

THE DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION IN A HUMAN
SERVICE ORGANIZATION: A CASE STUDY

© Catherine Heinrich

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Social Work

School of Social Work
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba (c) 1989



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-51646-1

Canada

THE DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION IN A HUMAN
SERVICE ORGANIZATION:
A CASE STUDY

BY

CATHERINE HEINRICH

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

© 1989

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

The case study applies a diffusion of innovation framework to the initiation and implementation of a special community development project in a human service organization. Working Together was introduced in Community & Youth Correctional Services as a new approach, designed to encourage community and citizen participation in the delivery of services to youth and dealing with juvenile crime. An underdefined project proposal permits individual interpretation and implementation. A decentralized structure also contributes to high variability in project implementation and activities. The Working Together project becomes operationalized at the regional level. Regional characteristics, such as traditional orientation, previous experience and need for change, also influence the rate of adoption of the innovation and the extent of routinization.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their support and assistance in the completion of this degree:

- to my advisor and friend Dr. Joseph C. Ryant for his guidance, understanding and sharing of knowledge;
- to the members of my committee Dr. Don Fuchs and Rod Kueneman for their helpful comments and informed input during the preparation of this document;
- to Marcia Thomson, the staff of Working Together and Community & Youth Correctional Services and the community members who shared their viewpoints and knowledge with me;
- to friends and family members who never doubted my capability,
- to Paul for his ongoing support, patience and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background.....	1
Chapter 2: The Nature of the Innovation Community Development.....	25
Chapter 3: Field Observations.....	56
Chapter 4: Organizational Structure Variables Complexity, Formalization, Decentralization.....	107
Chapter 5: Target System Variables Traditional Norms, Previous Experience, Need for Change.....	122
Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions.....	137
Bibliography.....	145

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Human service organizations frequently introduce new programs in response to some organizational concern or need of the target population. New programs begin as proposals or policies which must be translated into specific actions at the operational level. This process of translating program policy into a specific plan of action is often called implementation. Often, new programs also require some adaptation or change by organizational members. Encouraging this change often becomes part of the implementation process.

In the social work profession, analysis of program implementation often follows an organizational change model. The features of organizations and the characteristics of organizational members influence how new programs are introduced and implemented. A slightly different orientation which looks at this process is the body of literature dealing with the diffusion of innovation.

This paper will adopt a case study approach in an exploration of the diffusion of innovation. The innovation to be studied is the Working Together project. Working Together is a new program of Manitoba Community & Youth Correctional Services, designed to encourage and facilitate community involvement in

correctional services for young offenders. The project was jointly sponsored by the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada and the Province of Manitoba, Community & Youth Correctional Services and was formally launched in October 1985. In the fall of 1986, Dr. Joseph C. Ryant and I were contracted by the federal arm to carry out a performance monitoring evaluation.

The essence of the project was characterized by a sense of novelty - Working Together was an innovative, creative and valuable way of delivering correctional services to youth. An innovation is defined as "any proposed idea, or set of ideas, about how the organizational behaviour of members should be changed in order to improve its performance" (Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein, 1971, p. 16). "Diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system" (Rogers, 1983, p. 5). The Working Together project can be considered as an innovation. The implementation of the project and the activities of project staff can be seen as techniques employed to diffuse the innovation.

Although not commonly applied in the social work field, support for such an orientation is provided by Rothman (1974).

The human-service profession in general and the area of community organization in particular are frequently characterized as change-oriented fields. For this reason, scholarly endeavor referred to as

the diffusion and adoption of innovation seems of special interest to these areas. (p. 418)

The evaluation revealed that the Working Together project was defined and introduced at the central level but became operationalized at the regional level. The major finding of the evaluation was the high degree of project variability observed in different regions. The case study will apply a diffusion of innovation framework in an effort to explain the variation found in the Working Together project. Study of the community development literature provides information about the nature of the innovation and implications for the diffusion process. Organizational characteristics and organizational target system variables are examined to determine any influence on the diffusion process.

A case study approach has both strengths and weaknesses. Weaknesses include limited representativeness since case studies do not allow valid generalizations to the larger population. They are also vulnerable to subjective biases. "The case may be selected because of its dramatic, rather than typical, attributes; or because it neatly fits the researchers preconceptions" (Isaac and Michael, 1984, p. 48). However, case study approaches can provide good, intensive anecdotal information and can help identify important areas and variables for future research. Case

studies also provide the opportunity to test hypotheses in a specific example. Furthermore, the opportunity to generate new hypotheses and theory is created when the existing theory does not fit the case study.

BACKGROUND

Working Together was introduced into Manitoba Community & Youth Correctional Services in response to the newly enacted Young Offenders Act. The Young Offenders Act (YOA) was passed by parliament in 1982, proclaimed in 1983 and came into effect in 1984. The Young Offenders Act replaced the Juvenile Delinquents Act of 1908 and signified major changes in programs and services for youth. The Act aims to involve communities, victims and parents in the dispositions or measures for youth.

A new philosophy is codified in the Young Offenders Act including:

1. Young persons should be held more responsible but not wholly accountable for their behaviour since they are not yet fully mature;
2. Society has a right to be protected from illegal behaviour;
3. Young persons have the same rights as adults to due process, fair and equal treatment and those rights must be guaranteed by safeguards.

The introduction of new legislation requires changes and adaptations by related organizations and institutions. Juvenile courts, probation departments and child welfare organizations across Canada are directly affected by the YOA and must change policies, programs and operating procedures to be consistent with the new law. In Manitoba, Community & Youth Correctional Services is the organization which provides probation services to both young and adult offenders and is one of the organizations clearly affected by the new Act.

Probation services in Manitoba are provided through a decentralized delivery system. The central office and senior management are located in Winnipeg. This Directorate fulfills an overall planning and policy development function. Regional offices are located in Brandon (Westman Region), Portage La Prairie (Central Regional), Dauphin (Parklands Region), Selkirk (Interlake Region), The Pas (Norman Region), Thompson (Thompson Region), and Beausejour (Eastman Region). Several sub-offices are located in smaller communities within each region. Five urban units are located in sub-areas of Winnipeg. Each regional office is managed by an area director who is responsible for the full range of corrections services in the region. A staff of

probation officers and clerical workers are supervised by the area director.

Probation officers are typically assigned responsibility for a number of communities within the regional catchment area and provide services to these communities from the regional office. Daily travel to and from communities is a regular feature of the work, as is overnight travel in some regions. In some instances, clients are expected to travel to the regional office or sub-office for service.

Manitoba Probation Services recently experienced a change in philosophy and direction, symbolized by the name change to Community & Youth Correctional Services. The major focus of the reorganization spoke to a need and a greater interest in involving communities in the delivery of service. The organization "recognizes that problems of crime and delinquency are community problems, which cannot be solved by correctional professionals alone, but which require a partnership between corrections personnel, private citizens and community groups" (Manitoba Community Services, 1985 Annual Reports, p. 2). The organization formally adopted this view in the fall of 1985. Several trends are noted which provide rationale for the departmental reorganization.

A greater emphasis on devolution of native services and the involvement of native people

in the administration of justice in their communities,

an increased emphasis on networking functions with other justice and social service agencies accomplished through interagency committees and other liaison strategies with schools and agencies,

growing involvement with community resources and organizations, through community participation agreements, honorary probation officers and youth justice committees,

growing awareness of and interest in victim needs, combined with efforts to mediate or conciliate,

increased use of open custody for young offenders by courts and a decrease in the use of traditional probation supervision,

an overall emphasis on community-oriented activities,

recognition of an overall high number of individuals held in custody in Manitoba, and the need to change this by introducing sentencing alternatives and expanding temporary and early release programs, maintaining the view that custodial sanctions should only be used when they are necessary for the protection of society (ANNUAL REPORTS, p. 3 -4).

The interest in a community-based orientation to service delivery is responsive to the greater community focus found in the Young Offenders Act. The reorganization represents one way in which Community & Youth Correctional Services adapted its policies and procedures to comply with the new demands of the Act.

A second measure was also employed by the organization. A special project proposal was introduced

in 1985 to address some of the concerns created by the transition from the Juvenile Delinquents Act to the Young Offenders Act. Willing to assist this transition, the federal government was persuaded to provide financial assistance for the implementation of the Working Together project.

THE WORKING TOGETHER PROJECT

Working Together is a program of Manitoba Community & Youth Correctional Services, designed to encourage and facilitate community involvement in correctional services for young offenders. Community development activities are at the heart of the Working Together project. Goals of citizen participation at the community level are revealed by the project mandate. "The program's mandate is to promote effective implementation of community youth justice programming based on the principles of the Young Offenders Act" (PROGRESS REPORT October 1985 - May 1986, p. 2). This community programming takes several forms including youth justice committees, voluntary probation officers, victim-offender reconciliation programs, theft-offender programs, and public awareness and education activities. The common denominator is the active involvement of community members in dealing with young offenders and with juvenile crime.

Overtly, the Working Together project was implemented solely to involve communities and citizens more fully in the activities of the organization and services to young offenders. The rationale for the project is the belief that crime and delinquency are community problems which can be better addressed through the involvement of citizens and community groups alongside professional probation staff. Citizens act as volunteers for the organization and participate in the supervision of young offenders or the monitoring of alternative measures.

As a new approach, the Working Together project demanded changes in the roles and behaviors of organizational members. Thus, an underlying function of the policy becomes evident. Working Together must facilitate the organizational acceptance of changes in service planning and delivery.

The project director was located in the central office and provided program focus and leadership. Twelve and a half staff years were assigned to the project. Community facilitators were recruited, hired and trained in ideology and content of the Working Together project. These staff were then assigned to the various regional offices where they were expected to introduce, explain and implement the Working Together Project. Some positions were half-time Working Together

and half-time probation officers. Common activities of staff included: 1) development and nurturance of youth justice committees, 2) recruitment of volunteers to assist with probation supervision, alternative measures, public education and other probation duties, 3) educating the public about the Young Offenders Act, 4) negotiating Community Participation Agreements with communities for some services, 5) interagency networking and 6) victim-offender mediation. Some detail about these activities follows.

Youth justice committees have functioned in Manitoba since 1975 under the authority of the juvenile court. Groups of volunteer citizens meet to hear details of juvenile cases and offer suggestions or propose dispositions. Under the YOA, the role of these committees is outlined in section 69.

69. The Attorney General of a province or such other Minister as the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province may designate, or a delegate thereof, may establish one or more committees of citizens, to be known as youth justice committees, to assist without remuneration in any aspect of the administration of this Act or in any programs or services for young offenders and may specify the method of appointment of committee members and the functions of the committee.

Community facilitators were expected to encourage the development of new committees and provide ongoing support and growth opportunities for existing

committees. Committee development was a major component of the Working Together project.

Other activities were also considered important. The recruitment of volunteers to take on aspects of service delivery was also part of the community orientation. Volunteers, designated as honorary probation officers, fulfilled a variety of duties, such as supervising young offenders, overseeing the completion of alternative measures or transporting youth. Facilitators had a role in recruiting and supporting volunteers.

Community facilitators were also expected to inform the general public about the new legislation. Presentations in schools, community clubs and recreation centres were undertaken to fulfill this function. This education function extended to other human service organizations which might be involved with young offenders and Community & Youth Correctional Services.

The administrative design of the Working Together project saw centralized program management and decentralized service delivery. Due to the special project status of Working Together, community facilitators are directly responsible to the program manager, located in the central office. However, due to the regional authority structure, staff are also responsible to their area director. This dual

accountability is heightened in cases where staff are half-time community facilitators and half-time probation officers. Ideologically, community facilitators are accountable to the communities they serve (Lotz, 1969) creating a potential third line of accountability. A potentiality for conflicting demands and expectations is created.

As a central feature of the project, the notion of community development merits some attention. Community development is characterized by considerable division in the way it is conceptualized, in its purpose and in its methods (Compton, 1971; Khinduka, 1969; Rothman, 1968; Taylor and Roberts, 1985). Contributions have been made by a variety of disciplines and professions, yet the literature is characterized by a lack of closure on key concepts, models and theories. The most distinct characteristic of the literature is the conviction that community development activities are inherently valuable and virtuous.

As a new project based on community development principles, Working Together shares these characteristics of ambiguity and 'fuzziness.' Overall project description and identification of goals and objectives are somewhat vague and underdefined yet valued by proponents as inherently good. Desirable results are not necessarily identifiable in specific

terms. Working Together is only a partially defined project.

As a result of vague definition, a high degree of project variability can be expected, since specific project appearance is open to interpretation by individual actors. The decentralized delivery structure, in which authority and decision making is given to regional managers, also contributes to the potential for project variability. Job descriptions of project staff rank low on formalization permitting a variety of techniques and activities to be acceptable.

The Working Together project was introduced by Community & Youth Correctional Services in response to the Young Offenders Act. A community development orientation emerges as the essence of the project as revealed by a program evaluation. The evaluation observations invite a closer look at the Working Together project to assess organizational and contextual issues.

THE EVALUATION

In the fall of 1986, Dr. Joseph C. Ryant and I were contracted by the federal government to carry out a performance monitoring evaluation of the Working Together project. This evaluation provides much of the data for the present analysis. It is important to note

that the data were originally collected for a program monitoring function to satisfy the demands of a federal government contract. The analysis presented here thus represents an opportunistic, secondary analysis. As such, the non-observation or omission of certain elements becomes an unfortunate limitation. Specific limits of the data will be discussed later.

The selection of a performance monitoring orientation was not uncontroversial. It placed attention on organizational characteristics and the activities of staff. Other consultants would have preferred that the evaluation focus upon community characteristics and how these affected project implementation. Their view did not prevail and thus makes it impossible to address what would otherwise be an important and interesting question.

The overarching goal of the original evaluation was to provide the office of the Solicitor-General with a primarily descriptive view of how the project appeared and what activities were taking place. The evaluation revealed a project that varied in implementation and appearance from one region of the province to another. The detailed findings are laid out in a series of reports prepared initially for the Ministry of the Solicitor-General and later for the Department of Justice.

A broad analysis of the Working Together project could include an examination of the organizational bureaucracy and the actual communities involved with the organization. This thesis has a more limited scope and will restrict its focus to an examination of the organizational attempts to foster an innovation.

Three tasks formed the basis of the original evaluation. The first part was an overall description of the Working Together project, including statement of goals and objectives, description of the organizational structure, description of staff activities and community outcomes. The second component of the research involved compiling comprehensive descriptions of eight selected sites which would outline the Working Together initiatives in the community setting in detail. Before describing the methodological approach used to fulfill these two tasks, brief mention of the third task will be provided.

The third task of the evaluation involved the preparation and implementation of two recording systems - one for community facilitators and one for youth justice committees. The objective of the community facilitator form was to collect data about the daily activities and methods employed by project staff. These data would provide a record or diary of the community facilitation process. The youth justice committee

recording system concentrated on the activities, processes and dispositions of youth justice committees in their work with young offenders. Problems around timing, consensus and validity have resulted in the demise of the community facilitator forms. The youth justice committee forms have been dispersed and field tested.

The first two tasks were primarily descriptive in nature and required the retrieval of rich, descriptive and detailed data. For the purposes of the primary program evaluation a participant observation approach appeared as the most efficient and effective way to fulfill the requirements of the contract. As a research method, participant observation involves a blending of methods and techniques including "direct observation, informant interviewing, document analysis, respondent interviewing, and direct participation" (McCall and Simmons, 1969, p. 3). Unstructured interviews with informants and respondents allow the researcher flexibility to pursue new lines of questioning or investigation as the situation demands. Direct observation provides a sample of how the organization operates. Document collection and analysis can provide indirect, historical observations as well as perspectives on current events.

These methods were used to obtain information for the evaluation. To complete an overall project description, information was collected through interviews with the project manager and through access to file data and material.

The major component of the evaluation included the second task of describing eight selected sites. The eight sites were selected through a process of discussion and consultation with the program manager and regional staff. No attempt at randomization was made. Communities were deliberately selected to reflect variation in urban/rural, Native/non-Native and presence/absence of youth justice committees. Field trips, of two to four days duration, were made to Dauphin, Thompson, Norway House, Virden, Morden/Winkler, Peguis, North Winnipeg, and West Winnipeg.

Unstructured interviews were undertaken with all community facilitators, other corrections staff and members of youth justice committees. Most area directors, presiding judges, crown attorneys, and police representatives were also interviewed. In some areas, victims, offenders, Band Council representatives and community service order supervisors were interviewed. The interviews followed a general outline asking fairly standardized questions in key areas. The interviews

were also open-ended so that new lines of questioning could be pursued if prompted by specific responses.

Youth justice committees, in varying stages of development, were observed in seven communities. These observations provided a view of how committees actually operated. Discussion with committee members frequently followed the observation of a meeting. Committee members might respond to questions in a way which verified comments made by organizational members or in a way that showed a different perspective.

Finally, file material was reviewed and relevant material collected. Historical information about committee development or regional orientation was often provided through these documents. This process of interviewing, observing and reading resulted in the formation of eight community dossiers, composed of field notes of interviews and observations, photocopies of file data and interviewer comments and questions generated during the collection process.

Methodological problems with participant observation are noted (Dean, Eichhorn, and Dean, 1969, p. 20-21). A common criticism of participant observation and other qualitative techniques is that they are methodologically 'soft' as opposed to quantitative data which is 'hard'. The non-standardized collection of data limits statistical treatment. In

this evaluation, data is sometimes impressionistic. The range of respondents interviewed did permit some verification of impressions; where all respondents describe an event in essentially the same way, it is likely to be an accurate representation. Where differences emerge, file data and documentation sometimes provide a clearer picture. The likelihood of researcher bias is also present because of the dependence of social relationships in the field. The problem of 'over-rapport' is identified by Miller (1969). The non-random selection invites weaknesses of selection bias; in fact, the researchers were aware that communities were selected to 'show off' the successes and highlights of the project.

Despite these limitations, the participant observation technique was the most appropriate methodology for this particular evaluation. The field visits resulted in the collection of a rich, descriptive data base which permitted the fulfillment of the federal government contract.

This thesis represents a re-examination of data collected for the evaluation of the Working Together project. This thesis goes beyond a purely descriptive view and is primarily concerned with finding explanations for the variation observed.

For the secondary analysis, the eight community dossiers were thoroughly reviewed. No new information was collected from the field. Dossiers were carefully re-read, to look for details about project activities, roles of community facilitators, attitudes of area directors, and attitudes of probation staff. This analysis was guided by questions that went beyond those raised in the initial evaluation. The qualitative analysis of interviews was completed within a different conceptual framework which permitted a comparison of regional approaches to the Working Together project and a discussion of the diffusion process.

Much of the diffusion literature provides generalizations about the diffusion process and variables which can affect the rate of adoption. One factor influencing the diffusion of any innovation is the nature or character of the innovation itself (Rogers, 1983). Working Together is a community development project, thus prompting the investigation of the community development literature.

Rothman (1974) states "the most basic finding of diffusion and adoption literature is that all target systems do not adopt innovations at the same rate" (p. 422). A target system is defined as "a group, organization, community or society toward which an innovation is directed" (Rothman, 1974, p. 420). The

notion of target system may provide some explanation for variation in the adoption process. In Working Together, there are two potential target systems to examine. The project is targetted towards Manitoba communities. At the same time, the project requires adaptation and change within the organization, creating a second target system.

Therefore, three bodies of literature are suggested. First, the community development literature may hold some explanation for the varying conceptualizations found. As a community development project, the exploration of community development theory and practice will contribute to a better understanding of the underpinnings of the Working Together project.

A related body of literature refers to the study of the community itself. As a project directed to Manitoba communities, community characteristics can be expected to have an influence on project appearance since different communities have different needs and resources. Community factors may influence the appearance of Working Together.

The third important body of literature involves the study of organizations and organizational innovation. Organizations have certain features and structural characteristics which influence organizational behaviour. The features of Community & Youth

Correctional Services are important to examine since some of its characteristics may have an influence on the diffusion of the Working Together project.

Unfortunately, the data base does not permit inclusion of each of these important areas due to the secondary nature of the analysis. In particular, the data base does not support an exploration of community factors. A preliminary effort revealed there was not enough data collected about each community to allow an informed analysis of community type and appearance of Working Together. This is unfortunate because we are unable to account for differences in implementation which are due to community factors. Such an analysis remains beyond the scope of this paper.

Rothman (1974) explores the field of community organization. He identifies the change-oriented nature of human service professions generally and community organization particularly and notes the affinity for a diffusion of innovation orientation. Using a research retrieval approach, Rothman surveyed selected journals from ten disciplines and professions and identified articles relating to community practice in an effort to establish some trends and generalizations. Of particular interest to this paper is an entire chapter devoted to the diffusion and adoption of innovation.

Rothman identifies 27 generalizations and accompanying action guidelines for practitioners seeking advice on the diffusion and adoption of innovations. He looks at two areas: 1) diffusion of innovation among population groups, and 2) diffusion of innovation in organizations. Categories of generalizations addressing the former include: 1) target system variables, 2) attributes of the innovation, and 3) attributes of the diffusion and adoption process. Generalizations referring to innovation in organizations include 1) professional factors, 2) structural factors, and 3) variables affecting the success of implementations of innovations.

The Working Together data do not permit an examination of all 27 variables identified by Rothman. Some generalizations simply do not apply; others must be omitted because the data are inadequate or insufficient. Still others are omitted because they are not central to this analysis.

Three sets of generalizations are believed to hold special significance for the Working Together project. (1) The nature or attributes of the innovation can affect the diffusion process. (2) Structural factors are important to consider in the study of organizational innovation. (3) The organization can be identified as a

target system, thus target system factors must also be considered.

The analysis will unfold in the following way. First, a review of the community development literature is provided to permit an understanding of the ideological underpinnings of the Working Together project. An identification of the general orientation of the project is also permitted. Factors contributing to the motivation for the project are also considered.

The field observations appear in Chapter 3 and provide the reader with a detailed picture of how Working Together appeared in each site. Regional characteristics, staff characteristics and description of specific programs are presented. Some comparison to the current literature is also provided.

Chapter 4 discusses organization features of Community & Youth Correctional Services such as complexity, formalization and decentralization. Each of these factors has implications for the diffusion of Working Together within the organization. Chapter 5 examines the organization on a region-by-region basis and analyzes differences in rate and extent of diffusion according to regional staffing and management characteristics. A summary of findings is provided in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATURE OF THE INNOVATION

Working Together is described as a "proposal for province-wide community involvement in the youth justice system" with the goal of ensuring "maximum community participation in the planning, delivery and evaluation of services to communities and community members" (Progress Report, Oct. 85 - May 86, p. 6-7). Other key phrases in the Working Together reports claim a community development/community mobilization philosophy and describe the relationship between Community & Youth Correctional Services and the community as a 'partnership.' Community organization, citizen participation and voluntarism are also frequently encountered terms.

Community development is an intrinsic component of this innovation and in many ways, Working Together is equated with a community development orientation. An examination of the community development literature serves to clarify the nature of the innovation. The literature states that the characteristics of an innovation influence adoption or rejection (Rogers, 1983; Rothman, 1974; Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek, 1973). Many new products fail. Some innovations are quickly diffused and adopted while others are diffused over

several years. For example, the introduction, diffusion and adoption of the microcomputer in social service agencies is a fairly recent innovation, but one that is becoming more and more commonplace. As an innovation, the microcomputer is a tangible, concrete object with some obvious and unalterable implementation implications. Regional variation in microcomputer technology and methodology is not permitted if any central information management is to be effective and useful.

In contrast, an innovation like Working Together is a much less precise, intangible notion with only a few clear, concrete and detailed steps for implementation. Ambiguity in the innovation message may have implications for implementation. As a community development project, the exploration of community development theory and practice will contribute to a better understanding of the nature of the innovation and the ideological and philosophical underpinnings of Working Together.

Numerous texts and publications explore the concept of community development and describe actions, techniques and methods used in community social work practice. For example, Ross (1955) describes three divisions of community work - community development,

community organization and community relations. Rothman (1968) discusses three models of community organization practice - locality development, social planning and social action. Taylor and Roberts (1985) look at five models of community social work practice - community development, political action, program development and coordination, planning, and community liaison. All of these publications focus on a descriptive categorization of actions and methods used in the practice of community work. Rothman (1979) acknowledges this approach:

[I]n empirical reality there are different forms of community intervention and...at this stage in the development of practice theory it would be better to capture and describe these rather than to attempt to establish a grand, all-embracing theory or conception. (p. 26)

Tripodi, Fellin and Meyer (1983) explore the relationships among concepts, hypotheses, empirical generalizations, and theory.

Essentially, concepts are verbal symbols of ideas abstracted from experience, while hypotheses are predictive statements of relationships between two or more concepts...Empirical generalizations are hypotheses that have withstood refutation in a number of research studies. Theory consists of an interlocking set of hypotheses that are logically related, and it seeks to explain the interrelations among empirical generalizations. (p. 10)

A review of the community development literature demonstrates that most writers have been primarily concerned with the description and classification of methods, techniques and activities. Hypotheses and

empirical generalizations are not found in the literature. Without these, a solid theory of community organization and community development remains elusive. Kramer (1975) concurs. "Because community development is conceived variously as program, method, movement, approach or process, there is no single, generally recognized or universally suitable theoretical framework" (p. 184).

The absence of a theory of community development has implications for the Working Together project. First, it helps explain the underdefinition and vagueness found in the project proposal. Since community development itself is somewhat ambiguous, a project based on current community development concepts is likely to share this ambiguity. Rothman (1974) states "generally, innovations communicated with a clear and unambiguous message are more likely to be adopted than those subject to unclear and confusing interpretations" (p. 455). The ambiguity of Working Together may have made implementation and adoption more difficult.

Secondly, the range of concepts and approaches to community development described in the literature permits individual interpretations of community development by community facilitators, area directors

and probation staff. Variation in project implementation is invited by the conceptual openness of community development literature.

The funders of the Working Together project could have demanded a more tightly defined proposal associated with a specific model of community development. The office of the Solicitor-General was, however, willing to accept an underdefined and open-ended project. It has been suggested that it was in the interest of the federal level of government to do so as it would facilitate sending funds to Manitoba as much for political reasons as for reasons of detailed and specific research.

A review of the literature permits a discussion of general types of community development and the identification of some essential components. This information can then be compared with the Working Together case study to allow a categorization. The notion of improvement or betterment for the community in question is a universal aspect of community development. In some way, the community must benefit from intervention. Thus, community development takes place in third world countries to improve health, the standard of living, or to improve economic conditions. In Canada, welfare rights groups are established to improve

the conditions of impoverished and disadvantaged people. Social planning councils are concerned with establishing, arranging and improving the delivery of services to people in need.

The source of the impetus for change or improvement is variable. Sometimes, the impetus for change comes from within a community, where citizens have united to define needs and problems and identify potential solutions. Ross (1955) uses the term "inner resources". The inner resources approach emphasizes the need to involve communities in the assessment of community need and suggestions for solutions. "Projects are not predetermined but develop as discussion in communities is encouraged, proceeds, and focuses the real concerns of the people" (Ross, 1955, p. 14). The focus is on community, not external expert, definition of problems and solutions and the development of the capacity of people to work together cooperatively. Ross also uses the term "process objective" where the emphasis is the involvement of people in the community to identify and take action with respect to community problems.

Other authors also discuss the role of community members in the identification of problems and change. Rothman (1968) uses the term locality development. Locality development has a view of community

organization that includes themes of democratic procedures, voluntary cooperation, self-help, development of indigenous leadership and educational objectives. Community people are encouraged to participate in goal determination and action to effect change. The fullest possible participation of community members and reliance on community initiative is valued. Process goals take precedence over task oriented goals. The view "presupposes that community change may be pursued optimally through broad participation of a wide spectrum of people at the local community level in goal determination and action" (p. 21).

Lappin (1985) describes essentially the same concept in his discussion of the community development approach where citizen participation and social involvement are the focus. "This practice approach is seen as an opportunity system for self-help, aided by a professional worker who is sensitive to cultural nuances and skilled in educating" (p. 9). Emphasis is placed on community self-determination and on developing local leadership and structures.

In contrast to the inner resources or process orientation, sometimes the impetus for change does not originate from communities and citizens. Governments may implement policies and solicit programs on behalf of

their citizens to improve living or economic conditions. In this case, community development is externally imposed on those who will benefit and the input of those affected is not necessarily solicited. Ross (1955) discusses programs implanted by external agents. For example, an external agent may be hired to implant a specific technique or program in a community. The technique or program, such as a new school or a new farming method, is seen as beneficial for the community and is expected to improve some aspect of community life. Community members may have no involvement in the definition of problems or possible solutions.

Rothman (1968) discusses a social planning model more common to the North American setting. The social planning model "emphasizes a technical process of problem-solving with regard to substantive social problems, such as delinquency, housing, and mental health. Rational, deliberately planned and controlled change has a central place in this model" (p.22). Professionals have a definite role in this model since their expertise is required to guide the change process. Community participation, on the other hand, may be great or small. Building relationships among community members or developing a strong sense of community are tertiary goals. The model is task-oriented and is most

concerned with establishing, arranging and delivering services to people in need.

Quite similar is the planning approach (Rothman and Zald, 1985) which focuses on a rational, technical and neutral approach to planning future activities and conditions. The technical skills of the planner permit research and analysis of future conditions and develop a logical, rational and beneficial plan to respond to future needs. "Planning is part of a social and political process. It serves ends and purposes apart from its formal or stated goal of gathering information and choosing pathways to goals" (p. 129).

Closely linked to the planning approach is the program development and coordination approach (Kurzman, 1985). Whereas the planning approach is focused on the development of a plan, the program development and coordination approach is concerned with actual implementation of a plan. The focus is on understanding the political processes to allow implementation and in clearing obstacles by arousing political or local support. Examples include task forces, planning committees and advisory boards, community welfare councils, and united funds. "Focusing on the coordination of existing services and the development of support and resources for new service agreements, it is

intended to be a rational and incremental model that underscores study, planning, problem identification, initiation, and evaluation" (p. 95).

Two distinct approaches to citizen participation and community development are revealed in the literature. One approach emphasizes the process of citizen and community participation as a desirable and essential component of community development. In this view, citizens of a community get together and declare their own agendas for improvement and change. The most valuable aspect is the actual interaction and communication between members of a community.

The second approach is more task-oriented. Community participation occurs as a means of obtaining a particular desired end. Here, the process of interaction is less important and community members may not be involved in the identification of problems or need or the ways in which to respond to needs or problems. Achieving a particular goal or accomplishing a particular task is the important objective in this approach.

Examples of both approaches have been described and it is possible to combine elements of both. For example, Rothman (1968) discusses the social action model. The social action model is concerned with

organizing people who are disadvantaged in some way in order to demand a 'fairer deal' in the democratic society. In this case, impetus for change may originate internally or externally and both process and task objectives are considered important. Fundamental changes in organizations or institutions or community practices are essential goals. "Social action seeks redistribution of power, resources or decision making in the community and/or changing basic policies of formal organizations" (p. 22). Conflict techniques such as marches, demonstrations, protests and freedom rides are frequently used. System change, to overcome unequal power and privilege hierarchies, is a critical component.

Thus far, the discussion of community development has tended to describe the work of agencies or programs whose primary function is the practice of community social work. In organizations where community organization is the primary function (organizations established for the express purpose of carrying on community organization, like overseas community development projects or welfare planning councils), direct service to clients is not usually involved. Organizations that do provide direct service to clients usually see community organization as a secondary

function. The literature examines how community social work practice differs in direct service agencies.

Sieder (1962) discusses community organization in the direct service agency. In her view, community work takes place alongside client work and administrative work. She outlines three functions of community work:

1. inter-organizational relations, including referrals, inter-organizational exchange and joint agency action on behalf on its clients;
2. mobilization of community supports for the agency, its programs, financing, and ideology; and
3. change of community resources, including initiation, revision, elimination or combination of services needed on behalf of agency's clients. (p. 91)

Sieder believes that community work of this type leads to a better quality of service for clients. She advises agencies to participate consciously in a community organization process which includes definition of the problem, assessment of the facts concerning the problem, development and implementation of a plan of action, and evaluation.

Taylor (1985) also discusses the practice of community organization in direct service agencies in his description of the community liaison model. In direct service agencies, community work often becomes a secondary, rather than a primary function, practiced by administrators in their community relations role (Ross, 1955) and by clinicians in their client advocacy role.

The community liaison model places community practice within the generalist orientation of social work practice, and also within the ecological orientation which integrates environmental and intrapersonal levels (Taylor, 1985). Board members and senior administrators often work with the functional community - the "network of sponsors, funding sources, agencies, constituencies, and clients" (p. 203). Taylor sees activities by these actors to include forging alliances, soliciting financial support, lobbying, and negotiating service arrangements.

Clinical practitioners are also involved in community work, usually on behalf of a particular client or client group. If, for example, a particular problem, like unsafe or inadequate housing, is affecting a client, the practitioner may intervene and attempt to change existing by-laws or enforce housing standards. Or, a practitioner may wish to introduce a human sexuality course in the local high school to educate teenagers about unplanned pregnancy and birth control. Unfortunately, a lack of time or agency commitment of resources can limit this broader approach to practice.

Sometimes, agencies respond to this dilemma through the introduction of a special community project. Such projects usually obtain special funding or grants to

operate as a distinct, yet related, entity within the organization. The staffing of these projects may include supervisors, senior professionals or community practitioners and other agency "line staff may be unaware of, or uninvolved in, the program's efforts to mobilize community support and change the policies and procedures of local institutions" (p. 205).

The special community project, by its nature, auspices, and staffing patterns, allows agencies to pursue their traditional goals and activities and at the same time be responsive to government or community priorities. Such relationships with citizens and agencies are not characterized by full receptivity and responsiveness to community concerns or interests in self-determination but are designed to perform tasks or achieve goals that agency administrators, funders and sponsors have already negotiated. (p. 206)

Working Together is a good example of a special community project. Special funding permitted the introduction of the project as a discrete entity within the organization. Most line staff were uninvolved with the project's development and initiation, although some were recruited at a later point as project staff members. Working Together promoted a community orientation, which was responsive to the YOA, but allowed traditional probation work and orientation to continue.

The manner in which special community projects, like Working Together, are introduced in organizations

has been discussed in the literature. In this case study, the process of introduction and implementation is examined from a diffusion of innovation framework. The diffusion of innovation is described as a process, with identifiable stages and sub-stages (Rogers, 1962, 1971, 1983; Schon, 1971; Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek, 1973). The two major stages are initiation and implementation. A brief description of each stage is presented, followed by an elaboration of the initiation stage in the Working Together example.

In the initiation stage, the organization recognizes that there is some discrepancy between what it is doing and what it believes it should be doing. The recognition of a performance gap is essential in explaining what causes organizations to change or innovate (Downs, 1967; Rogers, 1983). In the agenda-setting sub-stage "general organizational problems which may create a perceived need for an innovation are defined [and] the environment is searched for innovations of potential value to the organization" (Rogers, 1983, p. 363). In the matching phase, "a problem from the organization's agenda is considered together with an innovation and the fit between them is planned and designed" (Rogers, 1983, p. 363). The end of the first stage is marked by the decision to adopt.

The second stage of the diffusion process is implementation. It includes all of the events, actions and decisions involved in putting an innovation to use.

Three sub-stages are identified:

Redefining/restructuring: The innovation is modified and re-invented to fit the situation of the particular organization and its perceived problem, and organizational structures directly relevant to the innovation are altered to accommodate the innovation.

Clarifying: The relationship between the innovation and the organizations is defined more clearly as the innovation is put into full and regular use.

Routinizing: The innovation eventually loses its separate identity and becomes an element in the organization's ongoing activities. (Rogers, 1983, p. 363)

The diffusion of innovation has been described as a process composed of two major stages. A brief description of the initiation stage explains what caused the organization to adopt this special community project. Detail about the implementation stage is provided in the next chapter.

MOTIVATION FOR INNOVATION

Neither innovations nor organizations can be considered without reference to their context. There is a larger social milieu within which the organization exists. The prevailing ideologies and values of the external environment influence organizational activities

and behaviour. Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek (1973) describe two levels of the social milieu. The larger level is society in general, in which governmental activity, technology and the economy, indirectly and directly influence organizations. The second level include the general industry of which the organization is a part, in this case the field of social work. Changes in either of these levels have an impact on the organization which may provide impetus for change.

As previously discussed, the introduction of the Young Offenders Act provided incentive for organizational change. The availability of new federal dollars to assist in the transition from the Juvenile Delinquents Act to the Young Offenders Act provided needed resources for the project. Without resources, Working Together could not have been introduced.

Other realities within the social and political system are important to identify. Concerns about accountability, cost-effectiveness and fiscal restraint have been well documented in the 1980's. Public organizations are under increasing pressure to be fully accountable for financial and non-financial aspects of service delivery. Organizations are faced with more stringently limited or decreasing resources with which to provide service and seek alternative, more economical

methods of delivery. In Community & Youth Correctional Services, the organization is also faced with the need to re-examine its methods of providing service and adjust those methods to respond to fiscal realities.

At the same time, Canada has witnessed an ideological swing to the right. Under a neo-conservative ideology, notions of privatization, voluntarism and participatory democracy are very popular. Some believe that the involvement of the private sector will lead to the debureaucratization and humanization of social service delivery, while at the same time reducing citizen dependence on government. Support for this model comes from the Macdonald Commission which advocates a quasi-public system "whereby the voluntary sector would assume major responsibility for the provision of services within a regulatory and funding framework established by the government (Hurl and Tucker, 1986, p. 606).

The introduction of volunteers and community members in government agencies can also be seen as encouraging participatory democracy. Whether volunteers participate directly in service delivery or indirectly through board membership, there is the firm belief that community involvement in service delivery will lead to more appropriate and higher quality service. In the

Working Together project, program staff and citizens share this conviction. At the administration level, there is a fervent hope that community development and citizen participation will save money. Philosophically and pragmatically, community development approaches are attractive.

Changes in the second level of the social milieu also influence organizational behaviour. Downs (1967) suggests that professional personnel are influenced by ideas generated within their profession. Themes of empowerment, networking and community are currently fashionable in the social work profession (Greenspan, 1984; Whittaker and Garbarino, 1983; Fellin, 1987). The Working Together project has high appeal since components of the project are consistent with current social work trends.

In Manitoba, recent changes in the parallel field of child welfare have seen a move towards decentralized, community-based services, responsive to community needs through some control by community boards. Services to Native people in Manitoba have also undergone change in recent years, with an increased emphasis on Native control and delivery of services. The "community" climate in neighbouring organizations contributes to the timeliness of the Working Together proposal.

A community approach also makes sense in light of the population distribution of Manitoba. The province of Manitoba has a population of approximately 1,000,000 people. Somewhat more than one half of the population lives in the only metropolis, Winnipeg. The non-Winnipeg population lives either in five cities between 10,000 and 30,000 or in numerous scattered settlements of much smaller size. In a province that is very much a collection of communities, the Working Together project has high 'common sense' appeal.

Furthermore, there are some internal organizational factors to consider. A change of government in 1981, a new Deputy Minister for the Department in 1984 and a new executive director of the department may have contributed to a willingness to try something new. It has also been suggested by some organizational members that these new actors may have been less aware of entrenched corrections ideology and procedures and thus endorsed a project which was thrust upon them by certain elements within the service. In any event, the new administration adopted the project, which would provide needed resources in the form of staff years and would also have some appeal to communities and citizens. The departmental reorganization in 1985 shows a commitment by senior management to move towards a community based

orientation. The organization was nicely poised, both internally and in the larger external environment, for an innovation like Working Together.

Earlier discussion has considered factors which contributed to the perception of a performance gap. In innovation language, the Young Offenders Act, fiscal restraint paired with neo-conservative ideology, professional trends, and developments in child welfare and Indian self-government represented changes in the social milieu which combined to create "a perceived need for an innovation". According to diffusion of innovation theory, organizations do not necessarily invent new ways of delivering service; rather they "continuously scan for innovations and match any promising innovation found with some relevant problem" (Rogers, 1983, p. 363). In this case, the organizational scan included its own system, which led to the elaboration of some components of the organization. The elaboration and enhanced development of Youth Justice Committees, for example, was based on a pre-existing base of 19 such committees (Bracken and Loewen, 1983).

In the matching phase, the justice committee concept was expanded and redesigned into the Working Together project. Youth justice committees would form

one component of a larger, community development oriented project, geared towards addressing the performance gap. An early version of the Working Together proposal was prepared in August 1984 after a series of meetings and discussions. A review of the proposal was also prepared (Kueneman, Linden, Bracken, Kosmick, 1984) in August 1984, but recommendations were largely ignored.

The Working Together proposal also submitted a model for diffusion. Two models of diffusion of innovation have been discussed (Rogers, 1962; Schon, 1971). Each model envisages a different type of relationship between the centre and the periphery. In the centre-periphery model, "the diffusion process consists of (1) a new idea, (2) individual A who knows about the innovation, and (3) individual B who does not know about the innovation..." (Rogers, 1962, p. 13-14). The second model Schon titles 'the proliferation of centres'. "This system retains the basic centre-periphery structure, but differentiates primary from secondary centres. Secondary centres engage in the diffusion of innovations; primary centres support and manage secondary centres" (p. 84-85).

The Working Together project chose this second model of diffusion. The project director was located in

the central office and provided program focus and leadership. A staff of Working Together personnel were recruited, hired and trained in ideology and content of the Working Together project. These staff were then assigned to the various regional offices where they were expected to introduce, explain, implement, and eventually routinize the Working Together Project.

A financial commitment from the federal government was obtained in May 1985 marking the decision to adopt. In July, the program manager was seconded from other duties; the final proposal was completed in September and project staff (community facilitators) were hired in October. Formal implementation is considered to be October 1985.

Working Together has been described as a special community project introduced in a direct service agency in response to organizational concerns. The project is portrayed as a community development project, encouraging a partnership between community members and the organization. Earlier in this chapter, two distinct approaches to community development were described - a process orientation and a task orientation.

Ross (1955) evaluates the divisions and approaches found in the practice of community organization. He

values approaches which include self-determination or the active involvement of citizens, working at the community pace, allowing the community to develop the plans, encouraging growth in community capacity, and paying attention to the community will to change. Ross identifies and defines one conception of community organization which reflects these values.

Community organization is a process by which a community identifies its needs and objectives, orders (or ranks) these needs or objectives, develops the confidence and will to work at these needs or objectives, takes action in respect to them, and in so doing extends and develops cooperative and collaborative attitudes and practices in the community. (p. 39)

The two aspects of community organization include planning a task and community integration. Ross is critical of community organization which focuses solely on the planning or task component. In his view, both aspects are essential to community organization and the integration function may be the most important.

Ross (1955) is critical of a task-oriented focus to community organization. This view is shared by Bregha (1971) who is critical of approaches which focus on service-oriented goals because they ignore the fundamental purpose of community development. The encouragement of citizen participation for service oriented goals is "perhaps the least important aspect of community development" (p. 79). Citizen participation

and community development should do more than provide services and utilities - finding solutions to the underlying problems which create the need for service are important. Bregha describes community development as "a method of intervention to transform the causes and conditions shaping the quality of life in a society so that as few people as possible would depend on any kind of service" (p.79). He distinguishes between "development-as-increase in resources or productivity (as it primarily is in the emerging nations... and development-as-reallocation of power and assets" (p. 75). In Bregha's view, real citizen participation and control of assets and power is compromised when the parameters of participation are established and maintained by government bodies.

Burke (1975) discusses the dilemma of citizen participation - "the demand both for participatory democracy and expertise in decision making" (p. 196). These two values can not both be maximized at the same time and the primacy of one requires the subservience of the other. Burke suggests that citizen participation is often advocated as a means of attaining specific ends, rather than as a value premise. Citizen participation thus becomes a strategy for attaining certain objectives. He goes on to identify five strategies -

education-therapy, behavioural change, staff supplement, cooptation, and community power.

In the Working Together project, citizen participation emerges as a means of attaining specific ends. The staff supplement strategy is defined as "the recruitment of citizens to carry out tasks for an organization which does not have the staff resources to carry them out itself" (Burke, 1971, p. 201). Rubin and Rubin (1986) use the term coproduction. Coproduction occurs when "community organizations undertake activities with government which in the past were carried out only by government agencies" (p. 10).

In the Working Together project, coproduction activities are emphasized and given higher status and prestige. Increasing the number of youth justice committees from 21 to over 40 is seen by the organization as extremely valuable and a measure of success. Increasing the number of volunteers to supervise young offenders or mediate between victims and offenders is also a highly valued achievement. We see fewer examples of community participation being valued as an end in itself. Community development, in the Working Together project, is operationalized as task oriented to help the organization meet the demands of service in a period of fiscal restraint.

A partnership between the community and the organization would include a relationship of mutual accountability. In the Working Together project, local citizen volunteers are accountable to the organization for the duties and functions they perform. Volunteers are supervised by a local staff member. Youth justice committees have a staff member that attends their meetings. There appears to be a lack of any clear line of accountability from the organization to the community.

In the initial proposal, Regional Advisory Committees were to be established, composed of members from the organization, the police, Native Tribal Councils and Metis organizations, the judiciary, youth justice committees, education, church groups, and selected service organizations. The committees would

review the progress in community involvement in their various areas or regions of the province, to examine needs, and to propose appropriate program ideas or solutions...These committees also would provide written recommendations for program direction and maintenance. (Working Together: A proposal for province wide community involvement in the youth justice system, September 1985, p. 20)

These regional committees did not develop, perhaps indicating low organizational interest or concern in creating a line of accountability to community members, which would be indicative of an interest in the process component of community development.

One other observation supports the notion that Community & Youth Correctional Services was primarily interested in a task orientation. In a project that stressed community input and community control and which valued the process component of community development over task, it could be expected that the needs, resources and characteristics of individual communities and citizens would influence the appearance of Working Together. In other words, there would be evidence of a local conceptualization of the project instead of the regional operationalization observed.

Although many authors are critical of a task emphasis, at least one author sees this in a positive way. Sundeen (1985) explores the concept of coproduction and its relation to the concept of community and the community context. He suggests that "coproduction shares several important attributes with community and in many respects may be said to be derived conceptually from the idea of community" (p. 388). Coproduction includes notions of mutual trust, problem solving, and shared responsibility which are common to the notion of community. The forces of urbanization, industrialization and bureaucratization have eroded the sense of community. Organizations and institutions take over functions and roles previously performed by

families, neighbours and friends. Sundeen sees coproduction as a method to strengthen community ties and relationships by allowing citizens to take over the functions of organizations. "Thus, one of the potential consequences of coproduction is the rediscovery of the community" (p. 389).

Interviews with committee members provide some support for this notion. Each committee member felt positive about his or her role in helping the young offenders in their communities. There is a sense of a return to earlier, less complicated times when citizens, not governments, solved community problems. Committee members see themselves as a more appropriate response to minor offences than the court system which might give a complete discharge. They believe they hold children more accountable for their actions in a manner that resembles a firm, but loving parent. The needs of victims are frequently taken into consideration and apologies to victims are present in a majority of dispositions. A reintegrative function is served by forcing youth offenders to face up to their victims and apologize.

In summary, the Working Together project can be classified as special community project emphasizing a coproduction relationship between citizens and the

organization. In most cases, the organization defines how volunteers will be used and what form of community involvement will occur. The parameters of the coproduction relationship are established by the organization. Within the coproduction model, organizational members were free to choose from a wide range of techniques and activities to introduce into communities.

Although community factors were not observed, it appears that except in communities with long-standing committees, individual citizens and community members had less input into how Working Together might be operationalized within their community. Thus, Working Together emerges primarily more as an organization-based implementation strategy than as a project primarily concerned with a community-based process orientation. The partnership relationship visualized in the project proposal is replaced by a coproduction relationship. In the Working Together project, a community development approach provides a rhetoric of justification for reassigning responsibility for tasks.

One observation about the Working Together proposal has been the characteristic of underdefinition, justified by the lack of theory in the community development field and accepted by the founders and

fundes of the original proposal. The underdefined nature of Working Together at the initiation stage permits individual interpretation by organizational members. This is the first factor leading to high variability in the implementation stage. A more clearly defined proposal may have contributed to a more uniform implementation.

CHAPTER 3

FIELD OBSERVATIONS

Working Together was introduced as an innovative project designed to encourage and facilitate the involvement of citizens in working with Community & Youth Correctional Services in the delivery of services to young offenders. The project espoused a community development philosophy to attain this mandate. What was perhaps unforeseen, or of little concern, was that the underdefinition of the project and non-specific goals and objectives would spawn a variety of organizational responses to the project. In Chapter 2, Working Together was described as following a coproduction model. Evidence for this classification is found in the field observations.

The field observations provide a picture of how Working Together appeared in each community visited, as well as the regional approach to the project. Observations are based on field visits and interviews and supplemented by data supplied from annual and progress reports. Observations were made between October 1986 and April 1987 and thus represent the status of Working Together during this period. Changes since the observation period have occurred.

Interviews with project and probations personnel, community members and members of the judiciary and police followed a general outline, asking fairly standardized questions in key areas. Detailed field notes were written, highlighting similarities and differences in attitudes, beliefs, activities, and outcomes. Eight community dossiers were the result.

For the purpose of the secondary analysis, community dossiers were thoroughly reviewed to compare project activities, roles of community facilitators, attitudes of area directors, and probation staff attitudes. In the presentation of the field observations, similarities and differences in project appearance will be highlighted. As the data permit, a general format of these descriptions will be followed. A description of the regional office and its staff will be provided. Included will be the status, tenure and self-declared orientation of the area director, community facilitator and other staff. Working Together activities will be described. The presentation of the field observations will permit some general comments and conclusions about the implementation and dissemination of the Working Together project.

Central Region - Morden/Winkler

The central region of Manitoba Community & Youth Correctional Services includes the geographic areas of the Central Plains and the Pembina Valley. The regional head office of the central region is located in Portage la Prairie. A regional sub-office is located in Morden and is staffed by two probation officers who serve the Pembina Valley, including the communities of Morden and Winkler. The Morden sub-office is supervised through visits from the area director who is located in Portage la Prairie office. A two day field visit was made to Morden-Winkler, followed up by a subsequent day trip a few weeks later.

One of the Morden staff members is designated as the community facilitator for the central region. His half-time facilitator position is combined with a half-time probation officer position. He has been employed by the organization for over twelve years and describes himself as 'army volunteered' for the Working Together position.

Most of the Working Together initiatives are concentrated in the geographic area served by the community facilitator. Thus, although the Portage la Prairie office lists some Working Together objectives (a Crime Prevention Committee, a Youth in Control program)

the focus of Working Together is outside the regional head office. Working Together activities are concentrated in the Pembina Valley.

The primary focus of Working Together in this area is the ongoing support and nurturance of four youth justice committees, only one of which was formed post-Working Together. All four committees are located in the area served by the Morden sub-office. These youth justice committees are primarily involved in the administration and handling of alternative measures cases. The community facilitator was involved in the development of all these committees, responding to interest from community members in tightly knit, cohesive communities. Now, the community facilitator acts as a support to these committees. He provides the referrals, gives details about specific cases, provides training, and encourages the work of committees. On some occasions he acts as the recording secretary for committees.

The facilitator also reports fulfilling a public education function in the schools and other organizations. Inter-agency work, as well as input to other groups, organizations and committees are also listed. Volunteers are used to serve on youth justice committees and also to assist with court report

preparation. The facilitator is also involved in the Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP) as a trainer to other provincial staff and volunteers.

Although Working Together initiatives and accomplishments are described by the facilitator, there is the sense that his practice has not changed radically since the introduction of the program. His orientation to probation work prior to Working Together already included an interest in and commitment to the community and volunteers. His previous work with an older youth justice committee is one example. His involvement on other community committees (Parents Without Partners, Big Brothers, Youth Drop-In Centre) is another. His residency in the community may also be a contributing factor. The facilitator has a community orientation that allows him to continue his job without major changes. Also, Morden and Winkler are both tightly knit, cohesive, Mennonite communities concerned about the welfare of their youth. This may contribute to a sense of responsibility for helping youth and a high responsiveness to organizational opportunities in dealing with young offenders.

The Morden-Winkler Youth Justice Committee, which was established prior to the formal implementation of Working Together, serves young offenders in both

communities. This committee was initially started by community interest and supported by the probation office. This all-male committee has been in operation since 1985 and has recently suffered from high member turnover. This committee meets in the community of Winkler early in the morning. The probation officer/facilitator brings cases before the committee and reads the pertinent details from the police file. One or two committee members then assume responsibility for the case and meet with the youth, parents and often, the victim. A disposition is determined and is monitored by the assigned member. Any problems are reported back to the whole committee as is the outcome of the case. Dispositions include apologies, community service work, and restitution.

The half-time status of the community facilitator creates certain problems. First, the facilitator identifies a time conflict between performing Working Together activities and legally mandated probation activities. He reports a continual struggle to balance the demands of the two positions. If there was a conflict between a court function and a community development function, the court function would be accorded a higher priority because of its mandated

nature. A Working Together initiative would take second place.

Secondly, when working with committees the role of the corrections employee is a mixed one. As the probation officer, he supplies cases, reveals details and occasionally acts as the committee secretary. He also maintains administrative responsibility for the file and makes notations and sends letters regarding a case. He may screen some alternative measures cases away from the committee and handle them himself. Perhaps 5% of all cases fall in this category and include the occasional complex case (eg. involving an offence in the United States) or cases that have been delayed for some time.

As the community facilitator, he has a different role. He is expected to support and nurture the committee and encourage a sense of autonomy and independence. He expresses the wish that the committee would become more independent of him but recognizes that committee autonomy may result in other problems. The youth justice committee was established to provide a service to the organization, that is to handle alternative measures cases. The chairperson of the committee recognizes this fact when he identifies the primary function of the committee is to reduce the

workload of the probation officer. If committee autonomy led to a redefinition of function, the community facilitator would be supportive and helpful, but the probation officer would have to assume responsibility for alternative measures. The dual position results in the potential for role conflict.

In the Central Region, Working Together becomes more strongly identified with the Morden sub-office because this is where the community facilitator is located. Distance from the regional head office insulates this sub-office somewhat from the influence of the area director on the appearance of Working Together. A somewhat 'hands-off' approach by the area director results in greater domination and definition by the local facilitator. Community participation takes the form of youth justice committees, which are nurtured by the facilitator. That three of four committees existed prior to Working Together, provides evidence that the practice orientation of this facilitator did not undergo radical change. Rather, Working Together provided organizational sanction for activities that were already taking place in the Morden sub-office.

Westman Region - Virden

The Westman Region central office is located in Brandon, Manitoba. Here, as in Central Region, the Working Together community facilitator is a half-time position. However, the other half of the job is not regular probation work but volunteer coordination, alternative measures and victim offender mediation. It should be noted that these duties are difficult to distinguish from Working Together duties and the position sometimes appears to be full-time Working Together. Furthermore, since the facilitator does not have regular probation duties, she does not experience the same conflict between court mandated work and community work. All of her duties have a community orientation and she is not redirected from this orientation by other demands. The facilitator is based in Brandon, although she does travel to other parts of the region. The community facilitator was recruited from within the organization - she had been previously employed by the office to introduce a victim-offender program and had also been involved with volunteers in other functions. Other probation staff include an acting area director and several probation officers. Two probation officers are located in sub-offices, while the rest reside in Brandon and travel to the communities

they serve. A three day field visit provided information about the region and the community of Virden.

Working Together activities in this region have a public education emphasis. The facilitator and other staff make presentations to schools and community organizations. An expanded volunteer network, and the training and support of these valued volunteers is another prominent Working Together initiative in this region. Four active youth justice committees exist which handle many of the alternative measures cases. The ongoing support of a Theft Offender Program, which deals with shoplifters and their parents in a group format, is cited as a Working Together goal.

Members of the Westman office describe themselves as having a community orientation and commitment prior to the initiation of Working Together. The establishment of five youth justice committees (one of which is inactive), the existence of a Theft Offender Program, the Victim Offender Reconciliation Program, and the use of volunteers are cited as examples of community-based programs which pre-date the Working Together program. The predecessor to the current area director is seen as having encouraged and nurtured this community emphasis. His enthusiastic support of

community ventures challenged staff to include community members in the corrections service. The introduction of Working Together formally allocated staff time to develop these practices further.

The current area director has a slightly different orientation as revealed by the following quote from the 1985 annual reports. "Despite the current Provincial emphasis on community-based programs, our unit also believes strongly that we must maintain our reputation for consistent provision of high quality service in our traditional mandated areas" (p. 16). The Working Together mandate appears as subservient to, rather than complementary with, the legal mandate. Here, the area director is described as permissive of community involvement, but does not challenge staff to practice in this way. He is not philosophically opposed to the notion of community development, but stresses the importance of assigning limited staff and limited resources to the 'meat and potatoes' of probation work. The change in leadership results in a lower priority being assigned to the community component.

The actual shape of Working Together is susceptible to the influence of key actors. In the Westman Region, the community facilitator has been involved in the victim offender reconciliation program since 1980. Her

interest in this form of community involvement remains high and is transferred to volunteers. Thus, youth justice committees in this region show a preference for victim-offender mediation as a method for dealing with young offenders. Volunteers are recruited to mediate between victims and offenders where committees do not exist.

Other probation staff in this region also influence the appearance, or more precisely the location of Working Together activities. Since the half-time facilitator does not carry probation responsibilities in the region, she must rely to a certain extent on her co-workers to introduce the concept. In areas where the facilitator and the probation officer are in agreement about the value and goals of Working Together, they may travel together and introduce programs. In areas where there is minimal interest and attachment to the community development notion by the probation officer, the facilitator is limited in her community developer role. For example, it is difficult, and possibly fruitless, to build a youth justice committee in an area where the probation officer will not participate and support such an initiative. In the Westman region, these staffing characteristics resulted in the concentration of Working Together activities south of.

the #1 highway. In this area, the views and approaches to community development between the facilitator and the probation officer were complementary. In other areas, lack of this level of agreement resulted in minimal activity.

In Virden the facilitator and the probation officer do share a similar view of the role of the community. A youth justice committee has been in existence since summer or fall of 1984. The committee was initiated by community interest. The preferred method of handling alternative measures is for a group of three from the committee to form a sub-group. This sub-group meets with the young offender and the standard approach is victim offender mediation. Victim-offender mediation is a process which brings the two parties together to discuss the offence and its effects on the victim. The youth justice committee members act as mediators to help the parties arrive at mutually satisfactory resolution. The influence of the facilitator, who has a history of involvement with victim offender mediation since 1980, is apparent. Dispositions include apologies, community service work, essays and restitution.

The Virden Committee is faced with a low caseload of young offenders, prompting it to examine other ways of serving the community. One suggestion has been to

take on more of a public education function and present information to local schools. The committee is also experiencing turnover in membership (due to the transfer of members) and is seen by probation staff as somewhat disorganized. For example, statistics regarding young offenders could not be located. Both the local probation officer and the facilitator believe ongoing support and nurturance is required for this committee before it is able to attain a sense of autonomy and independence.

Other activities in Virden have included public education in the schools. A series of lectures has been designed to familiarize grade 9 students with the Young Offenders Act and alternative measures. The students become familiar with a particular case and act as a student youth justice committee. An anti-vandalism workshop was also recently presented. In both cases, presentations were made by the facilitator and the probation officer. The Virden Youth Justice Committee has expressed some interest in taking on these sessions in response to its low caseload. The high degree of competence of the probation staff members may, however, unconsciously undermine the confidence of the committee and delay the transfer of these activities.

In the Westman Region, Working Together is a continuation of initiatives and objectives which predated the project. Much of the credit for the strong community orientation is attributed to a former area director. Under a new leadership, this enthusiasm has been slightly dampened, but a community approach continues to unfold. The community facilitator influences the appearance of the project, in that victim-offender mediation is given a higher status as the preferred mode of intervention with young offenders. Although other regions use victim-offender reconciliation as a technique, it's presence is most prominent in the Westman Region. Finally, Working Together initiatives are limited to those areas of the region where the community facilitator and the local probation officer agree on the value of such an approach.

Parklands Region - Dauphin

The head office of the Dauphin Region is located in the city of Dauphin. As in the Central Region, the Working Together position is half-time, shared with a half-time probation officer position. The facilitator is based in the Dauphin office and travels to other communities in her probation officer capacity. A three

day field visit provided data on the Working Together project in the region, in Dauphin and also in the communities that the the facilitator visits in her probation officer function.

In the view of the facilitator Working Together represented a "title put to something already there." The existence of the Dauphin Restitution Committee, established in 1975 as one of the earliest committees, supports this notion. A second committee in Swan River, a Crime Prevention Committee in Dauphin and the use of volunteers are other examples.

The facilitator, who was new to the organization, reports easy entry to her position and ready acceptance by other staff. Each probation officer in this office sees herself as performing Working Together activities and having a community orientation. As an approach, Working Together is well accepted in the office and becomes part of everyone's work. There is the sense that the Dauphin office continues to practice in essentially the same way as pre-Working Together; now there is organizational sanction for their methods. Like the facilitator in the Central Region the conflict over time and priorities is expressed in this region. Again, court mandated duties would take precedence over

Working Together duties. The facilitator believes there is enough work for a full-time facilitator position.

The acting area director, a former probation officer and liaison for the Dauphin Restitution Committee, has a positive community orientation that stresses community strength and control. In Dauphin, for example, virtually all alternative measures cases are referred to the committee; minimal screening is done by the probation office. The area director believes that it is the committee which should exercise discretion about which cases to accept. On the rare occasion, the area director may deem a particular offender as not benefitting from the committee process and handle the alternative measure internally.

Working Together initiatives in this region include public education in the schools, victim offender reconciliation training for staff, committee members and volunteers, and ongoing support of existing initiatives. Volunteers are used to provide intensive supervision, handle alternative measures, supervise community service work, and other service-related functions. The potential development of up to four new committees is an important initiative. There is interest in developing the victim offender mediation program to a greater extent, so that more probation officers, volunteers,

committee members, and even the court use this method. Special programming in the region includes STOP (students triumph over problems) in Swan River and Youth in Control (alcohol and drugs) in Ebb and Flow.

The Dauphin Restitution Committee itself is a very stable, open and experienced group of community members, recruited from a variety of occupations and positions in the community. It has been in operation since 1975. Originally, it operated as a court committee under the JDA and provided the court with ideas and advice about dispositions. The current acting area director then became involved with the committee and felt its full potentiality was not being tapped. She felt that the committee could be more helpful to the probation officers and more independent if it started implementing the dispositions itself. At the worker's initiative, training was provided and the committee began to take on more responsibility.

Now, the committee is characterized by an air of confidence and has clearly defined methods and rules for operating. The committee generally meets every two weeks or as required. Young offenders and sometimes their parents appear before the committee and give details of the offence and circumstances. In camera, the committee discusses the case and determines a

disposition in a free exchange of ideas and opinions. The young offender then returns to the group and accepts the disposition by signing a contract. Non-compliance is rarely a problem. Dispositions include the standard range of essays, apologies, community service work, and restitution.

The acting area director raises an interesting point with respect to the parameters of committee activity. She believes it is possible for the committee to take on more activities such as school and public presentations, which may be better received in the community if presented by other community members. She is unsure, however, of how far to 'push' or challenge the committee to expand its functions. To her, community development includes the notion of letting the members decide their future directions.

In Dauphin and the Parklands Region, the Working Together project is not as closely identified with only the community facilitator in contrast to Central or Westman. Each staff member interviewed practices with a view to community involvement and participation, which seems to them to be a natural and beneficial approach. The basic objectives and goals of Working Together were already present in the region and thus blur the boundaries around Working Together. To a great extent,

Working Together provides organizational sanction for a pre-existing regional orientation.

The Interlake Region - Peguis Indian Reserve

The head office of the Interlake region is located in Selkirk, a community close to the southern border of the region. A half-time community facilitator/half-time probation officer is located in the Selkirk office. Thus, like the Parklands and Central worker, he has probation duties for some geographic area and Working Together activities tend to be emphasized in that same area. A one day field visit was made to the Selkirk office, followed by two two-day visits to the community of Peguis.

The facilitator was recruited from within the regional office but was reluctant to accept the new duties. As a previous employee, he knew the daily operating procedures of the organization and had been exposed to a more traditional probation approach. In this particular region, this may have contributed to a somewhat slower introduction of Working Together activities.

The slower introduction can also be attributed to some political factors. When Working Together was officially launched and announced through a press

release, some reserves in the region objected to the fact that their opinion and advice had not been solicited for the proposal. Peguis, in particular, is a highly politicized reserve community and originally vowed to remain uninvolved in the project because it had not been consulted in advance. The passage of time tempered this view, but also delayed the introduction of Working Together. The "Working Together" title was somewhat underemphasized in this area to avoid potential conflict.

Finally, some problems around staffing (the resignation of the originally designated community facilitator and the training of a new probation officer in Peguis) also contributed to an apparent delay in implementation.

The area director claims a predisposition to the notions and practices of Working Together. Community based programs for probationers exist in the form of two youth justice committees in Selkirk and Gimli, a chemical abuse education program (CAEP), and the use of volunteers. The Selkirk committee, however, was initiated and operated somewhat independently of the probation office in close collaboration with a local judge. The probation office was not closely involved in setting up this committee.

Prior to Working Together, these activities were viewed as additional to the mandatory responsibilities. In the view of the area director, Working Together provides a clearer mandate for community activities and allocates specific resources for this function. The area director reports that the YOA provided an important initiative to resume and expand community based programming. He views Working Together as an outside force introduced into probation with a mandate separate from the traditional probation officer. He is however critical of the implementation of the project and believes the project was 'sprung' on the organization and communities without adequate preparation. He sees this as a greater problem for some regions than others, especially those who were more oriented to the traditional, casework approach of the probation service.

After a slow beginning, a flurry of activity in the fall and winter of 1986 has led to the initiation of an additional five committees. The area director, together with the community facilitator, has taken an active role in starting this process. Community meetings, where information is shared and written material distributed, are a common beginning method. From here, interested communities are contacted by the facilitator who assists them in the process of becoming a youth justice

committee. There is some reliance on written instructions, which outline steps and stages in the formation process. The facilitator has a busy role in meeting with all these fledgling committees, planning agendas, sharing information and travelling.

Other probation staff are only somewhat involved in Working Together activities. Community participation agreements have been used in other parts of the province to devolve service to Native communities. There has been interest in beginning a shoplifter's program as well as expanding some of the special programming. The ongoing recruitment and use of volunteers to extend a higher level of service to more clients is a Working Together objective. In the Interlake, this involvement seems to occur at the initiative of the individual probation officer rather than from directive regional leadership or from a unit-wide approach to community involvement.

In Peguis, a resident of the community has been recently employed by the Selkirk office as a probation officer. She is responsible for all probation duties on the reserve as well as in several neighbouring communities. Formerly, her area was covered by the current Working Together facilitator. Like the Westman Region, the community facilitator works with the

probation officer in the areas of Working Together, whereby he supports her efforts and assists with meetings and informational sessions. However, she maintains primary responsibility for Working Together activities in her areas. Community members and Band councils may be more receptive to initiatives proposed by a resident Native probation officer, as opposed to a travelling, non-Native staff person. In another Interlake community, the facilitator is entirely responsible for committee formation and development and the local probation officer is uninvolved.

The Peguis Youth Justice Committee was in an early stage of development during the field visit and was just beginning to establish the parameters of its activities. Members of the steering committee were recruited from a variety of resource agencies including the child welfare agency, the drug and alcohol program, and the treatment centre. It is unclear whether members attend meetings as private citizens interested in the welfare of young offenders or as part of their professional role in their official positions. The resident probation officer believes that using this group of individuals may be the only way to get a committee started. She left open the possibility of membership changing after the committee was established. It is too early to identify how the

committee will operate, but interviews reveal the hope that the committee could respond to community problems of alcohol and drug abuse. There is also the hope that this response will be more meaningful and helpful to community members than the existing court system.

After a slow start, the Interlake Region has focused on the development of additional youth justice committees where community interest exists. These activities are concentrated in the area served by the facilitator and Working Together appears less integrated into the unit. In the eyes of some probation staff, Working Together is the sole responsibility of the facilitator and the project maintains a distinctly separate status.

Thompson Region - Thompson City and Norway House

The Thompson Region of Community & Youth Correctional Services has its regional office in the city of Thompson. In many ways, Thompson represents the urban centre of the north - a variety of economic, social, educational, and health services are located here which provide service to the large surrounding geographic area. The Thompson Region received two staff years for Working Together initiatives which were distributed among three staff members. One of these is

held by the now acting area director. A five day field visit was made to the Thompson area. Three days were spent in Thompson City and two days were spent in the community of Norway House.

The Thompson Region provides a unique conceptualization of the Working Together project in the province. Its vision of community development is pervasive throughout the office. All staff members made themselves available for interviews, perhaps to symbolize the view that all Thompson staff see themselves involved in Working Together. Thus, even the open custody homefinder and a probation officer with a strictly adult caseload, positions which are strictly outside the Working Together mandate, met with me to share their involvement in the Working Together project.

The Thompson region sees itself as very oriented to community development and as the 'community development leader' within the probation service. Some credit for this is given to the former area director who is described as oriented to community development. The present acting area director, who also has community facilitator designation, is also seen as having a strong commitment to community organization. He was an active participant in the training of other community facilitators. His dedication to the Working Together

project as a staff member clearly has implications for his role as area director. His theoretical base in community organization is strong and he is able to articulate his orientation more clearly than most other informants.

This region used the broad mandate of Working Together to reconceptualize the heavy workload in this large area. Communities within in the region have been classified according to need - high, medium and low. Working Together initiatives are geared towards concentrating on those areas with the highest need. This focusing of energies is not seen elsewhere to this extent; more often, it is the more stable, conservative and law abiding communities, like Virden, Dauphin and Morden-Winkler, that respond to the Working Together project and establish the committees and programs desired.

The recruitment of many volunteers spread over numerous small communities provides an efficient way to provide more service to isolated areas. Fiscal worries over travel expenses limit the number of visits to a community by the probation officer. A resident honorary probation officer is able to monitor the actions and behaviour of young offenders (and adult offenders) to a greater extent than the travelling

probation officer. Eleven job descriptions for honorary probation officers exist. In addition, there are plans to develop up to twelve youth justice committees in the region. The Working Together project provides an organizational mandate to seek creative and more effective ways of providing service.

The use of Community Participation Agreements in this region signifies a way of transferring responsibility over all probation services in a reserve community to the governing Band and Council. These agreements set out the duties and responsibilities of each party (the province and the Band) to provide correctional services in the community. Honorary probation officers become accountable to the Band, which receives funds from the Department with which to provide the service. This type of agreement is politically appealing given the direction towards devolution of services to Native communities.

In other communities, like Norway House, a probation officer is hired by the Department and employed in the community. This worker is accountable to the area director in Thompson. Even here, however, the recruitment of honorary probation officers is pursued to help handle the load of supervision. The development of a youth justice committee in Norway House

is another Working Together activity, along with some public education for young people. Here, as in Morden, some activities of the probation officer occur as a result of his resident status in the community. Thus, participation on the arena committee or the fire fighting team are undertaken as a concerned citizen. That these activities connect him to the community is apparent; that they add to his role as a community oriented probation officer is coincidental.

The Norway House Youth Justice Committee was awaiting official Ministerial approval for some months at the time of the field visit. As a result, there was a sense of dormancy and disinterest. Since it was awaiting formal designation, the committee had not yet received any referrals and some members had dropped out. Interviews with individual members reveal few details about how the committee will actually operate since this was outside their experience. Individuals believe they will be helping young offenders and providing a better alternative to the existing fly-in court system. It remains to be seen how this committee will function.

As in Peguis, the committee in this community is primarily composed of individuals employed in other helping professions. Members include representatives from the child welfare agency, alcohol and drug program,

the school, and the hospital. An Elder is also on the committee. For the helping professionals, it is unclear whether their participation on the youth justice committee represents an extension of their paid work or whether they participate as citizen members. The similarities in membership between Peguis and Norway House raise the question about whether the Native approach to youth justice committees is consistently different from non-Native communities. Due to the limited sample, no generalization can be made, but this may be a worthwhile future research endeavour.

In Thompson, we see additional methods to distribute the work load amongst community members. The Thompson Reconciliation/Restitution Committee handles all alternative measures for the city. This long standing committee has an established recording system and method for dealing with young offenders. The probation officer assigned file responsibility for these cases has minimal involvement, since the committee receives its referrals directly from the administrative secretary of the probation office. It functions autonomously and apparently satisfactorily. Committee membership is primarily female, with only two male members. Members are drawn from a variety of occupations and positions. Young offenders, parents and

victims are all served official notice of the hearing by a committee member. Youths appear in front of the committee where details of the case are heard. A disposition is determined and one committee member assumes responsibility for monitoring compliance. Dispositions include apologies, community service work, restitution, and essays. This particular committee is hoping to expand its function by operating a shoplifter's program for first offenders.

A client reporting centre, which is used as an alternative to traditional supervision, has been started in the Thompson office. An honorary probation officer is present in the office for several hours a week. She receives information regarding the terms and conditions of a supervision order and meets with the clients to determine their compliance and identify any potential problems or difficulties. If such difficulties develop, they are handled by the professional probation officer, who is more skilled to deal with this type of case.

The general theme in the Thompson Region is to develop methods of freeing up the probation officer's time to be involved in more complex cases (which require professional skills and training) or program development. Probation officers become case managers over a regiment of volunteers who are very capable of.

dealing with some aspects of the work. Shorter versions of required paperwork are developed to save time. Other paperwork requirements are given a lower priority than community activities. Attendance at court is minimized. Alternative measures files are handled by justice committees instead of the probation officer. There is a conviction that this type of community participation is very valuable to the quality of service. Thus, it does not appear as a sloughing of services, but rather an informed redefinition of workload to accommodate high service demand with limited resources. The Working Together project, in this region, becomes a routine component of the daily work - the special project status disappears and is replaced by an office wide community orientation.

The Urban Setting - Winnipeg West and Winnipeg North

The city of Winnipeg is served by five probation units - North Winnipeg, West Winnipeg, East Winnipeg, Central Winnipeg Youth, and Central Winnipeg Adult. Each urban unit is staffed with an area director and probation staff. Each unit is responsible for a specific geographic area and provides the full range of probation services for citizens. Two units - North Winnipeg and West Winnipeg - were chosen for the

evaluation.

It is in the urban setting where we see more resistance by organizational members to the Working Together project. Outside of Winnipeg, the Westman, Thompson and Parklands regions all identify themselves as community oriented prior to the establishment of Working Together. In these regions, the project serves to formalize and legitimize previously existing methods and practice. The Eastman region considered itself so well oriented to the community that it declined a formal allocation of a Working Together staff and absorbed the position within the unit. Even in Central and the Interlake, where facilitators were "army volunteered" the essence of Working Together seemed to fit somewhat with the regional way of doing things. Community facilitators do not report a great deal of internal resistance to the activities and methods of the Working Together project.

In contrast, the three urban facilitators interviewed report a great deal of organizational resistance. "I worked for three weeks before anyone knew who I was or what I was doing" is the general sentiment. The urban facilitators had a much more difficult time arousing interest and attaining organizational acceptance. This can be partially

explained by some internal dynamics. In the urban setting the implementation of Working Together in October 1985 was closely followed by a change in organizational boundaries. The geographic boundaries and staffing complements of each urban unit were changed. Staff and administration were preoccupied with adjusting to these changes. Working Together appeared on the scene as an unwelcome complication to the organizational adjustment.

Urban probation staff describe Working Together as a 'flash in the pan' response to problems of high caseloads and inadequate funding. Some believe the introduction of Working Together project was an opportunistic response to the availability of federal dollars. Some staff feel that they could better have used the funds for additional probation officers, who could then get on with the real work of corrections. The urban staff members express a stronger attachment to a more traditional, casework approach to probation. This view of a skilled professional performing specialized tasks creates obstacles to the citizen participation and community development thrust of Working Together.

In Winnipeg North, a full time facilitator was recruited from outside the agency. She did not have an

insider's view of how probation services operated and functioned and reports minimal contact with other staff during the first three weeks. The unit was preoccupied with adjusting to the re-organization and did not know why she was there. She then spent time with the area director, working hard to establish a joint approach and plan to Working Together in the unit. These two key actors combined their talents to create a regional conceptualization of Working Together. They worked to identify community needs, community resources and the gaps between these.

At the same time, some of their time and energies were spent in criticism of the senior organizational members. They were quick to identify weaknesses in the senior levels and how these weaknesses contributed to a limited vision of Working Together. Both believed that the organization should commit resources, in the form of a staff position on a long term basis, to extend beyond the time frame of the Working Together project. Their reason for this was that it would be pointless to initiate community based programs that could not survive without organizational support. If the Working Together facilitator position was not extended, community programs would slowly erode and the growth would disappear.

To counter the sense of isolation and resistance from other probation staff, the community facilitator spent time simply getting to know staff and developing a relationship of trust with them. The facilitator sees Working Together as an organizational change strategy and her primary role as that of a change agent. This was seen as paramount to other activities, which did not really get started until the following spring.

After attaining some organizational acceptance, the facilitator turned to other activities. Working Together initiatives include the recruitment of volunteers to assist with supervision, court reports and victim impact statements. Training of these volunteers is also seen as an important function, a responsibility later transferred to a probation officer in the unit.

Contact with other organizations and institutions is another Working Together activity seen in Winnipeg North. Contracts are arranged with other organizations to take over special programming for young offenders. A Community Participation Agreement was signed with the Anti-Sniff Coalition to provide group support and counselling to high risk clients. A Native Insight Program was developed which provided guidance and counselling to youth.

Meetings with a variety of organizations, groups and community members are undertaken which serve several functions. A knowledge of the community enables an assessment of community resources which can be tapped. Community needs can also be identified. Finally, other groups can be informed of the Working Together project and the probation service. Contact with the functional community is maintained by both the facilitator and the area director. As a result, community members have two potential contacts within the organization, thereby lessening the dependence on any one staff member.

One youth justice committee has been established in the area and the need for an additional five has been identified. Further work with the potential committees is not scheduled to begin until there is a more definite commitment of resources. The North Winnipeg Judicial Alternative for Families and Youth was started by the interest of two community members who approached the facilitator for her help and support. Committee membership is primarily female. Several sociology or criminology students are members who hope to gain valuable experience. This committee assigns each referral to a pair of members. The two members interview the parties and gather information. They report back to the committee, a group decision about

disposition is made and the two member sub-committee imposes and monitors the disposition with the youth. After completion, it reports back to the committee.

The committee recognizes that it can not handle all the potential alternative measures and has established a screening procedure. The committee has specified certain conditions for cases with which it feels competent to deal. The probation office screens referrals according to these criteria and forwards appropriate cases. The committee retains the right to return any inappropriate referrals to the probation office. In 1986 the committee handled 458 referrals (Progress Report, June 1986 - December 1986). The range of dispositions is quite standard, including community service work, apologies and victim-offender mediation. The local YMCA, where meetings are held, monitors community service orders on behalf of the committee and the organization.

The committee is somewhat unique in its desire to move beyond a mere service provider role. It hopes to become involved in public relations and fulfill a community education function. A poster campaign, a mall display and a possible flyer distribution are efforts to increase committee visibility and also recruit new members. This committee emits a sense of 'community'.

spirit and concern. The members are hopeful that their efforts will not only be helpful to individual young offenders but will also contribute to a reintegration of the community.

At the same time, the committee is cognizant of the limits of its activities and involvement. There is the recognition that the organization controls the parameters of participation since the organization maintains control over referral. For example, committees are limited to working with young offenders, instead of the full range of offenders. Bureaucratic roadblocks are recognized as necessary evils that limit the committee's autonomy. Sometimes, ideas generated within the committee are delayed or blocked by the probation services. When the committee expressed a desire to recruit a Native committee member, organizational members asked for time to consult with a local probation officer about his recommendations. Letterhead designed by the committee was delayed in the approval process of the communications department.

At the time of the field research, a probation officer had been assigned to the committee as a resource person. This resource probation officer had initially been uninterested in the Working Together project. In her view, Working Together could happen around her, but

she was not prepared to participate. Her change in behaviour is representative of other probation officers who gradually, and even begrudgingly, acknowledge the validity of the Working Together project and begin to participate.

Several themes are repeated in the Winnipeg West Unit. Other probation staff are described as a source of resistance by the community facilitators. Working Together is seen by the facilitators more as a covert organizational change strategy than a community development project. The traditional casework role of the probation officer as a skilled professional is held in high esteem by staff and contributes to the resistance encountered. Probation officers appear reluctant to change their duties to permit less skilled volunteers to do the work.

The West Winnipeg unit has two offices and a full time facilitator is located in each office. Although each functions independently, there is a great deal of collaboration and contact between them. The area director for this unit is much less involved than the manager in North Winnipeg. Although not opposed to the community orientation, he remains preoccupied with the departmental reorganization and gives this his full

attention. This attitude may have strengthened the supervision bond between the facilitators and the project manager in the central office.

Other probation staff echo sentiments heard in the North office. They are prepared to allow Working Together to happen around them, but maintain a 'don't involve me' attitude. Community development is seen as an acceptable activity but scores very low on their priority list after the legally mandated work.

Like North Winnipeg, staff gradually became more involved and are now active in working with and training committees. They become more accepting of volunteers who are seen as capable of handling the menial aspects of the job. They express the hope that Working Together staff will continue in the unit to provide a community orientation, since they do not see themselves taking over this function. In this way, Working Together maintains its separate status and does not become integrated throughout the unit. Staff believe that if Working Together staff positions are not renewed, there will be a gradual erosion of the community based programs.

The West Winnipeg facilitators are also involved in working with the functional community. An inter-agency group has been established to share information and

identify problems. Both facilitators have been very active in creating this committee and attending as members. Public education in the schools, recreation centres and other community organizations is undertaken. Facilitators participated in a community newspaper printed by the social service agencies and distributed to local residents. All urban facilitators were involved in organizing a provincial conference for youth justice committee members.

The recruitment of volunteers is a major focus of the Working Together program in the West Winnipeg unit. Volunteers are used to provide minimum supervision, monitor community service orders and handle alternative measures. A group of 12 - 15 volunteers were handling 90 cases at the time of the field visit. Volunteers are described as providing a better service since they can see individuals more frequently than a probation officer and can give a higher priority to cases. The coordinator of the volunteer team is himself a volunteer, who spends almost 40 hours per week in this function. With the support of the area director, a proposal has been submitted to turn this into a paid position.

Four youth justice committees exist within the regional boundaries, only one of which pre-dates the

Working Together project. A great deal of time and energy has been devoted to the building of committees in Charleswood, St. James and Fort Garry.

The Alternative Choices Committee operates in Fort Rouge and was established in 1982. An interesting observation relates to this committee, which was originally mandated to handle cases now covered by the other committees. Alternative Choices feels that its clientele has been robbed from them without any consultation or discussion. Members are critical of the probation service for lack of communication and allegedly furtive activities. This unresolved dispute may lead to the demise of the committee.

Alternative Choices has a different procedure for dealing with young offenders. Individual cases are assigned to members who then take on full responsibility for interviewing the parties, determining a disposition and ensuring compliance. Consultation with the larger group is not required; this permits a highly individualized response to the young offender. Probation service has concerns about consistency and the appropriateness of dispositions. Combined with concern about a lack of training of new members and tardy handling of cases, the probation office has been leery about directing cases to the committee.

The other three committees were still in the forming stages during the field visit. All expected to be starting soon and were anticipating their first cases with a mixture of excitement and trepidation. One important goal for St. James and South Winnipeg is to select a membership representative of the communities they serve.

One measure of the accomplishments of the community facilitators in overcoming staff resistance is the involvement of probation staff in the training of committees. Probation officers also serve as a resource to committees, attending meetings and providing support.

The urban implementation of Working Together differs from the other settings. Staff resistance to the project is reported by community facilitators who must then expend more time and energy trying to overcome this resistance. Working Together activities in the urban centre include a larger staff training and teaching component.

The Working Together project is concerned with involving the community in programming for young offenders. To accomplish this, some understanding of the local community is required. The understanding of the community is a more complex process in the urban

setting. A large population lives in numerous blocks and neighbourhoods where neighbours may not know each other. A wide variety of organizations and institutions exist to provide service for the population. Some duplication of service occurs. Organizations may not be aware of each other and are not familiar with the full range of services available. The urban community facilitators must devote a larger portion of time to untangling complexity and understanding the community they hope to work with.

In contrast, the smaller rural or northern community is more close-knit and integrated. Organizations may share office space. Neighbours are familiar with each other because of school, church or work contacts. The rural facilitator begins with a more concrete notion of the community in which he or she works.

In the urban setting, all community facilitators are full-time. Unlike the half-time facilitator they do not have responsibility for regular probation duties in their work. This allows them to concentrate their activities in the community development area, but may also contribute to a sense of isolation from the other staff. A closer working relationship with the central manager instead of the area director may exacerbate the

separate status. One of the urban facilitators reported that her area director remained uninvolved in the Working Together project, since he saw full administrative authority resting with the project manager.

Working Together remains a separate, special project in the urban setting, moreso than in any other region observed. Organizational staff are the most sceptical of the project's worth and tenability and offer the most resistance to it. Facilitators must address these organizational factors which complicate an already complex environment.

COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Working Together project was introduced as a new, creative and valuable way of delivering probation services. The involvement of communities and citizens was an important goal of this approach. The field observations demonstrate that the appearance and implementation of the project varied from one region of the province to another. This variation is apparent in three areas - the activities of project staff, the attitudes and behaviour of organizational staff and the extent to which the project loses or maintains its special project status.

Most activities fall into a coproduction categorization, where citizens take over services previously undertaken by the organization. In most cases, the organization determines how 'citizen participation' is defined and operationalized; the implementation strategy is more organization-based and recruits helpful volunteers than community-based and responsive to local citizens.

Within the coproduction model some differences are evident among regional offices. These differences lie in the attitudes of corrections staff towards the local citizens. For example, in Thompson, volunteers are viewed as quasi-staff members. They are given full responsibility for dealing with clients and are expected to report to the probation officer/case manager much as an employee would report to a superior. In contrast, volunteers in the West Winnipeg unit maintain a different status and are seen as helpful citizens who, while external to the organization, can still assist with simple, uncomplicated and menial tasks. In both cases, citizens take on tasks for the organization but there is a distinct difference in the status assigned to them.

The activities of community facilitators vary from one region to another. The underdefined nature of

Working Together is permissive of a wide range of activities, any of which can be considered as meeting project goals and objectives. This allows individual community facilitators and area directors to choose activities according to their own ideological or personal preference. Different regions emphasize different activities resulting in a regional definition of Working Together.

A second area of variation is found in the attitudes and behaviour of organizational staff members. The probation officers in the various regions held differing opinions about the value or worth of the Working Together project. Some viewed Working Together as a natural fit with their practice orientation which required minimal change or adaptation. Others saw the new approach as a worthwhile goal, which did require a change in orientation and practice. Still others were not convinced of the value of the approach and resisted its implementation.

Area directors also held different views of the project. Some took a backseat role, expecting the project manager to be fully responsible for management and supervision. Others were more involved and permissive of a range of activities and practices. Still others were very enthusiastic about the potential

of the project. They took an active role in encouraging and implementing activities and assumed a strong leadership role in directing all probation staff to practice with a community orientation. There is a determination to fully implement the project.

As regional managers, area directors have the potentiality to overcome staff resistance with a strong leadership role. Management style can encourage adaptation by probation staff to accept the new project. On the other hand, management style can be merely permissive or apathetic.

In the initial proposal it was expected that community facilitators would carry responsibility for Working Together activities throughout the region to which they were assigned. At the operational level this ideal is somewhat compromised. Within each region, only some communities or neighbourhoods are involved in Working Together. How communities become involved with the organization varies and is dependent on the attitudes and beliefs of organizational members.

The Working Together project varies in one other important way. The extent to which the project maintains its special project status is variable. In some regions, Working Together is seen as a special project with a limited lifespan. Actors in the system

give the appearance of simply waiting the project out. The project remains strongly identified with the community facilitator and other probation staff express disinterest or tolerance at best.

In other regions of the province, the introduction of Working Together does not seem to change the status quo. The existence of community facilitators gives a higher profile to activities which were already being undertaken. Sometimes, as in Central, the project remains identified only with the facilitator. In Parklands region, all staff continue their community orientation and Working Together is less identified with one person.

In the Thompson region, Working Together loses its special status to the greatest extent. Here, there has been a deliberate reorganization of the work which is justified by the Working Together mandate. Working Together becomes diffused throughout the unit and spills over into all aspects of the work. The Thompson regions comes closest to routinization of the project where "the innovation eventually loses its separate identity and becomes an element in the organization's ongoing activities" (Rogers, 1983, p. 363).

These field observations demonstrate that the project was not implemented uniformly. Staff attitudes

and beliefs account for subtle and not-so-subtle differences in the diffusion of the Working Together innovation. The project varies from one region of the province to another. Activities in the north are quite different from the urban setting. Reserve communities adopt the project differently than rural non-Native communities. Attitudes among front line and management staff also vary, ranging from whole-hearted enthusiasm to disgruntled tolerance. The degree to which the project spills over into other aspects of the unit also varies. In other words, the implementation, diffusion and adoption of the project varies.

CHAPTER 4

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE VARIABLES: COMPLEXITY, FORMALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION

The two major stages of the innovation process are important in the study of organizational innovation and must be considered in the diffusion of the Working Together project. In the study of organizational innovation, researchers have found that the rate of adoption is related to organizational characteristics like complexity, centralization and formalization. These relationships vary, however, according to the stage of the diffusion process. Complex organizations are better able to conceive and initiate innovative ideas, but may have difficulties during implementation due to a lack of consensus. Organizations which are decentralized and low in formalization have a greater capacity to innovate during the initiation stage, but during the implementation stage, a centralized, highly formalized organization is better able to ensure implementation (Rogers, 1983; Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek, 1973). The implications of these generalizations for the Working Together project are discussed in this chapter.

An organizational decision to adopt an innovation does not ensure implementation. Organizations are

recognized as remarkably stable institutions which are resistant to change. Several factors have been suggested which contribute to organizational stability.

First, as public bureaucracies, human service organizations are controlled by powerful interest groups who seek to maintain the status quo. Second, since clients are so powerless, their needs and interests are likely to be ignored and thus do not stimulate change. Third, the bureaucratic structure of these organizations is rigid and inflexible, making change very costly. Fourth, professional and bureaucrats working in these organizations attempt to promote their own interests and resist any change that affects their status. (Hasenfeld, 1983, p. 219)

At the same time, there is the recognition that organizations are capable of change and some innovations are effectively introduced, diffused and adopted by organizations. The study of organizational innovation is concerned with clarifying the relationships between organizational characteristics and the diffusion process.

Mohr (1969) suggests that organizational capacity to innovate is a "function of the interaction among the motivation to innovate, the strength of obstacles against innovation, and the availability of resources for overcoming such obstacles" (p. 111). The motivation to innovate and the availability of resources have already been discussed. In the Working Together project, environmental factors contributing to the motivation to innovate have been described earlier

(Chapter 2). Resources for the Working Together innovation are provided in the form of new federal dollars which are used to employ staff.

Hasenfeld (1983) suggests that the values of the executive leadership can also affect motivation. This may be particularly important at the implementation stage. Internal capacity to shift resources is also important (Hasenfeld, 1983, p. 231). These two characteristics have not yet been considered and a discussion of their importance will be found in this chapter.

The obstacles to an innovation also require examination. The internal structure of an organization can create obstacles to the innovation (Hasenfeld, 1983). This chapter will focus on an examination of the internal structure of Community & Youth Correctional Services and what implications this structure had for the implementation of the Working Together project. The variability of the project may be partially explained by internal structural features. Two other features, the values of the executive leadership and the capacity to shift resources, will also be discussed.

INTERNAL STRUCTURE

Complexity, centralization and formalization are three variables which have been linked to rate of adoption of an innovation or rate of program change (Rothman, 1974; Hage and Aiken, 1980). "Complexity is the degree to which an organization's members possess a relatively high degree of knowledge and expertise, usually measured by the members' range of occupational specialities and their degree of professionalism expressed by formal training" (Rogers, 1983, p. 360). Centralization or decentralization refers to the distribution of authority and decision making in an organization. "The higher the level in the organization decisions are made and the less participation that exists in decision making, the more the centralization" (Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek, 1973, p. 161). Formalization is measured by the degree of job codification (number of regulations specifying who is to do what, where and when) and the degree of rule observation (the diligence in enforcing rules) (Hage and Aiken, 1980, p. 168).

Generalizations about these three variables and the diffusion of innovation have been proposed (Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek, 1973; Rogers, 1982; Hage and Aiken, 1970). Complex organizations, with diverse skills and

knowledge, are able to conceive new ideas and innovations. A decentralized organization, which accepts input and ideas from more organizational members, will encounter more innovative ideas and suggestions than a highly centralized organization. An organization in which rules and procedures are not highly formalized is more receptive to information and encourages the consideration of innovative ideas. Complex, decentralized and less formalized organizations are considered to be more innovative during the initiation stage.

During implementation, these same characteristics may become detrimental to the diffusion process. A complex organization may have difficulty reaching consensus which can make implementation difficult. A decentralized organization with a low degree of formalization is more susceptible to potential conflict and ambiguity that may impair implementation. A more centralized and formalized organization is better able to ensure and facilitate implementation.

COMMUNITY & YOUTH CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Community & Youth Correctional Services is a complex organization. Although the number of job specializations is not high (probation officers are the

main category of employee) there is a complex system of levels and categories for probation officers. The degree of professionalization is high in that most probation officers hold a university degree.

The organization is characterized by a decentralized structure. There is a central directorate where senior management plan policy and overall goals and objectives. Regional offices are located in centres throughout the province, including five urban units, and are managed by area directors. The area director is responsible for the activities and duties of corrections services and personnel within the catchment area. This decentralized structure means that corrections activities are susceptible to the management style and ideology of the regional manager. Depending on the style of the regional manager, authority and decision making may be shared with the staff.

The administrative design of the Working Together project saw centralized project management with decentralized service delivery. Twelve and one half staff years were assigned to the project and were distributed to the various regions. Due to the special project status of Working Together, facilitators are responsible to the project manager, located in the central office. However, due to the regional authority

structure, staff are also responsible to their area director especially in cases where staff are half-time community facilitators and half-time probation officers, placing community facilitators in a position of dual accountability.

Certain features of the organization are highly formalized and adhere to a rigid schedule of tasks and activities. For example, the legal mandate of a probation officer dictates activities and functions. A court-ordered predisposition report is not an optional task. Specific areas are pinpointed for inclusion in a report under specific time constraints. Similarly, supervision orders clearly delineate the duties of a probation officer in his or her relationship with a probationer. Even within these rigid roles, there remains a degree of flexibility in how a probation officer chooses to fulfill these requirements.

Volunteers can be used to supervise clients and some court forms can be revised or shortened. Furthermore, the setting of probation work is often in small, informal communities contributing to a less formal orientation.

Other positions in the organization are less formalized. Staff employed by the Working Together project provide an interesting contrast. The role of

the community facilitator scores low on the formalization dimension. Virtually any activity can be perceived as contributing to the community orientation of the project. A casual visit to a local community can be viewed as 'planting the seed' of a youth justice committee. Informing students about the Young Offenders Act in school presentations fulfills a public education function. Recruiting volunteers is seen as a way to promote citizen participation in the organization.

The organization is characterized as complex, decentralized and variable in its degree of formalization. According to the diffusion of innovation theory, these characteristics enable the organization to be innovative during the initiation stage, but may impair implementation. A closer look at each variable, focusing primarily on the implementation stage, follows.

COMPLEXITY

In the initiation stage, a complex organization will generate a wide range of ideas and opinions which can be applied to solving organizational problems. The complex nature of Community & Youth Correctional Services may have contributed to the initiation of the Working Together project, consistent with the

generalizations found in the literature. At the implementation stage, the complexity of the organization suggests that a variety of opinions and ideas will continue to be generated and that consensus among organizational members will be difficult to achieve and implementation will be hampered. In the Working Together case, this is not a problem because the conceptual openness of the innovation allows and encourages variation. Many activities and ideas are consistent with the project objectives allowing individual interpretation and implementation.

FORMALIZATION

The organization has been described as variable in its degree of formalization. Community facilitators especially have a low degree of formalization in the degree of job codification and rule observation. A highly formalized organization would set out specific rules and regulations for community facilitators and would monitor the fulfillment of these tasks. In the Working Together project, the specification of tasks and duties does not exist. Furthermore, the lack of closure on community development suggests that such specification is not possible. The essence of community development ideology suggests that such specification is

not even advisable since communities should have a role in defining their needs and solutions. In the Working Together project, a low degree of formalization for community facilitators is a function of the nature of the innovation and permits variation in implementation.

Probation officers have some strictly defined tasks and duties that are diligently monitored by the court. However, the manner in which these tasks are completed is less formalized. What emerges as a more important factor for the implementation of Working Together is the discretion accorded to probation officers and community facilitators in the performance of their duties.

The flexibility in degree of formalization allows probation officers to exercise discretion in how they do the work. For example, young offenders can be supervised directly by the probation officer or a volunteer can provide this service and report to the probation officer. A probation officer can administer all alternative measures for youth or he or she can recruit a youth justice committee to take over this function. A probation officer who decides to maintain a direct casework approach with clients and excludes volunteers and the community is seen as resistant to the Working Together project and an obstacle to implementation. On the other hand, a probation officer

who is eager to welcome volunteers and involve the community is seen as receptive to the project and implementation occurs.

As a structural variable, the degree of formalization is not as important as the discretion accorded to probation staff. The attitudes and actions of probation staff will be discussed in greater detail as a feature of the organizational target system.

DECENTRALIZATION

Community and Youth Correctional Services has been described as a decentralized organization. According to diffusion theory, the decentralized structure should have encouraged organizational members to conceive and propose innovations during the initiation stage. Considering that Working Together was based on initiatives like youth justice committees, that existed at the regional and community level, and filtered their way up to the central management level, this generalization holds true. The decentralized structure permitted the existence of some unique programs to operate at the local level.

The diffusion of innovation literature also hypothesizes that the decentralized structure should have inhibited the implementation process. In this case

study, this is not usually the case. The decentralized structure does, however, prohibit uniform implementation. The overall project description of Working Together is vague and underdefined. The decentralized structure dictates that Working Together becomes operationalized at the regional level, resulting in regional variation in program appearance. "Regional managers and local staff are free to put their own particular imprint upon the program" (Ryant and Heinrich, 1988, p. 97).

The decentralized structure increases the susceptibility of program appearance to the opinions and attitudes of individual actors within the system. The influence of individual community facilitators on program appearance has been described in the field observations. The duties and tasks of community facilitators are also influenced by both the central manager and their regional managers who supervise their work. This dual accountability creates the potential for conflicting demands. Where the views and beliefs of the program manager and the area director are in agreement about the directions and activities of the community facilitator, this duality of structure is not problematic and the worker can expect reasonably consistent direction and supervision. However, given

the lack of closure on both Working Together and community organization practice methodology, this mutuality is not assured, creating the potentiality for some friction and disagreement. In these cases, facilitators must decide whose authority will command their loyalty and direct their practice. Usually, the area director emerges as the more salient.

As the regional leader, the area director also has the opportunity to exert influence on the behaviour of subordinate organizational members. For example, in the Thompson Region, the area director is seized by the value of a community orientation and is able to encourage this perspective among his staff. In other regions, where community initiatives have been present prior to Working Together, credit for a community orientation is given to regional leaders. A strong, directive, regional leadership can also overcome some of the problems created by the levels of discretion identified earlier. As suggested by Hasenfeld (1983), the values of executive leadership "enhance the capacity of the organization to innovate by lending both legitimacy and power to such activities" (p. 232). This is clearly the case in the Thompson region, with both the current and former leadership, and in the Westman region with a former area director.

Authority at the regional level also permits the shifting of resources within the unit. If the area director is so inclined, resources can be shifted internally to respond to the Working Together initiatives. Again, the Thompson region provides an example. When one of the facilitators left the organization prior to the expiry of his contract, the fiscal resources for his salary were shifted to a community-based initiative. Human resources are also shifted. Volunteers are recruited, at a lower cost, to take on various duties and tasks. Staff resources can then be redirected towards additional Working Together initiatives.

The decentralized structure of the organization has definite implications for the implementation of Working Together. Rather than inhibiting implementation, as the theory suggests, the decentralized structure contributes to variation in program implementation. We see implemented distinctly different conceptualizations of Working Together at the regional level. The shape of Working Together at the regional level is susceptible to the leadership, direction and expectations of regional leaders.

The features of complexity and decentralization make the organization well suited to a diffusely defined

project like Working Together. The complexity ensures that a variety of opinions and ideas will be generated within the organization; many of these will be acceptable to the project objectives. The decentralized structure permits varying conceptualizations to be operationalized at the regional level, which are also seen as consistent with program objectives. Vague program definition dictates low degrees of formalization for community facilitators.

CHAPTER 5

TARGET SYSTEM VARIABLES:

TRADITIONAL NORMS, PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE, NEED FOR CHANGE

The Working Together project was directed towards two major groups - Manitoba citizens and communities and the organization itself. Although this thesis focuses on the organizational target system, some general observations about the community target system can be stated which serve to identify potential future research questions. A closer look at the organizational target system reveals several mini-target systems. Each regional unit is staffed by a community facilitator, an area director, probation staff, and citizen volunteers and is a unique mix in terms of these staff and the relationships among them. Each unit approached the requirements of the Working Together project in different ways. Each unit becomes a small target system within the organizational level. Seven organizational target systems are identified.

Rothman (1974) states "the most basic finding of diffusion and adoption literature is that all target systems do not adopt innovations at the same rate" (p. 422). Some target systems are more receptive to an innovation than others and Rothman identifies six variables associated with receptivity to an innovation:

1) cultural values, 2) socioeconomic status, 3) past experience, 4) felt need for change, 5) value orientation, and 6) social participation. The data base does not provide enough information to examine generalizations relating to socioeconomic status and value orientation. Social participation is an inherent component of the Working Together project innovation itself and cannot be considered as a variable. The remaining three generalizations do have some relevance.

The innovativeness of a target system is inversely related to the extent to which that target system adheres to traditional norms. Target systems with a more modern orientation are more innovative. (p. 422)

The innovativeness of a target system is directly related to previous experience with innovations and inversely related to previous negative experience. Target systems that have previously experienced successful innovations are more innovative than those which have not; target systems that have previously experienced unsuccessful innovations become even less innovative. (p. 432)

The innovativeness of a target system is directly related to the extent to which it feels a need for change. Discontented target systems are generally more innovative than contented ones. (p. 433)

THE COMMUNITY TARGET SYSTEM

As previously mentioned, the overt objective of the Working Together project was to involve citizens and communities more fully in the activities of the organization and services to young offenders. It is

apparent that some diffusion did occur. In every region observed, community based programs and citizen participation indeed took place.

One measure of the success of the diffusion of the innovation can be a simple count of the number of youth justice committees. An early report of the evaluation indicates an increase in the number of youth justice committees during the tenure of the project. In April 1985, 21 designated committees existed in the province, slightly up from the 19 reported in 1983 (Bracken and Loewen). In November 1986, 26 committees had been officially designated, 6 committees were in the final phase, awaiting designation and 8 additional communities had formed steering committees. This represents a significant increase in the number of youth justice committees during the life of the project.

Despite these numbers, it should be known that there was never an expectation that each and every community in the province would develop a youth justice committee. Thus, while a numerical count does show an increase in number of committees, it is unclear whether the number of committees was judged to be optimal or whether many more committees should be developed. A more specific targetting of potential communities would have been beneficial in determining the extent of

successful diffusion.

In addition, the Working Together project is not limited only to the development of additional youth justice committees, but also includes a range of other activities. In fact, the underdefinition of the project permits a wide range of activities to be acceptable to project objectives. At the same time, this feature makes measurement of extent of diffusion quite difficult. Again, it is evident that some diffusion of the Working Together innovation did occur, but it is not possible to comment on whether or not the diffusion was maximized.

As suggested by Rothman (1974) all target systems do not adopt innovations at the same rate. At the community level, adoption rates vary. The youth justice committee concept originated in communities like Rouseau River and Dauphin in the mid 1970's. In a sense, these communities are the true innovators of the youth justice committee concept which subsequently became an important base of the Working Together project.

A more detailed analysis of the community target system would require further study. One approach might include an analysis of the relationship between the diffusion of innovation and community characteristics. Certain types of communities may be more receptive to an

innovation than others or the diffusion process may need to vary according to community type. Kueneman, Linden, Bracken and Kosmick (1984) allude to this phenomenon in their critique of the Working Together proposal. A future study could search for relationships between type of community and recommended activities.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL TARGET SYSTEM

As discussed by Rothman (1974) the most basic finding of the diffusion and adoption literature is that all target systems do not adopt innovations at the same rate. In the Working Together project, this is certainly true. Some units were involved in aspects of the innovation before formal implementation. Parklands describes Working Together as a "title put to something already there." Westman and Thompson held reputations as being community-oriented. In Central and Interlake the community orientation is not as evident but both were responsive to the concept and made gains. The urban units emerge as the most reluctant participants and the slowest organizational units to adopt elements of the innovation.

It is in the urban setting where overt resistance to the project is evident. Community facilitators report feeling isolated and separate from other staff.

Probation staff describe Working Together as "just another flash-in-the-pan project." There is a sense that probation staff are only marginally complying with the project until it ultimately fizzles out.

Several reasons can be suggested for this resistance. First, the introduction of Working Together at the same time as other major changes in the organization represents poor timing. Staff and managers were preoccupied with the boundary and staff changes and were less receptive to another organizational change.

Secondly, the essence of the Working Together project does not fit as naturally in an urban application. The urban setting is characterized by a higher degree of social isolation and weak social networks. Neighbours may not know each other and may have little contact with each other. In contrast, the rural setting appears as a more cohesive, integrated community. The smaller population base suggests stronger kinship ties and a sense of knowing your neighbours. Even in reserve communities, which may have problems of high unemployment and high welfare enrollment, there is a sense of community and a recognition of the community by citizens. For professionals working in a rural setting, community development activities and techniques may be more easily

conceptualized and fit logically with the setting. The rural staff are also cognizant of differences among the communities they serve, which heightens their awareness of 'community' as a variable. At the urban level, community development or community organization becomes less comfortable partly because communities are not easily defined and citizens are not easily reached. The notion of 'community' is somewhat nebulous in the urban setting and thus a community-based project may be perceived as more trouble than it is worth.

A third possible reason for higher resistance in the urban setting may lie with the professional orientation of the urban probation officer. In the city, probation officers see their role as a professional clinician. They are highly skilled and well-trained caseworkers who specialize in supervision of probationers and professional court reports. The casework orientation holds that young offenders can be counselled into more law-abiding behaviour. In this orientation, probation officers are sceptical of the ability of volunteers to perform any of these duties. The involvement of citizen volunteers in the delivery of services may be interpreted as deprofessionalization. If untrained volunteers can provide the service it diminishes the status of that aspect of the work. This

perspective found in the urban probation officer acts to block the diffusion. In contrast, the youth justice committee model stresses accountability and teaching the young offender 'a lesson'. This orientation permits the involvement of volunteers who are not 'professionals'.

The urban probation officer, who is entrenched in a more traditional orientation to probation work, is resistant to the Working Together project because to accept it would require major changes in orientation and function. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) discuss the compatibility of an innovation as "the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with existing values, past experiences, and needs of the receivers" (p. 145). Rothman (1974) discusses value compatibility of the innovation. In both views, higher adoption occurs with more compatible innovations. For urban probation officers, the compatibility of Working Together with existing values or orientation appears lower, contributing to lower, or at least slower, rates of adoption.

In the rural regions, probation staff appeared more open to the Working Together approach and more willing to incorporate some aspects of the project into daily duties. The innovation may be more compatible with the

practice experience of the rural probation officer. The less formalized setting of many rural communities may require a more flexible orientation on the part of probation officers. The previous experience with at least some aspects of community involvement also helped rural staff perceive Working Together in a different way. A positive experience with one youth justice committee may encourage staff to recruit additional volunteers.

At the urban level, the probation officers perceive Working Together as just another in a long list of programs geared to solve organizational problems. Clearly, they have been exposed to other projects and programs introduced by the administration, which they perceive as not having been successful. Part of their reticence in trying or accepting Working Together may be attributed to previous negative experiences. Urban probation officers seem to be waiting for the project to end so that they can get back to 'business as usual.'

The discretion accorded to probation officers was discussed earlier in Chapter 4. This discretion permits individual probation officers to make a choice regarding taking on Working Together functions and duties. Especially in regions where the area director assumes a permissive, as opposed to directive, role Working

Together occurs at the interest of individual workers. In the urban setting, this interest was minimal.

In contrast to the urban setting, the Thompson region is a more eager adopter of the Working Together project. Here, the innovation is not only implemented, but a degree of routinization occurs. The Thompson region emerges as the leader in the province for routinizing Working Together in all aspects of the unit and job performance. Volunteers become the providers of service in remote locations, supervised by the probation officer or now, case manager. The whole range of services is contracted out to Band councils in other communities minimizing the probation office role and at the same time, responding nicely to the Native demand for control or devolution of services. In Thompson city, a volunteer deals with all minimum supervision cases through a client reporting centre, easing the work load of the probation staff and permitting them to spend time in other valuable activities, like program development or counselling clients. Volunteers are used in any way possible to perform duties and aspects of the job.

The Thompson region has the highest caseloads and the largest geographic area in the province. Much of the population lives on isolated reserve and Metis

communities, which experience poor living conditions and varying degrees of social disintegration. Some of the neediest communities in the province are located in this region. At the same time, travel to these communities is the most difficult and the most expensive. Some communities are only accessible for air. Road travel is often extensive under poor road conditions. Delivery of service is necessarily more expensive in this region. The Thompson region, like other units and other organizations, is faced with limited resources and fiscal concerns. They must provide service in a cost-efficient way.

The Working Together project provides an opportunity to address the problems of high demand and limited resources. The project invites community participation which is an ideal solution for the Thompson region problem. Working Together becomes embraced by this region as a way to maintain or improve service delivery within limited fiscal resources. Its greater need makes it more amenable to Working Together because the project provides a solution to the unique regional problems. The need for change is greater than other units and results in greater acceptance and adoption.

The Thompson unit also defines professional in a different way than the urban units. In Thompson, the caseworker is transformed into a case manager. Volunteers are 'hired' by the organization and supervised by the probation officer. The ability to recruit and supervise and support community volunteers is accorded higher status than the clinician function. Also the clientele in the Thompson region are of a type that is least amenable to counselling as the source of change. The case manager role may have appeal as higher status for probation officers who now have a bevy of 'employees' to supervise and manage.

Of the regions studied, the Thompson region emerges as the leader in terms of effective implementation or routinization. Here, Working Together loses its special project status and becomes a part of the daily work experience of all staff. Strong, directive regional leadership, both pre-Working Together and during Working Together, has contributed to this orientation. As a target system that can be characterized as discontented and feeling a need for change, the Thompson region emerges as the most successful at routinization of the innovation. Unlike the urban staff, regional staff do not oppose the project. Greater motivation to change is

provided by the high work load and change is encouraged by the regional leadership.

At the same time, the longevity of programs established in the Thompson region is unknown. Whether or not these programs can be sustained in communities characterized by underemployment, alcoholism, drug addiction and despair and infrequent contact with the probation office remains to be seen. In addition, native communities and groups of communities (that is, tribal councils) have political agendas of their own which largely supercede the organization's motives for community involvement. This too sets a limit on the extent to which they will cooperate with a coproduction model.

As an innovation, the Working Together project was targetted towards two groups - the community and the organization. Diffusion occurred at both levels and activities took place within each region. Every Manitoba community did not participate in Working Together, but this was not necessarily an objective. The non-participation by some communities is acceptable within a community development orientation which gives at least rhetorical value to the notions of community choice and autonomy.

At the organizational level, diffusion also occurred. In each region, community based activities took place. Participants in these activities were generally quite positive about their experiences. Even urban probation officers who were initially quite reluctant to participate, gradually became accepting of the project and adapted to its presence. The extent of routinization remains variable, with the Thompson region emerging as most successful at routinization. A true measurement of routinization would require a second look at the organization post-Working Together. It would be interesting to see how much of a community orientation remained within Community and Youth Correctional Services and how many community based activities and programs remained.

Support for each of Rothman's generalizations is found in the Working Together case example. Different target systems adopt at different rates. A traditional orientation and previous negative experience with innovation contribute to slower implementation and adoption in the urban setting. Previous positive experience with innovations in rural settings contributes to a greater willingness to adopt the Working Together innovation. As a target system which strongly perceives a need for change, the Thompson

region emerges as more innovative than all other regions.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Working Together was an innovative project introduced, implemented and diffused in Community Youth Correctional Services. A distinct feature of the project was variation in how the project was implemented, how organizational members responded and to what extent the project was routinized. This variation is defined at the regional level.

Several factors contribute to high regional variability. First, the conceptual underpinnings of the project are based on community development and community organization literature. This body of literature is characterized by considerable division in the way it is conceptualized, in its purpose and in its methods. It is therefore not surprising that project definition and objectives are somewhat vague and non-specific, allowing and encouraging a variety of responses to be considered as consistent with overall project goals and acceptable to central management. "The overall design functions more as a permissive envelope than as a call to more precisely defined action" (Ryant and Heinrich, 1988, p. 96). Specific project appearance is open to interpretation by individual actors. The non-specific definition is acceptable to the project funders.

Secondly, the decentralized service delivery structure results in the formation of seven organizational target systems, composed of an area director, a community facilitator, other probation staff, and citizen volunteers. Each organizational target system is accorded some choice in how to implement Working Together. The project becomes defined and operationalized at the regional level.

The decentralized structure provides a critical role for area directors since they maintain authority and responsibility for delivery of services in their region. Although community facilitators have a direct line of accountability to the central project manager, the regional manager often plays a more salient role in determining the actions and functions of the Working Together staff person. The value this regional manager accords to Working Together thus influences implementation. The area director can shift resources to allow fuller integration of Working Together. The area director can influence the behaviour and attitudes of subordinate staff and encourage a community orientation in their practice. In effect, the area director has a measure of control over the regional motivation to innovate, the regional obstacles to the innovation and the ability to shift regional resources

to overcome these obstacles.

Regional leadership alone may not ensure implementation if other organizational members are not convinced of the value of a community orientation. In Thompson region, the strong leadership is combined with organizational staff who are willing to endorse the project and adapt their practice. High caseloads and a large geographic area with lots of travel create a region where delivery of service is costly and time consuming. Working Together is embraced by all members as a way to improve service delivery within limited fiscal and human resources. Additionally, the political appeal of devolution of services to Native organizations may contribute to a more willing community target system. In the Thompson region, several factors are combined which explain the fuller degree of routinization.

In contrast, the urban units are representative of the highest degree of resistance to the project and the slowest units to adopt elements of the innovation. Probation staff are not convinced of the value of a community orientation which would require a major shift in their own practice orientation. A lower degree of involvement by regional managers can be interpreted by probation staff as an indication of the low priority

being assigned to Working Together. The elements of motivation, obstacles and resources take on a different balance resulting in a slower rate of adoption and a lower degree of routinization.

These two examples may provide suggestions for future projects of this general type. The importance of attaining the support and enthusiasm of regional managers is evident. If these organizational members can be co-opted at the initiation stage and involved in the decision to adopt, their fuller cooperation at the implementation stage may be more likely.

Working Together emerges as a model of coproduction, where citizens and volunteers take on tasks for the organization. Each regional unit within the organization determines the parameters of participation within broadly set guidelines established by central management. The Thompson region reassigned tasks and duties to citizens and communities to a greater extent than all other regions observed. All organizational members in this unit assume a community orientation in their practice and participate in Working Together initiatives. This successful diffusion at the organizational level may have implications for the diffusion of the project at the community level. Office-wide adoption at the regional level, as in

Thompson, may enhance or encourage the successful diffusion and routinization at the community target system level.

In the urban setting, diffusion within the organizational target systems took much more time, energy and commitment on the part of community facilitators. Staff attitudes ranged from outright dismissal to disgruntled tolerance. Diffusion of the Working Together innovation in the organizational target systems takes precedence over the diffusion at the community level.

The remaining regions fall somewhere between the two extremes presented. The appearance and diffusion of Working Together remains identified at the regional level and is dependent on the attitudes and beliefs of area managers, community facilitators and probation officers. The decentralized structure of the organization is a critical variable in explaining the variation of the project. In a decentralized structure, authority rests with a regional manager who makes decisions about resource allocation and program priorities. In this case study, some regional managers assigned a higher priority to Working Together than others, contributing to variation in program appearance.

This thesis has examined the Working Together project and offered some explanations for the variations found in the diffusion process. The thesis is unable to verify whether the factors discussed offer a full explanation. Community factors, which were not observed, could also account for variation in appearance and implementation. It is not known whether or not coproduction is the best choice for an explanation of the observed variation. The thesis is also unable to answer questions of a causal nature. It can not be stated that the organization caused activities to occur in the field or whether these activities may have occurred anyway. Unresolved questions in the community development literature and the diffusion of innovation literature remain.

These unresolved questions suggest that future projects of this type must take a different approach if they hope to answer questions about the role of the community or the most appropriate type of community development project. A more specific and tightly defined model of community development could be applied in specific types of communities to examine the relationship between type of community and most appropriate model of community development to accomplish tasks or achieve goals. A clear, specific and mutually

agreed upon model of community development is required at the initiation level and must be followed at the implementation stage if research is to answer these and other questions.

The analysis of the Working Together project itself could be elaborated on through a re-investigation. Taylor (1985) suggests that "when and if special funding incentives are withdrawn, such programs usually vanish, and their goals and working relationships become organizational orphans, relegated to token status or abandoned" (p 205). A post-Working Together organization-wide review might reveal the tenability of this hypothesis. At the time of the evaluation, the Thompson region had come closest to routinization of the project. Since the evaluation, the area director has left the organization. It would be an interesting task to complete a follow-up study to see what remains of the Working Together ideology. The discussion in this case study suggests that continuation of a community orientation might depend on the values and commitment of the new leadership.

A re-investigation of the Working Together project would also permit an analysis of the community target system and variables affecting the diffusion process. A primary analysis could focus on questions and issues

which cannot be addressed here because of the secondary nature of this analysis.

The Working Together project did make progress in involving citizens and communities in programming for young offenders, as evidenced by the increase in number of youth justice committees, volunteers and other programs. The community participants viewed their participation in a positive way and believed they were contributing positively to the lives of young offenders.

Working Together also made progress in nurturing organizational assimilation of a community development philosophy. What remains of this philosophy is the subject of another study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akabas, S., & Kurzman, P. (1982). Work, workers, and work organizations: A view from social work. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Blau, P. (1974). On the nature of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bracken, D., & Loewen, L. (1983). Juvenile court committees in Manitoba. Winnipeg: Report presented to the Consultation Centre, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, Prairie Region.
- Brager, G., & Specht, H. (1973). Community organizing. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bregha, F. (1971). Community development in Canada: Problems and strategies. in J. Draper, (Ed.). Citizen participation: Canada. Toronto: New Press.
- Burke, E. (1975). Citizen participation strategies. in R. Kramer & H. Specht (Eds.). Readings in community organization practice. (2nd Edition). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Compton, F. (1971). Community development theory and practice. In J. Draper (Ed.), Citizen participation: Canada (pp. 382-396). Toronto: New Press.
- Corwin, R. (1972). Strategies for organizational innovation: An empirical comparison. American Sociological Review Vol. 37 No. 4 441-454.
- Cox, F., Erlich, J., Rothman, J., & Tropman, J. (Eds.). (1970). Strategies of community organization. Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Cox, F., Erlich, J., Rothman, J., & Tropman, J. (Eds.). (1979). Strategies of community organization. (3rd Edition). Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Damanpour, F., & Evan, W. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: The problem of "organizational lag". Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 29 392-409.
- Dean, J., Eichhorn, R., & Dean, L. (1969). Limitations and advantages of unstructured methods. In G.

- McCall & J. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Downs, Anthony. (1967). Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Downs, G., & Mohr, L. (1979). Toward a theory of innovation. Administration and society. Vol. 10. No. 4, 379-408.
- Downs, G. (1974). Bureaucracy, innovation, and public policy. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Draper, J. (Ed.). (1971). Citizen participation: Canada. Toronto: New Press.
- Dunham, A. (1970). The new community organization. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Fellin, P. (1987). The community and the social worker. Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Germain, C. (1985). The place of community work within an ecological approach to social work practice. in S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.). Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gilbert, N., & Specht, H. (1977). Social planning and community organization: Approaches. in National Association of Social Workers. Encyclopedia of social work. 17th issue, volume 2. New York: Boyd Printing Co.
- Greenspan, M. (1983). A new approach to women and therapy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books.
- Guest, D. (1985). The emergence of social security in Canada. (2nd Edition). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Hage, J., & Dewar, R. (1973). Elite values versus organizational structure in predicting innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 18 279-290.

- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1970). Social change in complex organizations. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Hasenfeld, Y. (1983). Human service organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hendry, C. (1965). Community development. in H. Lurie, (Ed.). Encyclopedia of social work. New York: Boyd Printing Company.
- Hurl, L., & Tucker, D. (1986). Limitations of an act of faith: An analysis of the Macdonald Commission's stance on social services. Canadian Public Policy, 12(4), 606-621.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. (2nd Edition). San Diego: EdITS publishers.
- Khinduka, S. (1975). Community development: Potential and limitations. In R. Kramer & H. Specht (Eds.), Readings in community organization practice. 2nd Edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kramer, R., & Specht, H. (Eds.). (1975). Readings in community organization practice (2nd Edition). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kramer, R. (1975). The influence of sponsorship, professionalism and the civic culture on the theory and practice of community development. in R. Kramer & H. Specht (Eds.). Readings in community organization practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kueneman, R., Linden, R., Bracken, D., & Kosmick, R. (1984). Review of province of Manitoba Working Together proposal. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Kueneman, R., Linden, R., & Kosmick, R. (1985). A study of Manitoba's northern and rural juvenile courts. Working paper prepared for the Secretariat Research Division.
- Kurzman, P. (1985). Program development and service coordination as components of community practice. in S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.) Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Lane, R. (1939). The field of community organization. in Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lappin, B. (1985). Community development: Beginnings in social work enabling. in S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.) Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lindeman, E. (1921). The community, an introduction to the study of community leadership and organization. New York: Association Press.
- Lotz, J. (1969). Community developer: Outsider in the middle. International Review of Community Development, 21/22, 261-280.
- Manitoba Community Services and Youth Corrections (1985). A Manitoba proposal for province-wide community involvement in the youth justice system. Winnipeg: Department of Community Services and Corrections.
- Manitoba Community Services Community & Youth Corrections. (1986). 1985 annual reports. Winnipeg: Department of Community Services and Corrections.
- Manitoba Community Services and Youth Corrections (1986). Working Together: Progress Report October 1985-May 1986. Winnipeg: Department of Community Services and Corrections.
- Manitoba Community Services and Youth Corrections (1986). Working Together: Progress Report June 1986-December 1986. Winnipeg: Department of Community Services and Corrections.
- McCall, G., & Simmons, J. (Eds.). (1969). Issues in participant observation. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Miller, S. (1969). The participant observer and "over-rapport". In G. McCall & J. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Mohr, L. (1969). Determinants of innovation in organizations. The American Political Science Review. Vol. 63. p. 111-126.

- Nelson, R., & Yates, D. (1978). Innovation and implementation in public organizations. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Rogers, E. (1962). Diffusion of innovations. New York: The Free Press.
- Rogers, E. (1983). Diffusion of innovations. 3rd Edition. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- Rogers, E., & Shoemaker, F. (1971). Communication of innovation: A cross-cultural approach. New York: The Free Press.
- Ross, M. (1955). Community organization: Theory and principles. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Ross, M. (1967). Community organization: Theory, principles and practice. (2nd Edition). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Rothman, J. (1968). Three models of community organization practice. In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman & J. Tropman, (Eds.) (1970). Strategies of community organization. Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Rothman, J. (1974). Planning and organizing for social change. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rothman, J. (1979). Three models of community organization practice, their mixing and phasing. In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman & J. Tropman, (Eds.). Strategies of community organization 3rd Edition. Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Rothman, J., Erlich, J., & Teresa, J. (1976). Promoting innovation and change in organizations and communities. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rothman, J., & Zald, M. (1985). Planning theory in social work community practice. in S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.) Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (1986). Community organizing and development. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Ryant, J., & Heinrich, C. (1987). Working Together: A community development approach to the Young Offenders Act in Manitoba. Paper presented at the

3rd Conference on Provincial Social Welfare, Banff, AB.

- Ryant, J., & Heinrich, C. (1988). Youth court committees in Manitoba. in J. Hudson, J. Hornick and B. Burrows, (Eds.). Justice and the young offender in Canada. Toronto: Wall and Thompson.
- Ryant, J. (1986). Interim reports - Working Together. Winnipeg: Child and Family Services Research Group.
- Schon, D. (1971). Beyond the stable state. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Schwartz, M. (1965). Community organization. in H. Lurie. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of social work. New York: Boyd Printing Company.
- Steiner, J. (1930). Community organization: A study of its theory and current practice. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.
- Sundeen, R. (1985). Coproduction and communities. Administration and Society. Vol. 16 No. 4, 387-402.
- Taylor, S., & Roberts, R. (Eds.). (1985). Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, S., & Roberts, R. (1985). The fluidity of practice theory. in S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.). Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, S. (1985) Community work and social work: The community liaison approach. in S. Taylor and R. Roberts (Eds.). Theory and practice of community social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tripodi, T., Fellin, P., & Meyer, H. (1983). The assessment of social research. (2nd Edition). Itasca: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Whittaker, J., & Garbarino, J. (1983). Social support networks: Informal helping in the human services. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Young Offenders Act, Statutes of Canada 1980-81-82-83, c. 110.

Zaltman, G., Duncan, R., & Holbek, J. (1973).
Innovations and organizations.New York: John Wiley
& Sons.