


Managing Out


Michael J. Austin PhD

To cite this article: Michael J. Austin PhD (2002) Managing Out, Journal of Community Practice, 10:4, 33-48, DOI: [10.1300/J125v10n04_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v10n04_03)


To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J125v10n04_03

 Published online: 22 Sep 2008.

 Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

 Article views: 163

 View related articles [↗](#)

 Citing articles: 7 View citing articles [↗](#)

Managing Out: The Community Practice Dimensions of Effective Agency Management

Michael J. Austin, PhD

ABSTRACT. With the advent of welfare reform and managed care, the nature of managerial practice has increasingly shifted from a primary focus on internal operations to a more external, community focus which involves actively monitoring and managing the boundary between the external environment and internal organizational arrangements. This article explores the boundary spanning aspects of community practice, the related theories of inter-organizational relations, and the process of “managing out” by those in top management and middle management positions in human service organizations. *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]*

KEYWORDS. Management, community practice, management practice, boundary spanning, inter-organizational relations, human service organizations

INTRODUCTION

The implementation of welfare reform, based on the 1996 federal legislation, has provided those holding middle management and top management positions in public social service agencies with new chal-

Michael J. Austin is Professor of Management and Planning, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley.

Journal of Community Practice, Vol. 10(4) 2002
<http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J125>
© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

lenges. One of these challenges involves the need to expand and refine the community practice skills needed to guide organizational change and reposition public social service agencies in local communities. This analysis builds upon some of the early findings emerging from welfare reform implementation. For example, Carnochan and Austin (2002) found in their study of county social service directors who were implementing welfare reform that the new challenges facing managers included: (1) restructuring the agency's mission to capture the shift from determining eligibility to fostering self-sufficiency, (2) substantial organizational restructuring, (3) engaging in partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of partners, including other county departments, community-based organizations, and for-profit businesses, (4) renewed pressure to integrate services as part of inter-agency collaborations and inter-disciplinary teams, and (5) increased demand for data-based planning and evaluation at all levels of the organization. While strengthening an agency's mission, engaging in organizational restructuring, and data-based planning and evaluation are part of the traditional skill sets of most senior managers, the *building of community partnerships* and fostering *inter-disciplinary practice* require community practice skills. This analysis will focus on community-based inter-agency partnerships and intra-agency collaboration as a way of addressing the community practice skills needed for effective networking inside and outside the agency.

MANAGEMENT PRACTICE AS WE KNOW IT

The literature on managerial skills in the human services reflects a primary focus on overseeing the work of others (Austin, 1981; Kettner, 2002; Lewis et al., 2001; Lohman & Lohman, 2002; Netting, 1993; Rapp & Poertner, 1991). This focus includes an emphasis on supervising staff, managing financial and information resources, assessing client needs and evaluating services, service and program planning, and resource acquisition to maintain the agency's viability. This emphasis has its origins in the management sciences where lessons from the for-profit arena have been adapted and modified for the non-profit sector (Au, 1994;). For the purposes of this analysis, these traditional management functions are defined as *managing down* (Keys & Bell, 1982). In contrast, *managing up* involves middle management and top management influencing the thinking and behaviors of those at higher levels of authority (Austin, 1988). This paper explores a third domain of man-

agerial practice; namely, *managing out* which is defined here as the relationship-building process whereby: (a) top managers continuously network internally with their senior management group and externally with agency board members or county commissioners as well as with other community leaders and agency executives, and (b) middle managers actively network with other middle managers inside their own agency as well as outside with colleagues in other agencies.

The challenges of reaching out and networking are similar for both agency directors and middle managers. The increased pressure to integrate services, facilitate organizational change, foster interdisciplinary practice, and identify best practices is forcing middle and top managers to refine or add the community practice skills of “managing out” to their expertise in managing down and managing up. The community practice skills related to “managing out” include the group work skills of working on an inter-agency task force, the community work skills of building coalitions *inside and outside* the agency, and the community involvement and development skills needed to address social service issues. When referring to community practice skills, Weil’s (1996) definition provides the context for the practice of managing out. She refers to community building as the foundation of community practice that includes the activities, practices, and policies that support and foster positive connections among individuals, groups, organizations, neighborhoods, and geographic and functional communities. Managing out involves all of these connections but uses the service delivery agency as the auspice for reaching out to people inside and outside the agency. From one perspective of managing out, the agency can be viewed as a community unto itself with its own history, power structure, leadership capacities, communication patterns, and future directions. From another perspective, the agency can be seen as simply one element in a network of agencies and neighborhood/community organizations.

The need for knowledge and skills in the area of managing out emerged dramatically in the early 1980s when social agencies confronted the first major round of budget cuts, resource scarcity, and organizational restructuring (Austin, 1984). The early 1980s were a wake-up call signaling the end of the era of continuous growth in human service expenditures and the beginning of an era of planning for the strategic use of scarce resources. Agency executives began to realize that new leadership capacities were needed to more actively reach out and network with other agencies, funding sources, and governing bodies outside their agencies. Using coalitions to lobby at the local, state, and national levels and expand relationships with Board members and community influentials

became a top priority for agency directors. Some of the outreach lessons of the 1980s are repeated in the 1990s as public social service agency directors and staff reached out and networked in the rapidly changing environment of welfare reform and managed care.

When it comes to incorporating community practice into management practice, the “managing out” process can be viewed in terms of Quinn’s (1988) leadership domain of boundary spanning. This domain involves the skills of political negotiation and utilizing power relationships to carry out the roles of broker and innovator. *Brokering* includes the resource acquisition skills of developing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, monitoring the community environment, promoting collaborative relations with other organizations in the community, and effectively using power and influence. The *innovator* role involves envisioning and facilitating change by managers seeking out new opportunities, encouraging and utilizing new ideas, and displaying a high level of tolerance for ambiguity and capacity to take risks.

The early signs of the need for middle managers to “manage out” can be found in the research of Havassy (1990) who noted that successful supervisors are able to accept and deal with differences by: (1) dealing with underlying *connectedness* (searching for common ground required of someone in “the middle”) as a way to tolerate ambiguity, (2) *spanning boundaries* between various systems (departments inside and outside the agency) by maintaining loyalty to multiple groups, and (3) engaging in *cross-system communication* by expressing the needs, expectations, and demands for one system (top management or line staff) in the terms and concepts of another. In a similar way, Floyd and Woodridge (1996) identified the key interpersonal components of middle management practice: *synthesizing* (gathering new information and understanding the need for change), *facilitating* (preparing for change and nurturing the creative efforts of others), *championing* (stimulating change by matching recognized and unrecognized capabilities with emerging opportunities), and *implementing* (managing the process of changing the way existing capabilities are deployed). Successful efforts to “manage out” requires the synthesizing of new information, nurturing the creative efforts of others, seizing opportunities to promote change, and bringing people and resources together in new ways.

It is clear that the nature of managerial practice has shifted dramatically over the past two decades from a primary focus on internal operations to a more external, community focus. As Menefee and Thompson (1994) found in one of the few studies of management practice in social service settings:

No longer are social work managers predominantly concerned with structures, processes, and conditions within the agency; they now give equal if not more attention to the entire context of service delivery by actively monitoring and managing the boundary between the external environment and internal organizational arrangements.

Menefee and Thompson noted that managers actively engage in modeling the values and practices of boundary spanning for their staff as they seek to foster greater staff and community ownership in the service of the agency. They identified the core skills as networking, managing internal and external relationships, lobbying external and internal constituencies, fostering agency-community relations, and effectively using one's own power. They also found that boundary spanning took place at least once a week and was regarded as very important by the managers in their study.

In a follow-up study, Menefee (1998) found that boundary spanning had become the central skill needed to foster internal and external relationships. The skills for successful boundary spanning include communicating, teaming, facilitating, aligning, and coordinating which are defined as follows (Menefee, 1998):

- *Communicating*—Exchanging information between the agency and its internal and external stakeholders by keeping staff informed, making presentations in the community, and developing publications and related correspondence.
- *Teaming*—Organizing and enlisting the work of groups to support agency operations and services by developing coalitions to respond to community needs, organizing and developing staff teams, planning and leading agency/community initiatives, and modeling effective meeting management capabilities.
- *Facilitating*—Enabling others to carry out the work of the agency by helping others (staff and community) to influence agency operations and programs, empowering staff with educational experiences and career guidance, educating the board and community, and serving as a role model.
- *Aligning*—Arranging or rearranging structures, processes, and resources by delegating tasks and responsibilities, organizing tasks into jobs or programs, recruiting and hiring staff, and maintaining staff morale.

- *Coordinating*—Directing and guiding the agency which includes service delivery and infrastructure development, coordinating units/departments, attending to staff needs and concerns, providing distance supervision in the form of oversight/monitoring, and consulting through the use of advising and supporting staff.

This set of boundary spanning skills is part of a comprehensive array of managerial skills required to manage in a changing environment. The other skill sets identified by Menefee (1998) include: *futureing* (strategic planning), *managing and leveraging resources* (financial, physical, material, and human), *evaluating* (needs, effectiveness, cost-benefit, and capabilities), and *policy practice* (interpreting laws/regulations, translating policies into practices, and representing the agency by lobbying/testifying before policy-making bodies).

THEORY TO INFORM PRACTICE

Before exploring the major practice components of managing out, it is important to identify some of the critical concepts from inter-organizational relations theory to provide a context for understanding the need for managing out. In Reitan's (1998) review of inter-organizational relations in the human services, she notes the growing shift in focus from an emphasis on intra-organizational issues to inter-organizational relations. Based on an analysis that spans the social sciences, she concluded that inter-organizational relations in the human services: (1) feature new ways of governing through networks of agencies, (2) represent a continuous changing of intensity and content as agencies actively engage each other in an effort to address such factors as scarce resources and service fragmentation, (3) reflect inter-organizational structures (collaboratives, consortia, partnerships) that are designed to ensure goal attainment and efficiency (sharing insufficient resources or providing integrated services), (4) carry significant importance for the recipients of services (accessibility, availability, responsiveness), and (5) seek stability so that they can endure. The central feature of inter-organizational relations theory is the way agency interdependence is managed as the human services increasingly shift back and forth from competition to cooperation (Hasenfeld & Gidron, 1993). These issues are viewed differently by social scientists. The sociological literature on inter-organizational relations focuses on cooperating relationships (Hall & Taylor,

1996), while the political economy perspective emphasizes the inter-agency relationship factors of transaction costs, contracting, and accountability (Reitan, 1998). And the organizational psychology perspective focuses more on the strategic choices that organizational leaders make as they respond to problems in their environment by maximizing their discretion and producing different kinds of inter-organizational relations (Oliver, 1988).

Each of these social science perspectives adds an important dimension to our understanding of inter-organizational relations. It is also important to highlight the empirical research on inter-organizational relations among human service organizations. In his search for the key ingredients that foster inter-organizational collaboration, Bardach (1998) found that inter-agency collaboration was a “joint activity between two or more agencies intended to increase public value by working together” based on “tangible components” (formal agreements) and “intangible components” (expectations of each other). His major contribution to our understanding of inter-organizational relations is that successful relationships require a shared capacity to manage joint activity. In so doing, he isolated the following critical ingredients to managing collaboration: (1) an operating system that promotes flexibility around turf issues, cross-training to enhance trust and open dialogue, peer accountability, and financial incentives, (2) the sharing of resources (acquiring and allocating fiscal, human, and facility resources), (3) establishing a process of shared leadership to steer a course (strategic directions, customer-centered, shared problem-solving, leadership succession planning, and a set of shared values to guide decision-making), (4) building a culture of joint problem-solving (embracing change, mediating differences, and continuous trust-building), and (5) action planning (a structure of specific steps that builds from the bottom up and generates/sustains momentum beginning with early successes). To foster and maintain the collaborative process, Bardach (1998) calls for “administrative craftsmanship” in the form of seizing opportunities, playing new roles, converting problems into challenges, appreciating the slow pace of developing collaborations, working backwards from the goals to be achieved to build action steps, and “muddling through” to address shortcomings and promote continuous process improvement. Many of these elements of interagency collaboration are central to the process of managing out.

In addition to Bardach (1998), it is also important to note the significant empirical work of Alter and Hage (1993) on inter-organizational

networks and relationships. Their contribution is in the form of an evolutionary theory of collaboration and a set of key questions. The core elements of their theory are: (1) willingness to collaborate (linked to a culture of trust, history and complexity of relationships), (2) need for expertise (linked to innovation, standardization, and task complexity), (3) need for financial resources and shared risk (linked to the political economy of the organizational environment and the specialization of each agency's market niche), and (4) need for adaptive efficiency (linked to the size of collaborating organizations and the pace of change in technology and knowledge). While they document the complexity of inter-organizational relationships, they also provide important guideposts to the continuous search for understanding this complexity. The guideposts are in the form of key questions (p. 261):

1. What pushes organizations towards collaboration in spite of the difficulties?
2. What are the forms of collaboration and how do they differ?
3. What influences the way in which systemic networks (of organizations) are structured and operate?
4. What influences the choices of partners and insures compliance (with shared goals)?

These questions can provide a foundation for evaluating the impact of managing out.

And finally, the search for theory to inform practice needs to include the impact of internal operations on the external agency relationships. In essence, the ability to collaborate successfully with other organizations can be linked to the effectiveness of internal relationships and processes within the agency. This perspective takes us to the important work of Hastings (1993) and Senge (1990). Hastings focuses our attention on shifting the organizational culture from a traditional, bureaucratic mode to a new culture of networking. Senge identifies the important organizational roles needed to develop a learning organization.

It has become increasingly clear that leadership at any level in an organization is directly affected by the culture of the organization and the organization's capacity to learn and change. Identifying and modifying elements of an organization's culture can be exceedingly difficult. One approach used by Hastings (1993) is to restructure organizations by creating organizational networks and thereby grow a new organizational culture. The first step is to identify the nature of the old, traditional cul-

ture in contrast to the new, networking culture. Hastings (1993) identifies four key elements that need to be addressed in order to transform an organization's culture from the old way of doing business to the new networking model of operations; namely role, relationships, communication, and organizational perspective. Some examples of this transformation include: (1) making the *role* transition from one of specialists "telling" others to one of specialists "learning from" others, (2) facilitating the *relationship* transition from "exclusivity" to "inclusivity," (3) modifying the *organizational perspective* from "top down" to "inside out and outside in," and (4) transforming the *communication of information* from "retaining" information to "sharing" information.

Changing the organizational culture is related to transforming human service agencies into learning organizations. Senge (1990) first identified the art and practice of building a learning organization in which staff continually expand their capacities to understand complexity, clarify vision, improve their ability to think creatively, and take responsibility for continued learning. The challenge for the transformational manager is to foster a learning environment by refining one's skills in carrying out the following roles: (a) *designer* or "organizational architect" who constructs learning processes to deal productively with critical issues and develop a sense of mastery whereby all staff can approach their work from the perspective of "what can I learn today?" rather than "what must get done today?", (b) *steward* who seeks to balance the desire for continuity with the desire for innovation by integrating the "big picture" into the daily testing of new ideas as well as listening to the ideas of others as a way to demonstrate a willingness to change or modify one's own vision of the future, and (c) *teacher* who helps staff achieve more accurate, insightful, and empowering views of reality by shifting the focus of attention beyond the daily events and patterns of behavior (reactive) to the organization's purpose for existence and future direction (proactive) to assist others in developing systemic understandings of the role of the agency in the community. Each of these leadership roles is valuable for building a learning community inside and outside the organization by identifying the forces that contribute to current realities. The gap between current realities and the vision produces the creative tension needed to energize others. For example, the extensive efforts made by some California county social service agencies to involve the community in developing the county's welfare reform plan provided all segments of the community (including the business com-

munity) an opportunity to contribute to a new service system as well as share ownership in its processes and outcomes.

This brief literature review provides a foundation of key concepts for exploring the process of “managing out.” With regard to organizational structures, Bardach’s (1998) concepts suggest that new structures inside and outside the organization are needed to create effective operating systems, facilitate the sharing of resources and leadership, and establish mechanisms for linking joint problem-solving with action planning. When it comes to redefining organizational processes, Alter and Hage (1993) identify critical concepts that can facilitate collaborative processes; namely, a willingness to collaborate as well as a recognized need for expertise, shared risk, and adaptive efficiency. One way to capture the inter-relationships of these structural and process concepts is to frame them as part of the following checklist for those in organizations who are engaged in “managing out”:

Organizational Structures (Bardach, 1998)

1. Do we have the human resource capacities to build operating systems to support inter-agency collaboration in the community?
2. Do we have the mechanisms in place to share resources and leadership in the community?
3. Do we have mechanisms for joint problem-solving (internal work groups or external advisory groups) that can facilitate action planning and community collaboration?

Organizational Processes (Alter & Hage, 1993)

4. Do we have a method for demonstrating our willingness to collaborate and monitor the messages?
5. Do we have mechanisms in place to identify our need for expertise, our capacity to share risks, and our commitment to collaboration and change?

In addition to this focus on organizational structures and processes, the literature on organizational collaboration also suggests the need to redefine managerial leadership. As Hastings (1993) noted, traditional organizations need leadership that can foster a networking culture which calls for changes in roles, relationships, communications, and perspectives. In a similar way, Senge (1990) is calling for the new leadership roles of designer, steward, and teacher. Each of these concepts

can be reflected in the following questions that address the leadership challenges facing organizations with staff committed to effectively “managing out”:

Fostering a Networking Culture (Hastings, 1993)

1. Is there a capacity to promote *networks of staff* inside and outside the organization where “help-seeking” is seen as a strength by staff who reach out for consultation and advice?
2. Are there ways to promote *multi-disciplinary teamwork* based on *relationships* that are inclusive, capable of searching for common goals with outsiders, and oriented toward reducing barriers to exchange in the community?
3. Can *information* be *shared* on the basis of “wanting to know” rather than a “need to know”?
4. Can the *organizational perspectives* of staff be altered from a “top down” to an “inside out and outside in” viewpoint where boundaries are spanned, ambiguity is tolerated, and responsibilities are shared with others in the community?

Adopting New Leadership Roles (Senge, 1990)

5. How do leadership styles need to be modified to become the *designer* of learning processes that deal productively with critical issues?
6. How does one’s day to day work reflect a balance between the need for continuity and the need for innovation that includes actively testing new ideas, listening for new ideas and demonstrating a capacity to change one’s views (*stewardship*)?
7. How does one help staff gain new insights about the need to maintain a balance between reactive and proactive behaviors as well as gain a more holistic understanding of the role of the organization in the community (*teacher*)?

These questions, that seek to link theory with practice, provide a context for describing the community practice aspects of “managing out” in human service organizations.

THE MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF MANAGING OUT

While managing out can be demonstrated at all levels of staff (e.g., secretaries who coordinate effectively with other units in the agency as

well as network effectively with agencies and clients in the community), the focus here is on the top and middle levels of management. Irrespective of the level of management, managing out can include the three key functions of leading, managing, and partnering. Using Kotter's (1990) definitions for leading and managing, *leading* relates to coping with change (setting directions, aligning people, and motivating/inspiring) and *managing* refers to coping with complexity (planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, and evaluating and problem-solving). The third concept of *partnering* relates to the governance of human service organizations in a community, such as working with governing boards and inter-agency advisory boards (public and voluntary) and monitoring changing community needs and building partnerships with a wide variety of institutions and individuals. In order to illustrate the potential array of activities related to managing out, sample activities are highlighted in Figure 1 for two levels of management (middle and top) and the three domains of management practice (leading, managing, and partnering).

While the agency director may be able to devote a substantial portion of a typical work week to managing out, the challenge of setting priorities is no different than for anyone else holding a management position in the agency. However, in the case of top management there may be greater freedom and autonomy (often as a result of delegating tasks to others) than can be found in the middle management ranks. There is also greater accountability to keep members of the agency's governing board apprised of the director's managing out efforts on behalf of the agency. While most successful directors understand the importance of networking and relationship-building in the community, it has only recently become apparent that proactively seeking and scheduling public speaking engagements with community groups needs to receive higher priority (McDaniel, 1994). These outreach activities address one of the most neglected areas of human service administration, namely community and media relations (Brawley, 1995). By managing out, managers can engage in the continuous process of educating the American public about the nature of human services, sharing the successes emerging daily from excellent staff work, and reminding the community that it is their neighbors who need support from everyone, not just from the public and non-profit human service agencies (Goldberg, Cullen, & Austin, 2001).

The challenges facing middle-managers and supervisors related to managing out can be substantial. While top management has the authority to manage out, middle managers often need to secure that authority

FIGURE 1. Sample Activities of Managing Out

	Leading = Coping with Change	Managing = Coping with Complexity	Partnering = Building and Maintaining Relationships
<i>Top Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> scanning the local, regional, state, and national environment for issues of potential importance to the organization developing a shared vision of the organization's future by involving all key stakeholders continuously on the alert for opportunities to promote inter-agency collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuously seeking client's assessment of the organization consistently team-building at the top of the organization extensive schedule of meetings with key people outside the organization conscientiously mentoring those inside the organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistently fostering improved executive board relations coalition-building at local, regional, state, and national levels seeking public speaking and lobbying opportunities to market the organization continuously seizing opportunities to celebrate successes inside and outside the organization
<i>Middle Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuously assessing the needs for internal organizational change actively participating in setting organizational priorities proposing and designing strategies to modify and strengthen operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> negotiating and mediating inter-departmental conflicts building coalitions inside the organization continuously fostering a climate of collegiality and sharing repeatedly searching for opportunities for team-building mentoring others inside the organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> building coalitions with colleagues outside the organization negotiating and mediating inter-agency conflicts mentoring others outside the organization fostering a climate of collegiality and sharing in the community continuously seizing opportunities to celebrate successes inside and outside the organization

from top management. Even with the delegated authority, middle managers find their managing out activities to be primarily horizontal with peers, relying more on persuasive abilities than any authority to mandate change. Some of the most prevalent challenges facing middle managers engaged in managing out can be: (1) getting the “right” people at the table to foster exchange and collaboration across boundaries, (2) developing common understandings needed to get everyone “on the same page” in order to sustain momentum, (3) understanding differing agency politics that relate to “turf” issues in order to reach decisions, (4) dealing with the interests of agencies and communities that may differ, and (5) getting clarity as to who has authority to reach a decision and monitor its implementation. These challenges are organized in Figure 2 into four areas: (1) forming group structures, (2) addressing power and leadership issues, (3) fostering and maintaining group processes, and (4) engaging in follow-up and implementation.

CONCLUSION

This discussion of managing out began with the community practice dimensions of spanning organizational boundaries. It was followed by

FIGURE 2. Challenges Facing Middle Managers Engaged in Managing Out

I. Addressing Power and Leadership Issues

- Letting go of turf issues
- Building an understanding of who has authority to make decisions
- Knowing the politics of participating organizations
- Handling the mutual/competing interests between agency and community
- Meeting the needs of agencies and clients

II. Forming Group Structures

- Getting the "right" people at that table
- Identifying array of stakeholders
- Finding a time and place to meet
- Receiving support from above

III. Fostering and Maintaining Group Processes

- Getting everyone on the same page
- Getting groups to decide
- Sustaining momentum
- Developing common understandings
- Motivating participants to complete agreed-upon work
- Maintaining attendance levels
- Dealing with previous histories that affect involvement (collaboration issues)
- Handling a variety of issues/interests, especially competing interests
- Facilitating without dominating
- Identifying roles to be taken
- Dealing with a lack of openness
- Using the expertise of others
- Saying the "right" thing (being knowledgeable and not being stereotypical)

IV. Engaging in Follow-Up and Implementation

- Monitoring decision-making and implementation
 - Insuring unified agency position on a given issue (shared understandings)
 - Anticipating program implications
 - Identifying external constraints on implementation
 - Developing creative strategies to make departmental changes
 - Monitoring implementation to see that resources are not spread too thin
-

an assessment of inter-organizational concepts relevant to the process of managing out. This assessment identified a series of questions for agency managers to use in their ongoing assessment of the external and internal dimensions of their organizational structures and processes as well as the elements of leadership and networking. The questions pro-

vided a beginning framework for exploring the organizational dynamics of managing out. Particular attention was given to examples of managing out by those in top management as well as middle management positions.

For middle managers, managing out to others inside their agency as well as to those in other agencies may require a significant realignment of traditional middle management job functions. (e.g., reducing the amount of time devoted to supervising staff and increasing the amount of time devoted to managing out). For senior managers, managing out may require an expanded commitment to the agency's *external* issues in the larger community as well as the *internal* issues related to promoting the culture of a learning organization (DuBrow, Woche, & Austin, 2001).

In the cases of both middle managers and top managers, the rebalancing of current job activities to account for more managing out would mean that internal operations might receive less attention while external relations might receive more attention. Ultimately, the role of the middle manager and top manager in human service organizations will need to be redesigned if future managers are going to master the skills of managing out as well as monitor the impact of this increasingly important community practice component of effective agency management. As seen in the lessons learned from implementing welfare reform, top management will be increasingly called upon to build and maintain community partnerships and middle managers will be encouraged to give more attention to inter-disciplinary practice inside and outside the agency.

REFERENCES

- Au, C. (1994). The status of theory and knowledge in social welfare administration. *Administration in Social Work, 18*(3).
- Austin, M. J. (1981). *Supervisory management for the human services*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Austin, M. J. (1988). Managing up: Relationship building between middle management and top management. *Administration in Social Work, 12*(4).
- Austin, M. J. (1984). Managing cutbacks in the 1980s. *Social Work, 29*(5).
- Brawley, E. (1995). *Human services and the media: Developing partnerships for change*. New Brunswick, NJ: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Carnochan, S. & Austin, M. J. (2002). Implementing welfare reform and guiding organizational change. *Administration in Social Work, 26*(1).

- DuBrow, A., Woche, D., & Austin, M. J. (2001). Introducing organizational development (OD) practices into a county social service agency. *Administration in Social Work, 25*(4).
- Floyd, S. W. & Woodridge, B. (1996). *The strategic middle manager: How to create and sustain competitive advantage*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goldberg, S., Cullen, J., & Austin, M. J. (2001). Developing a public information and community relations strategy in a county social service agency. *Administration in Social Work, 25*(2).
- Hastings, C. (1993). *The new organization: Growing the culture of organizational networking*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Havassy, H. M. (1990). Effective second-story bureaucrats: Mastering the paradox of diversity. *Social Work, 35*(2).
- Kettner, P. M. (2002). *Achieving Excellence in the Management of Human Service Organizations*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Keys, B. & Bell, R. (1982). Four faces of the fully functioning middle manager. *California Management Review, 24*(4).
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June.
- Lewis, J. A., Lewis, M. D., Packard, T. & Souflee, F. (2001). *Management of human service programs, Third Edition*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Lohman, R. A. & Lohman, N. (2002). *Social administration*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- McDaniel, R. (1994). *Scared speechless: Public speaking step by step*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Menefee, D. (1998). Identifying and comparing competencies for social work management II; A replication study. *Administration in Social Work, 22*(4).
- Menefee, D. T. & Thompson, J. J. (1994). Identifying and comparing competencies for social work management: A practice driven approach. *Administration in Social Work, 18*(3).
- Netting, F. E., Kettner, P. M., & McMurty, S.L. (1993). *Social Work Macro Practice*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Quinn, R. E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rapp, C. & Poertner, J. (1991). *Social administration: A client-centered approach*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Schein, E. (1988). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Weil, M. O. (1996). Community building: Building community practice. *Social Work, 41*(5), 481-499.