multi-counties.

A CRD specialist was employed on November 1, 1974, to give leadership to the Title V Project. A graduate research assistant was employed on January 2, 1975, to assist the specialist with the research phase of the project.

The specialist was supervised by the state program leader for community resource development, who was responsible to the Assistant Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, and, through him, the Dean of the College of Agriculture.

He was advised by a statewide rural development advisory council composed of key leaders throughout New Mexico. The Dean of the College of Agriculture was chairman of this committee.

The CRD specialist's job description for the Title V Project in-

cluded both Extension and research activities:

Extension

- Responsible to State Program Leader for community development and educational activities.
- Responsible for organizing [illegible] citizen organizations in pilot communities.
- Responsible for implementing action plans in relation to the problems of the pilot communities.
- Responsible for evaluating the development process and progress toward the goals of the pilot communities.
- Maintains close working relationships with Extension supervision, program leaders, specialists, and county staffs.

Research

- Responsible to the head of the Department of Ag. Econ. and Ag. Business for research activities.
- Responsible for identifying social, economic, and cultural factors that enhance or inhibit growth in pilot communities.
- Responsible for developing guidelines for use in rural communities.
- Responsible for conducting limited feasibility studies for determining appropriate development alternatives.
- Responsible for evaluating economic and social changes in the pilot communities.
- Maintains close relationship with faculty in Ag. Econ. and Ag. Business (NM Plan of Work, 1974).

Current Developments

On January 9, 1975, the New Mexico Office of Manpower Administration approved a request from the Cooperative Extension Service to hire 35 CRD aids. These aids were hired to work at improving their community and the level of such local services as public safety, education, health care and sanitation, etc. One requirement was that they be hired by January 23, 1975, to take full advantage of the 13-month benefit period.

CRD aids were a new innovation for the Cooperative Extension Service. They were to assist CRD specialists and other Extension profes-

sionals.

Problem

In recent years, community resource development programs have seen increased emphasis on the use of CRD specialists. These specialists are individuals who are professionally trained in the eynamics of planned change. They may come from either inside or outside the community. The CRD specialist was a newcomer to the profession and community resource development work itself as a distinct activity was a recent arrival on the social scene in New Mexico (Handsworth & Wedell 1973, p 78).

While CRD specialists have only recently been employed in appreciable numbers, their role in future programs of planned change seemed to be greatly expanding. However, in many cases, the relation had neither been happy nor productive for the agency, the specialist, or the community clients involved.

For an "outsider" to go into a small community and stimulate the people to initiate and carry on with reasonable success a program of community resource development required considerable sensitivity and skill.

There was a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the approaches used by CRD specialists as they implement the community resource development process with communities.

A CRD process consisted of four broad phases. These phases were: (1) initial contact phase, (2) task definition phase, (3) contract negotiation phase, and (4) action phase.

The initial contact phase was further divided into several stages.

These were: contacting the community leaders; developing acquaintance with and acceptance by the people of the community, and establishing a basis for proceeding with the community leaders and interested people.

Objectives

The objectives were to evaluate the effectiveness of the initial approaches used in (1) contacting, (2) developing acceptance, and (3) establishing a basis for proceeding with the leaders of small rural communities.

This field study attempted to identify those approaches and steps which, if put into practice, would result in greater achievement by a CRD specialist whether he was a paid professional or a volunteer.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The origins of CRD in the United States dated back to frontier mutual aid practices and to the early private and public programs designed to encourage grass roots prosperity.

The processes and practices often considered most closely related to CRD in the United States were frequently called "community organization." In some discussions, "community organization," "community development," "rural development," and "resource development" were used interchangeably (Bilinski, 1969).

The Cooperative Extension Service

The Cooperative Extension Service engaged in CRD work since it was established in 1914. Every effort to help a farmer or his family in those early years was a contribution toward building rural communities.

Today, CRD work has a broader meaning, but it still includes helping to improve agriculture and rural people, plus community services and facilities, economic development, environmental improvement, and other services.

Pioneer Work

In 1911, C. J. Galpin, a rural sociologist at the University of Wisconsin, moved forward with three programs: (1) resident teaching, (2) research, and (3) off-campus extension. Galpin believed that the aims of rural life are unmistakably adjusted to the local rural group, the acceptance of local responsibility will be instant and organization

eventually will be effective. Thus, he formulated one of the basic principles of community resource development.

With the help of D. W. Sawtelle, Emily F. Hoag and others, Galpin advanced the community idea through off-campus extension. Their work included organizing clubs of many kinds, working with churches, working on community fairs and community surveys, etc.

Wisconsin was the first state in which CRD programs were begun, but Massachusetts, Kansas and Ohio soon followed. By 1935, sixteen states had CRD programs. By 1959, rural sociologists in 27 states were devoting at least part of their time and attention to community resource development. In addition, eight states had persons on the Cooperative Extension staff serving as "Community organization specialists" (Wiledon, 1970, pp 94-99).

During the 1960's, with rapid decline of the rural population and the problems of crime, noise, pollution, and congestion in the cities, CRD took a greater significance. In 1970, the Agricultural Act included specific funds for CRD work by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. About this time, many other public agencies entered the field and received funding for staff and facilities. An example was the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. In 1975, all states had persons on the Cooperative Extension staff working in community resource development.

Small Town Leadership

The 1970 Census data indicated that the population in most rural areas was increasing at a rate far below the national average. Many rural counties lost population, especially residents between the ages

of 20 and 55 years while the proportion of dependent younger and older persons increased (Williams, 1974, p 98).

A number of studies indicated that the degree of energy and skill exerted by local community leaders was a critical variable in determining the future of the community. Mitchell (1970, p 6) stated that the decisions of a small number of influentials will be of considerable importance in determining how a community responds to change.

One comparative study of leadership in two rural towns indicated that the character and activity of the community political leadership were deciding factors in whether the towns grew, declined, or disappeared altogether. Another comparative study of farming towns indicated that those leaders who most effectively organized their local resources to solve pressing community problems were also the most educated leaders and were in the "...high status occupational levels generally associated with organizational skills, know-how, and experience." Some community leaders did not want too much growth or prosperity because it might bring competition to the existing power structure (Williams, p 100).

Sorensen and Oakleaf (1971, p 3) pointed out that there was still a solid reservoir of skilled, dedicated leaders in the rural areas. With appropriate help and support, existing leadership could be mobilized.

According to Hunter (1959, pp 5-6), every community had a well-defined, relatively small group of people who constituted the community power structure, and gave their approval or disapproval to major community projects. This group of people were known as the informal

leaders or policy-making structure. They were self-appointed and represented the largest industries, banks, law firms, newspapers, etc. This power structure protected itself from too many demands by channeling policy execution through an understructure (Hunter, 1953, p 109).

This understructure was a fringe group of politicians, educators, clergymen, governmental officials, organizational leaders, etc. They were known as the formal leaders.

Beal and Hobbs (1969, p 5) recommended that both the formal and informal leaders be contacted for their reactions and suggestions on proposed programs. Such an approach gained approval for the program as well as obtaining additional suggestions for changes and for carrying out the program.

Identifying the Power Structure

Three somewhat different techniques were proposed for identifying the community power structure. The positional technique was probably the quickest and most direct method. This technique was to locate the people holding the traditional power offices, such as the heads of the largest manufacturing plants, the bankers, the larger merchants, the school superintendent, the editor of the local newspaper, the mayor, the heads of churches, the presidents of organizations and others.

The decision-maker technique was to secure the names of people currently involved in making decisions on important issues. These people were located by observing who makes the convincing statements on issues at meetings or by analyzing reports in local newspapers. These were people active in the affairs of the community. They were

potential power structure on the way up, or they were front men for the real power leaders in the community.

The reputational technique was the most frequently used for locating the real power structure of a community. This technique required the investigator to make an inquiry among "knowledgeable" people as to whom they believe to be the power actors in their community. These "knowledgeables" were those suggested under the positional technique. They were people who were in a position to know what is going on in the community. They were asked such questions as, "Who, in this community, do you believe has the most influence on important decisions affecting the community?" or "Whose support would you like to have if you wanted to propose something new for the community?" Those persons mentioned most frequently would be the community power structure (Wiledon, 1970, pp 228-230).

The identification of community leadership was also gained through a number of other techniques. These included such sources as seminars, advisory committees, existing organizations, and study committees. In each of these cases, the type of leadership differed. For example, the seminars and problem-solving techniques were designed to reach community leaders who had concerns about a specific problem area. This technique utilized selected leaders from existing organizations or experts in the area of concern and representatives of the segment of the community most affected by the problem (Sorenson and Oakleaf, 1971, p 164).

Community Resource Development Processes

Material was chosen from journals, books and monographs with the

aim of providing as rich a fare as could be found in the available literature about the different processes used in community resource development.

Processes in CRD work were diverse because the objectives, the types and levels of community work varied. The advocate of radical social change used processes aimed toward conflict and confrontation. The gradualist used processes to secure the greatest possible level of agreement and of shared decision or consensus. In general, the processes in CRD work were attempts to solve problems of many different kinds in many different situations (Handsworth & Wedell, 1973, p 21).

Most of the literature concentrated on the broad phases of the various processes. Little or none discussed the specific steps a CRD specialist takes to achieve these phases. It was those steps that appeared to this writer as being most critical in determining the success or failure of the specialist.

In 1957-58, two new processes based on a network concept of activity relationships were developed simultaneously. The U. S. Navy, assisted by the firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, developed PERT (Program Evaluation Review Technique) for management of the research and development of the Polaris weapons system. Du Pont, assisted by Sperry-Rand Corporation, developed CPM (Critical Path Method) for controlling plan construction. The logic of the two processes was basically the same.

A simplified process that borrowed and also eliminated concepts from both processes was developed by E. M. Kulp. The label PERT was used to identify this simplified process since PERT, perhaps because

of its catchy title, was much better known of the two systems (Kulp, 1970, p 434).

Rogers (1962, p 81), from his own research and a review of the research of others, empirically established seven developmental phases that he termed "the adoption process". These phases were: (1) awareness, (2) interest, (3) evaluation, (4) trial, (5) further evaluation, (6) adoption and use, and (7) re-evaluation. While used mainly in the development of agricultural practices, it also applied to CRD.

The success of any community or area social and economic development program depended, in large part, on how effectively the program mobilized human and non-human resources in the action phase. Beal and Hobbs (1963, pp 1-14) described a process of social action in community and area development. He termed this process the "social action process" that consisted of fifteen phases: (1) analysis of the existing social system; (2) convergence of interest; (3) analysis of the prior social situation; (4) delineation of relevant social systems; (5) initiation sets; (6) legitimation; (7) diffusion sets; (8) definition of need by more general relevant groups and organizations; (9) decisions and commitments to action by relevant systems; (10) formulation of objectives; (11) decisions on means to be used; (12) plan of work; (13) mobilizing resources; (14) action steps, and (15) evaluation.

From scrutiny of numerous case studies of CRD processes, Biddle and Biddle (1965, pp 90-91) concluded that there was a characteristic flow of events by which a responsible nucleus of people came into being or grew from an existing organization. He developed and

tested a process with six major phases and for each major phase, he described some detailed events. These major phases were: (1) exploratory, (2) organization, (3) discussional, (4) action, (5) new projects, and (6) continuation.

Jack Rothman (1970, pp 20-36) established three models of community organization practice. His models were: (a) locality development, (b) social planning, and (c) social action.

Another author, Arthur F. Wiledon (1970, pp 164-165), suggested that there were ten logical steps in the community planning process. He adapted these steps after observing the work of Gale L. Vandeberg, Extension Service, University of Wisconsin, and others. Wiledon's steps included: (1) identifying the problem or problems; (2) agreeing upon goals or objectives; (3) discovering and studying available resources; (4) considering different methods of solving the problem; (5) deciding upon the alternatives to be followed; (6) developing a plan for putting the alternatives into action; (7) assigning responsibilities; (8) informing the community; (9) following through on the plan, and (10) evaluating the results. These were almost identical to those used by the Agency for International Development.

Experience, theoretical thinking and a survey of CRD practitioners helped Kelsey (1972, p 3) identify a CRD process that involves, informs and motivates the people of the community. This process was not mechanistic as a specific procedure was usually not clear-cut in most communities. Experience in many communities had shown that willingness to take action to solve community problems was not enough. The way a community goes about solving the community problems was of

utmost importance.

The basic steps of this CRD process which was illustrated as circular were: (1) What ought to be. The ideal - identification of community ideals, issue awareness, problem identification. (2) What can be. The alternative - leadership identification and organization, resource identification and limitation, and identification and analysis of alternatives. (3) What shall be. Action - establish priorities, choose the alternatives, formulate detailed plan to implement and evaluate project, evaluation in terms of what ought to be.

Approaches to Implementing Community Development Processes

Beginning in the early 70's, researchers began to identify and evaluate steps within the different process phases. An example was the seven roles that were isolated by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, pp 229-230) by which a change agent introduced an innovation to his clients. These included: (1) develops need for change; (2) establishes a change relationship; (3) diagnoses the problem; (4) creates intent to change in the client; (5) translates intent into action; (6) stabilizes change and prevents discontinuances, and (7) achieves a terminal relationship.

In 1973, Huey B. Long and others described six approaches to CRD. These approaches were illustrative of the major thrusts of CRD in the United States during the 1970's. Each approach was described by a person who was well-known for his use of the specific approach. The six approaches to planned CRD were: (1) the community approach, (2) the informational self-help approach, (3) the special-purpose problem solving approach, (4) the demonstration approach, (5) the experimen-

tal approach, and (6) the power-conflict approach.

The personal experience as a CRD specialist taught Bennett (1973, p 58) that the professional CRD specialist provided five functions to the community client, that of: process consultant, technical consultant, program advocacy, organizational leadership, and resource provision. A professional might perform all of these functions although he was likely to develop a style using one or two.

Bennett (2nd ed., 1973, p 23) further outlined a sequential pattern of events or phases the CRD specialist takes with the community client: (1) initial contact-developing acquaintance, establishing a basis for proceeding; (2) task definition-diagnosis of initial problem statement, clarification of task to be undertaken; (3) contract negation-further definition of task, establishing expectations of performance of both educator and client; (4) educational program design, planning specific learning activities, mobilizing resources, implementing and evaluating.

For a deeper understanding of the use of approaches, the field of salesmanship was referred to. R. M. Haas (1939, p 6) suggested that a plan should precede every attempt at a sale and that it was necessary to modify the plan as unexpected situations arose. His suggested plan or strategy of a sale consists of: (1) knowing the product; (2) knowing the customer; (3) convictions that must be established; (4) behavior patterns that can be used, and (5) ideas and appeals to present. Haas further suggested that there were tactics of the sale which included the pre-approach, getting the interest of the prospect, presenting the proposition, meeting the objections, and closing the

sale.

The pre-approach step consisted of the accumulation and arrangement of all important information about the prospect and this company. This information was analyzed to find out the most advantageous means of securing an interview, the interests of the prospect, the probable reasons why he should purchase, and the needs of the company the buyer represents. Without this information, the salesman was at a great disadvantage for he had nothing definite, nothing concrete, on which to work. (Fernald, 1935, p 103).

Some salesmanship authors broke up the steps of a sale into attention, desire, conviction, resolve to buy, close of sale, etc., but explained that the transition between these steps was not always clearly defined. More often than not, the salesman was unable to tell where ... attention left off and interest began (Fernald, p 255).

These approaches were similar to those of W. R. Williams who offered a series of approaches for launching a CRD program. His approaches included: (1) choose the communities; (2) get advance information about the community; (3) contact leaders in the community; (4) help the leaders prepare for the first community meeting; (5) counsel the first community meeting; (6) help the organization get to work, and (7) get community improvement association organized and operating (Bridges, 1974, p 3).

Roles of Community Development Specialists

Programs of directed change had seen increased emphasis on the use of "community change agents"; individuals who were professionally trained in the dynamics of planned change but were hired from within

the community. These individuals were contrasted with "external change agents" who also receive professional training but whose origin lies outside the community. While community agents were only recently employed in appreciable numbers, their role in future programs of directed change seemed to be expanding (Winterton, 1973, p 53).

The professional community change agent or specialist played a variety of roles in practice. Terms such as enabler, encourager, and facilitator suggested role behavior for the practitioner and were found throughout the literature on community resource development.

Biddle and Biddle (1968) preferred to call community developers "encouragers". He stated that the distinctive role for an encourager became possible when a community developer rids himself of desires to act too professional. He stated that an encourager was not a health worker, doctor, nurse, sanitarian, nutritionist, or social welfare worker. His responsibility was to refer people who need these services to the appropriate specialist.

He was not a professional community organizer, but helped people to become aware of their needs and to develop competence in meeting them. Then, the people created the organizations they needed (Handsworth and Widell, 1973, p 12).

His role was to help groups with common interests to identify and define the problems which were of importance to the attainment of the goals of their community. He helped to put the community problem into a decision-making framework (Sorensen and Oakleaf, p 156).

He was not a teacher in that he told people what they should know or believe or how they should act. He educated by example. He raised

pertinent questions but avoided instruction. He was not a subject-matter expert in agriculture, home economics or any other specialty. He was a "generalist", able to understand enough of many fields to know when experts were needed. He was not a social scientist conducting experiments and writing for publication. He was an encourager of processes for self-development (Biddle & Biddle, 1965, p 13).

The CRD specialist served as a catalyst. He exerts indirect leadership. The volunteer community leaders got the credit and assumed the responsibility for the action (Cary, 1972, p 89). As an example, a CRD specialist, working in Korea in the early 1960's, found that under no circumstance should you try to sell any idea or try to persuade the villagers to undertake any action. The villagers were encouraged to explain their plans in detail and were asked to indicate specifically who would benefit and to what degree. It was the CRD specialist's experience that people were persuaded by their own arguments but would react negatively if outsiders made an effort to influence them (King, 1965, p 21).

Lee J. Cary (p 36) suggested that the major roles of the professional CRD developer were those of educator and organizer. He reinforced these ideas with the five types of helping roles identified by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley in their book, The Dynamics of Planned Change.

The first helping role was to make possible new connections among a community's sub-parts and to reorganize old connections. Second, the developer functioned as an expert in organizing more effective procedures. He did not attempt to influence the community's goals,

but he did suggest better means of achieving these goals. Third, the developer helped by providing internal strength through offering direct services or through other means. Fourth, the developer was interested in creating special environments or situations which would increase the possibilities of growth through learning, which brings about change. Fifth, and last, the developer gave help and support to the community during the change process, itself.

According to George Abshier (1973, pp 111-112), a CRD specialist must meet seven requirements: (1) Have a thorough knowledge of the tools, processes and procedures involved in community development work; (2) Be able to analyze, conceptualize, and articulate accurately and concisely the problems involved, including the causes of these problems; (3) Search diligently for applicable resources; (4) Be willing to refer questions to someone else when it is something he cannot answer; (5) Be disinterested in the alternatives of the community (not uninterested but disinterested); (6) Refuse to make the decision for the community, and (7) Refrain from being a coordinator - the guy who wants to coordinate everybody else.

Roles in CRD were more clearly defined by Paul H. Gessaman, an Economist at the University of Nebraska and David C. Ruesink, a Sociologist at Texas A & M University. They agreed that the primary role was being an educator. Further, they stated three principal components or sub-roles making up the educator role. The first of these was the role of listener or observer. The second was the role of thinker, and the third role was that of communicator. As a communicator, he stimulated and motivated the citizens into taking action

on community problems they identified.

Other roles included: motivator-stimulator, facilitator, issue identifier, leadership identifier, linker, organizer, leadership developer, provider of factual information, alternative identifier, and alternative analyzer, decision-maker, evaluator of alternatives, planner, implementor, evaluator of program effort, provider of rewards and penalties (Kelsey, 1972, pp 15-19).

The role of the CRD specialist was defined by many writers as a consultant to the community in its efforts to bring about desired change. He was a resource person to steering committees, to study groups, to local government officials, or to individuals or organizations that assumed responsibility for various phases of the community development effort. He made no decisions for the people but helped them make the best possible judgments from the alternatives available to them. He taught citizens methods of organization for the work to be done, or he helped with the design of surveys to be taken. He brought in other resource people for technical assistance. He encouraged citizens to take initiative and to be self-sufficient so that the work continued in his absence.

The above descriptions of CRD processes, approaches and roles from economists, educators, sociologists, and community development practitioners indicate definite criteria for a CRD specialist.

One significant observation was that the role of a CRD specialist at the local level was not an easy one.

Chapter III

PROCEDURES

This was a descriptive field study that attempted to identify the more effective approaches used by a CRD specialist during the initial contact with community leaders. It had, as a long range goal, the improvement of these approaches or the development of new approaches.

Two phases provided the CRD specialist with opportunities to approach the leaders of the communities. These were during the community selection phase and the initial contact phase. This initial contact phase lasted from about November 15, 1974 to March 15, 1975. A log was used by the specialist to keep track of the significant approaches used and the leader contacts made.

Interviewing was the method used by this investigator to determine how the community leaders viewed and reacted to the CRD specialist. The same method was used to get their opinions about the approaches used.

Community Selection

The Rural Development Advisory Council and the New Mexico State University staff, working on the Title V Project, recommended that three to five communities be provided community development assistance with the existing Title V resources.

The considerations in selecting the communities included: (1) communities in which pressing needs were obvious; (2) communities in which there were individuals with leadership ability and interest in improv-

ing their communities; (3) communities with some potential for development; (4) distance of the communities from the headquarters of the specialist, and (5) communities in which the leaders expressed a desire to take part in the Title V Project.

The CRD specialist used several steps in selecting communities. He developed a list of twenty small rural communities in southern New Mexico, and collected demographic information on each of the twenty communities. He contacted the council of government directors to get their opinions about which of these communities should be included in the project, and selected six communities by using a committee of Extension faculty members who considered the information gathered in the steps mentioned above. He then interviewed selected leaders in each of the six communities to assess their interest in improving their communities, and their desire to take part in the Title V. Project. Following this procedure, he recommended to the selection committee four of the six communities. The committee, using the additional criteria of potential for development and distance from the specialist's headquarters, selected three communities.

Community Data Review

The 1970 census data and data contained in the New Mexico Economic development profiles was reviewed to determine community and population characteristics. This knowledge improved the investigator's understanding of the environment in which the CRD specialist and leaders were interacting.

Log of Approaches

The CRD specialist kept a log of approaches he used in each com-

munity. These approaches included both the direct, such as personal contacts and the indirect, such as meetings. After each approach, he recorded his perceptions of the leader's reaction to this approach, what was happening in the community, and why it was happening (see Appendix A).

Leader Identification

An adaptation of the reputational method was used to identify leaders. Three knowledgable individuals in each community prepared separate lists of at least ten persons they considered influential community leaders. Those leaders mentioned most often were interviewed. During the interview, these leaders were also asked, "Who are the most influential leaders in this community?" Those mentioned most often by these leaders were also interviewed.

While this method identified the traditional leaders, the leaders of other socio-economic groups and the emerging leaders of the community may have not been identified.

Interviews

Face-to-face interviews were conducted by this investigator with key formal and informal leaders. These leaders represented a cross-section of community life, but were mainly the traditional leaders. They were asked questions concerning the role of the CRD specialist and their reactions to the approaches used (see Appendix B).

Chapter IV

REPORT OF FIELD ACTIVITIES

This report contains a brief description about each of the three communities, the significant approaches used by a CRD specialist in contacting the community leader, the results of the leader interviews, and a brief conclusion.

The description of the approaches includes what was happening at the time, what the specialist did, and a statement evaluating the approach. The communities included in this study represented three levels of government, three different agricultural areas, and had different potentials for growth and development. They provided a good cross section of the existing types of small rural communities in New Mexico. A total of thirty-eight leaders were interviewed in the three communities. They represented both the formal and the informal community leadership structures. They were business, governmental, educational, religious, agricultural, organizational, and agency leaders. They included men and women, Anglo-Americans and Spanish-Americans. At least nine were identified as key influential leaders.

Eighteen of these leaders knew that a CRD specialist was working in their community and twenty didn't know. Two leaders knew the specialist very well; three knew him a little; eleven had just met him, and twenty-two hadn't met him yet. Twenty-five leaders indicated approval when they first learned a CRD specialist was working in their community; ten were undecided; one disapproved, and two didn't know if they approved or not.

Twelve leaders thought the specialist was going to work with them and they would solve community problems together. Five thought that he was going to serve as an adviser or consultant but let the people of the community solve the problems by themselves. One thought that he would only help when called on to help, and twenty didn't know what he was going to do in their community.

When asked if they were encouraged to do some community work that they weren't already doing because of the encouragement or presence of a CRD specialist, fifteen leaders responded, "Very much." Thirteen said, "A little." Six thought, "Not at all." Four didn't know. Twelve leaders believed that other citizens would be very much encouraged to do some community work they weren't already doing because of the encouragement or presence of a CRD specialist. Seventeen believed that other citizens would be encouraged a little; two believed that other citizens would not be encouraged at all, and seven didn't know.

Thirty-five leaders said that the best way for a new CRD specialist to meet community leaders was through a face-to-face visit at their place of business. Nine suggested that a telephone call ahead of time would be helpful, but not necessary. Two wanted a letter of introduction before the face-to-face visit.

Eighteen leaders wanted the specialist to work with them and solve community problems together; fourteen wanted him to serve as an adviser or consultant but let the citizens solve the community problems by themselves; two wanted him to help only when called on; two didn't know what approach the specialist should take. One wanted him to take over and solve community problems for the people of the com-

munity, and one didn't want a specialist assigned to the community.

By taking the time to get to know the key leaders, studying the community, learning what the needs were, and then helping where needed was seen by twenty-nine leaders as the best way for a CRD specialist to get started in a community. Three felt he should start immediately to work on some community problem and six didn't know what the best way to start would be.

In getting started, nineteen leaders thought a CRD specialist should live in the community; five thought he should live outside the community, and for twelve leaders, it didn't matter where the specialist lived. However, thirty recommended that a specialist regularly work in the community from two to four days each week. Six leaders recommended two to four days a month, and five recommended that he just attend the important community meetings.

After listening to the components of a CRD specialist's job description, the leaders were asked just how important they thought a specialist would be to the future of their community. Thirty leaders responded "Very much." Four said, "Of little importance." One thought him not important, and three said, "Don't know."

Case Study Community A

This community was an unincorporated town situated about twenty-five miles south of the specialist's headquarters. There was a larger town about twnety miles to the south and another about twenty-five miles to the north. The town had a population of 1,728 in 1970. There was no census taken in 1960. It was governed by a county commission and did not have a local industrial foundation organized. The median

age was about 21.3 years, with 44.5% under 18, and 5.9% over 65 (U. S. Census, 1972). Irrigated agriculture and agri-business dominated the economy. Also, many people found employment in the nearby cities. Incorporation was the major issue concerning the community during the study period.

The county had a population of 69,773 in 1970, which was an increase over the 1960 census. Of this population, 44.75% were Anglo-American, 50.79% were Spanish-American, and 4.4% were others. There was a population growth of 7.4% between July, 1970 and July, 1973. In 1973, 5.7% of the population received welfare payments and 30.5% were eligible for food stamps. The 1973 monthly unemployment average was5.7% and the county was 18th in the state in personal per capita income (BBER, 1974, Vol. 1).

Specialist Approaches. The major approaches the specialist used with this community were telephone calls, community meetings, and face-to-face visitations. The following are examples of the more significant approaches: On November 21, 1974, the specialist attended a community meeting to discuss incorporation and the need for a sewer system. This was an excellent meeting where everyone was very concerned with the need for better community services. Those present were receptive of a specialist working in the community. At least five community leaders were at the meeting. On December 12, 1974, he had face-to-face visitations with several merchants to inquire about their gross receipts and to get their views on incorporation. He reported that some merchants were for incorporation and some were against it. The merchants received the specialist favorably. On February 17, 1975,

he conducted a business survey among the merchants and business people. He had an excellent response to the business survey, but a fair to poor response on incorporation. On March 6, 1975, he held a community meeting about incorporation. There was a different group of people from those attending the November 21st meeting present. The group was primarily Spanish-American. Some different leaders were also at this meeting. This, too, was reported as an excellent meeting although the specialist received some negative response from one person concerning incorporation.

During the four months of study, the specialist made several telephone calls to local leaders to obtain information and to keep them informed about the progress on incorporation. He had spent about eight to ten days working in the community and had established a good relationship with an influential leader of the low-income Spanish-Americans.

Leader Interview Responses. Interviews were conducted with fifteen local leaders on March 6-7, 1975. These leaders included six business leaders, four agency leaders, a priest, newspaper publisher, banker, school board member, and a high school principal. Four were women and eleven were men. Eight were Spanish-American and seven were Anglo-American. At least three were considered to be key influentials. However, the Anglo-Americans appeared to be the traditional power holders.

Five leaders knew a CRD specialist was working in the community and ten didn't. One knew the specialist a little and four had just met him. The specialist had made the initial contact with all five. Eight indicated approval when they learned a CRD specialist was work-

ing in the community. Four leaders were undecided, one disapproved, and two didn't know if they approved or not. An influential banker who disapproved said, "Why hasn't he been by to meet me? There are too many give-away programs, and this looks like just another one." An influential priest said, "We need to better know what he has to offer and what he can do." Those that approved thought that the community really needed the specialist's help.

When asked what they thought a CRD specialist was going to do in the community, three leaders thought he was going to work with them and solve community problems together; one thought he was going to serve as an adviser or consultant, and eleven didn't know. Ten were encouraged to do some community work they weren't already doing because of the presence of a CRD specialist, and five were not encouraged or didn't know. Twelve leaders thought other people would be encouraged and three didn't know if the presence of the specialist would be an encouragement. An influential Spanish-American woman said, "Oh, another one of those! He will just do what he wants to do and leave." A business man responded, "Businesses are taking a lot of time to run, and we need someone to do the leg work on community projects. People would be encouraged but would need to see that it can work and see what he can do."

Thirteen leaders believed that meeting community leaders, face-to-face, at their places of business was the best way for a new CRD specialist to get acquainted. Only two wanted a telephone call ahead of the interview.

Twelve leaders thought that the best way for a CRD specialist to

get started in the community was to take the time to meet the key leaders; study the community; learn what the needs were, and help where needed. One thought he should start to work on a community project immediately. An agency leader said, "There is a lot of local politics and he can't be aware of how people interact without at least six months of learning." A business leader said, "If he doesn't take the time to study the community, he can get on to something that isn't a priority."

Five leaders wanted him to work with the community leaders and they would solve problems together; five wanted him to serve as an adviser or consultant but let the people solve their problems by themselves, and one wanted him to help only when called on.

Twelve leaders thought that a CRD specialist was very important to the future of the community and three didn't know. Ten thought that it was important enough that he should live in the community. One thought that he should live outside the community, and two thought that it didn't matter where he lived. An agency leader said, "People sometimes listen to outsiders better." A priest responded, "There is no doubt. It is necessary to be a local person. Closeness is important. People need someone available to talk about what can be done for villages." A banker pointed out, "A specialist would be important if the people knew him. He wouldn't be important if he was a semi-politician or sponsored by a government agency. He should be a local person because an 'outsider's' heart is not really in the community." A business woman said, "The people are very cooperative, but you must contact them. If he lived in the community, the people

would get to know him, and the people speak more freely with someone they know."

Twelve leaders wanted a CRD specialist to work in the community from two to four days a week. One thought that two to four days a month was enough, and two thought he should just attend the important community meetings. A principal said, "He can't do the job living away. He must live in the community and feel a part of the community." A business leader said, "It would be great if he can coordinate and help the people solve problems; he would be an asset to the community. He should attend all meetings and everything that is going on. It would be a full-time job." Another business leader put it this way, "The average citizen doesn't have time or know where to go or look. Citizens are busy making a living. If a specialist has the time to get things done, he would be important to the community."

Conclusion. This community was a good example of the conflicts that go on between community groups. In this case it was incorporation. As the influential priest said, "The people of the community don't want incorporation." And an influential banker said, "The pillars of the community have met and they don't want incorporation."

A specialist approaching this community must take time to understand the issues and what the people really want. He may have to change this want into a need, but in doing so, he must be extremely careful not to take sides. He must bring out the facts, both the pros and cons, making sure that the leaders and important citizens understand them and allow the citizens to make their own decisions.

Case Study Community B

This community was a county seat located about 75 miles north of the specialist's headquarters. There was a larger town about 75 miles to the north and another about 75 miles to the south. The population in 1970 was 4,656 which was a slight increase over the 1960 census. The community was governed by a commission-manager and did not have a local industrial foundation organized. The median age was about 45.8 years with 26.9% of the population under 18 and 26.5% over 65 (U. S. Census, 1972). Businesses that served tourist, sportsmen, and people seeking health benefits dominated the economy. Some irrigated agriculture was carried on and ranching was an important activity in the surrounding area. Community services and facilities were the major issues concerning the community during the study period.

The county had a population of 7,189 in 1970, which was an increase over 1960. Of the 1970 population, 62.76% were Anglo-American, 35.85% Spanish-American, and 1.39% others. There was a population growth of 5.6% between July, 1970 and July, 1973. In 1973, 6.2% of the population received welfare payments and 18.8% were eligible for food stamps. The 1973 monthly unemployment average was 4.4%, and the county was 23rd in the state in personal per capita income (BBER, 1974, Vol. 5).

Specialist Approaches. The major approaches the specialist used with this community were city council and community meetings. Most of the telephone calls were to the city manager. There were a few face-to-face visitations with some other community leaders.

On November 18, 1974, the specialist attended an informal meeting

with the mayor, city manager and some local people. The specialist was well received and a great deal of information was exchanged. On December 9, 1974, he attended a city council work session and meeting. This was an informative meeting at which several relevant questions were asked and answered by the specialist. A discussion of establishing a community development committee was held, and plans for the development of this committee were made. On February 5, 1975, he attended a city council meeting. There was a fair response and those attending were very involved in community problems. The specialist thought he had better not interfere. On February 13, 1975, he attended a community development meeting of the general public. The specialist provided information to the people on the community development act and helped them to establish priorities of need. On March 5, 1975, he traveled to Santa Fe with the city manager. During this trip, the specialist learned a lot about the community's problems and needs. On March 10, 1975, he attended a council and general public meeting. He received a good response from most of the council members. The council had many internal problems. (Note: On March 11, 1975, the county grand jury brought three indictments against the city manager.) The specialist had spent about six to eight days working in this community and had established a good working relationship with the city manager.

Leader Interview Responses. Interviews were conducted with thirteen local leaders on March 13, 1975. These leaders included three business leaders, three agency leaders, two bankers, a superintendent of schools, the mayor, the city manager, a councilman, and a news-

paper publisher. Two were women and eleven were men. One was a Spanish American and twelve were Anglo-Americans. At least two appeared to be key influentials. Five of these leaders knew that a CRD specialist was working in the community and eight didn't. One knew the specialist very well and three had just met him. The specialist had made the initial contact with two leaders. One had contacted the specialist and a mutual friend had introduced one. Nine of the leaders indicated approval when they learned a CRD specialist was working in the community and four were undecided.

One agency leader said, "We need the help; we have to go too far away for help. There is no help here." Another said, "He will have more time to stay on top of things and can accomplish a lot more." A banker, while approving the project, stated, "A lot of time is wasted on meetings and not much done. Seventy-five percent of them are not worth a damn. Sometimes, you can get too much help. If there was one person that could really do something, it would be helpful."

Five leaders thought the specialist was going to work with them, and they would solve the problems together. Two thought he would serve as an adviser or consultant, and the people would solve their problems by themselves. Seven didn't know what the specialist was going to do. Nine leaders said they would be encouraged to do some community work they weren't already doing because of the presence of the specialist and ten thought that other citizens would also be encouraged. An influential banker pointed out that they would be encouraged if "...someone called short meetings; if the leg work was done, and if we could see some positive results." A city commissioner

said, "...getting people motivated will be the first problem." An older agency leader stated, "It is hard to learn new tricks. Those who are doing, are doing as much as they can. You need to encourage the younger people." Another agency leader said, "An outside person can sometimes see things that people living here can't."

Thirteen leaders believed that meeting community leaders face-to-face at their places of business was the best way to get acquainted. However, six wanted a telephone call ahead of the interview, and one wanted a letter. Twelve thought that the best way for a new specialist to get started was to take the time to meet the key leaders; study the community; learn what the needs are, and help where needed. Only one thought he should start to work on a community project immediately. An influential publisher said, "He must take the time because he doesn't know the scope of our problems." An agency leader added, "If he takes the time to find out what's what, he will get more cooperation that way."

Six leaders wanted the specialist to work with them and solve community problems together; five wanted him to serve as an adviser or consultant and let the people solve their problems by themselves. One wanted him to take over and solve community problems for them, and one didn't want a specialist assigned to the community. A banker who didn't want one assigned to the community said, "Each agency already has someone working here. This looks like a duplication. Should the University even be involved in this field?" An agency leader said, "He should go to work on a project immediately. Get his feet wet. Get involved. Show the people you are doing something. Get in the

papers. Get started. A month or two of fooling around doesn't mean much. Do something." A business leader said, "He should advise us but we must do the work ourselves."

Twelve leaders thought a CRD specialist would be important to the future of the community and one thought it was not important. Five leaders thought that he should live in the community; three thought that outside the community would be best, and five thought that it didn't matter where he lived. An influential banker said, "A specialist would be very important. He might find a need that we don't know we have. We don't have a Chamber of Commerce manager, just a secretary. Most business leaders are very busy and don't have the time to encourage industry to come to this community. We want industry but we don't know how to get it." A newspaper publisher said, "The importance depends on the person. If he could stimulate the community, he would be important. He could do a great deal of harm if he couldn't and might hurt future programs." An agency leader pointed out, "This is the first time this has been tried. We don't know how it will work out. It looks like it will be important to the future of the community."

Ten leaders wanted him to work in the community from two to four days each week, and three thought two to four days a month would be enough.

A superintendent of schools said, "The CRDs should live in the community and work full time here. We need to do much follow-up." The mayor said, "If he really wants to get things done, he should be working in the community several days each week, but it doesn't mat-

ter where he lives." An agency leader pointed out, "There are so many different programs. Many overlap. We need someone that knows where to go. There are a lot of people working on different things. He needs the time to work with all of them." A city commissioner responded, "There is so much to do. It is a full-time job and the specialist should live in the community and work here full-time.

Conclusion. This community was just large enough that it was attracting many state and federal resources. A specialist approaching the community would need to be well acquainted with all the agency personnel working in the community. Since few of the other agency personnel are living in the community, it would be desirable for the CRD specialist to live in the community. He might become a right hand to the city manager and the Chamber of Commerce secretary and attempt to coordinate the resources available so that the community gets maximum benefit from each resource and not a lot of duplication. He would need to approach the community with caution so that he doesn't alienate the agency personnel while gaining the support of community leaders.

Case Study Community C

This community was a county seat located about 126 miles northeast of the specialist's headquarters. There was a larger town about 150 miles north and another about 57 miles to the south. The population in 1970 was 1,123 which was a decline over the 1960 census. The community had a mayor-council government and had a local industrial foundation organized. The median age was about 28.4 years with about 33% of the population under 18 years and 11.3% over 65 years (U. S.

Census, 1972). Ranching dominated the economy. The development of an industrial park was the major issue concerning the community during the study period.

The county had a population of 7,560 in 1970 which was a decline over the 1960 census. Of this population, 62.58% were Anglo-American, 33.97% were Spanish-American and 3.45% others. There was a population growth of 9.2% between July, 1970 and July, 1973. In 1973, 5.5% received welfare payments and 14.9% were eligible for food stamps. The 1973 monthly unemployment average was 4.4% and the county was 8th in the state in personal per capita income (BBER, 1974, Vol. 2).

Specialist Approaches. The major approaches the specialist used with this community were city council and community meetings and telephone calls. Telephone calls were made on a weekly basis to the mayor and one or two agency leaders. Several face-to-face visits were made with county government personnel and some business leaders.

On November 13, 1974, the specialist attended a community meeting. There were local, district, state, and federal officials present and they considered the pre-application for an industrial park. The specialist met several leaders at this meeting. On November 27, 1974, he attended an informal meeting with the mayor, council of government director, and some of the town personnel. This was a good planning meeting with each person working through the industrial park application check list. On December 10, 1974, he attended a city council meeting. During this meeting, several of the councilmen asked relevant questions of the engineering firm they were considering hiring. Some of these questions were formed during an earlier meeting

between the specialist and councilmen. This meeting provided a much closer relationship between the entire town council and the specialist. On December 16, 1974, the specialist attended a council work session and town meeting. There was an excellent response from the council and the people present. They worked on community needs, gathered information on housing, and considered community development, federal funds, and housing problems. On January 23, 1975, he attended a meeting in Roswell with the mayor. On February 12, 1975, he attended a community meeting and thought that there was an excellent response to his assistance. On February 18, 1975, he attended another community meeting and discussed zoning with about 150 people present. March 11, 1975, he attended a city council meeting and presented information on housing and bureau of outdoor recreation projects to the mayor and councilmen. This was reported as an excellent meeting with high response. On this date, he also contacted several people around town to introduce the research assistant to them. There was an excellent response to both the research assistant and the specialist. The specialist had spent about eight to ten days working in this community. He had established a good working relationship with the mayor.

Leader Interview Responses. Interviews were conducted with ten local leaders on March 14, 1975. These leaders included four agency leaders, two business leaders, a newspaper publisher, a city councilman, a banker, and a school board member. One was a woman and one was a Spanish-American. At least four appeared to be key influentials. Eight of these leaders knew a specialist was working in the community.

Three knew the specialist well, and four had just met him. The specialist had made the initial contact with seven leaders. Four were contacted face-to-face at their place of business, and three had been contacted at community meetings. Eight leaders indicated approval when they learned a CRD specialist was working in the community, and two were undecided. An influential newspaperman who voiced approval said, "We have been through many planning and development groups with very little happening. I'm skeptical about what this one can do." An influential businessman and former mayor who was undecided said, "I heard the specialist at a community meeting and was impressed by his presentation."

Four leaders thought the specialist was going to work with them, and they would solve problems together. Two thought he was going to serve as an adviser or consultant and the people would solve problems themselves. One thought he was going to help only when called on. An influential business leader said, "He should be an adviser to the community, but the community must pull itself up by its bootstraps." An influential banker stressed, "The specialist should help only when called on. He should lend his expertize because a fresh injection helps the people. They can see that someone besides the mayor and council is trying to help."

Nine leaders said they would be encouraged to do some community work they weren't already doing because of the presence or encouragement of the specialist, and seven thought that the other citizens would also be encouraged. A city councilman said, "The people would be encouraged if they were aware of the specialist. They would get involved

but he must prove to them that he is here strictly to help instead of them proving to him that they want to help." An agency leader said, "We can always use the help. People would be more encouraged if they got to know him and what he could do."

Nine leaders thought that the best way for a CRD specialist to meet community leaders was just to drop in and talk to them face-to-face at their place of business. Only one wanted a letter prior to the visit. Nine leaders thought that the best way for a specialist to get started working in the community was to take the time to get to know the key leaders, study the community, learn what the needs were, and then help where needed. One thought the best way was to start immediately to work on some community problem or project. A business leader stated, "Starting to work immediately on a problem may or may not be what the community wants or needs. He could spin his wheels if not careful." An agency leader said, "He must learn what's what, but he might start on some small problem while doing so." A city councilman said, "He would be spinning his wheels if he didn't take the time to know who's who. But he could start on a project soon."

Five leaders wanted the specialist to work with them and solve community problems together, and four wanted the specialist to serve as an adviser or consultant but let the people solve their own problems, and only one wanted him to help only when called on. Most of the leaders said, "We need help and advice, but we must do things for ourselves." An influential banker said, "We know the problems and a specialist should help only when called on."

All ten leaders thought that the specialist would be very important to the future of the community. Four thought he should live in the community; one thought that living outside the community would be all right, and five didn't think that it mattered where he lived. An influential banker said, "It would be nice if he could live here. We need to get the Spanish-Americans more involved, and a specialist with a Spanish-American name would be very helpful." An influential newspaper publisher stated, "He should live and work in the community. 'Outsiders' don't understand a lot about the town or the people. He must work with all races. The goals and aims must be definitely outlined. We don't need any more damn surveys."

Eight leaders wanted the specialist to work in the community two to four days each week. Two thought that two to four days a month would be enough. As an agency leader said, "It doesn't matter where he lives, but the more time spent here, the better off we would be." A business leader pointed out, "If he sets a spark, he needs to be here to keep it going. Just attending meetings hasn't gotten the job done. We need someone here to carry the ball." A school board member stated, "We have many needs, but we don't have time to work on them. The person must have the time to spend here." An agency leader added, "There are so many government programs, we need someone here to keep track of them."

Conclusion. This community was a good example of small rural community individualism. As an agency leader stated, "This community has really put forth the efforts. Very few other communities of this size have put forth this amount of effort." The leaders believed that

the community must do its development work itself, but they wanted all citizens involved.

In approaching this community, a specialist should concentrate on advising and counseling the citizens and leaders, but he should be willing to do his part of the work. He must be well informed about legislation and new government programs for community development. He should know how to develop ideas so that the people will think that the ideas were theirs.

The power structure of this community was mostly Anglo-American but they were concerned about the lack of involvement of the Spanish-American population in community affairs. A specialist should know how to approach and involve all ethnic groups, especially the Spanish-Americans.

Differing Approaches

There were two different methods of approaching communities used by the professional CRD specialists working on the Title V Project. One was a process approach that required the specialist to take the time to get acquainted with key community leaders; study the community; learn what the felt needs were, and then start to work on a priority need. The other was a content approach that required the specialist to start to work immediately on some community project or problem, and, through these activities, get to know the community leaders and needs.

These are presented here to point out that there is probably no best approach for community resource development. However, a specialist must be flexible and able to adapt the approach best suited for a given community.

Chapter V

GENERALIZATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fourteen approaches discussed during the leader interviews were adaptations of approaches found in the literature review.

While the approaches were not unique, the opinions of the leaders about them might serve as a useful guide for CRD specialists. One must remember that all situations are different and that these generalizations may not apply to any other situation.

Generalizations

Study the Community First, a Process Approach. Specialists should take the time to know leaders, community, and felt needs before taking major action.

Work on Community Project Immediately, a Content Approach. Specialists should not initiate or take major action on community projects until they are accepted by the leaders and understand the important community interactions.

Take-over Approach. Specialists should not take over any community project. The leadership and responsibility should remain with the leaders.

Work-with-us Approach. Specialists should work on a project with leaders while performing the primary approach of advising or consulting.

Serve as an Adviser Approach. Specialists should first serve as advisers or consultants to leaders. Then, they should work only where needed on community projects with leaders. Follow-up work that leaders are unable to perform would be especially appropriate.

Help Only When Called On Approach. Specialists should take the

more active approaches of advising or working with the leaders. Leaders may be reluctant to call a specialist for help.

Attend Important Meetings Only Approach. Specialists should attend all community meetings as part of his working with or advising approach. Attending meetings only won't provide the help leaders need.

Live in the Community Approach. Specialists should live in the community and become an active member of the community life.

Live Outside the Community Approach. Specialists should not live outside the community unless they can spend several days each week working in the community.

Work Weekly in the Community Approach. Leaders need all the help they can get. Specialists should work several days each week in and for the community.

Work Monthly in the Community Approach. Spending a few days each month in a community isn't enough since leaders could use a full-time specialist.

Face-to-face Visitation Approach. Specialists should first approach leaders in person at their place of business since most leaders prefer to be informal.

Telephone or Letter Approach. These more formal approaches are usually not necessary in the smaller communities of 5,000 persons or less, but might be used in the larger communities of 5,000 persons or more. A pre-approach letter would be appreciated by most leaders.

Community Meeting Approach. Specialists should use this approach for informing and developing acceptance by leaders and not for making the initial contact with leaders.

Conclusions

The study objectives were to identify some effective approaches for (1) contacting, (2) developing acceptance, and (3) establishing a basis for proceeding with rural leaders.

At least one approach was favored over the other approaches for each of the above stages. During the contacting stage, leaders preferred an informal approach of meeting the CRD specialist at their places of business instead of being contacted by letter or telephone.

From this study it appears that in developing acceptance by leaders, a CRD specialist should become an active member of community life either by living in the community or at least, by working in the community several days each week.

Also, this study suggests that in establishing a basis for proceeding with leaders, enough time should be taken to carefully study the community before taking any major action on community projects or problems. This includes getting to know the leaders of all socio-economic groups and the community needs as seen by those leaders.

Further, as a generalization from this and other studies, it is recommended that CRD specialists and managers remain flexible and adapt approaches to fit the different situations and leaders.

Recommendations

Given the limitations of the present field study, the following recommendations are made to assist both specialists and managers in their community resource development work with small rural communities.

Specialists.

1. Before approaching community leaders, specialists should learn

all they can about the community including the names and addresses of present and potential leaders, important groups, history, past and present problems, facilities and services available, sources of income, economic potential, etc.

2. In contacting the community leaders, specialists should first stop by their places of business for a face-to-face visit. A pre-approach letter introducing the specialist would be appreciated.

3. During the visitation, specialists should use a pre-talk that explains what community resource development is; what it can do for the community; how it is done, and what the specialist's role is. The specialist should ask each leader: (a) What are the major needs of the community? (b) Would he or she be interested in participating in a community development program? (c) Who are other citizens in the community who would be interested?

4. This visitation procedure should be repeated with all citizens the specialist visits with in the community. It can serve as part of an agenda for the first community meeting the specialist participates in.

5. Specialists should take the time to get to know the community leaders and they to know him. He should carefully study the community, ask questions, and find out what the felt needs are. He should learn what not to do as well as what to do.

6. Specialists should serve as advisers or consultants and encourage the citizens to solve the problems themselves. But

he should be willing and able to do some work on community problems.

7. Specialists should live in the community. If they don't live in the community, they should spend several days each week physically working in the community. After the citizens have developed a greater reliance on self-help, they might spend less time in the community.
8. Specialists should consistantly seek to understand the motivations, conflicts, and complexities in the citizens' lives. They should constantly ask themselves how their actions or lack of action and attitudes are interpreted by the citizens.

Managers.

1. Managers should arrange orientation programs for new CRD specialists during which they develop guidelines for approaching and developing acceptance with communities.
2. Specialists should be assigned to a limited number of communities in the beginning and should work in each community several days each week.
3. Managers should obtain first hand information about a community by conducting their own review in a community during the first few months of the project's beginning.
4. Managers should provide regular training and evaluation sessions. During these sessions, specialists should be responsible for presenting problems, objectives, plans for achieving these objectives, and evaluating the progress made. This way, communications are improved and managers become counselors instead of judges.

REFERENCES

Abshier, George. "Roles of the Professional Community Developer," Journal of Community Development Society, Spring, 1973, pp 109-114.

Beal, George M. & Hobbs, Daryl J. Social Action: The Process in Community and Area Development. Ames, Iowa: Cooperative Extension Service, 1969.

Bennett, Austin E. "Professional Staff Members, Contributions to Community Development," Journal of Community Development Society, Spring, 1973, pp 58-68.

Bennett, Austin E. Reflections on Community Development Education. Orono, Maine: The Northeast Regional Extension Public Affairs Committee, Bulletin 576, 1973.

Biddle, William W. & Biddle, Loureide J. The Community Development Process. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Biddle, William W. & Biddle, Loureide J. Encouraging Community Development. A Training Guide for Local Workers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Bilinski, Russell. "A Description and Assessment of Community Development," Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development. Luther T. Wallace, et al. (eds.) Berkeley, California: Agricultural Policy Institute, 1969.

Bridges, William R. Helping People Develop Their Communities. University of Kentucky: Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Bureau of Business Research (ISRAD), State of New Mexico Economic Development Profile. The University of New Mexico. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Economic Development Division of the New Mexico Dept. of Development, 1972.

Cary, Lee J. "Roles of the Professional Community Developer," Journal of Community Development Society, Fall, 1972, pp 36-41.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP), National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Community Resource Development. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Fernald, Charles H. Salesmanship. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1935.

Haas, Harold M. A Short Course in Salesmanship. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939.

Handsworth, Lord Boyle of & Wedell, George. Current Issues in Community Work - A Study by the Community Work Group. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Hunter, Floyd. Top Leadership, U.S.A. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

Kelsey, Galen. "Community Resource Development Process," A Great Plains Community Development Publication. New Mexico State University: Cooperative Extension Service, 1972.

King, Clarence. Working With People In Community Action. New York: Associated Press, 1965.

Kulp, Earl M. Rural Development Planning - Systems Analysis and Working Method. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Long, Huey B., Anderson, Robt. C. & Blubaugh, Jon A. (eds.) Approaches to Community Development. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1973.

Mitchell, John B. "Small Town Power Structure," Selected Readings in Community Development. John S. Bottum & others, editors, Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1970.

New Mexico Cooperative Extension Service. Plan of Work, Title V, Rural Development Act, 1972. Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, 1974.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovation. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Rogers, Everett M. & Shoemaker, F. Floyd. Communication of Innovations, A Cross-Cultural Approach. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1971.

Rothman, Jack. "Three Models of Community Organization Practice," Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings, Fred N. Cox, et al. (eds.) Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, 1970.

Sorenson, D. M. & Oakleaf, S. K. (Eds.) Interpretive Report of the Fifth Annual National Workshop in Community Resource Development. Fort Colling, Colorado: Colorado State University, 1971.

United States Bureau of the Census. Nineteenth Census of the United States: New Mexico Population Characteristics. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Wiledon, Arthur F. Community Development, The Dynamics of Planned Change. Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminister Press, 1970.

Williams, Anne S. "Leadership Patterns in the Declining Rural Community," Journal of Community Development Society, Fall, 1974, pp 98-106.

Winterton, Jon A. & Rossiter, David L. "The Community Agent and Directed Change," Journal of Community Development Society, Fall, 1973, pp 53-63.

APPENDIX A

Community _____

STAGE I. CONTACTING COMMUNITY LEADERS

Date	Approaches Used (What, Who)	Evaluation Statement

STAGE II. DEVELOPING ACCEPTANCE BY THE COMMUNITY

STAGE III. ESTABLISHING A BASIS FOR PROCEEDING

NOTE: A SEPARATE SHEET WAS USED FOR EACH STAGE.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

COMMUNITY _____ NAME _____ OCCUPATION ____

Sex ____ Age ____ Other _____

DID YOU KNOW A CRDS WAS WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY? 18 YES 20 NO

1. HOW WELL DO YOU KNOW THE CRDS WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
   2 VERY WELL 3 LITTLE 11 JUST MET 22 HAVEN'T MET

2. HOW DID YOU FIRST MEET THE CRDS WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY:
   14 HE CONTACTED ME
   1 I CONTACTED HIM
   1 A MUTUAL ACQUAINTANCE INTRODUCED US

3. WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST WAY TO MEET COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE COMMUNITY?
   35 IN PERSON (FACE-TO-FACE)
   9 BY TELEPHONE
   2 BY LETTER
   5 AT A COMMUNITY MEETING
   18 AT THEIR OFFICE

4. WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION WHEN YOU LEARNED A CRDS WAS WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

APPROVED	UNDECIDED	DISAPPROVED	DON'T KNOW
25	10	1	2

5. WHAT DID YOU THINK THE CRDS WAS GOING TO DO IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
   ____ TAKE OVER AND SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS FOR US
   12 WORK WITH US AND SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS TOGETHER
   5 SERVE AS AN ADVISER OR CONSULTANT BUT WE WOULD SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS OURSELVES
   1 HELP ONLY WHEN CALLED ON
   20 DON'T KNOW

6. WERE YOU (WOULD YOU BE) ENCOURAGED TO DO SOME COMMUNITY WORK THAT YOU WEREN'T ALREADY DOING BECAUSE OF THE ENCOURAGEMENT OR PRESENCE OF A CRDS?
   15 VERY MUCH 13 A LITTLE 6 NOT AT ALL 4 DON'T KNOW

7. WERE OTHER PEOPLE (WOULD OTHERS BE) ENCOURAGED TO DO SOME COMMUNITY WORK THAT THEY WEREN'T ALREADY DOING BECAUSE OF THE ENCOURAGEMENT OR PRESENCE OF THE CRDS?
   12 VERY MUCH 17 A LITTLE 2 NOT AT ALL 7 DON'T KNOW

8. WHAT DO YOU WANT A CRDS WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY TO DO?
   - 1 TAKE OVER AND SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS FOR US
   - 18 WORK WITH US AND SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS TOGETHER
   - 14 SERVE AS AN ADVISER OR CONSULTANT BUT WE WOULD SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS OURSELVES
   - 2 HELP ONLY WHEN CALLED ON
   - 2 DON'T KNOW
   - 1 DON'T WANT ONE ASSIGNED TO OUR COMMUNITY

9. WHICH WOULD BE THE BEST WAY FOR A COMMUNITY CRDS TO START WORKING IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
   - 29 BY TAKING TIME TO GET TO KNOW THE KEY LEADERS, STUDYING THE COMMUNITY, LEARNING WHAT OUR NEEDS ARE, AND THEN HELP US WHERE NEEDED
   - 3 BY IMMEDIATELY STARTING TO WORK ON SOME COMMUNITY PROBLEM
   - 6 DON'T KNOW

10. IN GETTING STARTED, WHAT SHOULD A CRDS DO?
    - 19 LIVE IN THE COMMUNITY
    - 5 LIVE OUTSIDE THE COMMUNITY
    - 12 DOESN'T MATTER WHERE HE LIVES
    - 2 DON'T KNOW
    - 30 WORK IN COMMUNITY 2-4 DAYS A WEEK
    - 6 WORK IN COMMUNITY 2-4 DAYS A MONTH
    - 5 JUST ATTEND IMPORTANT MTGS.

11. HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU THINK A CRDS REALLY IS (WOULD BE) TO THE FUTURE OF YOUR COMMUNITY?
    - 30 VERY IMPORTANT
    - 4 LITTLE IMPORTANCE
    - 1 NOT IMPORTANT
    - 3 DON'T KNOW

12. WHO ARE SOME OTHER IMPORTANT LEADERS IN THIS COMMUNITY?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____