1972

An Exploratory Analysis of Developmental Sequences in Interorganizational Coalitions Involved in Community Planning

Clifford Albert Snyder
Portland State University

AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENTAL

SEQUENCES IN INTERORGANIZATIONAL

COALITIONS INVOLVED IN

COMMUNITY PLANNING

by

Clifford Albert Snyder

A report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF
SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University

1972

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE PRACTICUM COMMITTEE:

_____

Gerald A. Frey, School of Social Work

_____

Sumner M. Sharp, Urban Studies Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CHARTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is one of four exploratory studies concerned with coalitions of organizations that are formed to plan and develop social welfare programs within the local community. Although each study was conducted independently, taken together, their major purpose was to develop some insights and knowledge into the behavior of organizations and the ways in which they interact as they work together to develop community programs. They are then, exploratory studies of interorganizational behavior.

Each of the studies had a different focus. One study attempted to identify the present areas of agreement and disagreement regarding interorganizational behavior by systematically reviewing the literature. Another examined the decision-making process by first, constructing a decision-making model and then "testing" the model against a set of case histories. The final study, following a grounded theory approach, simply tried to identify a set of common variables or analytical categories which seemed to be present in a number of coalitions. Although each of these exploratory studies was conducted independently with a different emphasis and

analytical focus, they each utilized the same data---a set of case histories of coalitions. Consequently, each of the studies utilized a common set of data but viewed the data from quite different analytical perspectives.

The particular focus of this study is on the developmental sequences of stages which coalitions of organizations undergo in obtaining their objectives, attempting to determine if they follow similar developmental sequences as has been reported in the literature on small groups. This study is offered as a contribution to the theoretical study of developmental sequences of what is referred to in the small group literature as "natural-state groups", since they come together in the environment for some goal or objective over which the researcher has no command.[1] Few studies of this type of small groups exist within the literature and knowledge regarding their developmental sequences is even more limited. Of equal importance, the study is also a contribution to the theoretical understanding of the behavior of coalitions or organizations, knowledge of which is extremely limited and upon the practical interest in coalitions of organizations as an emerging structure in local community planning.[2]

THE CONCEPT OF THE COALITION

There is nothing new about the concept of a coalition of organizations. Organizational coalitions have been formed and reformed ever since man began working through organizational structures. They are common, everyday occurrences, yet surprisingly little is known about them since much of the theoretical work has focused on coalitions of individuals or small groups or on the

alliances and coalitions of political groups and nations. Surprisingly little work has been done specifically on organizational coalitions.

A coalition of organizations is an interorganizational structure. That is, a structure in which two or more organizations deliberately relate their behavior to each other as when several organizations jointly agree to plan some new program in the community. They are also unique structures in that each of the organizations maintains its own autonomy, but for a period of time they work together around some common issue or mutual problem.

Coalitions, in contrast to other types of interorganizational structures such as councils or federations, tend to be ad hoc and issue-oriented structures. That is, there is little permanence to the structure. A group of organizations join together around an issue, meet for a period of time, and simply disband or dissolve once the issue is resolved. They are rather fluid and amorphous structures, but they do represent one of the ways that organizations cooperate with each other.[3]

Within recent years the coalition has been viewed as a possible means to coordinate disparate programs within the community. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the United Way of America have jointly sponsored a project to examine the use of coalitions in the planning process. To some degree then, the coalition seems to be an increasingly important structure and one that needs to be fully understood by the planner if it is to be effectively utilized.

Consequently, an increased knowledge of organizational behavior especially on the relationship between organizations, would not

only aid the planner in his daily tasks but at the same time contribute to the limited knowledge of interorganizational behavior.

II. METHODOLOGY

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE

Descriptive analytical procedures will be systematically employed in examining three coalition case histories to determine if they undergo a developmental sequence similar to other small groups as has been reported in the literature. Each case history will be analyzed separately using the same analytical procedure, as follows:

1) A review of the literature with reference to studies that have been made of developmental sequences within small groups.

2) Creation of an integrated model of developmental sequences within small groups through a synthesis of these studies.

3) Testing the integrated model of developmental sequences within small groups through a descriptive analysis of case histories of coalitions of organizations.

4) Review and modification of the integrated model based upon the descriptive analysis of the case histories of coalitions of organizations.

THE CASES

The three case histories of coalitions which are to be analyzed were collected as part of a seminar in community planning. The setting of the case histories is Portland, Oregon, the largest city and economic capital of Oregon, with a metropolitan population of approximately one million.

The case histories were obtained from interviewing knowledgeable informants (i.e. chairman, organizer, staff persons, the most important participants, etc.) who were actively involved in the coalition. Five to six interviews were obtained from each coalition using the same structured interview schedule and tech-

5

niques. Field observations were obtained whenever possible.
Interview data was supplemented by secondary data, such as news-
paper articles, policy statements, meeting minutes, statements of
agreement when such data existed. Each case history was focused
around three major concerns:

1. The Developmental Pattern
2. The Structure of the Coalition
3. The Decision-Making Characteristics

During the data collection process, information was obtained on
the following topics:

1. Around what issue or issues was the coalition initially formed?
2. How did the coalition get formed?
3. What "stake" or interest did the member have in the coalition?
4. How accountable were the members to their constituency?
5. How did the coalition organize itself for decision-making?
6. Were there any conflicts or arguments between the members?
7. Over time, did new issues emerge, or did the group stick closely to its initial purpose?
8. What effect, if any, did the decisions make in the coalition's effect upon the members' own organizations?

On the basis of the interview and secondary data, a case history
was reconstructed.

Using the model as a framework, an examination of the possi-
ble developmental sequences which coalitions, as natural-state
groups, undergo in resolving some issue in the environment may be
defined. Similarities and/or differences between behavioral char-
acteristics of each of the coalition case histories will be ex-
plored. Questions that may be asked with regard to the descrip-
tive analysis of the case histories are:

1. Do the coalitions undergo a similar developmental sequence as has been found in other small groups?

2. What developmental behavior characteristics do the coalitions exhibit as they attempt to resolve some issue?

3. What similarities and/or differences in developmental behavior characteristics exist between the coalition case histories?

III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

THE REVIEW

Frey has defined the "interorganizational coalition" as " . . . an independent structure in which the members of the coalition represent some formal organization and are committed to some form of joint decision-making process around certain operational goals and objectives."[4] This definition appears to indicate that the coalition[5] can consist of individuals who represent some formal organization, groups of individuals who represent some formal organization and/or groups of formal organizations. This being the case, the coalition is made up of people who create an independent structure as a group and function as a group. When a coalition is formed, it becomes for all purposes a small group committed to some form of decision-making process, although in some cases such a coalition may grow beyond what is considered to be the boundaries of a small group.

The coalition may be conceptualized as a natural-state group. Tuckman defined the natural-state group on the basis that " . . . the group exists to perform some social or professional function over which the researcher has no control. Members are not brought together for self-improvement; rather, they come together to do a job. Such groups may be characterized either by appointed or emergent leadership."[6] Natural-state groups, therefore, are primarily characterized by individual and group oriented processes for the performance of some task in the environment. Tuckman went on to suggest that presidential advisory councils and industrial groups are representative examples of such natural-state groups.[7]

However, this definition appears to be a rather restricted view of the natural-state group, since it is based only upon the few studies which exist in the small group literature dealing with this type of group.

By using Tuckman's definition of natural-state groups, it is readily apparent that the coalition as a small group would be conceptualized within this group framework. The coalition is brought together to do a job--in this case, the planning and development of social welfare programs at the local community level, and may have either an appointed or emergent leadership. It should be noted that in most groups, including many natural-state groups, the group members are accountable for their performance of the group task to the group itself. In contrast, the members of the coalition are accountable for their performance not only to the coalition, but also to the organizations which they represent in the external environment.

While, as far as it is known, there have been no studies of the developmental sequences which coalitions as a natural-state group undergo in community planning, there have been some attempts to create hypotheses related to small political groups described as the study of coalition behavior. One of the authors dealing with this subject area is Kelly, who suggested eight hypotheses related to the analysis of coalitions, however, he did not suggest or note a hypothesis regarding the developmental sequences which coalitions might undergo.[8] Madron feels that small group theory can be used to study small political groups, since "Much of what politics is takes place within small groups."[9] He notes that when

a coalition is formed, it becomes a small group, although coalitions may grow beyond what is considered to be the boundaries of a small group.[10]   On this basis, it is felt that a review of major theoretical statements regarding the developmental sequences of small groups may be helpful in creating a model for the study of coalition developmental sequences.

While there has been extensive research on various aspects of small group behavior, there has been little systematic research related to developmental sequences in small groups.[11] Two of the most extensive reviews of the literature on developmental sequences in the small group are those of Gordon Hearn and Bruce Tuckman. Hearn found that the literature is rather meager with regard to major theoretical statements of developmental sequences in small groups after undertaking a review of over one hundred articles which take a longitudinal view of small group processes.[12] Tuckman reviewed fifty articles dealing with stages of group development and also found few major theoretical statements regarding developmental sequences in small groups.[13] In both cases, the majority of articles dealing with developmental sequences focused on therapy and human relations training groups with only a few studies concerning themselves with natural-state groups. Consequently, literature on natural-state groups is limited. However, by reviewing the few major theoretical statements that do exist in the small group literature regarding sequential stages of group development, a synthesis for a framework for coalition developmental sequences as a natural-state group may be created.

THE BALES MODEL

Robert Bales has formulated one model of developmental sequences in small laboratory groups based upon group problem-solving phases.[14] Phases in this model were defined as qualitatively dissimilar interactional sub-periods between initiation and the completion of a group problem-solving task. The behavior of group members were coded according to twelve categories which were based upon five variables. Changes in the quality of activity during problem-solving phases were called phase patterns as the group moved through time in attempting to solve its problems. Three phases were arbitrarily assigned to one third of the total category actions of the group. The three phases of orientation, evaluation, and control were weighted by the behavior within each of the five category variables. The three phases may be defined somewhat as follows:

> PHASE I: Orientation. Group attempts to define the problem which faces the group. Member behavior is directed toward giving an orientation (i.e. information, repeats, clarifies, confirms) and asking for an orientation (i.e., information, repetition, confirmation) regarding the problem.

> PHASE II: Evaluation. The group attempts to determine how they feel about the problem. Member behavior is directed toward giving an opinion (i.e., evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish) and asking for an opinion, (i.e., evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling) regarding the problem.

> PHASE III: Control. The group attempts to determine what they should do about the problem. Member behavior is directed toward giving suggestions (i.e., direction, implying autonomy for others) and asking for suggestions (i.e., direction, possible ways of action) regarding the problem.

Bales concluded that groups with problems of analysis and planning tend to show a typical phase movement through time with

the amount of behavioral activity increasing with each phase. The
different behavior activities of the three phases overlapped
throughout the sessions of the group, however, different beha-
viors were in greater evidence during the life of the group. The
major conclusion reached by Bales is that the development sequence
of these groups is systematic over time.[15]

THE BACH MODEL

George Bach has developed a developmental model based upon
his experiences with intensive psychotherapy groups.[16] The seven
phases of the model may be defined somewhat as follows:

PHASE I: Initial Situation Testing. The group attempts to
determine the nature of group psychotherapy and
determine the relationships which the therapist
will promote in the group.

PHASE II: Leader Dependence. Group members have initial re-
sistance to therapy and relate in an independent
manner to therapist which creates tension in the
group.

PHASE III: Familial Regression. The therapy group members
regress to the level of a family group through
transference to deal with the tension created by
resistance and dependency.

PHASE IV: Associative Compeering. The group develops mature
peer relationships in contrast to the immature
family relationships to overcome tension.

PHASE V: Fantasy and Play. The group engages in mature
socializing and role-playing themes.

PHASE VI: In-Group Consciousness. The group members become
a cohesive unit and develop a sense of being part
of a group.

PHASE VII: The Work Group. The group functions as a cohesive
unit as a support to the goals of therapy.

In all seven phases of group development, three common factors of
group dynamics were used to characterize the relation of each
phase to the others: (1) basic emotions, (2) values, and

12

(3) quality of verbal communication. Each of the phases was re-
lated to sixteen different group activities or themes discussed
by patients in group therapy.[17]

By using the concept of phases, Bach did not wish to imply
that a therapy group moves through a firm and orderly succession
of phases, rather he concluded that it moves through an orderly
model of varied group processes. These phase processes overlap
one another and may occur simultaneously during any one period of
a group therapy meeting.

THE HEARN MODEL

Gordon Hearn has postulated that as a group grows toward
maturity it moves through a series of "modes of activity" that
can be defined.[18] Hearn's model is based upon his observations
of about twenty-five graduate seminars which were conducted much
like sensitivity groups. On the basis of his observations, he
was able to identify five modes or phases of activity as the
groups grew towards maturity:

PHASE I: Attempts to structure the unknown and to find one's
position in the group.

PHASE II: Ideological conflict and polarization around the
issues.

PHASE III: Attempts to resolve conflict and restore group
harmony.

PHASE IV: Acceptance and utilization of difference.

PHASE V: Collaborative work on corporate tasks.

In an effort to validate his observations, he also analyzed
over one hundred articles which take a longitudinal view of group
processes. While he found some agreement with his model, he con-
cluded that phases of development in group processes may develop

in the way that we subjectively expect them to develop. Hearn's major conclusion is that groups do not go through specific phases, but rather engage in overlapping behavioral activities which may be defined.[19]

THE SCHUTZ MODEL

Another major theoretical statement of how groups develop in a sequential pattern is that created by William Schutz in his work FIRO (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation).[20] He postulated that the formation and development of a laboratory group always follows the same sequence of three phases: inclusion, control and affection. The three phases were defined as follows:

Inclusion is defined behaviorally as the interpersonal need ". . . to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association".[21] This phase begins with the formation of the group and deals with such problems as joining or not joining the group and committing oneself or not committing oneself to the group. These problems create anxiety which is directed toward the behavior of individuals in the group.

Control is defined behaviorally as the interpersonal need ". . .to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power."[22] The control phase begins when the problems of inclusion have been sufficiently resolved by the group. The central issues revolve around the problem of decision-making procedures and entail a leadership struggle between individual group members. The individual members of the group try to establish themselves in the group's developing status hierarchy. Anxiety in the group revolves around the amount of responsibility

14

and influence the members of the group hold.

Affection is defined behaviorally as the interpersonal need ". . . to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection."[23] The major issue in this phase is emotional integration of individuals within the group. Each individual tries to obtain the most comfortable amount of love and affectional interchange as possible. Anxiety in the group revolves around such issues as intimacy, closeness, and being liked.

Schutz concluded that inclusion, control and affection are not distinct phases. The behaviors of each phase are always present during the group process, but are not of equal importance or emphasis during any one period of time. Each phase places emphasis on some major problem in the group process. He also concluded that the emphasized behavior reoccurs in a sequential pattern of interaction which tends to reverse itself towards the end of the group process. This pattern is stated as follows: "I C A I C A . . . A C I"[24] or Inclusion, Control, Affection, Inclusion, Control, Affection . . . Affection, Control, Inclusion. In other words, the group both begins and ends with inclusion.

THE TUCKMAN MODEL

One of the most extensive theoretical models of group development is that of Bruce Tuckman who based his model upon a review of fifty articles dealing with this subject.[25] In his review of developmental studies, the author classified the studies into three settings in which the groups were found: (1) group-therapy, (2) human relation training groups (T-groups), and (3) nautral

15

groups and laboratory task groups. Within the studies reviewed, stages were identified to distinguish between those descriptive of group patterns of interpersonal relationship (group structure) and the content of interaction as related to the task at hand (task activity) exhibited in the group.[26] Tuckman proposed a universal hypothetical model of four general stages of development on the basis of his review of the literature. His model can be summarized somewhat as follows:

STAGE I: Forming: The first realm, group structure, is labeled testing and dependence. The group members attempt to discover the boundaries of the group situation through testing. They look dependently to some individual or individuals or standards for support and guidance. The task activity realm is labeled orientation to the task and is characterized by attempts to define the content of interactional tasks through discovery of the ground rules of the situation.

STAGE II: Storming. The group structure realm is labeled intergroup conflict and is characterized by a lack of group unity through expression of hostility toward each other and the group leadership. The realm of task activity is labeled emotional response to task demands and is characterized by individuals reacting to the task emotionally as a form of resistance to the demands of the task upon the individual member.

STAGE III: Conforming. The realm of group structure is labeled development of group cohesion and is characterized by the importance of harmony and avoidance of task conflicts. The realm of task activity is labeled open exchange of relevant interpretations and is characterized by openness to others in the group and information being acted upon so that other interpretations of information can be created by the group.

STAGE IV: Performing. The realm of group structure is labeled functional role-relatedness and is characterized by the group becoming a problem-solving mechanism directed toward the task, since the group is now an entity. The realm of task activity is labeled emergence of solutions and is characterized by

16

constructive attempts directed toward successful task completion and action.

The proposed four stage model is in itself the major conclusion of Tuckman's study. He feels that the suggested stages of group development were visible in the literature reviewed and provide an excellent fit for conceptualization. Tuckman also suggested in his conclusions that there is need for further study of temporal change as a dependent variable through the manipulation of specific independent variables. Tuckman did not discuss the problem of whether his stages follow a distinct developmental sequence, in contrast to the overlapping and reoccurring behavior patterns reported by the other authors.[27]

It should be pointed out that the previous authors did not specifically concern themselves with natural-state groups. The Bales and Schutz models were based upon the study of laboratory groups, although their concepts may be conceived as being useful to the study of natural-state groups. While Tuckman did use a few natural-state groups studies in the construction of his model, their impact was of little importance due to their minor significance and to the weight given the numerous therapy and training groups studied. However, one major theoretical model concerning developmental sequences in natural-state groups has appeared recently in the literature.

THE ZURCHER MODEL

Louis Zurcher examined developmental sequences in natural-state groups in a study of poverty program neighborhood action committees.[28] From this study seven stages of committee development were conceptualized somewhat as follows:

17

STAGE I: <u>Orientation</u>. Participants attempt to determine the meaning of the committee's function.

STAGE II: <u>Catharsis</u>. Participants provide an outpouring of injustices that have been committed against them. Emotions run quite high due to this factor. Rudimentary group identity and cohesion developed through "us" vs. "them" feeling.

STAGE III: <u>Focus</u>. Participants elect indigenous leader as chairman of the committee and begin work on a solution to member-specified needs. Group identity and cohesion increase.

STAGE IV: <u>Action</u>. Participants decide by vote on a specific community action funding proposal. Enthusiasm runs high which develops strong group identity and cohesion. Some sense of the power of participation gained by the group.

STAGE V: <u>Limbo</u>. Participants complete proposal and must now wait for funding. Frustration born of delay causes reoccurrence of emotional behaviors seen in Stage II. Group identity and cohesion decrease.

STAGE VI: <u>Testing</u>. The proposal is funded. However, participants appear less than enthusiastic about approval. Participants attempt to regain feeling of group identity and cohesion by testing the validity of participation and the reality of power and control.

STAGE VII: <u>Purposive</u>. Participants obtain a sense of meaningful participation as they carry out the objectives of the proposal. They manifest flexibility in obtaining community needs and develop a sense of community. The committee establishes and maintains its autonomy.

Zurcher concluded that the individual and group behaviors described and conceptualized in the study tend to overlap into the next stage as they occur and continued throughout the remaining development of the group after they occurred. The author also concluded that the committees did not specifically fit into any single type of group category, rather they assumed some of the behavioral and member characteristics defined by Tuckman as belonging to therapy, training and natural-state groups.

DISCUSSION AND SYNTHESIS

The six major theoretical models discussed in the above review appear to indicate that there is a basis for conceptualization of developmental sequences in small groups. It is felt that the six models of group developmental sequences are representative of the different therapy, training, laboratory and natural-state types of groups from which they are derived. However, the major issue with regard to these models of small group development is whether the various stages and phases of each may be conceptualized as being distinctly sequential or conceptualized as patterns of behavioral activity which may reoccur and overlap over time. Only Tuckman does not appear to deal with this issue, although this in itself should not be construed as support for either side of this issue. The other studies indicate that developmental sequences while occurring may be conceptualized as group behavioral processes which may be emphasized during certain periods of group growth, overlapping and/or reoccurring over time in some orderly sequence. On this basis, developmental sequences as defined in the literature do not appear to be conceptualized as specific distinct stages, rather they appear to be defined as orderly behavioral processes which may overlap and/or reoccur during the life of a group.

Since there is relatively little data on natural-state groups in the literature, generalizations based upon these six theoretical developmental sequence models must be dealt with carefully. However, it is felt that an approximate integration of these models can be created. (See Chart I) Such an integration of developmental models should not be construed as a complete synthesis, since they

represent different types of groups which may or may not be congruent with one another. In order to create an integrated reduction of these models, Tuckman's model of group development was used as a basis for the synthesis of the stages. Tuckman's model appears to be more universal in scope, since it transcends each of the various types of groups from which it was developed, thereby lending itself to such a reduction. Such a reduction was implied by Zurcher when he suggested that his seven stages could be reduced to the four stages developed by Tuckman:[29] Tuckman's "Forming" paralleling I. Orientation; "Storming" paralleling II. Catharsis; "Norming" paralleling a combination of III. Focus, IV. Action, V. Limbo, and VI. Testing; and "Performing" paralleling VII. Purposive. However, Zurcher felt that such a reduction would have made his stages of development less useful for the poverty worker.

The synthesis of these developmental models from the various types of groups suggest that there is some possible integration between the different models. What is specifically apparent within any type of group is that some form of developmental behavior exists during its middle stage(s), and some form of behavior during the termination stage of group life. A simple basic three-stage integration of the various developmental models can be created through synthesis. (See Chart I). Using such a three-stage model of group development, it is seen that each begins with some form of orientational stage during which the group's situation is defined and moves to some form of terminal cooperative stage of group behavior. However, before this termination stage is reached, the various groups in the different settings must deal with the

20

CHART I

INTEGRATION OF GROUP DEVELOPMENTAL SEQUENCE MODELS

... Groups	Schutz Laboratory and Natural State Groups	Hearn Training Groups	Zurcher Natural State Groups	Basic Three Stage Model
Initial ...n Test-	Inclusion	Stage I: Structuring the unknown	I. Orientation	Stage I: Orientation
...: Leader ...nce ...I: Famil-... ...ression	Control	Stage II: Ideological conflict and polarization around issues	II. Catharsis	Stage II: Middle Stage(s)
...: Associa... ...mpeering Fantasy ...y ...: In grp... ...usness	Affection	Stage III: Attempts to resolve conflict and restore group harmony	III: Focus IV: Action V: Limbo VI: Testing	
...I: The ...oup		Stage IV: Acceptance and utilization of differences Stage V: Collaborative work on corp. tasks	VII: Purposive	Stage III: Terminal

diverse situations around which they were formed which may or may not lead them into some form of conflict to be resolved before the terminal cooperative stage is reached. If group conflict does not develop during this middle stage(s), there must be some manner in which the possibility of group conflict is averted. On this basis, it may be concluded that a group moves through a basic three-stage developmental process:

STAGE I: Orientational stage during which the group's forming situation is defined and structured by the group.

STAGE II: Middle stage(s) during which the group must deal with its forming situation in some manner or form.

STAGE III: Terminal stage during which the group is characterized by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation.

To describe the behaviors within each of the three stages of the integrated model, it is felt that the sequential behavioral characteristics found in the few natural-state groups reported in the literature may provide a framework for the analysis of this type of group.

Modlin and Faris see the natural-state group as being characterized by:[30]

(1) Structuralization: member roles are defined by the external environment, upon well established norms, and a rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

(2) Unrest: Conflict and disharmony becomes apparent among group members.

(3) Change: The group is conceptualized as a functioning unit with the emergence of a team "dialect".

(4) Integration: The group structure becomes internalized and the group philosophy becomes pragmatic.

Schroeder and Harvey see the natural-state group as being characterized by:[31]

(1) Absolutistic Dependency: The emergence of a status hierarchy and rigid norms which foster dependency, but reduces ambiguity.

(2) Negative Independence: The emergence of group conflict and resistance.

(3) Conditional Dependence: The emergence of group integration reflected in mutuality and the maintenance of relationships.

(4) Positive Interdependence: The emergence of interdependent behavior among members with regard to mutuality and autonomy to achieve the group's task.

Both Tuckman and Zurcher generalized the laboratory group sequential behavioral characteristics found in the Bales and the Schutz Models to cover natural-state groups.[32] On this basis, the behavioral characteristics of these two laboratory groups may also be used to provide a framework for the analysis of natural-state groups:

Bales and Strodtbeck see the laboratory group as being characterized by:[33]

(1) Orientation: The group becomes concerned with increasing emphasis upon boundaries and approaches related to the task.

(2) Evaluation: The group members increase expressions of opinion to define the task.

(3) Control: The group establishes control over the task to reach some solution.

Schutz sees the laboratory group as being characterized by:[34]

(1) Inclusion: The group members deal with the problem of whether or not to commit themselves to the group.

(2) Control: The group deals with leadership struggles to define individual positions in the emerging group Hierarchy.

(3) Affection: The group deals with the problems of emotional integration, pairing and the final resolution of problems related to intimacy.

These natural-state and laboratory group sequential behavior characteristics can be summarized by being applied to the integrated three stage developmental model according to best fit. (See Chart II) As may be seen, the behavioral characteristics that best fit the middle stage(s) were divided between those that expressed conflict and conflict-management behaviors. The three stage model in this form can be used as a criteria for the analysis of developmental behavior in coalitions as natural-state groups, since it is felt that similar behaviors will be found in this type of group.

CHART II

Natural-State and Laboratory Group Sequential Behavior
Characteristics Applied to Integrated
Three Stage Model

STAGE I: <u>Orientational</u> stage during which the group's forming
situation is defined and structured by the group

    A.   Structuralization (Modlin and Faris)

    B.   Absolutistic Dependency (Schroder and Harvey)

    C.   Orientation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

    D.   Inclusion (Schutz)

STAGE II: <u>Middle</u> stage(s) during which the group must deal with
its forming situation in some manner or form.

    A.   Conflict behaviors.

        1.   Unrest (Modlin and Faris)

        2.   Negative Independence (Schroder and Harvey)

        3.   Control (Schutz)

    B.   Conflict-management behaviors.

        1.   Change (Modlin and Faris)

        2.   Conditional Dependence (Schroder and Harvey)

        3.   Evaluation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

        4.   Affection (Schutz)

STAGE III: <u>Terminal</u> stage during which the group is characterized
by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the
forming situation.

    A.   Integration (Modlin and Faris)

    B.   Positive Interdependence (Schroder and Harvey)

    C.   Control (Bales and Strodtbeck)

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE COALITIONS

PURPOSE OF THE DESCRIPTIONS

The purpose of the following descriptions of the three case histories of coalitions is twofold. First, it will provide the reader data to help understand the dynamic processes involved during the life of these coalitions. Second, it will provide a check of the fit of the integrated three stage model's behavioral characteristics against what occurred during their developmental history as a basis for a comparative analysis. The descriptions appear in a summary outline form highlighting the emphasized behavioral activities that occur during the life histories of the coalitions. They are not meant to be a detailed description of what occurs over time.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CHILD ADVOCACY COALITION:

The Child Advocacy Coalition focused upon the forming issue of planning for a federally funded proposal for a child advocacy program. Participation in the coalition was voluntary. The coalition met for three months through informal meetings. Its members represented seventeen organizations at its initial formation, although only six were to make up its decision-making "planning" committee.

PRE-STAGE: Organization Stage

The coalition's organization began prior to its first actual meeting when the executive director of a local child welfare agency was approached by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Program Liaison Office regarding NIMH's interest in the concept of child advocacy. The executive director met with a group of NIMH personnel in Washington, D. C., who proposed that the local

child welfare agency ought to be one of the applicants for such a proposal, since it was already involved in developing the concept of a child advocacy program. The idea was briefly discussed with the agency's Executive Committee and Board of Directors who showed interest in the proposal. Consequently, the executive director took the initiative to convene all interested organizations to a meeting to discuss the feasibility of the proposal for a child advocacy program for Portland.

Stage I: Orientational stage during which the group's forming situation is defined and structured by the group.

A. Structuralization (Modlin and Faris)

1. The executive director's role as a leader defined through his involvement in convening the meeting and contact with NIMH which supports his agency for proposal.

2. He assumes responsibility for planning the proposal in emerging rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

3. Creation of "planning" committee as decision-making body indicates roles defined by interest from the external environment, upon well established norms, and the development of rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

B. Absolutistic Dependency (Schroder and Harvey)

1. The emergence of a status hierarchy is seen in the leadership roles taken by the executive director and planning committee.

2. The emergence of rigid norms which foster dependency and submission in the other representatives, but which reduces ambiguity in the coalition is seen in the creation of "planning" committee and lack of definition the larger group has in the decision-making process.

C. Inclusion (Schutz)

1. The coalition members deal with whether or not to commit themselves to coalition. This

27

characteristic seen in the committment
various organizations make to the coalition's
task.

D. Orientation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

1. The coalition becomes concerned with in-
creasing emphasis upon boundaries and
approaches related to defining the task
through creation of the "planning" committee.

Stage II: Middle stage(s) during which the group must deal
with its forming situation in some manner or form.

A. Conflict behaviors.

1. Unrest (Modlin and Faris)

a. Conflict and disharmony among coalition
members becomes apparent over issue of
what agency should sponsor proposal to
Federal government---child welfare agen-
cy or local community action agency in
target area.

b. Conflict and disharmony among members
becomes apparent when executive direc-
tor pushes for his agency as sponsor
causing polarization of "planning" com-
mittee.

c. Disharmony among members becomes ap-
parent when interpersonal conflict ex-
isting before the coalition's formation
emerges in coalition between the execu-
tive director and another member.

2. Negative Independence (Schoroder and Harvey)

a. The emergence of coalition conflict and
resistance over the issue of what agency
should sponsor proposal.

b. Conflict and resistance seen when execu-
tive director pushes for his agency as
sponsor, causing polarization of "planning"
committee.

3. Control (Schutz)

a. Leadership struggle develops between ex-
ecutive director and members of "planning"
committee over which agency should sponsor
proposal.

B. Conflict-Management Behaviors

    1. Change (Modlin and Faris)

        a. Coalition "planning" committee begins to function as a unit through the development of a team "dialect" seen in the drawing up of an alternative proposal with target area community action agency as sponsor and efforts to seek its approval.

    2. Conditional Dependence (Schroder and Harvey)

        a. Integration reflected in the mutuality and the maintenance of relationships in the "planning" committee to draw up alternate proposal.

    3. Affection (Schutz)

        a. No behavioral characteristics of this type noted in the case history.

    4. Evaluation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

        a. Increased expressions of opinion reflected in the drawing up of the alternate proposal by the "planning" committee as a functioning unit to define the coalition's task.

Stage III: Terminal stage during which the group is characterized by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation.

    A. Integration (Modlin and Faris)

        1. With formal withdrawal of the child welfare agency as a possible sponsor of the proposal, the coalition's structure was internalized and the coalition's philosophy became pragmatic, thereby allowing it to draw up a final copy of the proposal to submit to the Federal Government.

    B. Positive Interdependence (Schroder and Harvey)

        1. The emrgence of interdependent behavior among the members of the "planning" committee and the coalition with regard to mutuality and autonomy to achieve the coalition's task as seen in the drawing up of the final proposal to be submitted and the written support received from most of the member organizations.

    C. Control (Bales and Strodtbeck)

1. The coalition established control over its task through the drawing up and submission of the final copy of the proposal which is the solution to the situation which created the coalition.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ACTION CENTER COALITION:

The Legislative Action Center (LAC) Coalition focused upon the informal "neutral" coordination of legislative activity of local organizations interested in social legislation. Participation in the coalition was voluntary. The coalition met for a total of seven months during the state legislative session in regular weekly meetings. Its members represented fifteen organizations at its initial formation. Although more were later added, an average active representation at the coalition's meetings was twelve to fifteen organizations. The decision-making body of the coalition was a "planning" committee made up of representatives of six organizations. The "planning" committee later evolved into the Executive Committee.

PRE-STAGE: Organizational Stage

The coalition's organization began prior to its first actual meeting when an attorney for the local Legal Aid Office began to think of possible allies to help support legislation on tenant's rights for the forthcoming Oregon Legislative Assembly. He thought that a coalition of "liberal" organizations might be put together. The idea of such a coalition was presented at a meeting of another already formed coalition representing twenty organizations which focused on the plight of public welfare recipients. Apparently, the strategy was to try to build a base from the organizations involved in this coalition. These organizations were "liberal" and were concerned not only with welfare issues, but other social

legislation as well.

Stage I: Orientation stage during which the group's situation is defined and structured by the group.

A. Structuralization (Modlin and Faris)

   1. The attorney's role as a leader defined through his involvement in developing the idea of a LAC.

   2. A committee was appointed at the meeting of the welfare coalition to explore the concept and report back to the coalition. Roles in the committee defined by the external environment, upon well established norms and through the development of a rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

   3. Attorney was named chairman of committee, indicating the development of a rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

   4. Member roles of emerging LAC coalition defined through the development of a "planning" committee as a decision-making body by the external environment, upon well established norms, through the development of a rigid hierarchy of responsibility.

B. Absolutistic Dependency (Schroder and Harvey)

   1. The emergence of a status hierarchy seen in the leadership roles taken by attorney and committee to draft tentative proposal for LAC.

   2. The emergence of rigid norms which foster dependency and submission in the other representatives of the welfare coalition, but which reduces ambiguity seen in the creation of the committee.

   3. The emergence of rigid norms which foster dependency and submission in the other members of the emerging LAC coalition, but which reduce ambiguity seen in the creation of "planning" committee as a decision-making body.

C. Inclusion (Schutz)

   1. Possible interested organizations contacted regarding the creation of a LAC of which ten informally commit themselves to coalition's task.

D. Orientation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

31

1. The emerging coalition becomes concerned with increasing emphasis upon boundaries and approaches related to defining the task through welfare coalition's appointment of committee, drafting of tentative proposal for a LAC, and development of "planning" committee in emerging LAC coalition.

Stage II: Middle Stage(s) during which the group must deal with its forming situation in some manner or form.

A. Conflict behaviors

1. No apparent conflict behavior noted in case history

B. Conflict-management behaviors

1. Change (Modlin and Faris)

a. The "planning" committee begins to function as a unit through the development of a "team" dialect to define the objectives and the details of operation for the LAC and appointed director.

2. Conditional Dependence (Schroder and Harvey)

a. Integration reflected in the mutuality and maintenance of relationships in the "planning" committee and appointed director to define the objectives and the details of operation for the LAC.

3. Affection (Schutz)

a. No behavioral characteristics of this type noted in the case history.

4. Evaluation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

a. Increased expressions of opinion reflected in the defining of objectives and details of operation for the LAC by the "planning" committee and by appointed director.

Stage III: Terminal stage during which the group is characterized by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation.

A. Integration (Modlin and Faris)

1. The coalition's structure becomes internalized

and its philosophy becomes pragmatic with the official formation of the LAC to carry out the coalition's objectives as a functioning reality.

B. Positive Interdependence (Schroder and Harvey)

    1. The emergence of interdependent behavior in the coalition members with regard to mutuality and autonomy to achieve the coalition's task objective of a functioning LAC.

C. Control (Bales and Strodtbeck)

    1. The coalition established control over its task objective as a solution to the forming situation with the official formation of the LAC as a functioning reality.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT INTERCOM COALITION

The Project Intercom Coalition focused upon the planning of a jointly sponsored preventive services program for pre-alienated youth in the local community. Participation in the coalition was voluntary. It met for an eleven-month period in regular monthly meetings. The coalition was made up of four family service agencies during its initial formation, although two more agencies were later added. The entire coalition acted as the decision-making body.

PRE-STAGE: Organization.

The coalition's organization had its origins in two mutually exclusive events. First, the director of a controversial agency operating on the "store front" concept to reach alienated drug-oriented youth developed the idea of using drop-in centers in local high schools to reach young people who had not as yet dropped out of high school. A demonstration project was proposed with the support of the administration of two high schools, however, the School Board turned down the project. Shortly afterwards, the board of a sectarian family service agency raised the question

33

during a meeting of how the agency could provide services to alie-
nated youth. A committee of board members decided to call together
representatives from two other sectarian and one non-sectarian
family service agencies with whom they had established positive
relationships.

Stage I: Orientational stage during which the group's form-
ing situation is defined and structured by the group.

A. Structuralization (Modlin and Faris)

1. Leadership role of convening family service
agency defined by external environment, upon
well established norms, and emerging rigid
hierarchy of responsibility in the coalition,
due to its interest and ability to commit time
and money to the project.

2. Leadership roles of non-sectarian and "store-
front" agency defined by external environment,
upon well established norms and emerging rigid
hierarchy of responsibility in the coalition
due to their ability to commit time and money
to the project.

3. Other two sectarian family service agencies assume
lesser roles defined by the external environment,
upon well established norms and emerging rigid
hierarchy of responsibility due to their in-
volvement in other projects and lesser ability
to commit time and money to project.

B. Absolutistic Dependency (Schroder and Harvey)

1. The emergence of a status hierarchy seen in the
leadership roles taken by the three primary
agencies and the lesser roles taken by the
other two in development of the project.

2. The emergence of rigid norms which foster de-
pendency and submission in the other agencies,
but which reduce ambiguity seen in the leader-
ship roles taken by the three primary agencies
and the lesser roles taken by the other two.

C. Inclusion (Schutz)

1. Coalition agencies decide to commit themselves
in varying degrees to coalition's task.

       2. Two other agencies decide to commit themselves in varying degrees to coalition's task.

  D. Orientation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

       1. The coalition became concerned with increasing emphasis upon boundaries and approaches to define issues and pressures related to the development of such a project.

Stage II: Middle stage(s) during which the group must deal with its forming situation in some manner or form.

  A. No important conflict behavior noted in case history.

       1. No conflict behavior noted during six month planning phase of the coalition. However, some conflict did arise after the project was underway around the issue of "advertising" and who was responsible for the project. This conflict did not appear to influence the structure or the operation of the project and is considered to have only minor importance, since it was not the emphasized behavior during the terminal stage.

  B. Conflict-Management Behaviors

       1. Change (Modlin and Faris)

          a. The coalition began to function as a unit through the development of a "team" dialect through definition of the task seen in the drafting and approval of a formal proposal for the project.

       2. Conditional Dependence (Schroder and Harvey)

          a. Integration reflected in the mutuality and maintenance of relationships to draw up and approve a formal proposal for the project due to the mutual needs of the agencies of the coalition.

       3. Affection (Schutz)

          a. No behavioral characteristics of this type noted in the case history.

       4. Evaluation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

          a. Increased expression of opinion reflected in concern regarding an alliance with controversial "store-front" agency, however, the coalition was possible due to the mutual needs of the agencies involved.

b. Increased expressions of opinion reflected in defining the task of the coalition seen in the drafting and approval of a formal proposal for the project.

Stage III: Terminal stage during which the group is characterized by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation.

A. Integration (Modlin and Faris)

1. The coalition's structure became internalized and philosophy became pragmatic with the creation of an executive board as the decision-making body and the School Board's approval of the project as a functioning reality.

B. Positive Interdependence (Schroder and Harvey)

1. The emergence of interdependent behavior in the coalition with regard to mutuality and autonomy to achieve the coalition's task object of a functioning project. None of the agencies was threatened with any loss of autonomy in obtaining their mutual needs through the project.

C. Control (Bales and Strodtbeck)

1. The coalition established control over its task objective as a solution to the forming situation when the project became a functioning reality.

V.   A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

There appear to be both significant similarities and differ-
ences in the three case histories of coalitions with regard to
their development over time when the integrated three stage model
is used as a framework for analysis.

One similarity that exists between the coalitions is that par-
ticipation in all three was voluntary. None of the organizations
that became involved were forced to do so. A difference that was
noted between the coalitions was that the Child Advocacy and Project
Intercom Coalitions focused on a planning task while the Legislative
Action Center Coalition focused on a coordinating task.

A significant similarity that exists between the three coali-
tions was that there was behavioral activity during which the coa-
lition was organized around some issue of community concern prior
to its first actual meeting. Examples of this behavior were ap-
parent in all of the coalition. Both the Legislative Action Center
and Project Intercom Coalitions were organized when an individual
sought out specific organizations to join together around some
issue. In contrast, the Child Advocacy Coalition was organized
when organizations convened around a set of circumstances and com-
mon organizational interests, with one organization acting as the
convener of the coalition. In reality, organization may be concep-
tualized as a pre-stage of development, since the coalitions had as
yet not met to deal with a situation of community concern. As will
be seen later in this discussion, the two coalitions that were or-
ganized in the same manner during this pre-stage hold greater
similarity to each other with regard to their developmental behavior

than does the Child Advocacy Coalition.

In all three of the coalitions, a stage of developmental behavior which would be defined as _orientation_ was evidenced. During this stage, the coalition's forming situations were defined and structured by their members in terms of how the coalition would be used to accomplish its task and objectives. This form of behavior appeared to be emphasized during the early meetings when the coalitions first began to function as a group. While all of the various behavioral characteristics of natural-state and laboratory groups were in greatest evidence during this stage, they continued to occur in an overlapping manner throughout the life of the coalitions in lesser forms.

During this stage the representatives of the formal organizations in all of the coalitions had to deal with the problem of whether or not to commit themselves to the coalition. Various organizations committed themselves to a greater or lesser degree than others depending upon their interests defined in the external environment.

All of the coalitions during this stage developed some form of formal or informal decision-making structure as a means to deal with their respective situations. Both the Child Advocacy and Legislative Action Center Coalitions developed formal "planning" committees as decision-making bodies, while the total membership of the Project Intercom Coalition appeared to function as the primary decision-making body. However, it is felt that the development of the resultant decision-making structure is related to the size of the coalition. The Project Intercom Coalition, due to its smaller size,

37

could function as the primary decision-making body, while the two larger coalitions developed more formal "planning" committees as decision-making structures.

The creation of some decision-making structure in all three case histories is an example of the coalitions concern to define the roles the various representatives would play in the emerging rigid hierarchy of responsibility of the coalition based upon the interests of the formal organizations to which they belonged in the external environment. In all of the coalitions, the creation of some decision-making body defined the norms of the coalition and reduced ambiguity related to the task.

An organization's representation on the decision-making body of the three coalitions appeared to have some influence during this stage upon the roles various members assumed in the developing hierarchy of possible roles. This appeared particularly true with regard to the Child Advocacy and Legislative Action Center Coalitions, where the majority of leadership roles were connected to membership in the "planning" committee. The external interests of the organizations whose representatives took leadership roles appeared to influence this aspect of coalition behavior. In the Project Intercom Coalition where the total coalition functioned as the decision-making body, leadership roles appeared to be influenced by the amount of time and money an organization felt that it could commit to the coalition's task.

In retrospect, all of the behavioral characteristics found in natural-state and laboratory groups during this first stage were in evidence within all three coalitions: structuralization, absolutistic

dependency, inclusion and orientation.

During the middle stage(s) of coalition development during which the coalitions must deal with their respective situations in some manner or form, a significant difference is apparent between the three coalitions. The Child Advocacy Coalition was characterized by a middle stage(s) where activity was emphasized by conflict behavior followed by activity which was emphasized by conflict-management behavior. In contrast, the Legislative Action Center and Project Intercom Coalitions were characterized by a middle stage(s) where activity was emphasized by conflict-management behavior alone, although the latter coalition did exhibit some conflict of a minor nature during the terminal stage.

The Child Advocacy Coalition appears to conform to the natural-state and laboratory group behavioral characteristics which have been defined in the three-stage mode of group development which was used as a framework of analysis. Conflict behavior revolved around the basic issue of the coalition as to what organization should sponsor the child advocacy proposal to the Federal Government. All of the conflict behavior characteristics found in the studies of natural-state and laboratory groups during this stage(s) of group development were apparent in the case history: Unrest, Negative Independence and Control. These behaviors continued to occur throughout the remainder of the coalition's life, although they were in greatest evidence at this point.

The conflict-management behavior which occurred after conflict was in greatest evidence in the Child Advocacy Coalition, appears to be a response by the coalition's "planning" committee to resolve

the conflict situation, so that its alternative proposal would be funded by the Federal Government. Conflict-management behavior characteristics found in other natural-state and laboratory groups were apparent: Change, Conditional Dependence, and Evalution. Behavior of this type again was in greatest evidence during this period, and continued to reoccur throughout the remainder of the coalition's life with less emphasis. However, it should be noted that Schutz's characteristic of Affection was not in evidence.

In contrast, the Legislative Action Center and Project Intercom appear not to conform to the natural-state and laboratory group behavior characteristics which have been defined in the three stage model during their middle stage(s). During this period, conflict was not an emphasized behavior in either of the coalitions. In both coalitions, the behavior that was in greatest evidence during the middle stage(s) were those related to conflict-management: Change, Conditional Dependence and Evaluation. These behaviors tended to reoccur throughout the coalition's life, but with less emphasis. As in the Child Advocacy Coalition, Schutz's characteristic of Affection was not noted.

It is difficult to explain the conformity of the Child Advocacy Coalition and the non-conformity of the other two to the behavioral characteristics of the three stage model. However, as has been noted, the latter two coalitions did have essentially the same modes of organization. This factor may be an influencing variable in how the coalition deals with the situation in which it finds itself, although this cannot be determined specifically from the information given in the case histories.

40

What makes this issue even more difficult to explain is that the concept of conflict is a relative abstraction used to explain behavior. However, it appears that this concept, while critical, is rather ill-defined in the small group literature when used to describe group developmental behavior. What appears to be the case in the use of the concept of conflict in the small group developmental literature is reference to some form of basic issue situation[36] which the group must deal with in some manner or form. The issue situation of the Child Advocacy Coalition appeared to entail little possible agreement between the coalition organizations with regard to who should sponsor the proposal; this provided a basis for a high level of conflict within the coalition. In contrast, the other two coalitions were characterized by issue situations during their middle stage(s) which entailed a high possibility of basic agreement as to how their respective situations should be resolved; this provided a basis for a low level of conflict within those coalitions. These differences in issue situations may act as an influencing variable during the middle stage(s) of coalition development with regard to the existence of conflict behavior.

All three of the coalitions underwent some terminal stage during which cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation was emphasized. The behavior characteristics found in other natural-state and laboratory groups were in evidence during this stage: Integration, Positive Independence, and Control. In each of the three coalitions the forming situation around which they were organized was resolved and obtained through these forms of behavior.

Through cooperative behavior, the Child Advocacy Coalition achieved its purpose, with the drawing up of the final draft of the Child Advocacy proposal and its submission to the Federal Government. In the case of the other two coalitions, cooperative behavior allowed their respective projects to become functioning realities.

It was quite difficult to determine the specific nature or the types of interpersonal relationships involved between the various members of the three coalitions, due to the lack of information regarding this aspect in the case histories. This was particularly true with regard to interpersonal activity related to what Schutz labeled as "Affection" behavior in all three of the case histories, since its existence could not be determined from the information given. While there appears to be evidence of quite a bit of interpersonal conflict between principal members of the Child Advocacy Coalition, the specific nature and type of conflict was not defined in the case history. However, it is felt that the interpersonal conflict exhibited in this coalition had some negative influence upon the work of the coalition. While the Project Intercom Coalition did evidence conflict, its existence appears more related to the issue than to interpersonal relationship. The Legislative Action Center Coalition case history took little note of the nature and type of interpersonal relationships which may have existed between members. What influence the variable of interpersonal relationships played in the three coalitions must be left undefined. However, the influence which interpersonal relationships play in the coalition should be explored, since they are important in determining how the coalition goes about its task.

This is particularly true during the middle stage(s) since it is felt they may influence the existence or non-existence of conflict.

From this discussion of the comparative analysis of the three coalition case histories, it may be concluded that there are some indications that coalitions do undergo stages of development during which they attempt to deal with a situation of community concern. However, on the basis of information provided in the case histories, it is difficult to state that they undergo similar stages of development as has been reported in the literature. All three of the coalitions studied evidenced behavior characteristics during a first stage which could be defined as orientation. In a like manner, they all evidenced emphasized behavior characteristics which could be defined as cooperation during a terminal stage. The greatest difference between the coalitions and the three stage model appears to be related to what occurs during the middle stage(s) of the coalition's life histories. Only the Child Advocacy Coalition appeared to conform to the conflict and conflict-management behavior characteristic of the middle stage(s) of the model, while the other two did not do so.

As has already been noted, whether conflict develops during the middle stage(s) may depend upon both the interpersonal relationships in the coalition and the issue situation in which the coalition finds itself. However, if the issue situation entails little possible agreement among organizations over the issue which the coalition is attempting to resolve, then a relatively high level of conflict will result. In contrast, if the issue situation entails a high possibility of basic agreement among organizations

43

over the issue the coalition is attempting to resolve, then a rela-
tively low level or no conflict will result. If this hypothesis
is correct, then the existence of conflict during the middle
stage(s) is an either/or proposition dependent upon the basic issue
situation in which the coalition finds itself. On this basis, the
conflict-management behavior characteristics appear to be a response
to the coalition's issue situations, rather than to conflict be-
havior which may precede them.

This calls for revision of the middle stage(s) of the three
stage model used for analysis. Since it is felt that there is
evidence in the case histories to indicate the issue situation
may play a critical role in the existence or non-existence of con-
flict during this period, a modification of Warren's concept of
basic issue situations may be used to explain this phenomena:[37]

(1) Issue consensus: the coalition has a high possibility
     of basic agreement as to the way the issue should be
     resolved. Low level of conflict indicated within the
     coalition.

(2) Issue difference: the coalition has some possiblity of
     agreement between organizations, but the organizations
     are not in complete agreement with regard to the issue.
     Medium level of conflict indicated within the coalition.

(3) Issue dissensus: there is no possibility of agreement
     between coalition organizations upon the issue. High
     level of conflict indicated within the coalition.

If an issue consensus situation exists for the coalition, no or a
low level of conflict will be evidenced during this period. The
emphasized behavior during the middle stage will be characterized
by conflict-management.[38] However, if an issue difference or dis-
sensus exists for the coalition, a medium or high level of conflict
will be emphasized during this period. This conflict will be evi-

44

denced by the conflict behavior characteristics found in other natural-state and laboratory groups. In all three issue situations, conflict-management behavior would be the emphasized response. This revision has been incorporated into the revised three-stage model (See Chart III). It should be noted that Schutz's behavior characteristic of Affection has been deleted from the revised model, since it was not in evidence during the life of any of the three coalitions.

CHART III

REVISED THREE STAGE MODEL
OF COALITION DEVELOPMENTAL BEHAVIOR

STAGE I: <u>Orientational</u> stage during which the coalition's forming situation is defined and structured by the coalition.

    A.   Structuralization (Modlin and Faris)

    B.   Absolutistic Dependency (Schroder and Harvey)

    C.   Orientation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

    D.   Inclusion (Schutz)

STAGE II: <u>Middle</u> stage(s) during which the coalition must deal with its forming situation in some manner or form.

    A.   Conflict behavior dependent upon the existence of issue difference or dissensus situations:

        1.   Unrest (Modlin and Faris)

        2.   Negative Independence (Schroder and Harvey)

        3.   Control (Schutz)

    B.   Conflict management behavior in response to issue consensus, difference and dissensus situations:

        1.   Change (Modlin and Faris)

        2.   Conditional Dependence (Schroder and Harvey)

        3.   Evaluation (Bales and Strodtbeck)

STAGE III: <u>Terminal</u> stage during which the coalition is characterized by some form of cooperative behavior to resolve the forming situation.

    A.   Integration (Modlin and Faris)

    B.   Positive Interdependence (Schroder and Harvey)

    C.   Control (Bales and Strodtbeck)

VI. A NOTE ON PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS

There were several problems encountered in the course of this exploratory study. The case histories, while providing a vew of the historical development of the coalitional groups, did not provide enough "hard" information regarding the coalition's behavior over time, and did not allow for other than an exploratory analysis of the developmental pattern of the coalitions. The developmental sequence model provided by the study is seen as an outline of behavior and is not seen as a definitive statement. Collins and Guetzkow have pointed out that the performance of a group is dependent upon the group's task environment and interpersonal environment.[39] In many respects these two group environments appear to be much like Tuckman's separation of each stage of group development into the realms of task activity and interpersonal relationships.[40] The task and interpersonal environments appear to be operating simultaneously upon the productivity of the group, as do the realms of task activity and interpersonal relationships. While it is apparent that these factors are in operation in the interorganizational coalitions studied, it is quite difficult to specifically determine their interaction and influence during the developmental life of the coalitions from the case histories.

What specifically is suggested is that only through the study of "live" coalitions while they are in progress can the interactional developmental processes of coalitions as small groups be studied. This would require the researcher to utilize the interview as well as the field techniques of participant observation similar to those proposed in Gold's "observe-as-participant" typology.[41] Such a

technique should be used to obtain the needed behavioral inter-
personal environments to determine developmental behavior as they
relate to developmental sequences.

1. Robert T. Golembiewski, The Small Group: An Analysis of Research Concepts and Operations, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1962), pp. 56-66.

2. Gerald A. Frey, "Interorganizational Coalitions in Community Planning: An Exploratory Study", a mimeographed dissertation proposal, (September, 1969), pp. 2-4.

3. For discussion see Roland L. Warren, "The Interorganizational Field As a Focus for Investigation", Administrative Science Quarterly, XII (December, 1967), pp. 396-419.

4. Frey, p. 8.

5. The term "coalition" will be used in the rest of this study in place of the terms coalition of organizations and interorganizational coalition.

6. Bruce W. Tuckman, "Developmental Sequence in Small Groups", Psychological Bulletin, LXIII (June, 1965), p. 385.

7. Tuckman, p. 385.

8. E. W. Kelly, "Techniques of Studying Coalition Formation", Midwest Journal of Political Science, XII (February, 1968), pp. 62-84.

9. Thomas W. Madron, Small Group Methods and the Study of Politics, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, (1969), p. 9.

10. Madron, p. 9.

11. See Paul Hare, Handbook of Small Group Research, New York: The Free Press (1962) for an extensive bibliography on small group research.

12. Gordon Hearn, Theory of Group Development, unpublished manuscript, in Part III, Chapter XVII, "Group Change and Development", pp. 1-47.

13. Tuckman, p. 393.

14. Robert F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley (1950); Robert F. Bales and Fred L. Strodtbeck, "Phases in Group Problem-Solving", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVI (October, 1951), pp. 485-495; and Robert F. Bales, "The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups", Working Papers in the Theory of Action, edited by Talcott Parsons, Robert F. Bales, and Edward Shils, New York: The Free Press (1953), pp. 111-161.

15. Madron, pp. 113-125, has proposed that the Bales inter-actional process analysis system provides a structured system by which the interactional processes of small political groups (i.e. coalitions) can be studied while they are in progress.

16. George R. Bach, Intensive Group Psychotherapy, New York: The Roland Press (1964), pp. 268-293.

17. Bach, See Table II, p. 69 and discussion of these six-teen themes, pp. 70-73.

18. Gordon Hearn, "The Process of Group Development", Autono-mous Groups, XIII (Autumn and Winter, 1957), pp. 1-7.

19. Personal discussion with Dr. Gordon Hearn.

20. William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (1958), pp. 168-188.

21. Schutz, p. 18.

22. Schutz, p. 18.

23. Schutz, p. 19.

24. Schutz, p. 169.

25. Tuckman, pp. 384-399.

26. Tuckman labels these patterns of group structure and task activity "realms".

27. While Tuckman did not test his model, it is interesting to note that an emperical test of the fit of the hypothetical model has been made using work groups in a classroom setting which tends to support Tuckman's model. See Philip J. Runkel, Marilyn Lawrence, Shirley Oldfield, Mimi Rider, and Candee Clark, "Stages of Group Development: An Emperical Test of Tuckman's Hypothesis", The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, V (March and April, 1971), pp. 180-193.

28. Louis A. Zurcher, Jr. "Stages of Development in Poverty Program Neighborhood Action Committees", The Journal of Applied Be-havioral Science, V (March and April 1969), pp. 223-258.

29. Zurcher, p. 229.

30. H. C. Modin and Mildred Faris, "Group Adaptation and Inte-gration in Psychiatric Team Practice", Psychiatry, IXX (February, 1956) pp. 97-103.

31. H. M. Schroder and O. J. Harvey, "Conceptual Organization and Group Structure", Motivation and Social Interaction, edited by O. J. Harvey, New York: The Roland Press (1963), pp. 134-166.

32. See Tuckman, pp. 393-395 and Zurcher, p. 245.

33. Bales and Strodtbeck, pp. 485-495.

34. Schutz, pp. 168-188 and p. 18-19.

35. See Frey, pp. 13-15, for a discussion of modes of organization. The mode of organization for the Legislative Action Center and Project Intercom Coalitions would be labeled a partisan mode and that of the Child Advocacy Coalition would be labeled a convention mode.

36. For a discussion of the concept of issue situations, see Roland L. Warren, "Types of Purposive Social Change at the Community Level", pp. 205-222; Harry Specht, "Disruptive Tactics", pp. 372-386, in Readings in Community Organization Practice, edited by Ralph M. Kramer and Harry Specht, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall (1969); and Ralph M. Kramer, Participation of the Poor: Comparative Case Studies in the War on Poverty, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall (1969), p. 184.

37. See Warren, pp. 205-222; Specht, pp. 372-386; and Kramer, p. 184.

38. The term "conflict-management" will continue to be used even though conflict may not exist. It is felt that these behaviors are evidenced not only to manage conflict when it occurs, but also to maintain the issue situation at the lowest possible level of conflict. The potential for conflict always exists within any group.

39. Barry E. Collins and Harold Guetzkow, A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision Making, New York: Wiley (1964) p. 57.

40. Tuckman, p. 385.

41. R. L. Gold, "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", Social Forces, XXXVI (March, 1958), pp. 217-223.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bach, George R.. Intensive Group Psychotherapy, New York: The Roland
    Press (1954).

Bales, Robert F.. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the
    Study of Small Groups, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley (1950).

       and Fred L. Strodtbeck. "Phases in Group Problem-Solving",
    Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XVVI (October, 1951),
    pp. 485-495.

       ."The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups", Working Papers
    in the Theory of Action, edited by Talcott Parsons, Robert F.
    Bales, and Edward Shils, New York: The Free Press (1953),
    pp. 111-161.

Collins, Barry E. and Harold Guetzkow. A Social Psychology of
    Group Processes for Decision Making, New York: Wiley (1964)

Frey, Gerald A. "Interorganizational Coalitions in Community
    Planning: An Exploratory Study", a mimeographed dissertation
    proposal, (September, 1969).

Gold, R. L. "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", Social
    Forces, XXXVI (March, 1958), pp. 217-223.

Golembiewski, Robert T. The Small Group: An Analysis of Research
    Concepts and Operations, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
    (1962).

Hare, Paul. Handbook of Small Group Research, New York: The Free
    Press (1962).

Hearn, Gordon. "The Process of Group Development", Autonomous Groups,
    XIII (Autumn and Winter, 1957), pp. 1-7.

      .Theory of Group Development, unpublished manuscript, in
    Part III, Chapter SVII, "Group Change and Development".

Kelly, E. W. "Techniques of Studying Coalition Formation", Midwest
    Journal of Political Science, XII (February, 1968), pp. 62-84.

Kramer, Ralph M. Participation of the Poor: Comparative Case Studies
    in the War on Poverty, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
    Hall (1969).

Madron, Thomas W. Small Group Methods and the Study of Politics,
    Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press (1969).

Modlin, H. C. and Mildred Faris. "Group Adaption and Integration in Psychiatric Team Practice", Psychiatry, IXX (February, 1956), pp. 97-103.

Runkel, Philip J., Marilyn Lawrence, Shirley Oldfield, Mimi Rider, and Candee Clark. "Stages of Group Development: An Emperical Test of Tuckman's Hypothesis", The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, V (March and April, 1971), pp. 180-193.

Schroder, H. M. and O. J. Harvey, "Conceptual Organization and Group Structure", Motivation and Social Interaction, edited by O. J. Harvey, New York: The Roland Press (1963), pp. 134-166.

Schutz, William C. FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (1958).

Specht, Harry. "Disruptive Tactics", Readings in Community Organization Practice, edited by Ralph M. Kramer and Harry Specht, pp. 372-386.

Tuckman, Bruce W. "Developmental Sequence in Small Groups", Psychological Bulletin, LXIII (June, 1965) pp. 384-399.

Warren, Roland L. "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation", Administrative Science Quarterly, XII (December, 1967), pp. 396-419.

        . "Types of Purposive Social Change at the Community Level", Readings in Community Organization Practice, edited by Ralph M. Kramer and Harry Specht, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall (1969), pp. 205-222.

Zurcher, Louis A., Jr. "Stages of Development in Poverty Program Neighborhood Action Committees", The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, V (March and April, 1969), pp. 223-258.