STRUCTURING NEW EMPHASIS ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

by E. J. Niederfrank

The Challenge to Understand

Community development today is far more than an academic subject. It is also more than an ideal or something that would be nice to add to a program if and when time permitted. Rather, a major part of it is "community action or involvement" relating to all "extension" work. This is especially true of program areas such as rural area development, economic growth and agricultural adjustment.

Sometimes community development is referred to as "mailbox painting" and other nice non-economic welfare projects. In some places there may be a tendency to equate community development with some particular type of small local community program, overlooking the fact that the term applies to community action on a larger community, county or area basis as well, and to a wide sphere of interests and problems.

Any program involving work with people beyond the family contains community involvement aspects. These aspects include decisions in regard to different segments and interests to be served, organization of committees, recruitment and motivation of leaders, involvement of specialists for effective study of situations, relationships with other resources, communication and group techniques in deciding on and carrying out plans of action.

It is in the community action phase of programs where shortcomings frequently cause program failure or minimum results or contrawise, where adequacy and competence produce maximum results. Research and experience have long since proved the worth of effective involvement and self-imposed activities as contrasted with inadequate involvement and directed activities imposed from the outside. Yet even today, program leaders frequently overlook this fact until it is too late, having given attention to only the technical subject matter of the problem or to some particular kind of improvement. Then they have to back-fill and correct mistakes on community involvement before being able to go ahead toward effective results.

Sometimes there is lack of interest in the community action involvement phase of community development because it is an unseen, unconscious phase of program progress. This is especially true if this phase is handled well by others and programs succeed without realization on the part of outside resource people of all that happened in local operations. On the other hand, when programs fail, the failure can be seen as due to some degree of breakdown of community involvement.
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As shown in figure 1, community development consists of not just (1) things -- the better living conveniences and services -- but, (2) the incomes required to provide things -- the better farming and more nonfarm jobs and (3) the human element or motivating attitudes, abilities, felt needs, desires and standards. Around all these is (4) the overall framework of organization, leadership, planning and cooperation that spearheads and guides the obtaining of higher incomes, more community improvements and the changes in attitudes and abilities. This fourth phase, the real power wheel, is truly community development -- the development of community as an acting group.

People everywhere want things of one kind or another. They want nice homes, good roads, adequate health services, leisure time opportunities and facilities, strong church facilities and programs, education to fit today's youth for tomorrow's work, area beautification and many other kinds of improvements in home and community.

But in most cases an important factor back of all this is money -- more adequate farm and nonfarm incomes. This means good farms on which are applied the latest technology of production and marketing, alert and progressive main street businesses, industrial growth and job opportunities within accessible distances or the shift of residents nearer to job opportunities. Inside of all this, of course, are the resources essential to economic and human growth.

Community development truly is organization, leadership, planning and group action -- the development of the people as an acting community area group -- to achieve more incomes and more things. It is more than the community improvements attained themselves, but it might include these.

Not all communities or counties can expect certain services or sizes of industries or number of high income farms. But every community or social area -- large or small, declining or expanding, rural or urban -- can have strong organization and leadership for functioning as a community group in achieving the things it wants, either alone or in cooperation with others. For example, certain communities may be too small to seek industries or build a hospital by themselves. But with adequate relationships with the wider community they can achieve much.

Thus, basically community development means making the community or social area truly a functioning group. It is achieving desired improvements for better living through consciously-planned community action. Without this, no expanding programs of improvement in either things or income will ever be easily achieved. Economic growth and community improvement are goals. Community action (development) is a process of achieving them. Without it new leadership and organizations have to be set up for every new program or project. The closer you are to having continued overall organization for economic growth and human development, the closer you are to "true" community development.
Figure 1. Elements of true community development.
Some Background Philosophy

The main problem in undertaking community development is really not so much a matter of structure as it is a matter of (1) objective and direction, or of what your concept of the end product is, and (2) a matter of speed or how fast you intend to go in that direction. Experience in recent years has proved that these two factors -- objective or end product and speed are the most treacherous pitfalls faced in establishing and expanding community development work in the extension-university program.

Some states have gone at community development from the standpoint of sincere concern for true development of people and improvements through community action. Other states have gone at it from the narrower question of how to combat "general extension." Yet from the latter has come some very good new setups.

The recent extension emphasis on farm and home development, program projection and the Scope report, and the rise of the rural areas development and depressed area development programs in the federal government have accentuated the need for community development or the action of people as a total area group. Moreover, they have given community development a kind of immediacy. In addition, pressure from state legislatures may have been the greatest motivating force for moving some states more into community development. At the same time some states have approached community development with careful, deliberate thought, trying to be content with the slow speed of staff development. Others have moved more rapidly and deliberately to blanket the state with community development by administrative edict.

But albeit these realistic angles, in recent years there does seem to be a fresh concern with living at the local community level. This undoubtedly is due to several reasons. One is that we are becoming more and more progress-oriented, and the community happens to be one of the social units that a lot of people think can be made better and better.

Another reason is that because of the increased complexity of our socio-economy today, the individual one-to-one relationship no longer suffices (doctor-patient, farmer-agent, school teacher-family, clergyman-parishioner, merchant-customer). We have for years tried to remake the individual. Nor is merely the special-interest group approach enough for today's problems. Now it is more realized that problems are made up of various interrelated aspects calling for interdisciplinary and group approaches -- cooperative team efforts. In this there has been talk about dealing with such problems via the "social engineer" idea, the socio-economic planner.

So now we are talking about another way than the individual and special interest approaches: it is the self-powered community development approach whereby "all" the people of a given area with the help of professional resources seek to help themselves as a community group.
On the other hand, not all the work today on community development is really of fresh concern. Community organization and improvement clubs of one kind or another were widespread in the extension work of many states over 40 years ago. The community club-type of extension work was started in West Virginia during the 1920's when Nat Frame, a pioneer rural sociologist of that day, was the Extension director. There were township Farm Bureau units here in Iowa during that time, too. So some kind of community development has long been a part of Cooperative Agricultural Extension in most parts of the country. But much of it was more special-interest oriented and "improvement" oriented than overall "development-of-community action" oriented.

The accompanying figure 2 quickly gives us an overall explanation of today's complex social relationships and processes. It shows the different kinds of groups or communities of interest by area, by function and by interest. From it, one is impressed with the many organizational forces that impinge upon the local community today, to say nothing about economic-social forces and technological change itself. Technical and social changes have produced situations in which communities are in constant tension and transition. Local communities are in a constant process of change -- a process in which one type of community or group relationship is being eclipsed or covered over by another.

Certain basic processes or primary forces have been acting within and upon the community to give modern community life today a seemingly constantly changing image. These processes are science and technology, industrialization, urbanization and administrative organization, designed to accomplish the large-scale tasks in coordinating the work of many individuals and resources.

The main point is that such transitional processes as these, occurring all the time at the local level, transform and develop social relationships at every step along the way. It is not a once and for all structuring of the community, but a constant re-structuring process. At any point there may be problems that prevent satisfactory solution of problems arising from certain patterns of social relationship.

**Relationships -- A Main Part of the Definition**

If there is a valid reason for men and women to devote their lives to community work it is to enable communities to solve human problems. This is the way Dr. Dan Schler, community development specialist in the Missouri Extension Service, put it recently during a seminar there:

"In line with this reasoning, we conceive community development to be a process in which the local community willfully and consciously seeks to structure the various relationships within its boundaries in order to assure constant satisfaction of human needs in accord with human values."

To be complete, this statement needs to also take into account the relationships of the geographical community to the larger society -- often referred to as "mass" society.
Figure 2. Community as local geographical, functional and vertical groupings.

**Functional Community**
People serving specific functions in terms of local community:
1. Health
2. Government

**Extra-Community Influences and Decision-Making Units (County, state and nation)**
1. Economic and social impacts and relationships
2. Professional and administrative codes and legal structures
3. Goals and objectives
4. Resources -- subject matter & leadership
5. Extra-community power & influence
"In the complete arena of modern everyday life, the healthy local community seeks to direct the transformation of relationships within the local unit in conjunction with the forces, relations and processes of 'mass society.' The goal of development is to enable the local community to function as a meaningful and goal-satisfying situation for people who center their lives in that locality," Schler said.

Other community development and adult educators (Brunner, Sanders, Hoiberg, Verner, Houle, Poston, McClusky) similarly define community development as "an educational method by which systematic learning and action goals are accomplished through the group planning and action of people living in a given immediate or local social environment. The purpose is to equip them to maintain themselves and their environment in a state of continuing adjustment to change; it means development of the environment economically or non-economically whatever concerns or should concern the people."

The U. S. Agency for International Development has defined community development as "a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action, define their common and individual needs and problems, make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems, execute these plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources and supplement these resources, when necessary, with service and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community."

Community development is not a movement which seeks to steer man and society safely up the road to Utopia. And let us hope that it is not a tool which now may be employed to bring up from the grave the traditional, secure way of life known to our parents and grandparents in the small towns and countryside of bygone days.

Rather, the applied social scientist looks upon community development as a social and psychological condition which develops locally when people come to appreciate the common problems, values and goals which bind them together. He looks upon his work with local communities primarily as an attempt to advance effective relationships among the functional units in the area to solve common problems -- thus, to make more effective adjustments between person, family, community and larger society, leading toward their desired ends.

**Certain Assumptions are Essential**

No work on community development can be successfully undertaken with courage without also having in one's framework some broad assumptions to undergird method and content. Some such cornerposts, as suggested by Dan Schler and others are:

**People want change and can change.** There is the tendency to assume that all people are contented with status quo, do not want to change and will resist change. Of course, this may seem to be true for some. Surely the preponderance of evidence is not only that the great majority of people as families and communities
constantly change their way of life, but are rather consistently interested in making things a little better even though there often are major forces which lessen motivation or make it hard to work out the new relationships. We have to be optimists with philosopher Hegel, who said, "Man, insofar as he acts on nature to change it, changes his own nature."

**People should participate in making and adjusting or controlling the major changes taking place in their communities.** This is not to suggest that changes cannot take place without voluntary participation or that collective action is superior to individual initiative. However, studies in all parts of the world verify the significance and permanence of self-imposed change over change imposed from outside. Furthermore, man grows and fulfills himself as he participates in the regulation of his own life, and unless man so participates, he becomes subjected to the whim of forces which leave him isolated and his life meaningless. So it is with the community -- without any sense of participation in or conscious planning of adjustment to changes a community or group of people tends to become disoriented.

**The community development idea also assumes that a "wholistic or over-all" approach can deal successfully with problems with which a "fragmented" approach cannot cope.** Most of the community problems which extension is concerned with today have multiple roots. Thus, a single specialized or disciplinary approach is often of limited value. A community's effort to cope with a problem often creates those changes in attitude necessary to any successful approach, changes not only among the people but among disciplines and cooperating agencies as well. Thus, the effort to work cooperatively on a problem in its total setting may be the most significant step in the solution of the problem, and this has an accumulative effect which is an important product, too.

We must also assume that people need help in organizing themselves. They must establish relationships among area, functional and interest or concern "communities of interest" to deal with their needs as communities. They need help in this just as many individuals or families require help in coping with their own problems, as suggested by the well-known sociologist, E. A. Ross.

This help required by communities, as with individuals, will be of different kinds. It may be need for refinancing, for advice on road construction or recreational development or school program revision; it may be need for technical economics and other subject matter for use in study and planning; it may be help on development of leadership skills.

Of course, some communities are fairly effective in operating as a community without help, but many would function better if assistance and training were available. Certainly, they should need less help as their own leadership improves in quantity and quality. This ought to be considered one of the important products of community development.

Community development requires adequate institutional structure along with field staff development and professional assistance. Back of all this, of course,
is administrative attitude and understanding. All of this leads us into our next and main sections.

**Program Content in Community Development**

The institutional structure for community development is governed by what one conceives as its program content and elements. Here are main types of community development, classified more or less in terms of content and scope:

1. **The accumulative-fragmented project type program.** Much of our traditional extension work is of this type, and many people hold that this type of community development is enough -- an adding together of many separate pieces operated or attained separately. This is the idea that any single improvement, made by any single person or part of the community, such as a new barn on a farm or a new bridge on the road, is community development.

2. **Primary subject area-special interest type of program.** This is a somewhat broader program than No. 1. It is built around various special group interests or community interests, such as improved dairying or recreation in the total area through the work of a given organization set up for this purpose.

3. **General discussion type programs to stimulate community and area study** for economic and human development and encourage follow-up local action with or without additional state leadership and assistance. Examples are the self-administered discussion study group and "Challenge" or "Advance" type programs of Ohio, Iowa, Pennsylvania and North Carolina.

4. **A community counseling service type of program.** This is based on special requests as they arise from scattered communities, usually including spot case-community counseling or some service rendered. For example, going to a community once or twice to advise or assist with some special problem.

5. **Promotion of overall community improvement associations or councils.** These may serve primarily as a tool or channel through which extension and other agencies may better serve the people of certain local areas and by which the people may achieve certain goals or accomplishments by more united action.

6. **Same as No. 5 except that it involves a county or area orientation beyond the "local" community.** Specific projects deal with broad major concensus, based on studies of situations, involvement of needed professional resources and development of local leadership for the self-powered solution of problems. It also includes public sponsored area economic development programs.

The first decision a university staff has to make is which one of these general directions it wants to go -- what type of content it wants to emphasize. Of course, what is done in any one state or area may be, in some degree a combination of two or more of these types.
Some people still think that community development means only economic growth and that everything else is pittling. Some also hold that the fragmented project idea is enough, for in the long run it all adds up to community development. Still others think of community development in terms of improvement other than economics, such as health services, roads and beautification. But more and more public leaders and scientists are thinking of it more broadly. They are thinking of it in terms of community group action on community problems. This need not necessarily require total concern of all families in all things. Figure 2 illustrates the idea of community development maturity. Fragmental activities diminish as the community idea grows.

Do you want to continue mainly along the lines of No. 1 and No. 2 with a little along No. 4, perhaps just enough to get by? Or do you really want to go further in the direction of No. 5 and No. 6, and gradually orient all extension work of the university into a broader overall community approach? Or can you do both? Is it necessary to combine them into a single program built upon a single county program-planning setup? Or are both feasible, built around different county planning operations? Questions such as these have become crucial for several state extension services which have gone the farthest toward setting new patterns for work in community development under unified extension.

Actually, much of this problem boils down to two basic questions: which people do you want to serve and why? Once having made the decision on these questions it would be assumed that the program content would relate to the felt needs of the people to be served. If these were both farm and nonfarm people, this would mean a program strong in common overall community economic and living problems. In fact, it is this trend toward a wider audience that is leading extension, sometimes almost forcibly, toward community development types of programs.

The question "why community development" has tremendous underlying importance. If staff members have a sincere feeling toward the need for and goals of community development -- toward tackling the major problems affecting the economic and social welfare of the people of the area served -- that is one thing. But if not, then there is danger in being too much concerned about the structural patterns too soon. You have to "sell" the why and the how.

But once the decisions are made to go more toward an overall community oriented route, the basic administrative tasks are primarily ones of (a) providing for the essential interdisciplinary involvement and (b) providing for staff understanding all down the line, beginning at the top. Both of these relate to structure, to which we now turn.
Main Types of Structure for Community Development in the United States

1. Community Improvement Clubs or Councils in Cooperative Extension. This involves one or more specialists (in several cases trained rural sociologists) with emphasis on promoting and improving the organization of small community improvement clubs or councils in the counties. This program generally includes a contest feature, operated in cooperation with business and industry groups. Overall community improvement clubs are formed, with officers and project committees to which all the people belong. This type is found throughout the South. In some states it has been in operation over 20 years, and today 300 to 1,000 communities are so organized in most of the southern states. The extent and quality varies according to the interest and abilities of the county agents and the district supervisors. The program is basically sound, has proved successful and has accomplished much. But it needs strengthening throughout the region, with emphasis on getting into broader, deeper programs and staff and leader training.

It is primarily a better channel through which extension programs reach otherwise not-so-well served families and a means for achieving certain community-type improvements beyond the direct purview of extension subject matter. Some form of county and area organization of the program also is found in some of the states. In North Carolina this functions as the "official" RAD organization. The local clubs and area organizations have proved very effective in strengthening the agriculture and industry of the area, greatly increasing community leadership and pride, improving community services and beautification, and building relations among resources and programs. Because of all this progress they have been indirectly influential in attracting industry to these areas.

A special variation of this type is the chamber of commerce type of area development setups found here and there, such as those at Ashville, North Carolina, and Tupelo, Mississippi. Extension is an important sponsor and there is emphasis on agricultural improvement and community improvement clubs. Professional assistance is provided by the county agents and a regional fieldman employed by the area development associations (chamber of commerce).

2. Department Centered Program. Here community development is mainly a part of extension rural sociology and/or agricultural economics of the respective land-grant college, with the community work of the department being limited mainly to minimum case-community counseling and involving or building relations with other agencies concerned with programs of "community welfare." Such efforts are under way in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin and Washington state and some other states. This type of approach represents a good beginning, but is far from adequate to meet today's community development needs. In some states it includes the extension education work with county planning and zoning commissions.

More recently this department-centered type of limited program in some states is

---

2/The reader should bear in mind that these descriptions are very brief and based on only rough first-hand knowledge by the author, to convey the general ideas only. Additional ad lib comments were added throughout presentation of the paper and in the discussion period.
greatly assisting or having major leadership for the more general economic development work and RAD-type work of extension in the university. (By 1963, Iowa had developed an excellent program of this type, calling it "Resource and Community Development.")

3. **Bureau of Community Development in General Extension.** The main program here is intensive case-community counseling by one or more trained staff members having a community process-adult education and social work orientation. Outstanding examples are the University of Nebraska, University of Missouri, University of Michigan, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin, University of Utah, University of Kentucky and the University of Southern Illinois and what was in operation at the University of Missouri but is now a part of overall extension there as described under type No. 5.

These have become quite extensive programs in some states and are beginning to be so in others. A field force of one to four or five community development specialists is employed to carry on the case-community intensive study and counseling type program with a limited number of case-communities each year. Usually this work has grown out of general extension correspondence courses and night school courses for credit, located in various places in the state. It was only natural to add a community advisory service, which has grown quite large in some of the state universities.

In almost every case such work is done with local communities apart from Cooperative Extension. In one or two states there is a kind of gentlemen's agreement between the two, the one taking the larger town-centered and city communities and the other the more rural-type communities.

4. **Broad Cooperative Extension Program Planning or Program Projection.** This has become involved in programs of community development, but on the whole, to a minor degree except perhaps in a few states. In most states emphasizing "program projection" approaches, some counties have committees on community development in county program planning, but frequently there is not enough state and county staff leadership to help them decide what to do and how to develop meaningful programs.

However, in some states Cooperative Extension is working intensely on the development of county program building committees or development councils, which serve as the county RAD group as well. The trend is to try to get on a one-group basis, rather than having several overlapping county program planning groups. Some notable examples to date are Texas and Arkansas. The county and area organization of the community club program serves in somewhat the same way in North Carolina. In Colorado county community development councils are being emphasized, but they have not yet generally replaced extension county program planning groups.

5. **Consolidated All-University Extension Service.** This involves intensive case-community counseling service in development with several area-located specialists, working through the county extension offices. The University of Missouri and Utah State University at Logan provide outstanding examples of this type of structure.
Figure 3. A sketch of possible future extension.
The two extension services in each institution are tied together under one director, with the goal of developing a more or less completely unified single extension system from which will emanate all the field services and non-resident campus services of the various colleges of the respective university.

This is a truly significant pioneering effort in what may portend to be a common pattern of the future. Both states are going at it fairly slowly, and marriage has still not brought about complete integration of programs. Problems of county cooperative extension staff development and of revising county program planning still are to be solved. Administrators are now raising the question as to whether there needs to be a single unified program at the county level -- perhaps separate approaches locally but united administratively for maximum use of resources is enough. Presumably there certainly needs to be at least correlated planning and wide staff involvement.

Several other state universities have more recently unified extension administration at the top, but programs and operating structure are yet to be developed. West Virginia University has gone a long way toward extension unification and broadening of the total services of the university to the state, centered around general economic-social development related to the special problems of Appalachia.

6. Coordinated University Field Services -- Resource Development Program. This is what Michigan State University has in the Upper Peninsula. There is a central area office, staffed with a director and a number of subject specialists including one on community organization. The main three elements coordinated are Cooperative Extension, the Institute of Community Development and Services of the Continuing Education Service and other colleges of the university beyond agriculture. The institute is a research and advisory resource housed in the university at East Lansing. It is drawn upon for assistance by the area extension office. This area program also stems from and relates to the USDA Rural Development Program. The county resource development councils and special agents are the center of the total county extension program. Both "extension services" are under a vice president for extension.

Local program development still centers in the usual county extension offices with the rural resource development committees and extension committees. But these groups are taking a broader and deeper look than before, then drawing upon various resources as needed through the area office including especially the Institute of Research and Advisory Service of the Continuing Education Service of the university at East Lansing.

The Michigan State program seems to be more of a coordinating type program, while the programs of Missouri and Utah State represent more nearly consolidation or integration. The Michigan State program has not yet progressed very far in other sections of the state outside the Upper Peninsula.

A variation of this type is the Eastern Kentucky Area Development Program sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and the University of Kentucky. Like the
Michigan State Upper Peninsula Program, the Eastern Kentucky Area Development Program is under the immediate supervision of the State Cooperative Extension Service, but is sponsored and serviced by the entire university on an informal coordinated service basis. There is an area central staff of specialists, particularly including fields supplementary to extension, such as career guidance, youth organization, community development, industrial development and forestry and wood utilization. Other agricultural subject matter specialists are doing intensive work adapted to the area. The trend is toward having a single county committee or council giving leadership to "regular" extension and RAD type programs together. An area steering committee or council is in process of formation. So far, the program does not include much community development orientation below the county level, but more of this is in the offing.

7. University-Wide Interdepartmental Coordinating Community Development Committee. A good example of this is at the University of Illinois. It works with case-communities, drawing upon whatever university or other resources which are needed for assisting local groups with the necessary studies, planning and action projects. One big job has been special study and plans for a Wabash Valley area program in cooperation with what is known as the Little Wabash Association. This project has been inter-county and even inter-state in certain phases.

But most of the Illinois program consists of assisting case-communities or counties with special problems, such as on school reorganization, church reorganization, main street business improvement, land-use zoning and the like. The extension specialist in community organization has been chairman and more or less executive secretary or key contact resource person of the committee, but this position moves about somewhat from year to year. He takes the lead in involving whatever resources of the university which are needed to handle the problem brought to the university by a given community. It is a clearing-house type of program.

8. State Inter-Agency Organization. It is such as the Wisconsin Community Organization Committee and the Iowa Council for Community Improvement. These groups serve to provide overall state leadership of ideas, program content and interdepartmental staff development. For example, among its activities the WCOC sponsors annually a three-day professional workers conference on community development and leadership for selected staff members of various agencies and organizations, including their top administrators, in order to facilitate cooperation locally. It has also published a bulletin on the what and how of community councils.

State inter-agency approaches such as this serve several useful purposes, but they do not operate locally as an organization. Their impact is made through the various agencies that may be involved. They do require continued leadership. State extension rural sociologists usually play key roles in such groups, including general direction.

9. Development Programs of Public and Quasi-Public Agencies. Such agencies include state and local development departments or commissions, zoning boards and the like. Actually, in most cases these are not overall community development
programs as such but rather are resources to be drawn upon for help in dealing with certain aspects of community development, such as with industrial development, outdoor recreation resources and county-suburban land-use planning and development.

However, here and there, a state industrial development department encourages and assists overall development studies and planning and promotes and assists the organization of local development councils for doing the same. A good case in point is Utah.

The U. S. Department of Commerce has just completed a compilation of the extent and nature of state development commissions around the country which is available upon request from the department.³

This study shows that during 1960 all 50 states and Puerto Rico spent a total of $39,000,000 on development and planning to promote economic growth in local communities. Of this total, 29.2 percent was spent on industrial development, including industrial location, economic research and industrial advertising; 27.1 percent on tourist promotion; 11.1 percent on state and local planning assistance; 30.8 percent on general administration relating to all programs and .75 percent on what is called community development, which includes mostly general guidance service to local communities on miscellaneous problems other than industrial and tourist promotion. Total expenditures ranged from less than $50,000 in some states to over $7 million in Puerto Rico, an average of $384,000 per state. However, there was much variation among the states, many not spending anything or very little for certain fields.

There is little emphasis in such programs on community development as a process and method. Major emphasis is on economic things such as getting new industries and promoting tourism. A few state economic development commissions do have programs for helping areas or communities study and plan for improvement and are promoting local development organizations to do this. Utah provides a good example of this kind of state government program.

10. Privately Sponsored Community Development Programs. Examples are those of the United States and state chambers of commerce, the National Grange and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The state chambers of commerce are important units promoting and assisting community development, but in general, they do not operate programs as such. However, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce is encouraging some, especially with respect to city and town economic development. It has guide booklets to help towns or cities study their situations and plan projects of action. Several state chambers of commerce do have somewhat elaborate "Main street improvement" type programs (Kentucky, North Carolina, West Virginia and Indiana). Some

state chambers of commerce sponsor state-wide conferences on community economic development. In addition, the railroads, public utility companies, cooperatives and other private industrial groups also devote considerable funds and manpower to general industrial community development in some places.

The National Grange program is a nationwide rural community improvement contest, with 10 national prizes, ranging from $10,000 to $1,000 for the national winners and smaller prizes for state winners. Usually several hundred communities compete in this contest each year, but the program is almost entirely Grange operated, locally. It draws upon what resources are needed for specific projects. The contest of the General Federation of Women's Clubs is somewhat similar, but tends to be a little more town and city centered. Usually the winning communities feature two or three particular projects in a given year; it is not overall community development as previously defined.

All of these types of community development programs can be more or less classified into about four main types and as being intensive or limited in nature. But at the same time one has to keep in mind the nature of program content because this also affects problems of structure. The classifications are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
<th>Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily university department operated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily cooperative extension operated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily university-wide under unified extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative with other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no limit to what a community can do if it wants to. When led by the people themselves, a small scale achievement may be truly community development, while large changes added singlehandedly from outside is hardly so. Thus, the extent and quality of the community action process is the basic ingredient in defining and achieving community development in addition to the subject content "things" achieved.
Crucial Elements in Summary

1. What do you want the content and nature of community development to be? Administrative certainty about this is a first essential.

2. Why be concerned with community development -- the basic problems or concerns of people in a broad orientation? Unless there are pretty strong staff convictions to want to go in this direction, there is little use in trying to devise and push certain structural and procedural patterns.

3. What are the primary competencies required which will help devise and implement program? Are these competencies available and administratively organized to make their best contributions?

4. Provision for across-the-board work, interdisciplinary involvement is crucially essential.

5. Consideration of the nature of existing county extension program planning and what revisions and relationships in it to community development are needed in order to provide for expanding work in community development.

6. Speed of implementation desired; shall it be blanket statewide adoption or on a selective basis in places where some readiness and potential already exist?

7. Existing degree of total extension-university staff understanding and education in community development; when and how is this to be developed?

8. Understanding of community development on the part of cooperating agencies and groups, with continued staff education and communication among them.

9. Additional personnel needed -- numbers, competencies.

One unified all-university extension with all programs centered around community action and development -- this will tend to become the framework of the extension of the future.