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1. Jack Rothman

APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY INTERVENTION

A PERSONAL PREFACE

This article presents a revision and refinement of the "Three Models" construct, which I introduced originally in 1968 and which has, with minor modifications and updating, provided the organizing framework for this book over its previous five editions. Through that time period, practices and conditions in communities have changed, and certain intellectual loose ends in the formulation have teased at me. My research studies pointed to gaps and uncertainties, and feedback from students and professionals in the field posed dilemmas that were difficult to resolve. It was as though I had packed a large and assorted pile of conceptual clothing into a cognitive suitcase and found there was a sock or the end of a tie sticking out after I had pressed it closed. The publication of this new edition has given me the impetus to try to tidy things up.

The basic ideas, it seems to me, hold up—but there is more complexity and variation than I had perceived. The best way to present the new perspective, I believe, is to do it in two sections. "Core Modes of Community Intervention" lays out the original schema, with some refinements and updating. "The Interweaving of Intervention Approaches" comprises an expansion and reformulation.

My first years of teaching were taken up with grappling to construct some type of unitary approach. But no matter how I labored, there were always contradictions and rough edges (the conceptual suitcase troubles started early). Someone who recently sought to summarize the intellectual contribution of a complex American thinker was led to comment: "At the end of the exercise, worst of all, you may find you are left with a few extra pieces which seem to fit nowhere" (Gellman, 1984, p. xv). That's how I felt about the subject matter I was wrestling.

Meanwhile, as my students presented themselves in class, they also didn't compose a unitary entity. I came to realize that they broke roughly into three types, each of which was looking for different things from the school and from me. There were those who were concerned with the better delivery of services, including coordination among agencies and effectiveness in meeting the needs of various vulnerable populations. They were interested in doing social planning and policy development for organizations such as the United Way or comprehensive health planning councils. Another group had the Peace Corps or VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) in mind and were focused on working at the grassroots level. They were motivated to bring people together to solve their local problems through discussion on a cooperative, self-help basis. A third group was influenced by the civil rights, antiwar and student movements (such as SNCC, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Council, and SDA, Students for a Democratic Society) and had a strong social action bent. Their aim was to aid the oppressed, promote social justice, and change society.

It gradually became clear to me that these different interests and motivations...
could not be encompassed comfortably by one practice orientation, and that it would be useful to think of different approaches that addressed each of the three empirically distinct groupings represented by the students. I began to stake out these three approaches conceptually, delineating a set of practice variables to be used to analyze variations among them. This was, perhaps, a risky departure from the prevailing casework mode, but, in time, clinical practice also broke from its solitary theoretical mold and began to include behavior modification, cognitive therapy, ecological practice, and other frameworks.

Social action presented a special challenge. Professional fields are typically conservative and eschew any taint of militancy—and that was especially true in the wake of the conformity-drenched decade of the 1950s, when any connection with radicalism was viewed with supreme suspicion. I needed to create an intellectual framework that would legitimate social action as an academic activity as well as an area of practice on par with other forms, something that did not exist in professional schools at that time.

I thought of the three approaches, or models, as ideal-types. They did not exist to a large extent in pristine, full-blown form in the real world, but were useful mental tools to help describe and analyze reality. Over time I have come to de-emphasize or soften the notion of “models,” which gives greater importance and internal validity to the approaches than seems warranted, and to accent the overlap and intermixture among approaches. The next section of this discussion will sketch out the original approaches as ideal-type constructs, and will also make a cross-comparison of them against a set of twelve practice variables. The last section, which is more practical and the place where the analysis leads, will consider combined and variant patterns that serve to integrate the different modalities.

**Core Modes of Community Intervention**

**Three Modes of Intervention**

Planning has been defined as the act of deciding what to do about some community affair while, meanwhile, life is bringing it around to a firm conclusion. And a typical committee assigned to deal with the task is, of course, merely a form of human organization that takes hours to produce minutes. These quips express a widespread popular view of social intervention as it is commonly carried out. Here, we will try to conceive of disciplined human reckoning that plays tricks on the natural course of life and actually begets intended effects, in furtherance of community well-being.

Differing and contrasting formulations of community intervention currently exist, which has been a source of perplexity and discomfort for the struggling practitioner and teacher. Taylor and Roberts (1985) describe the fluid nature of theory development, stating that in this field, “eclecticism, pragmatism and practice wisdom of professionals foster a turbulence and diversity that makes categorization and model-building especially difficult tasks” (pp. 24–25). In the founding issue of the *Journal of Community Practice*, editor Marie Weil states: that in order to “reclaim and strengthen community practice, theoretical approaches, guiding values and practice strategies need to be articulated so that they are both clear and carefully connected . . . a grounding . . . in reality and theory should be part of that movement forward” (Weil, 1994, pp. xxvii). A special issue of *The Journal on Conceptual*
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Models of Practice was issued in 1996 (vol. 3, no. 3/4).

Three important approaches to purposive community change can be discerned in contemporary American communities, both urban and rural, and internationally. We will refer to them as approaches or Modes A, B, and C, and they can be given the appellations respectively of locality development, social planning/policy, and social action. Within each mode there are several variations and distinct emphases, but in this initial discussion we will select out and treat one prominent form within the mode for purposes of analysis. The three basic Modes of action do not necessarily exhaust all possibilities, but they offer a serviceable framework for a broad inquiry. These strategies are general in nature and are applicable across professional fields and academic disciplines. However, the author's grounding in social work and sociology will give a particular slant or tinge to the discussion.

In the presentation, community intervention is the general term used to cover the various forms of community level practice. "Community organizing" ordinarily implies social action and sometimes includes neighborhood work involving self-help strategies. But it excludes social planning/policy development approaches. Community organization has traditionally been the inclusive nomenclature, but it often becomes confused with more narrowly focused radical community organizing. Community work is frequently used to convey a locality development outlook. On the other hand, social planning usually fails to embrace grassroots organizing efforts. Recognizing that there is no standard terminology, community intervention seems to be a convenient and useful overarching term to employ, although "community practice" has similar attributes and will be used occasionally as an alternative.

Administration (or management) is another form of social practice that takes place in the community within organizational settings. It involves developing organizations and keeping them running through obtaining funding and other resources, arranging staffing, establishing and carrying out procedures, maintaining records, and similar activities. Organizations constitute the vehicle through which social goals are pursued and relevant tasks are carried out. Thus, they provide the machinery for steering the endeavors of all three modes of community intervention—in addition to direct-service agencies and a wide spectrum of other programs in the community. Administration practice has a crucial bearing on the performance of all organizations, but it exists in a different dimension than community intervention and will be treated independently and apart from this analysis.

Mode A, Locality Development. This approach presupposes that community change should be pursued through broad participation by a wide spectrum of people at the local community level in determining goals and taking civic action. Its prototypic form will be found in the literature of a segment of the field commonly termed community development. As stated by an early U.N. publication: "Community Development can be tentatively defined as a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance on the community's initiative" (United Nations, 1955).

Locality development is a community-building endeavor with a strong emphasis on what Selznick (1992) terms the "moral commonwealth." He describes this in words such as mutuality, identity, participation, plurality, and autonomy. Locality
development fosters community building by promoting process goals: community competency (the ability to solve problems on a self-help basis) and social integration (harmonious interrelationships among different racial, ethnic, and social-class groups—indeed, among all people). Leadership is drawn from within, and direction and control are in the hands of local people (Dionne, 1998; Mattessich and Monsey, 1997; Minkler, 1997). It is a type of activity that has been initiated and sponsored by religious and service groups such as The Catholic Church and The American Friends Service Committee, and it reflects highly idealistic values. The style is humanistic and strongly people-oriented, with the aim of “helping people to help themselves.” The process of educating participants and nurturing their personal development has high priority. “Enabling” techniques that are nondirective in character and foster self-direction are emphasized.

Many of the precepts of the feminist perspective on organizing overlap with the locality development approach, including stress on wide participation as well as concern for democratic procedure and educational goals—including consciousness-raising (Hyde, 1989; Naples, 1998; Halseth, 1993). The approach is also used, some would say misappropriated, by political and business leaders who espouse local initiative and privatization, relying on enterprise zones and like programs that essentially intend to scale back social programs for the poor that are carried out under governmental auspices.

Some examples of locality development as conceived here include neighborhood work programs conducted by settlement houses and other community-based agencies; federal government programs such as Agricultural Extension and The National Service Corps; and village-level work in some overseas community development programs, including the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development (AID). To these can be added community work in the fields of adult education and public health education, as well as self-help and informal helping network activities conducted through neighborhood councils, block clubs, consumer cooperatives, and civic associations (Burns and Taylor, 1998).

Thinkers who contributed intellectual roots for locality development include John Dewey, Mary Follett, Kurt Lewin, and Eduard Lindeman. Among professional writings that express and elaborate this mode are Blakely (1979); Chavis et al. (1993); Cnaan (1991); Henderson and Thomas (1987); Lappin (1985); Mayer (1984); Ross (1955).

The terms “community development” and “locality development” have been used to identify the approach. The locality development nomenclature was employed in the original version of this analysis to convey this perspective on intervention in a precise way. Community development is a more polymorphic term, which sometimes connotes institutional and policy means to strengthen communities from above (Mier, 1993), or suggests industrial expansion through economic development (Bingham and Mier, 1993). Sometimes it has a national or international frame rather than an explicitly local one (Goetz and Clarke, 1993). Locality development will be the terminology of choice here, and when “community development” is used it will connote a Mode A strategy.

While locality development espouses highly respected ideals, it has been criticized for its performance record. Khinduka, in the prior edition of this book, characterizes it as a “soft strategy” for achieving change. He indicates that its preoccupation with process can lead to endless
meetings that are frustrating for participants and conducive to a slow pace of progress. Khinduka further argues that concern with modifying attitudes and values may divert attention from important structural issues that need more direct engagement. Also, many projects draw their participation largely from racial and ethnic minorities and the poor, when it is the attitudes of the affluent and well-placed that need rearranging.

Embracing consensus as a basic modus operandi precludes arbitrary actions from occurring, but it puts those who stand to lose from needed reforms in a position to veto effective action. The heavy emphasis on the local community may be inappropriate at a time when the locality has lost much of its hold over people and patterns of life are influenced significantly by powerful national and regional forces. Khinduka admires locality development for playing a gentleman’s game in the often sordid arena of community affairs, but he worries about whether it can win.

Mode B, Social Planning/Policy. This emphasizes a technical process of problem solving regarding substantive social problems, such as delinquency, housing, and mental health (Kettner, Monroney, and Marlin, 1999; Burch, 1996). This particular orientation to planning is data-driven and conceives of carefully calibrated change being rooted in social science thinking and empirical objectivity (unlike other existing forms of planning that are more political and emergent). The style is technocratic, and rationality is a dominant ideal. Community participation is not a core ingredient and may vary from much to little, depending on the problem and circumstances. The approach presupposes that change in a complex modern environment requires expert planners who, through the exercise of technical competencies—including the ability to gather and analyze quantitative data and to maneuver large bureaucratic organizations—are needed to improve social conditions. There is heavy reliance on needs assessment, decision analysis, Markov chains, evaluation research, delphi techniques, computer graphics, and a plethora of sophisticated statistical tools.

The design of formal plans and policy frameworks is of central importance, as is their implementation in effective and cost-efficient ways. By and large, the concern here is with task goals: conceptualizing, selecting, establishing, arranging, and delivering goods and services to people who need them. In addition, fostering coordination among agencies, avoiding duplication, and filling gaps in services are important concerns in achieving service ends (Austin, 1997; Mandell, 1999).

Within the field of social work, educational programs in planning and policy typify the social planning/policy approach. It also finds expression in university departments of public administration, public health, urban affairs, city planning, and policy studies. It is practiced in numerous federal bureaus and departments, in United Ways and community welfare councils, and in city departments and voluntary agencies geared to planning for mental health, health, aging, housing, and child welfare. The National Association of Planning Councils has been formed to strengthen these local community planning efforts.

Intellectual roots for the approach can be found in the thinking of scholars such as Comte, Lasswell, Keynes, Herbert Simon, and Jesse Steiner. Some professional writings that reflect this mode include Gil (1976); Gilbert and Specht (1977); Kahn (1969); Lauffer (1981); Moroney (1991); Morris and Binstock (1966); and Tropman (1984).
While this approach emphasizes rationality in an explicit and formal way, and leans on it to lend legitimation for recommended actions (often by way of voluminous and impressive reports), the other approaches (Modes A and C) also need to be firmly embedded in rationality. Developing a means to successfully achieve broad civic participation or carrying out a protest demonstration to place pressure on public officials each require a high level of strategic calculation, linking chosen means logically to intended ends. The rationality may not be as overt and public, but it is equally related to effective and professionally sound intervention.

Planning and policy are grouped together in this discussion because both involve assembling and analyzing data to prescribe means for solving social problems. They overlap in some measure, but they also probably have distinct features. Frequently, in scholarly and practice writings, the two are treated as though they are mutually exclusive. Policy is often associated with higher social levels—with national and state, governmental structures, and the act of selecting goals and framing legislative or administrative standards rather than actually establishing programs and services.

No clear basis exists for this compartmentalization of policy functions. There is policy development at the local level as well as at higher echelons (Flynn, 1985). It is conducted under private auspices as well as under governmental sponsorship (Pierce, 1984). And it has implementation and monitoring functions in addition to the goal-setting aspect (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984). Gilbert and Specht (1974) conceive of a "policy planner" and define policy as "a course or plan of action," thereby essentially blending the two.

In this discussion we are addressing policy as professional practice rather than as a method for conducting an analysis to understand social welfare programs (Tropman, 1984; Jansson, 1984). Ironically, many planning and policy scholars write as though the other area does not exist, although upon examination these authors cover a great deal of similar ground. A divergence or different emphasis (areas of less overlap) lies in policy practice's concern with megagoals or quasi-philosophical frameworks that guide legislative enactment and program development, while planning is interested to a greater degree in the details of program construction and service delivery.

In this discussion, "planning" will serve as a shorthand and convenient designation for the planning/policy approach.

The data-driven form of planning and policy practice has a certain currency and appeal, with its coherent intellectual structure and ostensible ease of implementation. Urban planning schools and policy studies programs place a great deal of emphasis on providing students with ever more complex and elegant statistical procedures and computer modeling methods. This may be because these are readily available, can be manipulated easily in a technical sense, and have an aura of mastery and completeness that is missing in more political forms of planning.

Webber and Rittel (1973) state that the data-driven approach is flawed because it is based on the assumption that problems are easily definable, well-bounded, and responsive to professional intervention. Instead, they say, contemporary problems are "wicked" in nature—unique, intractable, intermeshed with others, and situated in a constantly changing and turbulent social environment.

Two important factors place constraints on the prototypical rationalistic mode. The first is the intensification of constituency politics, a contemporary development that
makes planning highly contentious and interactive. Interest groups of various kinds feel they should have a say and have acquired a voice, and they place themselves vigorously into the pluralistic process through which decisions are made. Many planners and policy professionals believe that interests of various kinds rightfully should go into the defining of goals and setting the community agenda, because these are socially constructed phenomena and involve value choices that extend far beyond the purview of the expert or bureaucrat.

Another factor confounding prototypical rationalistic intervention is the impact of fiscal constraint. There is public aversion to taxation and to governmental spending for social programs. Concrete economic conditions involving industrial decline and recessionary trends also place objective limits on social program options. These public attitudes and economic strictures have shifted planning from an optimizing stance to what Herbert Simon refers to as “satisficing.” The dual effects of contentious community politics and a public leaning toward a “get by” level of social programming place into question the utility of elaborate, data-driven planning modalities.

**Mode C, Social Action.** This approach presupposes the existence of an aggrieved or disadvantaged segment of the population that needs to be organized in order to make demands on the larger community for increased resources or equal treatment (Bobo, Kendall, and Max, 1996). The particular approach we are describing has a militant orientation to advocacy with respect to goals and tactics (although not all advocacy is militant). It aims at making fundamental changes in the community, including the redistribution of power and resources and gaining access to decision making for marginal groups. Social action intervention seeks to change legislative mandates of political entities such as a city council, or the policies and practices of institutions such as a welfare department or housing authority. Practitioners in the social action arena generally aim to empower and benefit the poor, the disenfranchised, the oppressed. The style is highly adversarial, and social justice is a dominant ideal (Karp, 1998).

Classically, stemming from the high point of social action in the 1960s, confrontational tactics have been emphasized, including use of demonstrations, picketing, strikes, marches, boycotts, teach-ins, civil disobedience, and other disruptive or attention-gaining moves. Disadvantaged and aggrieved groups frequently do not have at hand the funds, connections, and expertise available to others, and consequently they rely heavily on the resources of “people power,” which has the potential to pressure and disrupt. Training institutes sponsored by the Midwest Academy and Industrial Areas Foundation have been established to equip low-power constituencies with the skills to impact higher circles of power.

The social action approach has been used widely by AIDS activists, feminist organizing groups, gay and lesbian organizations, consumer and environmental protection organizations, civil rights and black power groups, and La Raza and victim rights groups. It has been embraced by Industrial Areas Foundation and ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now) projects, labor unions, including the United Farm workers, and radical political action movements.

Thinkers providing an intellectual foundation for this approach include Marx, Fourier, Bakunin, and Habermas and it was advanced in part by advocacy activities of Jane Addams and her Progressive Era allies.
Alinsky’s *Revelle for Radicals* (1946) and *Rules for Radicals* (1972) have typified the orientation of the social action mode. Newer writings also reflect this orientation (Boyte and Riessman, 1986; Burghardt, 1987; Cloward and Piven, 1977; Delgado, 1986; Fisher, 1994; Freire, 1974; Kahn, 1992).

In recent years, social action movements have expanded their strategy bent beyond the confrontational style, and “new wave” organizing now employs a wider range of adversarial tactics. Political and electoral maneuvers that are more fine tuned and diversified are being used in considerable measure. This is because the groups have become more sophisticated over time, there is less public tolerance for disruptive methods, and power elites have become skillful in counteracting confrontations. Organizing has become less stridently ideological, and middle-class groups (and right-wing factions) have been drawn into campaigning on their own behalf or in joint actions.

However, there is a great deal of fragmentation among groups engaged in social action. Advocacy has taken on a particularistic caste, with each aggrieved constituency advancing its own special goals and interests in a “politics of identity” (Byrd, 1999; Gitlin, 1996). Even among people of color, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans go their own ways, independently and often competitively. Thus, coalition building has become a central concern in social action, since groups are typically not strong enough to achieve significant results on their own. But these coalitions are fluid, shifting, and irregular; new configurations have to be formed for different issues on a continuing basis—thus draining off energy that might be focused on external targets.

Fragmentation is especially handicapping because of the growing concentration of political and economic power locally, nationally, and even globally (see the discussion by Fisher on Political Economy). Relatively weak local entities that are disunited find themselves contending with powerful extracommunity entities that are functionally consolidated.

Human service professionals have not been prominent in the social action area, but there has been continuing participation on a small-scale basis over the years. Major national organizations such as ACORN and the United Farm Workers Union have been headed by social workers. There are relevant professional groups, such as the Union of Radical Human Service Workers in Boston and the Bertha Capen Reynolds Society nationally, and there is also a specialized periodical, the *Journal of Progressive Human Services*.

Modest salaries and the absence of professional perquisites are a deterrent to long-term involvement. But new graduates with an interest in basic social change are in a position to take this on as a communal responsibility for a limited time at the beginning of their career. The Nader organization’s publication *Good Works* (Anzalone, 1985) and the “Community Jobs” newsletter list a multitude of positions and career opportunities. The richness of the experience, the chance to join hands with aspiring members of oppressed and dispossessed groups, and a sense of accomplishment in advancing a valued and meritorious cause can compensate for temporary material loss. Some professionals have and will continue to make this a lifetime commitment.
device for community intervention, has a certain intuitive logic. Historically, several schools of social work have developed specialized programs for training according to the three modes. Thus, a community development program that was situated at the University of Missouri epitomized Mode A; the doctoral program in planning at Brandeis University, Mode B; and a social action program based at Syracuse University, Mode C.

Morris and Binstock (1966), based on an empirical examination of community organizations, suggested a similar threefold division. Friedmann (1987) attaches different language to these same approaches—social learning, policy analysis and social mobilization, as does Lyon (1987)—self-help, technical assistance and conflict. The formulation has also provided an effective conceptual framework for a historical volume on community intervention (Betten and Austin, 1990).

Empirical studies of the formulation lend general support. Cnaan and Rothman (1986) found that a sample of community workers in Israel distinguish between these approaches in their perception of their work and in their practice activities. Several studies in progress have replicated the inquiry with apparently similar results in Sweden, Egypt, Japan, Chile, India, and several other countries. (In the original study, social action appeared to be a more complex phenomenon than the other interventions.) In a series of case studies in Canada, Wharf (1979) observed that locality development and social planning were distinctly discernable, but that social action, while evident, again was more diverse. (We will discuss this disparity in the next section, “The Interweaving of Intervention Approaches.”) Practitioners in Wharf’s project found the framework particularly useful as an assessment tool, as did those in another Canadian study (Johnson, 1974).

The studies also suggest the existence of variations and mixed configurations, which is the subject of the next section. However, here, for analytical purposes, we view the three approaches as relatively “pure” expressions. The merit in this is suggested by Morris and Binstock (1966) when they refer to their own classification system:

The categories are somewhat arbitrary, for it is sometimes difficult to say that a particular experience fits one category but not another. For these reasons it is particularly important to achieve as narrow a focus as possible in analyzing [intervention]: Otherwise a systematic treatment is virtually impossible (p. 15).

Examining ideal-types, while recognizing they are to some degree artificial, has the particular benefit of allowing us to perceive practice variables and intervention components within the modes in explicit and crystallized form. This generates a wide range of distinct practice options, across intervention orientations, that can be employed selectively and in combination. (This will be expanded upon subsequently.)

PRACTICE VARIABLES AND
COMMUNITY INTERVENTION
APPROACHES

In order to proceed with the analysis, we will specify a set of practice variables that help describe and compare each of the approaches when seen in ideal-type form. Each of the orientations makes assumptions about the nature of the community situation, goal categories of action, concepts of the general welfare, appropriate tactics, and so on. A set of twelve such variables will be treated in the passages that follow. The variables are based on the writer’s long-term experience and review of the analyses of practice by others. They are assumed to be salient but by no means exhaustive. A
number of themes from the previous discussion will necessarily be reiterated here, but they will be applied in a different and conceptually systematized way. Table 1.1 (p. 45) provides a summary and substantive overview, and the discussion offers further clarification and interpretation for those who wish to go into the details.

1. Goal Categories

Two main goals that have been discussed recurrently in the community organization and macro practice literature have been referred to as "task" and "process" (Rothman, 1964; Gilbert and Specht, 1977). Task goals entail the completion of a concrete task or the solution of a delimited problem in a community system: establishing new services, improving coordination of existing ones, passing specific social legislation, or changing the behavior or attitudes of residents, say, in regard to health practices. Process goals are oriented to system maintenance and enhancement and local empowerment, with aims such as creating self-maintaining, problem-solving structures, stimulating wide interest and participation in community affairs, fostering collaborative attitudes and practices among people, and enhancing indigenous leadership, all linked to enhancing community integration and local problem-solving capacity. Process goals are concerned with a generalized capacity of the community system to function over time; task goals are concerned with the solution of pinpointed functional problems of the system.

Locality Development. Process goals receive heavy emphasis. The community's growing capacity to become integrated and to engage in cooperative problem solving is of central importance. This view is expressed by Henderson and Thomas (1987) as follows:

The challenge faced by professionals . . . is to realize that they must seek not just to deliver services to meet people's needs but to do so in a way that enhances people's autonomy, self-respect and their ability to work together to solve common problems (p. 7).

Social Planning. There is stress on task goals, focusing on the solution of substantive social problems. Social planning organizations often are mandated specifically to deal with concrete deficiencies, defects, or illnesses, and their official names signify this—mental health departments, municipal housing authorities, legislative committees, The American Cancer Society, commissions on physical rehabilitation or alcoholism, and so on.

These aims of social planning have been described as: the solving of social problems; the satisfying of social needs; . . . coordination of services (including interdisciplinary cooperation), [and] the initiation and development of new services and facilities . . . (Weyers, 1992, p. 133).

It is difficult for many planners to attend to process goals because their organizational assignments often have official mandates, legislative directives, formal time lines, and prescribed procedures.

Social Action. The approach may lean in the direction of either task goals or process goals. Some social action organizations, such as civil rights groups and cause-oriented organizations, emphasize obtaining specific legislative outcomes (higher welfare allotments) or changing specific social practices (discriminatory hiring). Usually these objectives entail changes in policies of government or formal organizations. Other social action groups lean in the direction of process goals—aiding a constituency to
acquire and exercise power—as exemplified by feminist organizing, ACORN, or the early black power movement. This objective of building local-based power and decision-making centers transcends the solution of any given problem situation.

A dual perspective encompassing both goal types has been put forth by Kahn (1982) as follows:

Organizing has both short- and long-range benefits. In the short run it's an effective tool for getting things done: for improving schools, for lowering taxes, for establishing rights on the job, for improving transportation and health care, for protecting and defending neighborhoods and communities .... But it is also an end in itself. As we organize, we clarify ourselves as individuals because we learn to speak for ourselves in ways that make us heard (pp. 7–8).

In recent years social action groups have given increasing attention to process goals and capacity building. The feminist movement's theme, "the personal is political," articulates that trend.

2. Assumptions Concerning Problem Conditions

Locality Development. The local community is seen to be overshadowed by the larger society, lacking in fruitful human relationships and problem-solving skills and plagued by isolated individuals suffering from anomie, alienation, disillusionment, and, often, mental illness. Technological change, it is believed, has pressed society toward greater industrialization and urbanization with little consideration of the effects on social relations. Henderson and Thomas (1987) state:

not only are people set apart from each other by conflicts and scapegoating, but we may wonder whether people know how to manage their relationships with each other. This state of affairs may have come about partly because social skills involved in neighboring and networking may have atrophied (p. 4).

Alternatively, especially in Third World international projects, the community is often seen as tradition-bound, ruled by a small group of autocratic elite, and composed of an educationally deprived population who lack skills in problem solving or an understanding of democratic methods.

Social Planning. The community is viewed as burdened by concrete social problem conditions. Warren (1972) reflects the outlook of social planners as follows:

It is apparent that certain types of "problems" are broadly characteristic of contemporary American communities. They appear in such forms as the increasing indebtedness of central cities, the spread of urban blight and slums, the lack of adequate housing which people can afford, the economic dependence of large numbers of people in the population, poorly financed and staffed schools, high delinquency and crime rates, inadequate provisions for the mentally ill, the problem of the aged, the need for industrial development, the conflict of local and national agencies for the free donor's dollar, the problem of affording rapid transit for commuters at a reasonable price and at a reasonable profit, and the problem of downtown traffic congestion. This list is almost endless, and each of the problems mentioned could be subdivided into numerous problematic aspects (p. 14).

Social Action. The community comprises a hierarchy of privilege and power in the eyes of those with a militant advocacy stance. There exist islands of oppressed, deprived, ignored, or powerless populations suffering social injustice or exploitation at the hands of oppressors such as the "power structure," big government, corporations, global capitalism, and racist or sexist institutions. This oppression can imply material deprivation or psychological dehumanization. Kahn (1982) states the social action position succinctly:
In the United States today power is concentrated in the hands of a small number of well-organized individuals and corporations. These corporations and the individuals involved in them have extraordinary power to make decisions that affect all our lives... regardless of the suffering that it has caused people... (p. 14).

Again, we caution that these are dominant motifs rather than discrete categories. Many social actionists are greatly concerned about apathy and substantive problems, even as some social planners are deeply concerned about the quality of social relations. We are defining tendencies in thinking rather than mutually exclusive cognitive compartments.

3. Basic Change Strategy

Locality Development. The basic change strategy may be expressed as “Let’s all get together and talk this over.” This involves a concerted effort to bring a wide range of community people into determining their “felt” needs and solving their own problems. Local initiative and shared decision making are key.

Social Planning. The basic change strategy in the data-driven modality we are describing is captured by “Let’s get the facts and think through the logical next steps.” Planners and policy practitioners in this framework focus on gathering pertinent data about the problem and then deciding on an empirically supported and feasible course of action. The practitioner plays a central part in assembling and analyzing facts, establishing goals or policy frameworks, and determining appropriate services, programs, and actions. This may or may not be done with the participation of others, depending upon the planner’s sense of the utility of participation in the given situation and the organizational context within which he or she functions.

Social Action. The change strategy is expressed through “Let’s organize to overpower our oppressor and change the system,” that is, crystallizing issues so that people know who their legitimate enemy is and mobilizing them to bring pressure on selected targets. Such targets may include an organization, such as the welfare department; a person, such as the mayor; or an aggregate of persons, such as slum landlords.

4. Characteristic Change Tactics and Techniques

Locality Development. Tactics of consensus are stressed, including discussion and communication among a wide range of different individuals, groups, and factions. Blakely (1979) makes a case for cooperative, deliberative techniques in locality development: “Development specialists attempt within the conflict situation to place the stress on problem solving as opposed to win-lose strategies and attitudes” (p. 21).

Social Planning. Fact finding and analytical skills are of central concern. Tactics of conflict or consensus may be employed, depending upon the practitioner’s analysis of the situation. For example, writings on managerial planning often emphasize the value of cooperative participation (Peters and Waterman, 1982). At the same time, hostile takeovers are not unheard of in the business world, nor is there a dirth of aggressive moves by planning agencies and their client organizations to win over a larger share of United Way Funding. Policy specialists differentially seek allies from one or another faction to support a preferred legislative initiative as necessary.
**Social Action.** Conflict tactics are emphasized in the militant advocacy modality, including methods of confrontation and direct action. The ability to mobilize relatively large numbers of people is necessary to carry out rallies, marches, boycotts, and picketing. Success of social action groups is based on: “their ability to embarrass the target or their ability to cause the target political harm if the target is a public official, or financial harm if it is a business” (Bobo, Kendall, and Max, 1991, p. 29).

Alinsky (1962) felt it is important to “rub raw the sores of popular discontent.” His strong philosophical/theoretical position was clear:

Issues which are noncontroversial usually mean that people are not particularly concerned about them; in fact, by not being controversial they cease to be issues. Issues involve differences and controversy. History fails to record a single issue of importance which was not controversial. Controversy has always been the seed of creation (p. 7).

5. and 6. Practitioner Roles and Medium of Change

**Locality Development.** The practitioner’s characteristic role is that of an “enabler” or, as suggested by Biddle and Biddle (1965), “encourager.” The role has been described in this way by Henderson and Thomas:

At a very basic level, locality development is about putting people in touch with one another, and of promoting their membership in groups and networks. It seeks to develop people’s sense of power and significance in acts of association with others that may also achieve an improvement in their social and material well-being (p. 15).

The practitioner employs as a major medium of change the creation and guidance of small task-oriented groups, requiring skill in fostering collaborative problem finding and problem solving.

**Social Planning.** More technical or “expert” roles are emphasized. Referring to Ross (1955), the expert role contains these components: community diagnosis, research skill, information about other communities, advice on methods of organization and procedure, technical programmatic information, and evaluation. The practitioner employs as a salient medium of change the guiding and maneuvering of agencies, bureaucracies, and legislative bodies in addition to the collection and analysis of data. Weyers (1992) indicates that the role of the planner involves:

- correlating identified needs and available resources. The nature and range of these needs are identified primarily with the aid of different forms of research, while the sources, on the other hand, are mainly the concern of formal systems and the structure of authority. To obtain these desired sources, the social worker has to employ available data (for instance in the form of need identification) in order to be able to claim support (p. 132).

**Social Action.** Roles entail the organization of disadvantaged groups to act on behalf of their interests in a pluralist political culture. The practitioner seeks to create and guide mass organizations and movements and to influence political processes. Mass mobilization is necessary because:

Power generally consists of having a lot of money or a lot of people. Citizen organizations tend to have people, not money. Thus, our ability to win depends on our being able to do with people, what the other side is able to do with money (Bobo, Kendall, and Max, 1991, p. 9).

Classic 1960s social action focuses on organizing disadvantaged populations to act on their own in their own behalf, which is seen as true empowerment. We will examine variations from this pattern within the social action mode later.
7. Orientation Toward Power Structure(s)

Locality Development. The power structure is included within an all-encompassing conception of community. All segments of the community are thought of, holistically, as part of the action system. Hence, power elites are considered allies in a common venture embracing the well-being of all. One consequence of this might well be that in this approach only goals that have mutual agreement become legitimate or relevant; goals that involve incompatible interests are ignored or discarded as inappropriate. Hence, aims involving fundamental shifts in the configuration of power and resource control, which can contribute materially to elevating the position of minorities and the poor, are likely to be excluded.

Social Planning. The power structure is usually present as the sponsor or employer of the practitioner. Sponsors may include a voluntary board of directors, an arm of city government, or a legislative unit. Morris and Binstock (1966) state the case this way: "Realistically, it is difficult to distinguish planners from their employing organizations. In some measure, their interests, motivations, and means are those of their employers." Planners are usually highly trained technical specialists whose services require considerable finances for salary as well as support in the form of supplies, equipment, facilities, and auxiliary technical and clerical personnel.

Frequently, planners can only be sustained in their work by those in the society possessing wealth, control of the machinery of government, and high prestige. As Rein (1965) suggests, much planning is by "consensus of elites" who are employers and policy makers in planning organizations. Usually this consensus is reinforced through technical language, selective use of factual data, and an expressed commitment to impartial rationality.

Social Action. The power structure is seen as an external target of action; that is, the power structure lies outside the beneficiary system or constituency itself and is an oppositional or oppressive force.

The person with the power becomes the "target" of an issue campaign. The target (sometimes called the decision maker) is always the person who has the power to give you what you want (If no one has such power, then you haven't cut the issue correctly.) (Bobo, Kendall, and Max, 1991, p. 11).

Power elites, then, usually represent a force antithetical to the group whose well-being the practitioner is committed to advance. Those holding power, accordingly, must be coerced or overturned in the interests of equity and social justice.

8. Boundary Definition of the Beneficiary System

Locality Development. The total community, usually a geographic entity such as a city, neighborhood, or village, is the beneficiary system. Accordingly, "Community Development is concerned with the participation of all groups in the community—with both sexes, all age groups, all racial, nationality, religious, economic, social and cultural groups" (Dunham, 1963).

Social Planning. The intended beneficiaries may be either a total geographic community or some area or functional subpart. Community welfare councils and city planning commissions usually conceive of their intended beneficiaries as comprising the widest cross section of community interests. On the other hand, sometimes the service populations of social planners are
more segmented aggregates—a given neighborhood, the mentally ill, the aged, youth, juvenile delinquents, or the black community. Policy practitioners work with representatives who may view beneficiaries varyingly in universalistic commonweal terms or in terms of particularistic constituencies.

Social Action. Intended beneficiaries are usually conceived as some community subpart or segment that suffers at the hands of the broader community and thus merits the special support of the practitioner. According to Kahn (1982):

When people in government, such as community planners and developers, talk about community development, they often mean the development of an entire city. This idea is misleading. You can’t develop an entire city. What’s good for some people is not good for others. If something is good for one group, another group loses out. There are conflicts within groups. The poverty of one group may be caused by the profits of another (p. 80).

Practitioners are likely to think in terms of constituents, brothers and sisters, or allies rather than in terms of a “client” concept, which is seen as patronizing, detached, or overly clinical.

9. Assumptions Regarding Community Interests or Subsystems

Locality Development. The interests of various groups and factions in the community are viewed as reconcilable and responsive to the influence of reason, persuasion, communication, and mutual goodwill. Hence:

Community developers accept the notion that people, regardless of race, sex, ethnicity or place of birth, can find ways to solve their problems through group efforts. The community development movement is humanistic in orientation. This implies a genuineness or authenticity in relationships that permits open, honest communication and feedback (Blakely, pp. 18, 21).

Social Planning. There is no pervasive assumption about the degree of intractability of conflicting interests; the approach appears to be pragmatic, oriented toward the particular problem and the actors enmeshed in it. Morris and Binstock set out the social planning orientation as follows:

A planner cannot be expected to be attuned to . . . the overriding interests of dominant factions. Considerable study and analysis of factions and interests dominant in various types of organizations will be needed before planners will have sufficient guidance for making reliable predictions as to resistance likely in a variety of situations (p. 112).

Social Action. The approach assumes that interests among community subparts are at variance and not easily reconcilable, that resources are limited or dominated, and that often coercive influence must be applied (boycotts, strikes, political and social upheavals) before meaningful adjustments can be made. Those who gain privileges and profits from the disadvantage of others do not easily give up their edge; the force of self-interest makes it foolish to expect them to do so. Saul Alinsky (1962) states:

All major controlling interests make a virtue of acceptance—acceptance of the ruling group’s policies and decisions. Any movement or organization arising in disagreement, or seeking independent changes and defined by the predominating powers as a threat, is promptly subjected by castigation, public and private smears, and attacks on its very existence (p. 6).

10. Conception of Intended Beneficiaries

Beneficiaries are those who are in line to gain from the efforts of the practitioner and the intervention process.
Parameters of Intervention

Locality Development. Intended beneficiaries are likely to be viewed as average citizens who possess considerable strengths that are not fully developed and who need the services of a practitioner to help them release and focus these inherent capabilities. The Biddles (1965) express this viewpoint as follows:

1. Each person is valuable, and capable of growth toward greater social sensitivity and responsibility.
   a. Each person has underdeveloped abilities in initiative, originality, and leadership. These qualities can be cultivated and strengthened (p. 60).

Social Planning. The beneficiary group is more likely to be thought of as consumers of services, those who will receive and utilize those programs and services that are the fruits of the social planning process—mental health treatment, public housing, health education, recreation, welfare benefits, and so forth. Weyers (1992) makes this clear in highlighting the provision of social services as a key objective of social planning. "According to this point of view the efficiency of the community’s social functioning will depend on the quantity and quality of professional services rendered to the community, as well as the way in which the community’s concrete needs are provided for" (p. 132).

In policy settings beneficiaries may be conceived as both consumers and constituents.

Social Action. The intended beneficiaries are seen as aggrieved victims of “the system”: of slum landlords, the medical establishment, government bureaucracies, racist institutions, patriarchal entities, and corporate polluters. Those on behalf of whom action is initiated are often characterized in “underdog” terms.

11. Conception of the Role of Intended Beneficiaries

Locality Development. Beneficiaries are viewed as active participants in an interactional process with one another and with the practitioner. Considerable stress is placed on group discussion in the community as the medium through which learning and growth take place. Beneficiaries engage in an intensive group process of exploring their felt needs, determining desired goals, and taking appropriate action.

Social Planning. Beneficiaries are clients, consumers, or recipients of services. They are active in using services, not in the determination of policy or goals.

Opportunities for members and consumers to determine policy are severely limited because they are not usually organized for this purpose. . . the opportunity to control policy is short-lived because the coalition will fall apart, lacking sufficient incentive to bind together the otherwise diverse constituent elements (Morris and Binstock, 1966, pp. 109–110).

Decisions, then, are made through the planner, often in collaboration with some community group—a board or commission, usually composed of business and professional elites, who are presumed to represent either the community-at-large or the best interests of those being served.

The data-driven policy specialist is likely to be looking over his or her back through this process, realizing that constituency interests and pressures could have an impact on policy enactment.

Social Action. The benefiting group is likely to be thought of as an employer of the practitioner or constituents. In unions the membership ideally runs the organization. The Industrial Areas Foundation will
usually not enter a target area until the people there have gained a controlling and independent voice in the funding of the organization. The concept of the organizer as an employee and servant of the people is stressed. Kahn (1982) holds that the "staff director of the organization, if there is one, should be directly accountable to the board and should be held accountable by the board" (p. 70). Those not in key decision-making roles may participate more sporadically in mass action and pressure group activities, such as marches or boycotts.

12. Uses of Empowerment

Empowerment is a highly valued concept in contemporary thinking and parlance (Colby, 1997). However, in some ways it seems to be a buzzword that has to do more with creating a warm feeling than conveying a precise meaning. In the context of our discussion, each intervention approach values empowerment, but uses it in a different, sometimes contradictory, fashion.

Locality Development. Empowerment signifies the gaining of community competence—the skills to make decisions that people can agree on and enact together. It also implies the development of a sense of personal mastery within residents, as individual growth in people is considered a component of community building and a goal of practice.

Social Planning. With its reliance on facts and rationality, this approach tends to associate empowerment with information. Empowerment occurs when residents and consumers are asked to inform planners about their needs and preferences, so that they can be incorporated into plan design. Such information may be obtained through community surveys, including focus group techniques and public hearings, or through analysis of data from agency service records. Through this arrangement, consumers are afforded the right and means to have their views enter into the process by which decisions affecting them are made. Consumers are also empowered when information is provided to them about the various services that are available and particularities about these services, so they become equipped to make the best decisions about what programs and services to use. Information plays an important part in the other approaches also, but is given special emphasis in data-driven planning intervention.

Social Action. Empowerment means to acquire objective, material power—for residents to be an equal party in decision-making bodies such as agency boards or municipal commissions, or to have the political clout to directly affect decisions made by these bodies. Electoral campaigns are mounted to win seats on legislative units by representatives from the group, who will thereby have the authority to vote and engage in tangible trade-offs on the group’s behalf. There is also attention to participants’ personal sense of empowerment, because those individuals with a feeling of potency are more likely to lend themselves actively to the cause, and to contribute to the number count necessary for “people power” tactics of social action.

There is still another way that empowerment is viewed, emanating primarily from the conservative camp. Empowerment is equated with the elimination of governmental regulations and involvements, so that citizens presumably gain the freedom to conduct their lives without restraint. The popular slogan, “get the government off our backs,” characterizes this way of looking at empowerment. It is reflected in the work of
neoconservative planners and action groups on the radical right. Getting the government off the backs of some people at the same time removes protections and assistance given to other, disadvantaged, people and simultaneously disempowers them.

USES OF A MULTIMODAL APPROACH

This analysis puts us in a better position now to describe what an ideal-type intervention mode would look like. For an ideal-type mode to be in operation it has to include, in well-developed form, a large proportion of the variables attached to that mode in Table 1.1 (within its column), and to exclude all or nearly all of the components peculiar to any other mode. This is a tough and rare standard to reach in the emergent, disorderly arena of community affairs. Modal tendencies are a more realistic prospect.

Still, there are advantages to viewing intervention from the kind of multimodal perspective that has been presented. In the first place, it is important for practitioners who are grounded in a particular organizational situation to be aware of their moorings. This framework provides a means for assessing the strategic leanings in the practice context: What are the basic assumptions and preferred methods of action in the particular setting? In this way, the practitioner is more likely to perform appropriately, consistent with the expectations of supervisors, colleagues, participants, and other relevant actors.

Going beyond conformance to what exists, the practitioner may be in a position to create a form of action to deal with specific problems. Some rough rule-of-thumb guidelines can be posited. When populations are homogeneous or there is a willingness to exchange among various community subparts and interests, it would be useful to employ locality development. When problems are evident and agreed upon in the community and lend themselves to programmed solutions through application of factual information, so planning/policy approaches would be viable way to proceed. Finally, when groups are hostile and interests are not reconcilable through usual discussion negotiation methods, it may be functional to engage in social action.

By assessing when one or another of intervention is or is not appropriate, practitioner takes an analytical, problem solving stand and does not become rigidified captive of a particular ideological or methodological approach to practice. Consequently, practitioners should be attuned to the differential utility of each approach, particularly to the tactics use each, and should acquire the knowledge and skill that permit them to utilize them disciplined and flexible fashion. We will expanding on that theme in the next section.

This discussion has focused on a comparison of practice variables by following Table 1.1 horizontally across the community intervention approaches. For a fee how each intervention mode would be implemented using its own set of variables interactively in combination, the table should be examined vertically, down the columns. This highlights the partiality and coalescence of each of approaches, but it also encapsulates them synthetically. The next section demonstrates why that is so.

Before proceeding with the expansive treatment, it is useful to take a moment to clarify the domain of discourse and indicate what is excluded. Any analysis carves its area of inquiry out of the infinite possibilities in the empirical world. This domain in this instance is the community...
## Approaches to Community Intervention

### TABLE 1.1
Three Community Intervention Approaches According to Selected Practice Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mode A (Locality Development)</th>
<th>Mode B (Social Planning/Policy)</th>
<th>Mode C (Social Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal categories of community action</td>
<td>Community capacity and integration; self-help (process goals)</td>
<td>Problem solving with regard to substantive community problems (task goals)</td>
<td>Shifting of power relationships and resources; basic institutional change (task or process goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assumptions concerning community structure and problem conditions</td>
<td>Community eclipsed, anomie; lack of relationships and democratic problem-solving capacities; static traditional community</td>
<td>Substantive social problems, mental and physical health, housing, recreation, etc.</td>
<td>Aggrieved populations, social injustice, deprivation, inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic change strategy</td>
<td>Involving a broad cross section of people in determining and solving their own problems</td>
<td>Gathering data about problems and making decisions on the most logical course of action</td>
<td>Crystallizing issues and mobilizing people to take action against enemy targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Characteristic change tactics and techniques</td>
<td>Consensus: communication among community groups and interests; group discussion</td>
<td>Consensus or conflict</td>
<td>Conflict confrontation, direct action, negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salient practitioner roles</td>
<td>Enabler-catalyst, coordinator; teacher of problem-solving skills and ethical values</td>
<td>Facet gatherer and analyst, program implementer, expeditor</td>
<td>Activist advocate: agitator, broker, negotiator, partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Medium of change</td>
<td>Guiding small, task-oriented groups</td>
<td>Guiding formal organizations and treating data</td>
<td>Guiding mass organizations and political processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orientation toward power structure(s)</td>
<td>Members of power structure as collaborators in a common venture</td>
<td>Power structure as employers and sponsors</td>
<td>Power structure as external target of action: oppressors to be coerced or overturned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Boundary definition of the beneficiary system</td>
<td>Total geographic community</td>
<td>Total community or community segment</td>
<td>Community segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assumptions regarding interests of community subparts</td>
<td>Common interests or reconcilable differences</td>
<td>Interests reconcilable or in conflict</td>
<td>Conflicting interests which are not easily reconcilable, scarce resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conception of beneficiaries</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conception of beneficiary role</td>
<td>Participants in an interactional problem-solving process</td>
<td>Consumers or recipients</td>
<td>Employers, constituents, members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
TABLE 1.1 (continued)
Three Community Intervention Approaches According to Selected Practice Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode A</th>
<th>Mode B</th>
<th>Mode C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Locality Development)</td>
<td>(Social Planning/Policy)</td>
<td>(Social Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Use of empowerment</td>
<td>Building the capacity of a community to make collaborative and informed decisions; promoting feeling of personal mastery by residents</td>
<td>Finding out from consumers about their needs for service; informing consumers of their service choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and, in particular, purposeful community change. This analysis is concerned with how such change is brought about by people at the community level, rather than through societal currents or federal policies. In other words, the community is examined as both the vehicle and the target of change.

Further, the analysis is concerned with the domain of strategy, the broad interventive initiatives employed to create change. These entail general strategic options available to anyone, but the discussion emphasizes actions taken by professional change agents—who may be identified with any professional field or discipline. However, because of the author’s background, the discussion is tinged by social work and sociological language and perspectives.

There are other interesting and important areas of community intervention that do not fall within this domain, at least in terms of substantive coverage. Some of these include work with special populations (cultural or ethnic groups, and women), coalition building, interorganizational coordination, metropolitanization, and so forth. Nor does the analysis attempt to provide a ubiquitous theoretical framework for all of macro practice. Any of these areas, and others, are worthy of sustained theoretical development in their own right, and cumulatively will provide a rich, expanding intellectual and conceptual base to inform community intervention.

The approach taken is at the level of middle-range theory. It does not try to develop a grand theory formulation that is highly abstract and comprehensively encompassing. In keeping with a middle-range perspective, there is use of grounded theory, which involves the observing of real-world empirical patterns, identifying them, naming them, and constructing indicative cognitive categories to reflect them. Other approaches to theoretical development could have started more deductively, with concepts such as power structure or exchange theory, and built complex constructs concerning community intervention from these.

Obviously, it would not be realistic to expect middle-range theory to carry the burden of embracing all the dimensions of community intervention, and if it tried to accomplish that it would certainly become unwieldy and incoherent. Conversely, hovering at the middle range, this construct does not provide the level of detail desired by some: how community developers should work with task groups, how planners should use data, how social actionists should organize demonstrations or form coalitions. These questions require exercis-
ing the art of application of the strategic initiatives, or developing specialized additional constructs.

**THE INTERWEAVING OF INTERVENTION APPROACHES**

This analysis has attempted to delineate rather distinct and coherent categories of community intervention practice. Alfred North Whitehead offered a rationale for this: "The aim of science is to seek the simplest explanations of complex facts." But while supporting the effort to harness complicated processes, he also alerted us to the underside. We may come to actually believe the original facts are simple because our quest was to arrive at a simplified construction. The French social critic Raymond Aron once spoke of this as *delire logique*—logical delirium. Therefore, Whitehead went on to admonish: "Seek simplicity and distrust it." Following that dictum, we will now reexamine the previous discussion, bringing to it the eye of the skeptic.

Up until now we have treated each community intervention approach as though it were a rather self-contained ideal-type. That conceptualization is depicted visually in Figure 1.1. Actually, intervention approaches overlap and are used in mixed form in practice (Rothman, 1999). Figure 1.2 reflects broadly the movement toward overlapping.

Practice in any mode may require tactics that are salient in another approach. For example, neighborhood social actionists interested in aiding the homeless may find it necessary to draw up a social plan in order to obtain funding for desired service projects from DHHS (Modes C and B). Or social planners may decide that the most effective way of establishing a viable low-income housing project is to engage potential residents in deciding on the geographic layout and common facilities, and to organize a tenant action council to fight drug pushers (Modes B, A, and C).

A more true-to-life depiction of the character of overlapping is in Figure 1.3. Here we see that the ideal-type modes have a limited scope of frequency and that mix-
tures of various kinds, along the lines just described, predominate.

To clarify the place of the three practice modes in the overall schema of community intervention, it would be useful to turn to the physical world and the phenomenon of color and its properties. We know that there are three basic colors—red, green, and blue. Scrutinizing the properties of these primary colors is valuable because when the properties are mixed they generate an enormous array of hues and shadings. A set of composite secondary colors is yielded when the primary colors are blended in equal proportions. Further mixtures among all of these result in an almost infinite melange of tones.

Realizing that the analogy is not exact, the three intervention modes can be compared to the three primary colors (but they can only roughly approximate perfect composition in the real world). The basic modes are represented by the outer spheres in Figure 1.3. We can visualize them spawning multiple practice combinations. When two combine, the results are composite bimodal interventions, depicted in the figure by the designations Development/Action, Planning/Development, and Action/Planning. These are analogous to secondary colors.

The center of Figure 1.3 depicts mixed interventions that include a cross-section of variables from all three modes. These combinations involving complex balances of variables are difficult to categorize or even visualize in any succinct fashion.

Just as the primary colors make up only a very small proportion of the total universe of color, the basic intervention modes comprise only a fraction of the world of practice. Predominately, most practice situations probably entail three-fold mixtures. Bimodal composites, those situations consisting of relatively strong leanings toward two intervention approaches, are probably intermediate in frequency.

These are guesses or loose hypotheses about intricate intervention patterns, rather than verified conclusions. The entire schema is basically a heuristic device that is meant to aid conceptualization. The heuristics, however, have grounded empirical referents and are subject to testing through controlled social research.

**COMPOSITE BIMODAL MIXTURES**

It would be helpful to further illustrate the overall paradigm in Figure 1.3 and the mixing phenomenon through some examples of the three composite bimodal forms. Note that the composite forms are not uniform in character or coloration, as Figure 1.4 depicts. The mid-area in each composite section of the diagram represents an equally balanced mixing of practice variables from the basic modes, but as we move away from the mid-area, toward one or another of the basic modalities, variables from that mode
increasingly predominate in the blend. Myriad mixtures are possible. We will discuss each of the bimodal composites in turn below.

**Development/Action** in balanced form is portrayed in feminist organizing and in the Freire style of grassroots work. Hyde (1989) indicates that feminist organizing comprises a combination of traits that are traditionally considered feminine with those that are often considered masculine. The feminine aspect includes humanistic qualities such as caring and nurturance, coupled with the use of democratic processes and structures (an emphasis on consensus, the rotating of tasks, and respecting and engaging the skills of all participants). These aspects are all associated with the locality development mode.

At the same time, the feminist organizing perspective is concerned with fundamental cultural and political change—the elimination of patriarchal society. Hyde indicates, "feminist practice is revolutionary . . . it provides a vision of a radically different society in which the oppressive means of power and privilege are eradicated" (p. 169). These tougher, more militant elements of the practice in the past often have been associated with a masculine posture and the social action intervention mode. Following Hyde's line of analysis, we can say that the feminist organizing perspective, to a considerable degree, is a balanced composite of practice variables involving assumptions and goals of social action joined with the methods of locality development. (See Figure 1.4 for the location of feminist organizing in the Development/Action composite.)

Pablo Freire's work involves a similar blend, in that he has endeavored through an educational approach to empower impoverished peasants in Brazil and Chile to act against the forces of their oppression. He visualizes "education as the practice of freedom," and through "conscientization" seeks, in a sympathetic and enabling manner, to assist illiterate people to see clearly and realistically their objective state of being (Freire, 1974). Fortified with this information, they presumably will gain the motivation and wherewithal to take the steps necessary to transform the closed, unjust societies that repress them. Again, we see the means of locality development wedded to the goals of social action.

The composites we have illustrated represent a somewhat equal mixing of practice variables from Development and Action. They are akin to what is represented by "pure" secondary colors. But the mix might also involve a disproportionate weighting of variables from one or other of the two intervention modes. A composite leaning closer to locality development (see Figure 1.4) is found in Neighborhood Block Clubs. They promote socialization, sharing of information, neighborhood safety watches, mutual aid, and preservation of cherished neighborhood values and landmarks. The overall emphasis is on these Development features. However, when threatened by a porno movie house
moving into the area, or the need for a traffic light to protect their children, the organization occasionally swings into a strong and even emotional ad hoc advocacy style.

On the other side of this dual composite stands an organization such as the United Farm Workers, as shown in Figure 1.4. Here the main thrust has been to raise the economic and social well-being of migrant farm workers, using a variety of advocacy measures, such as picketing, marches, and a sustained grape boycott. But there is also a less prominent or visible component that involves mutual aid and community-building among the membership, almost in the form of an extended intraethnic block club. Again, both modes coexist, but in different proportions from the typical block club on the other end of the spectrum.

The Action/Planning composite in balanced form is manifested in the various consumer protection programs of the Ralph Nader organization. This is shown in Figure 1.5, which depicts all the other illustrative organizations mentioned in this presentation. Figure 1.5 will serve as a useful reference guide through the remainder of the discussion. Advocacy in favor of consumer interests is a key thrust with Nader, including tactics that involve media exposure of corporate and governmental abuses, consumer boycotts, legislative campaigns, and the like. At the same time, there is heavy reliance on factual documentation through well-researched and sophisticated reports prepared by expert data analysts and policy specialists. There is also the dissemination of accurate empirical information to consumers so that they can make valid choices. The integration of Action and Planning methods is inseparable. Nader's Public Citizen organization carries out some grassroots programs—particularly on college campuses—which include a locality development component.

But locality development is in pale hue, overall. Another prominent example of a close mix of Action and Planning/Policy is The Children's Defense Fund, a high-profile child advocacy organization that uses research data most effectively.

A different type of balanced example is found in municipal-level citizen housing councils. While advocating for more and better housing, consistent with community welfare, these councils have to be prepared to engage in sophisticated interorganizational coordination and negotiation, and to bring to the bear the tools and procedures of urban planning professionals, whose analyses and recommendations from within the planning bureaucracy they need to be able to convincingly counter or modify.

Action/Planning with an accent on social action is embodied in organizations on the left that draw up well-formulated policy blueprints for fundamental tax reform, massive low-income housing, and widespread single-payer health services provided under governmental auspices. The groups are essentially geared to social change, but they incorporate data-based reports and policy analyses into their work. The Institute for Democratic Socialism, a "think tank" of the Democratic Socialists of America, is an example. Similar in nature, but pointing to change in another direction (dismantling the welfare state, as an example), are a number of ideologically conservative institutes (the Hoover, for example), commissions, and foundations.

Another example is the area of "advocacy planning" (Davidoff, 1965), whereby grassroots organizations dedicated to change (or blocking intrusive projects) hire a planner or receive pro bono services from a professional, in order to design proposals that can be used with governmental bureaus of planning officials in support of given aims or positions. These planners may
serve for only a limited time period or for only one of the many issues being advocated by the organization.

Shifting emphasis toward the planning dimension, Friedmann (1987) suggests a role involving a planner/policy analyst firmly ensconced within a governmental structure, where the professional essentially carries out technical planning functions, but with social reform in mind. Friedmann notes the role of Rexford Tugwell in Roosevelt’s New Deal administration as an example. Robert Moses, in his role during the LaGuardia mayoralty in New York City, would be another. The Koerner Commission functioned similarly, transforming an investigation of urban civil unrest from a focus on social control to issues of equal opportunity. The practitioner’s position, methods, and tone are fixed within a governmental bureaucracy, but there is a social advocacy dimension. Friedmann conceives of this government-sponsored planned reform as a distinct fourth intervention mode, in addition to the three we have discussed.

Planning/Development mixtures have a different patterning. The United Way, a convenient balanced example, is dedicated to systematic welfare decision making on the community level with regard to fundraising, budgeting, fund allocation, and coordination of services. However, it places a great deal of stress on citizen participation...
in these processes. Planning and volunteerism are the traditional hallmarks of the organization. Planning for the annual campaign and distributing financial resources to agencies are ongoing activities. But a considerable amount of energy is applied to recruiting community participants (who are most often business and professional elites), training leaders, giving workshops, and holding meetings and conferences of various kinds. Planning and Development are intimately intertwined.

Enterprise/empowerment zones also closely blend these modes of intervention, but in a different way. Their aim is to promote community building in inner cities through enhancing the capacity of minority residents to perform in economic and social realms, particularly by starting and running their own businesses. Local initiative and self-reliance are watchwords. But these programs also involve heavy inputs from the outside by corporate and government experts, and the design of elaborate processes to steer a process that is complex and quite technical in nature.

A composite that is weighted toward the planning side is found in citizen advisory committees that are established in the health field by departments of health, community hospitals, and hospital planning councils. These committees have an adjunct role in supporting the basic planning function, which often has a strong technical component. The committees do not ordinarily impact on policy, although they may play some part in policy implementation. They serve to provide legitimation in the community for decisions of planners and administrators; they also have a public relations element. For this reason, energy is applied by the organization to recruiting members, orienting them, and maintaining their bonds. This locality development component is, generally speaking, token rather than substantive in character.

On the other side of the spectrum, an organization such as the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise is committed to furthering local initiative in urban neighborhoods, as well as seeking to empower poor and minority communities through self-help (while discouraging the means of political insurgency). The Center reflects the work and views of Robert L. Woodson, Sr., who is perhaps the chief organizer of locality development endeavors within African-American communities. In pursuing its goals, the Center actively compiles relevant data and employs the techniques of policy analysts and social planners. These, however, are subsidiary to and in support of the main development thrust.

Taking a different analytical stance now, the character of composite mixes result from the particular configuration of practice variables from each intervention mode. The exact coloration can be influenced by the sheer number or volume of variables from either mode of the types of variables from each (goals, assumptions, roles, tactics). The potency of different types of variables also may have an effect. For example, in feminist organizing, the goal of fundamentally changing gender roles in society is in ascendancy, sometimes dominating the question of tactics (as indicated by existing tactical variations between the position stated by Hyde and that of the radical lesbian movement).

Trimodal mixtures are even more varied than what we have already discussed. An example should suffice to illustrate the general notion. Community welfare planning councils bring social agencies together to share ideas and information, and to strengthen their bonds, in order to become a more successful and integrated service delivery system. The councils also hammer
out specific plans and policy frames, in con-
junction with the agencies, that are geared to
providing more effective and efficient ser-
vices to community residents. In addition,
these organizations actively engage in advoc­
cacy, lobbying the city council and the state
legislature for more funds and better man­
dates to meet client needs and expedite
agency operations. Chambers of commerce
use the same set of intermingled actions on
behalf of the business community.

Illustrating intervention mixtures, with
all their gradations, can go on endlessly.
Examples given here should suffice to
demonstrate the basic concept, to generate
useful efforts by others, and to fuel cri-
tiques of the general formulation.

DILEMMAS IN EACH INTERVENTION
MODE

There are other ways of analyzing the
blending of forms of intervention. For
each intervention mode we will frame a
key issue that confounds the original
modal formulation and has implications
for expanding and mixing the intervention
modes. The dilemmas we will pose spring
in part from deliberately positing con-
structs in ideal or synthetic form, but they
arise also from the complex, contentious,
constraining, and obdurate social environ-
ment in which change agents currently
find themselves. In response, practitioners
have designed strategies that are more
variegated, subtle, flexible, and inventive—
and less one-dimensional—than in
an earlier time.

Locality Development—External
Linkages

We have seen that locality development
places heavy emphasis on a self-contained
local community context. This circum-
scribed, while holistic, community system
is the arena in which features of grassroots
initiative, self-help, intimate relationships,
and enhanced competency are played out.

A dilemma is that often locality devel-
opment programs are sponsored and funded
by outside entities: municipal (city depart-
ment of community development); national
(The National Service Corps, Campaign
for Human Development of the United
States Catholic Conference); or interna-
tional (The World Bank, The World Health
Organization). This poses a threat to the
conceptual integrity of the formulation.
Jacobsen (1990) observes that “much of the
initiative for community development actu-
ally originates from outside the community,
which is a clear violation of the principles
of community development” (p. 395).

Vertically linked organizations provide
planning and administrative inputs that are
hierarchically structured in nature. They chose
the main goals to be pursued, recruit and
select the staff, train them, set the program
emphasis, and establish the rules of prac-
tice engagement.

Local groups are also often linked hori-
zontally at the city or regional level with
other similar local groups. Thus, a block
club can affiliate with a council of neigh-
borhood block clubs, or a neighborhood citi-
zens association can become part of a
citywide council of citizen groups or an
interfaith umbrella organization of congre-
gations. Here the coordination and informa-
tion-sharing aspect of planning play a part,
although elements of social action coalit-
ion-building may also be involved.

These relationships and entanglements
contradict the self-enclosed quality of the
original modal formulation. The broader
formulation of locality development is
shown in Figure 1.6, with the shaded area
delineating the original construct.
Social Planning/Policy—Participation

A dilemma in the original social planning concept is that even highly technical planning and policy development that is data-driven and expertise-based often includes elements of participation, in various forms and to varying degrees. This injects an important element of the locality development approach into the picture.

Political analyst Joel Kropkin observed, in the early Riordan mayoralty in Los Angeles, that there was a danger the new civic leader would lean too heavily on his previous corporate experience in his effort to reorganize city government operations and services. In industry, Riordan was able to use soundly conceived technical plans “for brokering deals between well-defined and somewhat logical, shareholders and other constituencies.” Planning in a community context is different—more fluid and political—says Kropkin, with no evidence that “once a rational plan is developed, support for it will naturally follow.” Instead, he maintains, it is essential that interests of various kinds be drawn into participation in this process, including municipal unions, churches, grassroots groups, city council members, and others (Kropkin, 1993, pp. 1, 6).

A reformulation of planning that includes the participation dimension is in Figure 1.7. We observe that decision making, as proposed in the original modal formulation, is sometimes concerted—in the hands of a small group of elite leaders and professional experts (see the shaded area of the Figure). Often city departments of child welfare, mental health, housing, and health operate in this way, as do the boards of private agencies like family service organizations, Jewish federations, and boys’ clubs.

But planning can entail dispersed decision making, where other than elites alone take part in making judgments and choices. This broader form can involve both substantive participation in decision making, and ancillary, more peripheral involvement.

First, let us consider substantive activity. Residents and citizens can join in policy decisions of a basic nature, or they take
part in implementation decisions that relate to carrying out programs that grow out of policy decisions by others. The OEO “War on Poverty” spawned a multitude of grassroots organizations where “maximum feasible participation” at the highest policy-making levels was emphasized. Free clinics providing health services to low-income ill people have traditionally encouraged such participation. The United Way’s Regional Planning Councils attempt to involve local residents in allocation and program decisions affecting the area.

Substantive implementation decisions, within established policy parameters, are frequently given over to members of local branches of national organizations, such as the American Cancer Society, The Urban League, League of Women Voters, and so forth. Federal legislation, such as Title XX, has often left discretion for implementation in the hands of the states, counties, or municipalities.

Second, ancillary participation can be facilitative or symbolic. The facilitative form draws residents into the decision-making process by seeking their reactions to proposals, or asking for their advice. It may also entail providing information about impending changes in order to prepare people for them, thereby reducing stress or disruption in their lives. Regional meetings called by city planning departments to announce zoning changes or to ask people for their opinions about these changes are an example. Local hearings conducted by Congress or a city council are another, as are hearings related to environmental impact studies.
Symbolic participation serves to provide the appearance or aura of participation, but not its actuality. The aim is cooption, whereby the opposition is won over or “cooled out.” Real estate developers and housing officials often use this approach in trying to influence residents to accept a new project, as do social planners who attempt to establish group living “halfway houses” in urban neighborhoods for the mentally ill, delinquent adolescents, the homeless, and other vulnerable groups.

There is a tendency among human service professionals to instinctively reject the use of symbolic forms of participation, particularly when these are applied to them and their clients. There are, of course, vital ethical objections to the deceptive quality of this tactic but the question is intellectually complex.

Brager, Specht, and Torczyner (1987) address this issue in a penetrating discussion, taking the view that “manipulation is an unavoidable component of professional behavior” and that “political maneuvering” is inevitable in community intervention (p. 321). In seeking to advance the interests and well-being of those we seek to benefit, when facing inhospitable or potentially damaging actions by others, the practitioner is obligated to “employ artfulness in inducing desired attitudinal or behavioral outcome in others” (p. 317). The foes of our allies and constituents use powerful tools of accepted political in-fighting that challenge our capability to provide protection and nurturance. Brager and his associates recognize the importance and delicacy of this issue, and they delineate a set of factors to be weighed carefully in arriving at ethically sound conclusions about tactics. At the same time, they resist discarding the “planned ambiguity” tactic of symbolic participation, which, if it occurred, might mean abandoning to the winds of political fortune in pluralistic American communities the possibility of establishing group homes for the homeless and the mentally ill.

Social Action—Multiple Actors and Conventional Tactics

Social action is more complicated than the original model conveyed, as reflected in studies that found it to have complex qualities. For example, Cnaan and Rothman (1986) in a factor analysis inquiry discovered that planning and development can be explained through a single, consistent factor. However, social action comprised two or more factors, which were difficult to identify with clarity.

There are three dimensions that probably account for this complexity (see Figure 1.8). The original formulation did not take into account, and did not differentiate, the two essentially different types of goals of this intervention mode. These include radical change goals that aim at fundamental alterations in society or at specific policies or institutions within it, and more normative or reformist change goals that aim at incremental alterations. This is a basic context within which social action needs to be understood.

It is difficult to delineate precisely the division between radical and normative goal changes in social action. Radical change suggests breadth of alteration in the society and culture. Examples of this thrust include organizations that militate to eradicate racism or to transform the relationship between the races (as with the Nation of Islam), or to change the basic economic system of the country (as with the Democratic Socialists of America). However, a change that on the surface seems modest can have a broad impact. As an example, changing regulations about what can appear on TV, or the tone of presentation, can have
FIGURE 1.8
Social Action Intervention Divided by Type of Goal and Further Differentiated by Tactical Means and the Composition of the Action Constituency (original construct in shaded area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radical</strong></td>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Industrial Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties Mainly</td>
<td>Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian Movement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AIM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT-UP</td>
<td><strong>Tenant Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disruptive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parties</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantaged</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Center for Third</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Center for Third</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td><strong>World</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parties Mainly</strong></td>
<td><strong>World</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parties</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Radical  
  - American Indian Movement (AIM)  
  - ACT-UP  
  - Greenpeace  
  - The 60s Student and Anti-War Movements (SDS)  
- Normative  
  - Industrial Areas  
  - Foundation  
  - Tenant Action  
  - Organizations  
  - Ad Hoc Protests by Alliance for the Mentally Ill  
  - Animal Rights Groups  
  - Nation of Islam  
  - American Association of Retired Persons  
  - La Raza  
  - Democratic Socialists of America  
  - Childrens' Defense Fund  
  - Coalition for the Homeless  
  - Center for Third World Organizing  
  - Women's International League for Peace and Freedom  

a rippling effect throughout the entire culture because of the widespread influence of the media. In addition, fundamental change can be narrow and deep rather than wide in scope. The aim may be to alter a specific law or specific sphere of living in a radical way. As an example, the Pro-Life movement focuses on the single issue of abortion legislation, but is interested in drastically overturning existing legal arrangements rather than adjusting or tampering with them. Because of the saliency of the issue, the change being advocated would be seen by many as fundamental, and a deep threat. Alternatively, radical change can be accomplished through a particular combination of breadth and depth that in aggregate goes beyond incrementalism. The precise calculus of this combination is elusive, but the possibility of it occurring seems plausible. In any case, it is difficult to establish a firm dividing line between fundamental and incremental change, partly because incremental change is sometimes carried out as a
strategic step leading to fundamental change. The extremes of each are easy enough to discern (the Communist Party as compared to the League of Women Voters); it is pinpointing the middle border that separates the two tendencies that is vexing.

Two other dimensions beside goal categories suggest revisions rather than additions to the original formulation. One of these concerns the constituency action system for the change effort. Going back to the sixties, social action movements focused on the disadvantaged or aggrieved group only as the vehicle of social change, as with the Black Panthers, AIM (American Indian Movement), La Raza, gay and lesbian groups and others, playing out the politics of identity. Going it alone was a way of ensuring that the fundamental interests of the group were safeguarded, that outsiders who might take over were contained, and group self-empowerment was promoted. This was the outlook incorporated within the original modal formulation.

Contemporary “new movement” organizing is seeking to become broader, more ecumenical. Fisher and Kling (1991) speak in support of “a more consciously ideological politics. New formations and groupings will only make community mobilization stronger... an explicitly challenging ideology is necessary if community movements are not to remain bound by the limits of personalized and localized consciousness” (p. 81). Advocacy groups across class and ethnic lines are forming, focused on environmental protection, crime prevention, neighborhood preservation, animal rights, and health issues. These new groupings and alliances involve community-building methods for achieving cohesion and continuity. Not only are the economically oppressed organizing to act on their own behalf, but, in addition, middle-class aggrieved persons, including right-wing activists and the Ross Perot movement, are involved in victim rights, tax reduction, Pro-Life, government reorganization, and school reform efforts. The expanded constituencies include linkages and coalitions by grassroots groups that are national in scope.

The additional dimension is tactical in nature. Action groups have been characterized by their reliance on aggressive and abrasive advocacy measures, which was reflected in the original formulation. More recently, tactics have been refined and diversified. They are more normative in quality, utilizing conventional political maneuvers.

Many community organizers today cite a trend toward pragmatism that emphasizes electoral politics, consensus building, data collection and research, and the use of political and administrative channels. Confrontational tactics, while sometimes required, are considered ineffective in many cases. Although sit-in and demonstrations have succeeded in creating awareness of problems, administrators and officials also have learned how to defuse them (Hiratsuka, 1990, p. 3).

These new social action elements suggest the inclusion of practice variables from the other intervention modes. For example, conventional advocacy methods, such as factual documentation of environmental despoilment, include data-based techniques from planning and policy practice. Community-building within and among different advocacy constituencies brings to bear locality development practice.

These elements of social action are tied together and systematized in Figure 1.8. The top two shaded cells encompass the original intervention mode, and the additional six are expanded representations of the advocacy strategy. Each cell incorporates a different form of the admixture of: type of goal (radical/normative), type of advocacy (radical/normative), and type of
constituency action system (disadvantaged parties mainly/multiple parties). Examples are provided for each of these social action amalgams. The information is essentially self-evident and does not require extended explication.

PHASING, VALUES, AND PRACTICE OPTIONS

The broad approaches, and sets of practice variables within them, offer a range of interrelated possibilities for designing intervention strategies. The point has been stated by Gurin (1966) as follows:

Our field studies have produced voluminous evidence that (various) roles are needed, but not always at the same time and place. The challenging problem, on which we have made a bare beginning, is to define more clearly the specific conditions under which one or another or still other types of practice are appropriate. The skill we shall need in the practitioner of the future is the skill of making a situational diagnosis and analysis that will lead him to a proper choice of the methods most appropriate to the task at hand (p. 30).

In addition to mixing approaches as discussed, there is a phasing relationship among them. A given change project may begin in one mode and then, at a later stage, move into another. For example, as a social action organization achieves success and attains resources, it may find that it can function most efficiently out of a social planning mode. The labor union movement, to a degree, demonstrates this type of phasing. As organizational growth and viability are achieved, headquarters operations (for example, the teamsters or UAW) become larger, more bureaucratized, and more technical, and social policy and administrative factors become more salient. The practitioner needs to be attuned to appropriate transition points in applying alternative modes.

As practitioners phase through their own careers, there will be demands to emphasize one or another modality. Historically, circumstances and preferences change, resulting in shifts in professional fashion and the employment requisites of agencies. For this reason, it is useful for practitioners to be broadly prepared, with the full range of competencies tucked into their professional portfolio.

Locality development was in vogue in the quiescent 1950s, when interactive, enabling practice was considered the quintessence of professionalism (Pray, 1947; Newstetter, 1947). Planning/policy was important during the Charity Organization Society and Community Chest and Council movements of the 1920s, as an aspect of emergent social work institution building. This mode came to the fore again during the New Deal spurt of policy development and program organization intended to cope with the Great Depression. It was called upon again in the Nixon and Reagan-Bush times of policy reversal and program curtailment, where efforts to promote efficiency, scrupulous evaluation, and cost containment were given prominence. Social action had its heyday during the roiling 1960s, and also in the early years of the century when progressives were advocating for legislation on child labor, workmen's compensation, and housing and municipal reform. Cycles in the relative rise and fall of different intervention modes will doubtless continue in the periods ahead.

In the past, professional actions and conceptualizations were often constrained by particular value orientations to practice—for example, acceptance of only collaborative, nondirective practice (Pray, 1947). Alinsky followers derided all others as "sell-outs," while planners were often disdainful of militants for fomenting disorder and antagonism. The current outlook,
However, is more accepting of varying value orientations. An examination of empirical findings on professional values leads to the conclusion that “human service professions do not appear to be highly integrated with regard to the existence of a delimited, uniformly accepted value system” (Rothman, 1974, p. 100). The approaches suggested in this presentation are in the spirit of such a position.

The locality development practitioner will likely cherish values that emphasize harmony and communication in human affairs; the planner/policy specialist will give priority to rationality; the social actionist will build on commitments embracing social justice. Each of these value orientations finds justification in the traditions of the human service professions. It would be difficult to claim monopoly status for any one or other. Indeed, contemporary thinking suggests that values are plural and conflicting, and may well come in pairs of divergent commitments (Tropman, 1984). Mixing occurs on those frequent occasions when more than one value is being pursued at a given time.

The various intervention approaches can all be applied in a way to pursue values conducive to positive social change and human betterment. Our position accepts the validity of each of the stated value postures and encourages their interrelated employment.

Values aside, the intervention modes have to draw from one another because of the inherent functional limitations within each. Planning and policy initiatives have created worthy programs, particularly when pushed by the other two modes, but have accomplished little in redistributing wealth and power or in preventing the victimization of the have-nots. They have typically concealed the vested interests of the professionals and failed to address the widespread alienation of society. Locality development has had its successes in countering isolation and depersonalization in specific places, but not in removing the social conditions that continue to generate anomie and inequality. Social action has confronted power and economic inequities in some measure at the local level, but has not had sufficient potency to cope with larger national power issues or to shape a strategy to rehumanize those it cannot defeat. Each modality alone faces obstacles that the others can contribute to addressing.

Another reason for seeking new configurations of action is that, at the highest societal levels, established institutions and modes of operating are showing grave defects. Eastern European communism, with its outrageous tyrannies and rigidities, has collapsed from within and left a widespread landscape of upheaval and turmoil. But the Western market-dominated countries, who are now the only game in town, are saddled with the cruel by-products of an acquisitive ethic, and they display persistent pathologies of economic and social disparity, industrial decay, recurring joblessness, cultural decline, racism, and anomie—to use the short list.

New social forms are called for that combine the liberal ideal of political democracy and the socialist ideal of economic democracy, ensuring a balance of liberty and equality in both spheres. Barbara Ehrenreich (1993) has stated the challenge aptly:

We must outline how we believe that the community of human beings can live together more equitably and peacefully than it does now. The vision has to be a vision beyond capitalism, with its inevitable economic injustice. This is a time when people looking for change don’t have some kind of precise model to inform that struggle for change. Everyone has some responsibility to start imagining, dreaming, inventing and visualizing the kind of future we would like.
This discussion prompts us to look back at Table 1.1, the listing of practice variables across intervention modes, and read it in a different light now. The table, in aggregate, provides a repertoire of practice options, for flexible application. Each of the thirty-six cells describes an analytical or behavioral intervention initiative. (This is not a complete enumeration of the possibilities by any means, but it is a suggestive one.) The practice options, when used critically and selectively, can provide vital components to interweave creatively into the design of strategy.

This moves us toward a contingency formulation where practitioners of any stripe have greater range in selecting, then mixing and phasing, components of intervention. An important next step is to identify a set of situational criteria to inform such tactical packaging. A number of social parameters of the situation readily come to mind, among them the type of change goal and its scope, the quality of constituency leadership, availability of knowledge regarding relevant problems and solutions, the extent and character of resistance, the degree of financial and other resource support at hand, and stage of development of the action system.

There is a need for research concerning which situational criteria, or clusters among them, are most critical for strategy development. Beyond that, it would be useful to study how these criteria specifically inform the selection and meshing of practice options from the repertoire of intervention components, in the interests of designing change strategies with greater impact.

In summary, the goal of this piece has been to lay open and chart a multifaceted change process that plays a large role in inducing the progressive development of society. Historically, what humans have been able to capture cognitively, they often have been able to master behaviorally—which is a reason for persisting in the endeavor. However, there are no panaceas inherent in this text. The world is an unpredictable place, and humans have struggled through time to gain greater control over and better their social environs. One can only believe and hope that a sound, informed analysis coupled with disciplined action will provide some increment of probability beyond intuitive strivings. Through systematic evaluation and other research we can hone our techniques and monitor our results, thereby learning cumulatively from experience and improving our record.

Such efforts are analogous to the realm of interpersonal helping in psychotherapy. It is assumed that use of theory and tested practice will improve on the natural advice and support that neighbors and family provide to one another. Still, despite the best efforts of dedicated therapists some clients remain mired in despair and confusion. Those of us in the human services hold the limited aspiration that, to some unknown degree, what we do will enhance the probability that beneficial results will come to pass.

The sharpening of change methods is an endless and evolving process. The mental skirmishing involved in this revision of an earlier construct is captured in T. S. Eliot's wise and edifying words:

We shall not cease from exploration.
And the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time.

From that ground, naturally, the exploration begins anew.
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