McGILL UNIVERSITY

THE CONCEPT OF AREA SERVICE CENTRE

A systematic review of the literature on
the area service centre to ascertain its
exact meaning, origins, modern versions
and implications for contemporary social
work practice.

A Research Report submitted to

The School of Social Work
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for

The Master's Degree in Social Work

by

Michael J. Keyes

Montreal, October, 1969

ABSTRACT

THE CONCEPT OF AREA SERVICE CENTRE

A systematic review of the literature on
the area service centre to ascertain its
exact meaning, origins, modern versions
and implications for contemporary social
work practice.

by

Michael J. Keyes

Following a review of the literature, it is concluded that it is
meaningful to talk about an area service centre as a distinct social agency.
It is argued that the characteristics differentiating the area service
centre from other types of social agencies as well as agencies subsumed
under this label are basically those which have been discussed in the text
under the heading of innovative goals or innovative means.

The antecedents of area service centres have been discussed under
two main headings, unorganized or individual efforts on the one hand, and
organized or formally constituted efforts on the other. The former included
charity workers, "lady bountifuls", political ward leaders and heelers.
The latter included neighborhood associations or councils, and settlement
houses.

Modern area service centres date from the Arden House Conference
of 1958. They constitute, from an organizational standpoint an adaptation

on the part of settlements to the War on Poverty as well as an adjustment on the part of several traditional agencies to the deficiencies of urban welfare systems.

It is argued that this type of social agency has adapted to the realities of poverty both in terms of its philosophy, and in its orientation to problem-solving at a time when private welfare has tended to abdicate its responsibility in this area. Its services are tailored to the expectations and needs of low-income groups principally through strategies such as "maximum feasible participation" of the people served, and the utilization of indigenous non-professionals. Its neighborhood organization efforts seek various goals appropriate to disadvantaged groups such as the basic redistribution of power in society. Its philosophy centres around advancing the cause of the poor by altering their opportunity structure through militant social action whenever necessary. Certain strains associated with the area service centre are explored. The degree to which it can function as an organization without jeopardizing its institutional maintenance needs or invoking problems of overlapping systems, is discussed. It is suggested that the neighborhood organization should have complete independence from the area service centre if radical goals are being pursued through militant means. Other types of relationships such as sponsorship, and nominally independent association have been explored in relation to the pursuit of moderate goals and the deployment of less controversial means.

The area service centre has ramifications and implications for the social work profession. It has been suggested that few professionals are prepared to function in the area service centre as a work setting

because of status-reversal, absence of colleagues, open hostility from
indigenous staff, and location outside the mainstream of social work.
It might follow from this that social work education should be altered
in order better to prepare its graduates for such practice demands.

The profession of social work is commonly carried out through social
agencies. How much professional behavior directed at the private, govern-
mental and institutional centres of power in the community can be tolerated
without jeopardizing the viability of the agency or the position of the
organizer on its staff is an open question. The behavior of the social
worker when operating outside the counselling realm, and away from the
agency itself becomes increasingly visible to the public. A crucial
question for the profession as a whole is the degree to which this new,
more active role can be incorporated into professional practice and
suitable organizational structures developed to support it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I will always be indebted to several men whose friendship, advice and encouragement gave me confidence to pursue social work as a profession, namely Messrs. W.A. Dyson, N.R. Hanlon, R.A. Manson and Rev. W. Ryan, s.j.

I also wish to remember all the staff and students of the School, and my two field instructors namely, Mr. C. Antoniou and Mr. P. Katadotis, who helped me in various ways throughout the past two years.

I reserve a special vote of thanks for Dr. Patrick Deehey, my research advisor. His advice, and assistance in this undertaking have been invaluable and his patience and kindness noteworthy.

Lastly, without my wife's support, understanding, and gentle prodding this report might never have been completed. She also deserves special mention as my typist.

M.J.K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The object of the present study is to examine in some detail the
nature and development of the area service centre as a social work agency.
It is proposed to examine the various ways in which the term has been used,
and the kinds of programs that have been subsumed under this general
heading. The various definitions that have been offered in the literature
will form the subject matter of this analysis. For the sake of clarity,
however, the following tentative definition is offered as a starting-point.
The area service centre as the term is generally found in the literature
refers to a social agency, operating in a defined geographic area, usually
a neighborhood or slightly larger district, which offers a wide spectrum
of services to individuals and families while at the same time engaging
residents of the area in social action to remedy environmental conditions.
The term is often used to describe agencies associated with the anti-poverty
efforts of recent years, which utilize the notion of "maximum feasible
participation of the poor"[1] in such matters as the operation of the centre,
service programming and social action.

As an organization, the area service centre has the following
functions in common with what will be called "traditional agencies".[2]
Both seem to provide some degree of information and referral services,

---

[1]Provision is made in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for
"maximum feasible participation" of the people served and local residents
in anti-poverty programs.

[2]This term is defined more precisely infra.

"advocacy"[1] and opportunities for social action. Both deal with problems
of one kind or another and to a greater or lesser degree with the socially
disadvantaged, although it has been suggested by some authorities[2] that
there has been a shift away from problems of poverty per se by more
traditional agencies.

Area service centres and traditional social agencies differ, however
in several respects. The traditional agency is usually organized around a
specialization by method or by type of clientele, whereas the area service
centre is organized around multi-service functions. It is argued that the
consumer thus escapes the stigma attached to the use of such traditional
agencies since the services he seeks are not readily identifiable, and
his use of the agency is not ipso facto evidence of his inadequacy and
pathology. Clients of traditional agencies have to go to the agency for
service, whereas the area service centre locates itself in the neighbor-
hood where the services are needed. The traditional agency typically has
as its goals individual change or adjustment on the part of the client,
whereas the area service centre extends these goals to include such things
as institutional change and the transferring of power to the poor. The
traditional social agency uses casework and groupwork as its principle
methods whereas, the area service centre also includes in its repertoire
such techniques as social protest, demonstration and boycott. The goals

----

[1]This term refers to the worker arguing or pleading a client's
cause to a third party.

[2]Richard A. Cloward and Irwin Epstein, "Private Social Welfare's
Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies", in
Community Action Against Poverty, ed. by George A. Brager and Francis P.
Purcell (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967), pp. 40-63.

of the traditional social agency tend to be limited to individual and group counselling or some service specialty, whereas the goals of the area service centre are of a wider range and include structural changes at the organizational, community and political levels. The traditional social agency tends to be characterized by centralization and bureaucratization, whereas the area service centre is more decentralized in its structure and anti-bureaucratic in its ideology. The traditional social agency has but one mode of contact with the consumers of its service and that is in the formal client-professional relationship. The area service centre in contrast has several modes of contact with clients as service-consumers, participants in policy decisions and members of neighborhood organizations.

The present study is descriptive in nature and is based upon a review of the literature. Three broad areas of interest give focus to the study, and form the chapter headings which follow. The first chapter deals with the antecedents and development of the area service centre. The second is a description of the area service centre as it currently exists. The third is an analysis and discussion of its implications. A set of questions is listed at the beginning of each chapter to serve as an outline of the specific chapter content and organization.

CHAPTER 1

THE AREA SERVICE CENTRE: ANTECEDENTS AND DEVELOPMENT

1. What general concerns were evident in the welfare field and
   in the social work profession at the time the area service
   centre was conceived?

2. What were the antecedents of this type of organization?

3. How can the area service centre be differentiated from the
   service structures that preceded it?

1. **What general concerns were evident in the welfare field and in
the social work profession at the time the area service centre was
conceived?**

The area service centre reflects the concerns and approaches to

problem-solving of its time. Michael Harrington's book, The Other

America,[1] dramatized the continued existence of a great deal of poverty

in America, the "land of opportunity". The public concern that this aroused

was followed by a series of anti-poverty measures, that came to be known

as the "War on Poverty". It was marked by an increase in direct federal

participation in problem-solving activity. The federal agency that was

set up for this purpose under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act

of 1964 was the Office of Economic Opportunity. The act in question was

based on direct social action that was increasingly seen as the remedy for

social problems. This emphasis was written into a provision of the

legislation for social action by the poor themselves under the terms

"maximum feasible participation".

-----

[1]Michael Harrington, The Other America (New York: The Macmillan
Company, 1962).

The OEO itself is not quite sure what it means. When the
words were put into the act —— by the task force that
helped draw up the legislation —— they found a fond hope:
to give the poor a say in their own salvation and to break
the hammerlock hold of the traditional welfare agencies.[1]

This was coupled with a definite shift within the social work

profession from explanations of social problems which focused on

individual pathology to explanations that took into account social and

structural factors. All anti-poverty projects[2] reflected this new

articulation of the problem and emphasis on participation by the poor.

Although their organization and techniques differed, all
were based on the assumption that social, structural and
environmental pathology were major causes of youthful
deviance. Inherent in the concept of these programs was
the belief that neighborhood residents needed to become
INVOLVED in planning and implementing social services,
that the RECEPIENTS of these services had also to become
PARTICIPANTS in shaping the structure of service.[3]

It will be argued that the theoretical base of social work began

in a sense to return to the emphasis characteristic of an earlier phase

of its development when such people as Shaw and McKay were exploring the

relationship between urban areas and delinquency.[4] With the War on

---

[1]"The War on Poverty", Newsweek, September 13, 1965, p. 24.

[2]The list of major anti-poverty projects includes: Action for Boston
Community Development, Inc., (ABCD), Boston; Crusade for Opportunity (CFO),
Syracuse; Community Progress, Inc. (CPI), New Haven; HARYOU —— Act, Central
Harlem, New York City; Mobilization For Youth (MFY), New York City; United
Planning Organization (UPO), Washington, D.C.

[3]Charles F. Grosser, Helping Youth: A Study of Six Community
Organization Programs (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health,
Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of
Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1968), p. iii.

[4]Clifford Shaw and H.D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

Poverty, the social and ecological nature of social problems were again

being stressed and as a result there had been a shift in social work

back to sociological rather than psychological explanations of social

problems. A number of writers[1] had suggested that problem-solving efforts

should be articulated in terms of changing the milieu rather than changing

the person.

It has been said that the welfare structures of many urban centres

constitute the initial environmental target of direct social action by the

poor.

> When a program of neighborhood organization begins to deal
> not only with the enhanced functioning of the people who
> are drawn to it but also with the accomplishment of some
> sort of general change in the environment, the chances are
> that its immediate goal will be to improve some type of
> delivery of services.[2]

These efforts frequently result in proposals for a multi-service type of

agency geared to providing comprehensive service in a broad attack on

total problems, rather than the traditional, segmental approach which has

often produced interagency competition for scarce funds and led to agency

overlap.

---

[1]Albert Cohen offers the thesis that the subcultural association
constitutes a solution to problems encountered in the larger society.
The delinquent subculture is where youth accept antithetical values such
as property destruction, as norms of the group; see Deviance and Control
(Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice - Hall Inc., 1966), pp. 1 - 11.

Howard Becker argues that deviance is not a quality of the act
the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others
of rules and sanctions to an offender. The deviant is one to whom the
label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that
people so label; see Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance
(New York: Free Press, 1966), p. 9.

[2]Arthur Hillman and Frank Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study
of Neighborhood Organization (New York: National Federation of Settlements
and Neighborhood Centres, 1966-67), p. 25.

2. **What were the antecedents of this type of organization?**

The antecedents of the area service centre[1] can be roughly categorized into the following two groupings, unorganized or individual efforts on the one hand, and organized or formally constituted efforts on the other. The former included charity workers, "lady bountifuls", political ward leaders and ward heelers. The latter included neighborhood citizens' associations or councils, and settlement houses.

The earlier types of entrepreneurs engaged in essentially similar activities as the area service centre at an earlier point in time. The targets of intervention, poverty and juvenile delinquency on the one hand, and to a lesser extent the interventions themselves on the other hand, were similar in both cases.

The earlier types of service delivery can be differentiated from area service centres in several ways. The charity workers and "lady bountifuls" of the nineteenth century tended to engage in this activity by doing-for the poor in the charity tradition.[2] The area service centre differs from the entrepreneurs in that it places greater importance on the technique of self-help and defends the ideological commitment to serve people as a matter of right. This ideological premise stems from the fact that in an industralized society many contributing factors to individual hardship are outside the individual's control.

---

[1] Robert Perlman and David Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967), pp. 8-9.

[2] Kathleen Woodroofe suggests that the activities of charity workers and "lady bountifuls" were engaged in as a means of assuaging their own guilt; see From Charity To Social Work, In England and the United States (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 21-23.

Political ward leaders and ward heelers of the early twentieth century frequently provided information and referral services as well as advocacy and direct services. Banfield[1] notes however that certain external forces changed their functions. These included the assimilation of immigrants, extension of public welfare programs and increase in per capita income during the post war boom years. Voters became increasingly reluctant to accept the inducements of ward leaders when they could get similar services through social work and welfare channels as a matter of course and with no strings attached. The system of "favouritism" differed from the public right to services assured by area service centres.

Neighborhood citizens associations or councils in the first half of this century often carried out the social action function largely on an ad hoc basis. They had a high rate of turnover: "Councils become organized around a critical problem, attempt to deal with it, and dissolve when the need passes".[2] Strong on social action, they differ with the area service centre in their lack of permanence as organizations and their limitation to the social action function.

The settlement house differs from the area service centre in a number of ways. The area service centre, however, can be considered the last in a series of adaptations by the settlement house movement to a rapidly changing world. For purposes of clarity in presentation and analysis, the settlement house movement can be arbitrarily seen as having

---

[1] Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson, City Politics (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966).

[2] Robert McRae, "Community Welfare Councils", Social Work Year Book, 1957 (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1957), p. 189.

made three major adjustments in its long history. These adjustments can
be understood in the following terms: 1) the "movement phase" represents
an adjustment to the Industrial Revolution and the new poor of the 1880's
2) the "recreational phase" represents an adjustment to the delinquency
of youth in the 1930's and 3) the "area service centre phase" represents
an adjustment to the War on Poverty of the 1960's and to the chaotic
welfare system of many urban centres.

It is suggested that a gradual decline of the settlement house
appears to have taken place for the following reasons. The centre-city
areas where settlement houses were commonly found, were becoming rapidly
depopulated. The populations that remained in centre city areas often
consisted of people less capable of moving out because of age, health,
income, or some other reason. Inner-city areas tended to become deprived
areas. Consequently, serving the neighborhood meant providing a compre-
hensive service plan at a time when neither the settlement nor the chaotic
welfare system could provide one. This is due to the fact that since the
depression, the settlement had given up many of its original functions
to public and private agencies and restricted its function to recreational
programs geared in many cases to elaborate physical plants. These build-
ing-centred settlements, frequently, were being called into question as
being superflous to the real problems of poverty and delinquency out in
the neighborhoods themselves. The settlements were also criticized on
other grounds.

> Taking due account of the value of efforts to teach the
> poor how to make the best of themselves and their means,
> it needs to be recognized that but a small part of
> settlement effort is directed to the real cause of class

distinction, viz. the economic.[1]

An important issue surrounding the participation of residents in the settlements was also raised at one point.

> For example a recent survey* of neighborhood centre activities reports extensively on new programs and on what these ought to do for the clients. It describes what programs were offered but it gives no evidence that these programs were wanted by the clients or that the clients' wants had any role in shaping the program.[2]

The traditional welfare systems of many urban centers were increasingly seen as inadequate from the point of view of meeting the needs of low income groups. Buell[3] and his co-workers pointed to the need for coordination and elimination of fragmentation and duplication in services to families in poverty on both economic and treatment grounds. Others explored the reasons why potential consumers of welfare services were not being reached. It was argued that traditional social agencies were abdicating their responsibility to the poor. Richard A. Cloward and Irwin Epstein[4] cite evidence for the case of a disengagement from the poor on the part of private social welfare. Their discussion centres mainly upon family adjustment agencies but they cite references to similar trends

_____

[1]William H. Noyes, "Institutional Peril of the Settlements", in Readings in the Development of Settlement Work, ed. by Lorene M. Pacey (New York: Association Press, 1950), pp. 67-68.

*The survey referred to is the following. Arthur Hillman, Neighborhood Centers Today, Action Programs For A Rapidly Changing World (New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1960).

[2]Herbert J. Gans, "Redefining the Settlement's Function for the War on Poverty", Social Work, IX (October 1964), 7.

[3]Bradley Buell, and Associates, Community Planning For Human Services (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

[4]Cloward and Epstein, "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies", pp. 40-63.

elsewhere. Family agencies increasingly refer economically disadvantaged clients to public agencies where they are almost certain not to receive help for other problems. There is evidence of early closing of files to encourage the use of resources elsewhere, irrespective of the expressed wish of the client. They also argue that the profession of social work tends to adopt a therapeutic model which is selective, in that treatment is given only to certain types of clients, namely those with emotional problems. There is a general lack of involvement in providing direct services desired by the poor and a disproportionate investment in counselling those who can use it. The indifferent, chaotic traditional welfare system is well summed-up in these words:

> In fact, however, existing social agencies have widely
> bogged down into bureaucratic inefficiency, indifference
> and misguided paternalism. They have lost contact with
> their improverished constituency.[1]

3. How can the area service centre be differentiated from the service structures that preceded it?

The modern area service centre really dates from the Arden House Conference of 1958, called by the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers to decide on the future role, if any, of settlements in a rapidly changing world. The conference addressed itself both to the general decline of settlements and to what it perceived as the chaotic state of the welfare system of many urban centers in the face of tremendous social problems. It came up with the following emphases for future policy.

1. To serve as one of the few agencies in contemporary
   society that is not wholly bureaucratized, channelized
   .... that offers a personal face-to-face relationship

---

[1]"The War on Poverty", p. 24.

in which a whole human being can be seen and talked
to in something like his entire life situation.

2. To help give people roots, a sense of identification
with a place, other people, existing agencies of their
society, and, if they stay long enough, with the
ongoing good and traditions and obligations of that
society.

3. To experiment in using new knowledge and social
techniques for dealing with human problems.

4. To provide decentralized services to people who need
help in areas close to their homes.

5. To help promote cultural activities, ── an 'active
participant culture', counteracting pressures toward
passivity in American life, helping to develop ways
of using our increasing leisure for creative
activities.

6. To provide important services in the planning and
execution of programs for urban renewal.[1]

These new emphases on broad interpretation of problems, returning

to the neighborhood, decentralizing services and promoting an active

participant culture constitute one of the first descriptions of activities

and approaches that we commonly associate with the area service centre

today.

This awareness that many agencies were not serving the poor, as

well as the fact that the settlements had declined is reflected in the

acceptance by the Arden House Conference of a responsibility to those

people caught up in "pockets of poverty". Once this target of inter-

vention was clearly set out, there was wide acceptance of the need to

involve the poor directly in problem-solving and in designing service

centres. The availability of funds under new federal legislation in the

---

[1]Margaret Berry, "Settlements and Neighborhood Centers", in _Social_
Work Year Book, ed. by H. Kurtz (New York: National Association of
Social Workers, 1960), pp. 523-529.

United States, earmarked specifically for innovative problem-solving proposals, resulted in the creation of a number of area service centres. In addition, many traditional agencies utilized these funds and began to operate in accordance with this new philosophy.

CHAPTER 2

MODERN AREA SERVICE CENTRES

1. How can area service centres be differentiated?

2. What goals are associated with area service
   centres and what means are adopted in pursuing
   them?

3. What types of relationships can exist between
   neighborhood organization programs and area
   service centres?

1. <u>How can area service centres be differentiated?</u>

The label of area service centre is used in the literature to refer

to several demonstration-research projects and a variety of types of

practice agencies.[1] In order to differentiate modern area service centres,

irrespective of whether they are demonstration-research projects or practice

agencies, a social agency differentiation chart will be used. The vertical

axis shall differentiate social agency goals according to whether they

are traditional or innovative (to be defined below). The horizontal axis

shall differentiate social agency means according to whether they are

---

[1]Neighborhood center is used interchangeably with the word
"settlement" in much social welfare literature. It is used by recently
established agencies more often than is the term "settlement". Neighbor-
hood-serving agencies also call themselves neighborhood houses, neighbor-
hood associations, community houses, community centers, social centers,
social settlements or university settlements; see <u>Standards for Neighbor-
hood Centers</u>, John Ganter, Chairman of Membership Standards and Admissions
Committee (New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood
Centers, Revised Edition, 1968), p. 4.
     Note also that the term area service centre is commonly used in
Canada instead of neighborhood service centre. The former was adopted
for this study because "area" is better understood than "neighborhood"
which has a variety of connotations.

traditional or innovative (to be defined below). This tool will enable
the discussion and analysis of a variety of social agencies subsumed in
the literature under the label area service centre to proceed. Still
a further differentiation of area service centres will then take place
on the basis of the relationship between the centre and neighborhood
organization efforts. The four types of relationships referred to in
the literature will be discussed. They include: 1) SPONSORSHIP
2) NOMINALLY INDEPENDENT ASSOCIATION OR COUNCIL 3) COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE
AND 4) COMMUNITY CORPORATION.

2. What goals are associated with area service centres and what means are adopted in pursuing them?

The area service centres referred to in the literature possess,
in most cases, both service and neighborhood organization components.
On the basis of the historical evidence presented in earlier sections,
it seems appropriate to refer to the new service and neighborhood organiza-
tion goals as innovative.

A list of service component goals seems to be embodied in the
following principles that have been articulated in the literature.[1]

1. DECENTRALIZATION of services and programs to the
   neighborhood level;

2. increased RESPONSIVENESS of services to the needs
   and desires of residents, especially the poor
   residents;

3. opening ACCESS to programs and services by co-
   LOCATING some and building referral networks to
   others and by means such as outreach, advocacy,
   follow-up, etc.;

---

[1]Michael S. March, "The Neighborhood Center Concept", Public Welfare,
XXVI, No. 2 (April 1968), 110.

4. COORDINATION of services into a COMPREHENSIVE
   pattern in keeping with the best principles of
   social work and rehabilitation;

5. arranging a CONTINUUM OF SERVICES in proper
   sequence for the individual or the family
   through development of a service plan based
   on team analysis, scheduled appointments,
   implemented by follow-up;

6. CONCERTING of resources by involving in the
   service system both the old-established service
   agencies and the new OEO funded agencies, and
   by incorporating the EXISTING resources as well
   as the possible ADDITIONAL increments;

7. INTEGRATION of operations through core services
   which are administered through central intake,
   diagnostic counselling, case management, and
   record systems.

8. direction of services and assistance to STRIKE AT
   THE ROOT CAUSES of social problems as they afflict
   individuals, families, and the neighborhood.

The goals commonly associated with neighborhood organization efforts

of area service centres seem to be those that are isolated by Perlman and

Jones.[1] These goals include the following: 1) to provide social and

psychological benefits to participants; 2) to provide self-help and

mutual aid; 3) to increase the effectiveness of service delivery; 4) to

achieve institutional change. According to the same writers, institutional

change has several meanings.

> In general it seems to refer to any significant and
> relatively permanent change in structure, policies, or
> practices of organizations concerned with welfare,
> health, education, employment, housing, and government.
> Some reserve it for more radical changes involving some
> redistribution of resources of power. More usually it
> is used to indicate change in some aspect of a social
> situation affecting a whole category of people, as
> contrasted with helping a particular individual to adjust

---

[1]Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, pp. 49-53.

to a social situation, or some modification of it achieved solely for that individual.[1]

These innovative goals differ with many of the goals commonly associated with other types of social agencies. The latter will be called traditional goals. They include: 1) character building, 2) socialization, 3) individual change, 4) counselling and 5) family adjustment.

Although it is often difficult to distinguish just what is a goal and what is a means in the case of the area service centre, this exercise can be useful in deriving certain differences in approach and orientation from other social agencies. To illustrate this point, the emphasis on resident involvement in the planning and delivery of services constitutes an innovation in terms of means and also a goal, namely, the countering of paternalism associated with other social agencies. Notwithstanding arbitrariness in judgments, one can isolate several other innovative means adopted by area service centres. They include hiring "indigenous non-professionals"[2] and having a neighborhood organization component with a wide spectrum of strategies and structures. Their strategies include social protest, demonstration, boycotts, consensus, collaboration and others. The structures at times develop into issue-centered coalitions, community corporations and other types.

Traditional social agencies are not characterized by such inno-

---

[1] Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, p. 51.

[2] The term indigenous nonprofessional refers to a person who is hired by a social agency because of his capability for acting as a bridge between the middle class oriented professional and the client from the lower socioeconomic groups. Robert Reiff and Frank Riessman, "The Indigenous Nonprofessional", Community Mental Health Journal, Monograph Series, no. 1 (Massachusetts: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1965), p. 7.

vations. They typically pursue the agency goals in a fragmentary way offering specialized services and accepting only certain types of clientele according to problem areas that are amenable to either casework or group-work methods. Clients are not usually involved in programming or delivery of service. These means are to be referred to as traditional means.

At this point it becomes possible to make some distinctions between various types of social agencies that have either been proposed or have been in operation and discussed in the literature. This social agency differentiation chart will provide an instant overview of the agencies subsumed under the label of area service centre.

<u>SOCIAL AGENCY DIFFERENTIATION CHART</u>

GOALS

		Traditional	Innovative
M E A N S	**T r a d i t i o n a l**	social agency (no neighborhood[1] organization)	advice & referral centre (sponsorship type of neighborhood organization)
	I n n o v a t i v e	diagnostic centre (nominally independent association)	one-stop multi-purpose neighborhood centre (complete independence of neighborhood organization)

[1]The types of relationships between neighborhood organization and social agency cited in the brackets are articulated on pp. 23-26.

Some social agencies pursue the innovative goal of decentralization by following the course of establishing "advice and referral centers". This represents a trend established by several traditional agencies pushing out and decentralizing certain of their functions including contact, cursory screening, advice and/or referral. Michael S. March describes this model which he developed as follows.

> The advice and referral center would have a very small staff — possibly one or two persons. They should inform people about the available services, but the service agencies should remain in their present scattered and/or downtown location. Intake would largely be "walk-ins". Broadly trained "generalists", well-informed about the spectrum of public and private agencies, would tell authoritatively what services can be provided and where to go, and would do elementary screening. The staff could answer questions, hand out forms, and could even make appointments for clients. The approach is similar to that used in the Citizens' Advice Bureau in Great Britain. Many OEO "store-front" centers perform these functions, at least partially.[1]

Michael S. March appears to have had in mind when designing this centre, the type of community described elsewhere[2] as having numerous high calibre services. According to Perlman and Jones this centre has the function in such a community of facilitating communication and feedback between residents, agencies and institutions rather than providing direct services itself.[3]

In terms of our social agency differentiation chart, it is argued that the advice and referral centre pursues a few innovative goals of the service kind including greater decentralization, easier access, and greater follow-through potential by consumers. The traditional system of welfare

---

[1] March, "The Neighborhood Center Concept", pp. 105-106.

[2] Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, pp. 78-79.

[3] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

remains intact and the traditional means are maintained. It might be

argued that where the neighborhood organization component exists, it is

of the sponsorship type (to be discussed below). The suggested reasons

why this area service centre might sponsor the neighborhood organization

is to safeguard its own interests. These include making sure that the

neighborhood organization is not attacking the referral suppliers or

jeopardizing other institutional maintenance needs such as funding

sources. It could on the other hand encourage neighborhood organization

groups geared to service improvement.

Another type of area service centre was proposed by Michael S.

March and called a "diagnostic centre". He describes its operations as

follows:

> ..... would require co-location of representatives of
> service agencies under central administrative supervision,
> and development of strong ties to the service components
> to assure availability and continuing service pursuant
> to the service plan developed for a particular family
> or individual. It also offers an opportunity for
> unified intake, application and eligibility procedures.
> Common sense records would minimize competitive and
> duplicatory paper work and repetitive interviews. The
> outreach and many case management functions could be
> performed by neighborhood resident subprofessionals.
> A transportation unit could materially facilitate the
> effectiveness of the system.[1]

March seems to have had in mind in designing such a centre, the

community described elsewhere[2] in which gaps exist in the service systems

and specific services are unavailable. Perlman and Jones seem to attribute

the following role to a centre in such a community:

---

[1] March, "The Neighborhood Center Concept", p. 106.

[2] Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, pp. 49-53.

The centre would undertake these programs on an interim
basis and would use its experience to demonstrate and
document the need for other agencies to assume their
appropriate responsibilities in closing the service
gap.[1]

Although the type of neighborhood organization effort required is

not spelled out in the literature, this centre would seem best to relate

to the nominally independent association or council type (to be discussed

below). This would seem to follow for the following reasons. This centre

based on colocation of services demands a certain amount of collaboration.

This is probably encouraged by looser policies which would give the

neighborhood organization greater theoretical independence. Funding and

other resources would be provided since the neighborhood organization aims

of co-ordination and collaboration are basically reinforcing the area

service centre policies and outlook.

In terms of the social agency differentiation chart, this centre

appears to pursue traditional goals with certain innovative means geared

largely to the improvement of intraorganizational service delivery. The

innovative means include: team diagnosis, family comprehensive service

plan, case management including referral, advocacy, and follow-through.

The goals are the traditional types referred to earlier.

Another type of area service centre was referred to by March as

a "one-stop multi-purpose neighborhood centre". He describes it in this

way:

Have a major community development and organization
arm which would look to the neighborhood wide needs.

Have "core service" units working with clients both

---

[1]Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, p. 79.

in-center and out-center, performing the central
outreach, advocacy, case management and follow-
through functions. Staff for such units would
typically be subprofessionals who would work in
close concert with the professionals on the
central counselling staff.

Co-locate the various specialized service
agencies and ideally organize them along
functional lines.[1]

March seems to have in mind in designing this centre the community
described elsewhere[2] as generally lacking programs, or having inadequate
ones. Perlman and Jones envisage a more autonomous neighborhood organi-
zation in this situation.

Under these circumstances, greater resources will
have to be employed to induce other agencies to
fulfill their responsibilities. This would require
a stronger type of neighborhood organization,
capable of using more militant methods.[3]

It is suggested that the type of relationship between the neighbor-
hood organization and the area service centre, in this case, would probably
be of the third order, namely, complete independence (to be discussed
below). The suggested reasons for this follow. Complete independence
means a reduction in tension created by overlapping systems. Since the
area service centre is comprehensive in its program and outlook, a peer
relationship can be encouraged. The neighborhood organization is freer
to get involved in social action even espousing radical goals as a con-
sequence of this freedom.

In terms of the social agency differentiation chart this centre

---

[1]March, "The Neighborhood Center Concept", pp. 107-108.

[2]Perlman and Jones, Neighborhood Service Centers, p. 79.

[3]Ibid., p. 79.

is characterized by innovative goals and innovative means. It is based
on co-location of essential services at appropriate neighborhood sites
and involves the residents meaningfully in its process and operations.
The neighborhood organization requires militancy and this is perhaps the
type of centre that can best be operated by a community corporation (to
be discussed below).

3. What types of relationships can exist between neighborhood
organization programs and area service centres?

The neighborhood organization relationship to the area service
centre can take four forms. This provides another useful way to look at
social agencies. In some cases, the area service centre SPONSORS the
neighborhood organization and provides both physical and staff resources.
The latter are central to the whole operation. The structure and policy
of the centre is very closely identified with the neighborhood organization.
While residents play an advisory role in policy matters, the area service
centre staff and board retain decision-making powers. The literature
reports:

> This kind of sponsorship structure seems to lend itself
> more readily to programs which emphasize service rather
> than social action, and such action as is undertaken
> usually is of the environmental or service delivery
> improvement type instead of that espousing institutional
> change.[1]

In other situations, area service centres provide staff and other
resources to a NOMINALLY INDEPENDENT ASSOCIATION OR COUNCIL. This type
of relationship engenders more formal and permanent neighborhood struc-
tures. A discussion of the implications of this type of relationship

---

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, p. 42.

follows.

> Policy-making is in the hands of the participants, but
> dependence on the settlement for resources (in terms of
> facilities, staff service, legitimacy in the eyes of
> the broader community, and access to its hall of power)
> often means that the independence from the agency is
> more theoretical than real. However, to encourage
> local initiative and independence some agencies have
> stated policies which set only very broad limits for
> autonomous action. Program, while action-oriented,
> will seldom be directed at matters requiring
> institutional change; style will probably be moderate
> rather than militant; and the strategy adopted will
> usually be directed at achieving agreement by
> consensus. Nevertheless, these matters are all
> relative, and when a controversial issue arises the
> very difficulty of defining the precise nature of
> the relationship often re-creates tension 1) within
> the neighborhood organization 2) between that body
> and the settlement, and 3) within the settlement
> itself.[1]

The third relationship is marked by COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE. The
area service centre is simply a participant with no more authority than
the other participants in an autonomous structure. The relationship has
been referred to as a "peer relationship". Perhaps the mark of complete
autonomy is the evidence of some conflict or competition. Arthur Hillman
and Frank Seever say:

> Under this third type of relationship the settlement
> may act as an occasional resource not only for a
> simple neighborhood organization but often for many
> such groups, some of which may be competing with
> each other and even with the agency itself.[2]

The fourth relationship refers to a COMMUNITY CORPORATION either
organizing or taking over the operation of the centre. Although the exact

---

[1] Hillman and Seever, <u>Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-hood Organization</u>, p. 43.

[2] Ibid., p. 43.

sequence of how this comes about or the degree of participation by the

poor in the process and operation do not appear to have been recorded,

the community corporation suggests real possibilities as we learn from

the illustrations below.

A typical corporation is a legal entity based on neighborhood stock-

holders living within a geographic area. Each resident is entitled to

membership simply by signing up. The Corporation is controlled by a voting

system wherin each member has a vote.

> The Community Corporation recalls the spirit of the
> New England town meeting —— the people closest to
> the problem are responsible for solving it; local
> leadership is recognized and in control ......
> Those who recognize that economic development is
> a good idea may with a little imagination, also
> see that funds for community social service might
> be derived from the community itself. If the
> Community Corporation were not merely a conduit
> for outside funds —— but instead were also a
> rigorous economic enterprise which purchased
> businesses —— profits could be plowed back
> into the community for social services. We are
> talking about community control of economic
> development, in which a deprived community
> would provide its own anti-poverty funds and
> manage its own anti-poverty programs.[1]

The community corporation was found workable in a Negro neighbor-

hood in Columbus, Ohio.

> The people in the area formed a non-profit
> corporation called ECCO, the East Central
> Citizens Organization, made up of all the
> residents age sixteen and above, constituting
> an assembly and electing officers as well as
> (having) powers to employ and discharge pro-
> fessional staff, remove officers, authorize
> and terminate programs ....
> ECCO is a self-help project, not in a romantic

---

[1]Gar Alperovitz, "Are Community Corporations The Answer?", cited in
Senate debate, Congressional Record, (United States: August 2, 1968),
s10092 to s10093.

sense of the people doing everything themselves,
but in the practical sense that the residents do
for themselves what they are capable of doing,
and the hire, and have the power to fire, pro-
fessionals and experts to do the rest.[1]

Even where the community corporation does not internally generate

funds for social services, something must be said for neighborhood control

and self-determination.

Public things, which belong to the people, flow
into this private agency and are translated by
a private person, the director, not accountable
to either the government or the residents of the
neighborhood. There is a lot of social product
in that private agency, and from another point
of view, there is a lot of power there. The
direct lines from the citizen to the government
have become vague.[2]

Thus the transfer of the private agency to neighborhood control

can be well argued.

This concludes the analysis and differentiation of the social

agencies discussed in the literature under the label of area service centre.

We shall proceed in the next chapter to consider the implications of the

various models.

---

[1] Milton Kotler, "Self-Government in the City: the Neighborhood
Foundation", (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Policy Studies; excerpted
from Congressional Assistants Seminar on Housing and Urban Development,
Spring 1966), mimeographed p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

1. What are the implications of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor as an anti-poverty strategy?

2. What ideological issues are involved in a War on Poverty and how do these affect the area service centre?

3. What issues surround the strategy of utilizing indigenous non-professionals in social agencies?

4. What are the implications of service for social action to bring about institutional change and vice versa?

5. What is the relationship of various strategies for goal achievement of area service centres?

6. What are the implications of funding sources for approaches to problem-solving?

7. How do area service centres propose to achieve a terminal relationship with the communities they serve?

8. How successful are area service centres in terms of the goals they pursue?

9. What are common criteria of success for area service centres?

1. What are the implications of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor as an anti-poverty strategy?

The implications of maximum-feasible participation of the poor are basic to anti-poverty efforts and whether a War on Poverty will be won. Yet issues involved in implementation of such important words are powerfully contradictory to their intent of giving the poor power. Instead, participation is becoming a means of institutionalizing an advisory role for the poor to serve as glue in perpetuating the status quo and guarantee

acceptance of hand-me-down programs. One reason for this is the fact that
the chances are great that participation will mean co-opting the informal
leadership of the masses or simply "buying them off". There can be no
meaningful participation until such time as the poor organize their numbers
and have their own powerbase. Then bargaining with the powers-that-be can
meaningfully occur and the chances of co-optation be substantially reduced.

Another reason why the realization of "maximum feasible participa-
tion" of the poor will be thwarted is because it involves basic undermining
of much of what has been built up over the years and that will be defended
vehemently. It is one thing to encourage participation by the poor and
still another to subsidize open conflicts against private, political and
institutional centers of power in the communities. Besides, some social
workers might be bothered by or reminded of how little of their organizing
for such a social revolution is legitimate professional activity and how
close it resembles class hatred, so easily identified with Marxism.

Another reason why "maximum feasible participation" can prove
meaningless is that there is little rational evidence in our society to
convince people in power with their education and reputed expertise to
transfer decision-making to the poor simply because they are poor. Saul
Alinsky, a professional organizer puts it this way:

> Should people with no more credentials than a skinny
> wallet make decisions normally trusted to government
> and welfare agencies? They should, says the charter*
> But they won't be allowed to, adds Alinsky.[1]

The underlying assumption of maximum feasible participation is

---

* The charter refers to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

[1] "The Gadfly of the Poverty War", Newsweek, September 13, 1965, p. 30.

that people who exercise decision-making power will be likely to give up easily what they have known. Saul Alinsky is not quite so optimistic. Incidentally, this includes social workers who might not be so anxious to transfer the decision-making which would undermine their professional expertise and perhaps ultimately their livelihood. But of course, we have professional associations and unions to defend our vested interests as do most civil servants and others who stand to loose something.

These powerful contradictions surrounding maximum feasible participation lead one to conclude that this strategy is only legitimated when it is misused or not implemented fully. By deduction the area service centre is legitimated so long as it does not do its job with this key tool. This points up the more fundamental consideration of the goals of any war on poverty and the system of belief about people or the ideological premises on which the war is being based.

2. What ideological issues are involved in a War on Poverty and how do these affect the area service centre?

In his article, "Can a War on Poverty Be Won?", Leonard Schneiderman raised many ideological issues of what we believe, of what we seek, of what we aspire to. These questions are basic to legislation aimed at combatting poverty. They are as important as the methodological question of how best we get there. It is important to grasp the ideological commitments that give direction to the change efforts represented in legislation and area service centre operations.

Leonard Schneiderman mentions three types of goals that are often referred to in connection with the national poverty program of the United States. They are: 1) SOCIAL CONTROL GOALS — goals designed to bring

the anti-social or asocial behavior of the poor under effective control;
2) ECONOMIC GOALS —— which see poverty legislation as a mechanism for
pumping money into the economy and thereby encouraging economic growth
and development for the nation as a whole; 3) SOCIAL JUSTICE GOALS ——
which raise the issue of the morality, the rightness and the justice ——
of having people with inadequate access of food, clothing, shelter, and
medical care in a society that has all such goods and services in
abundance.[1]

These goals seem relevant to the analysis of the area service centre.
In particular, it is important to question whether the area service centre
has a social control goal of combatting delinquency and crime in the streets
or a social justice goal of remedying social injustice at all costs.
The economic goal is more relevant to the whole OEO program in United
States with its hundreds of area service centres. Whatever the goal is,
this goal must become the test of effectiveness and adequacy of the program.

Leonard Schneiderman also questions whether or not "maximum
feasible participation of the poor" represents a social control strategy
or a social justice strategy? This question is basic to the area service
centre. Is the impression of giving participation to the poor a strategy
to gain acceptance of predetermined community goals? With this acceptance
guaranteed, the poor will not ask for more. Or, is it a means of giving
them opportunities to solve the problems as they define them?

Maximum feasible participation of the poor in planning and
executing anti-poverty programs has been renamed by Daniel Moynihan
maximum feasible misunderstanding. This man who helped to plan the War

---

[1]Leonard Schneiderman, "Can a War on Poverty Be Won?", Public
Welfare, XXVI, No. 2 (April 1968), pp. 91-92.

on Poverty is a main exponent of an indictment of it.

> The trouble was, says Moynihan, that the Government never
> really comprehended what community action was all about and
> "did not know what is was doing".
> As groups of the poor sought in city after city to elbow
> aside mayors and established agencies and take over the
> programs, Johnson came to fear that he had created a
> political monster.
> At one point, Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley became
> "mightily upset" because the federal poverty project
> was becoming a "champion grabber and distributor of
> antipoverty funds". Daley relished that role for
> himself, and he let Washington know that he did not
> like the competition. According to Moynihan, John-
> son told OEO "to keep community action programs as
> quiet as possible".[1]

As such, even national pressures were brought to bear on the im-

plementation of this important legislation. The control from Washington

through funding was implicit in the very operations of the area service

centres and especially its social action orientation. Moreover, the

politicians were particularly sensitive targets of community action

projects and had considerable power to determine their future.

In another article, Daniel Moynihan reflects on the professional-

ization of reform in the Office of Economic Opportunity legislation.

> The idea of community action was in one sense the purest
> product of academia and the Ford Foundation. Its under-
> lying propositions with respect to opportunity structure
> and economics constituted a systematic theory as to the
> origins and cures, if not of poverty, at least of
> juvenile delinquency. Moreover, in making its way
> through the maze of the Executive Office Building,
> it had acquired a managerial gloss which, while never
> fully, or even partially, intended by its original
> sponsors, nonetheless proved decisive in its adoption
> by the mandarins of the Budget Bureau. Community
> action was originally seen as a means of shaping
> unorganized and even disorganized city dwellers into
> a coherent and self-conscious group, if need be by

---

[1] Editorial, _Time_ (Canadian ed.), December 27, 1968, p. 23A.

techniques of protest and opposition to established
authority. Somehow, however, the higher civil
service came to see it as a means for coordinating
at the community level the array of conflicting and
overlapping departmental programs that were proceeding
forth from Washington in ever increasing numbers,
legislative statements to the contrary notwithstanding.[1]

Amidst these conflicting perceptions of what the problem of poverty

was all about and differing conceptions of what to do about it, community

action programs were borne. These very confusions permeate at the neighbor-

hood level, too. Differing conceptions of the area service centre's purpose

and nature persist. Some see it as a means of cutting out the duplication

and fragmentation at work in the welfare industry of large cities. Others

see it as a protest agency aimed at restoring to the poor social justice.

These confusions tend to mean that unrealistic expectations surround area

service centres in some cases. Yet in others, it is fair to assume complete

potential is not being realized.

These points are discussed below:

Optimists say that consumers of social services can
provide helpful insights into the effectiveness of
such programs. They argue further that the poor
are an important and reliable source of information
about themselves and their problems and that they
can best define their own needs and suggest approp-
riate uses for Federal funds.
Pessimists have argued that if the poor could be
relied upon merely to carry out politically neutral
self-help programs there would be no resistance to
allowing them to have a meaningful voice in poverty
programs and control over funds. When organization
of the poor, however, is coupled with the idea of
organizing for social and political action, the poor
become a threat and their involvement and their
control is blocked. The assumption is that the poor
may be involved only so long as they know and stay in
their place. To guarantee this, the typical city-wide

---

[1] Daniel P. Moynihan, "The Professors and the Poor", in Commentary
XLVI, No. 2 (August 1968), pp. 21-22.

community action board assures that the poor will be
outnumbered and contained by articulate leaders of
civic, religious, labor, business and welfare organ-
izations as well as by representatives of municipal
government. When the poor have organized to fight
for a better life through rent strikes, demonstrations,
and picketing against inadequate welfare grants, they
have been opposed by the community, threatened with
the termination of funds, and investigated as
communists.[1]

The question of area service centre goals is important. It is

also important to question who sets these goals and by what authority are

these decisions taken. These questions will then be related to the choice

of strategies or lack of choice. It must be reemphasized that there is

no such thing as meaningful citizen participation until such time as the

citizens have their own powerbase. Until this occurs the poor will be

co-opted and perform an advisory function rather than negotiate as equals

from a position of strength. Two related issues, however, are representa-

tiveness and eligibility. Eligibility refers to the composition of the

powerbase in terms of who is able to participate and on what basis.

Representativeness refers to who the spokesmen are speaking for or the

legitimacy of their authority. This may be difficult to ascertain in

densely populated urban centres with diverse ethnic composition, many

transient groups, and much mobility.

3. **What issues surround the strategy of utilizing indigenous non-
professionals in social agencies?**

A second force in the war on poverty generally, and area service

centres in particular, is the utilization of indigenous nonprofessionals.

The employment of this strategy by area service centres is often

---

[1]Schneiderman, "Can a War on Poverty Be Won?", pp. 94-95.

seen as a solution to the problem of bridging the gap between middle class professionals and lower class clients. It is to be pointed out though, that it also creates new problems for professionals, for area service centres and for the community at large. They are employed for the following purposes among others: 1) offsetting professional manpower shortages; 2) improving the delivery of service; 3) demonstrating a commitment to maximum feasible participation of residents; 4) acting as an important source of employment opportunities for ghetto residents; 5) helping in therapeutic situations.

A number of issues surround this strategy. Are the indigenous workers truly representative of the community? At what point do they become ineffective because they model themselves after the professional life-style and behavior? What is there to stop this acculturation process or should it be stopped? Perhaps, the indigenous workers are chosen by the professionals in a highly subjective manner and according to their mutuality of interest and aspirations. How are indigenous workers perceived by their so-called peers? These issues surrounding the use of non-professionals in social welfare are discussed in the literature.

The position of professionals as opposed to nonprofessionals is an important variable in the War on Poverty. The position of the professions in the recent past according to T.H. Marshall[1] was one of enjoying varying degrees of group monopoly and developing as colleagues, varying degrees of group spirit, and group conscience. It is suggested, however, that this has never been so completely the case for social work

---

[1] T.H. Marshall, "Professionalism and Social Policy", in Man, Work and Society, ed. by Sigmund Nosow and William H. Form, (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1962), p. 226.

as other professions because there has always been a shortage of manpower
and thus it has not been possible to establish a complete monopoly. Yet
in area service centres the professionals are at times called upon to work
with, if not under consumers, and indigenous non-professionals. The latter
in some instances can carry out managerial functions through the community
corporation of which they can also be members. It is argued a structural
divergence between professionals and indigenous staff can exist and be
reinforced by differing values, beliefs, and perceptions of both goals
and means.

The problems encountered by staff of one area service centre are
noted by Frank Loewenberg.[1] He argues that community action workers
(mainly indigenous workers) hold expectations of social workers which the
latter are unable to accept. One of these conflicting expectations is
over the amount of time the social workers feel they have to spend in the
office rather than in the community. Another is that social workers find
it difficult to accept the carefree attitudes of the indigenous workers
toward keeping appointments and the like. Moreover, social workers find
situations in which indigenous workers criticize them in front of clients
impossible. In his particular study, he found that the centre director
(untrained) was making administrative decisions according to criteria
which the professionals did not accept. He notes that while consumers
stress direct services, social workers tend to have little budgeted to
them for this purpose. Instead, they are expected to coordinate existing

---

[1]Frank M. Loewenberg, "Social Workers and Indigenous Nonprofessionals;
Some Structural Dilemmas", Social Work, XXIII, No. 3 (July 1968), pp. 65-71.

services. Moreover, social work practitioners in the centre felt isolated from the mainstream of professional social work practice. The centre came to be seen by professionals working in other agencies as nonprofessional. At the same time, indigenous workers and consumers generally view social workers within the centre negatively.

Loewenberg also argues that staff and clients in traditional social agencies represent two separate interactional networks. However, in area service centres generally, the two interactional networks are not distinct but blurred. Indigenous nonprofessionals are recruited from the client group, and are not supposed to overidentify with the professional, but rather remain typical of the client group. The client network and peer network are not separate.

> For the social service workers there is little that
> distinguishes colleague from client. At the very
> time when social service workers needed the help
> of a collegial group to internalize unfamiliar and
> new role expectation they find themselves without
> teammates.[1]

Loewenberg also found that indigenous nonprofessionals commonly devaluate education, professionalism, and the like. They are impatient with bureaucracy. Moreover, low income groups generally are openly antagonistic toward social workers. He noted:

> To meet these responses among colleagues is a new
> experience for social workers, yet these patterns
> were characteristic of many Neighborhood Center
> staff members. When indigenous workers are asked
> what they would do if the center budget were cut,
> they commonly suggested the firing of social workers
> and other college graduates. This open antagonism
> toward social workers and other professionals

---

[1] Frank M. Loewenberg, "Social Workers and Indigenous Nonprofessionals: Some Structural Dilemmas", p. 69.

created a morale problem among social service
staff.[1]

It is argued that these features, coupled with managerial control
in the hands of consumers can make professional staff recruitment very
difficult. What incentive is there to participate in an organization that
can destroy you?

The professionalism of colleagues moreover, demands a certain
"secrecy" in the face of nonprofessionals and consumers. Professional
mistakes, if exposed, are done in a private "backstage" fashion. Loewenberg
noted however, that this was not the case in the centre he studied:

> At Neighborhood Center, however, staff members were
> generally not aware of these professional norms.
> Community action workers felt a stronger bond with
> clients than with their social work colleagues;
> consequently they had little hesitation about
> criticizing social workers in front of clients.
> Public discussions of "secrets", were, in fact
> encouraged by the structure of the center,
> especially the imperative of maximum involvement
> of the poor.[2]

In traditional agencies the status hierarchy locates the pro-
fessional higher up the ladder, carrying more complicated cases, than case
aides or non-professionals. When an interdisciplinary team is involved,
the professional group most closely identified with goal achievement is
higher in the ranking. Much discussion in the literature of social work
deals with the relation of social work to other professions such as medicine,
and psychiatry, when the social workers tend to rank lower in terms of
status than the other team members. Loewenberg found however, a situation

---

[1] Frank M. Loewenberg, "Social Workers and Indigenous Nonprofessionals;
Some Structural Dilemmas", p. 69.

[2] Ibid., p. 69.

of status-reversal.

> It is difficult to think of examples in which
> nonprofessionals outrank professionals, but
> Neighborhood Center is one such example of
> status-reversal since there the apex of the
> status pyramid is occupied by community
> action workers, an occupational group that
> does not meet the conventional criteria of
> a profession. Social workers are accustomed
> to function in subordinate positions to
> members of other professions, but to be
> outranked by nonprofessionals is a new ex-
> perience for which few professional social
> workers have been prepared.[1]

4. What are the implications of service for social action to bring about institutional change and vice versa?

A third issue in area service centre operations is the question

of service versus social action. The discussion in the literature centres

around the necessity of providing services so that needs may be met at

the same time that community organization programs are pressuring for

institutional change. One writer raises this issue in a very succinct

way:

> Are service and change mutually exclusive?
> Do organizations which attempt both accomplish
> neither?[2]

It is suggested that the service versus social action debate is

perhaps a false one. The origins of this debate can be traced to the

juxtaposition of the "psychiatric world-view" against the "sociological

worldview". The latter leads to the emphasis on prevention, the former

to the emphasis on treatment. Proponents of the latter advocate social

---

[1] Frank M. Loewenberg, "Social Workers and Indigenous Nonprofessionals; Some Structural Dilemmas", p. 69.

[2] Charles F. Grosser, Helping Youth, A Study of Six Community Organization Programs, pp. 57-58.

action aimed at institutional change and view services as a mere palliative

to problem-solving. Services deal with the symptoms whereas social action

tries to remedy the causes. Charles F. Grosser sets this in perspective:

> Since the professional and general communities
> persist in debating the priorities between
> preventing pathology and curing its victims, it
> is necessary to point out that this dichotomy
> is a false one. Neither function can be under-
> taken alone. Social circumstances must unquestion-
> ably be changed so that people are not victimized.
> At the same time, those victimized by social
> disorder must be treated.[1]

Grosser is not alone in his view of a dynamic partnership of

these functions. It is reported elsewhere that:

> The neighborhood center's program of service
> and action is determined by environomental
> conditions which the neighborhood presents
> and by the needs and interests of the people
> in the neighborhood. It varies, therefore,
> from one period to another in accordance
> with changing needs and conditions. Likewise,
> neighborhood centers serving different kinds
> of neighborhood offer different service
> programs.[2]

Notwithstanding the importance of such a dynamic partnership, the

manner in which service and social action interact is equally important to

consider. The experience of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency Projects

suggests that complete independence of the neighborhood organization

efforts from the area service centre might be highly desirable.

> Social action and service components may exist
> as part of a comprehensive project, or, more
> desirably, as separate cooperative entities.

---

[1] Charles F. Grosser, Helping Youth, A Study of Six Community Organization Programs, p. 58.

[2] Standards For Neighborhood Centers, pp. 5-6.

> The seperation of the action and service
> functions into discrete organizations is
> suggested here because the two functions
> are frequently in disharmony.
> For example, it is not easy to negotiate
> with an agency for a client on quid pro
> quo basis and at the same time attempt to
> change its policies or personnel.[1]

Certain operational difficulties seem to underlie the interplay

of the two functions wherever they coexist in an area service centre.

These difficulties are broadly related to problems of "overlapping systems".

Does the area service centre rely on outside treatment organizations that

the community organization might be implicitly or explicitly attacking?

What impact do the funding sources have for actions undertaken and

strategies adopted? Client groups relate to some systems more than others.

What effect does this have on targets of intervention and strategies

adopted?

Grosser discusses certain of these problems of "overlapping

systems" and their solutions from the experience of Office of Juvenile

Delinquency projects.

> The experience of the projects illustrates that
> dispensers of public agency services are congenitally
> and organizationally unable to distinguish between
> the protest and service function when practiced
> by the same organization. Thus the public agency sees
> social action against itself as a breach of faith,
> as a disloyal act violating arrangements between
> the staffs. This estrangement is furthered when
> the public agency worker contacts the project which
> has undertaken both service and action functions,
> and requests that social action cease. Such requests
> for individual cooperation are made and granted
> routinely in the pursuit of service goals. But when
> the request is for withdrawal of an independent
> social action, it is refused because community organ-

---

[1]Charles F. Grosser, Helping Youth, A Study of Six Community
Organization Programs, p. 58.

izers do not control the actions of their constituents.
This explanation, however, is often not believed or
understood by the public agency, and the service
function may be seriously, if not irreparably,
disrupted. On the other hand, if the project agrees
to withdraw its social action on the basis of the
target institution's request, it jeopardizes its
potential for organizing in good faith.
Experience also illustrates that the service needs
of the poor are so varied and proliferating that
they will consume all the resources of the commun-
ity organization group. To disregard the immediate
problems of the evictee on the sidewalk while
dealing with the total tenement housing problem
is unthinkable; yet the service problems of a
single large family on the street may take weeks
of work by several workers, may, in fact, absorb
more organizational resource than is entitled in
mobilizing the entire neighborhood to social
action. As evidenced in the projects reviewed
here, wherever the service and action aspects of
program are present in the same organization,
compassion for individuals in distress is usually
sufficient unto itself to set aside the action
part. Project experience indicates that dual
programs either converted to service alone
(while continuing to utilize social action
metaphors) or separated the functions.[1]

The social action versus service question is a perennial problem

for area service centres. Tensions seem to be reduced however, whenever

the centre's goals are clearly understood and the proper relationship exists

between the centre and the neighborhood organization to accommodate the

means necessary to pursue the goals. Thus, for example where radical goals

such as institutional change are being sought, the ideal relationship

for the task is complete independence so that militant strategies can be

adopted.

---

[1]Charles F. Grosser, Helping Youth, A Study of Six Community
Organization Programs, p. 58.

5. What is the relationship of various strategies for goal achievement of area service centres?

A fourth issue in area service centre operations and any War on Poverty is strategy. Three types of strategies can be identified in the literature namely, consensus; demand; and independent activity. The strategy of consensus

> is based on the assumption that some common ground of interest exists or shared objectives can be developed among those concerned with any given condition or problem. The task is therefore to utilize means appropriate to the situation, especially education and persuasion, to create a climate in which differences can be accommodated and adjusted.[1]

The strategy of demand or protest,

> assumes conflict rather than mutuality of interest in a given situation. The task is therefore to mobilize as much 'power' as possible with which to confront and overwhelm the other party or parties in the negotiations which hopefully will take place, or in some kind of showdown between opponents. The nature of the power is not always clear; sometimes it is an impact to be made on public opinion through publicity, and at times it is more directly translated into pressure through votes or economic boycotts.[2]

The strategy of independent activity is "essentially the self-help approach to problems".[3]

The literature reveals that: "there is some general consistency between avowed goals and strategies". Centres which say their goal is social change "are reported frequently to utilize conflict or demand, together with the militant style and preoccupation with power which have

---

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighborhood Organization, p. 30.

[2]Ibid., p. 32.

[3]Ibid., p. 33.

come to be associated with it". Similarly, centres which "emphasize per-
sonal and social development and the provision of services, almost always
employ the strategy of consensus (or of independent activity) and rarely
that of demand".[1]

The strategy of independent activity is evident in the community
corporations. Other types of closely related activities include credit
unions, remedial education and manpower training programs sponsored by
area service centres. Many workers are skeptical about such independent
initiatives. Small scale efforts of local volunteers may not be able to
come to grips with community-wide problems. Although a small number of
participants may benefit, the vast majority will not. Kenneth Clark[2] is
one among several other authors who pointed out the caveat for the use of
self-help.

> In essence it is that this strategy should not be
> employed if it will have the effect of relieving
> a public agency from carrying out its rightful
> responsibility for cleaning up vacant lots or
> providing vocational training, for example.
> This principle might be extended to say that a
> strategy should never be used to avoid dealing
> with a question of public social policy. On the
> other hand, a program undertaken as a demonstration
> of needed services may be a means of joining ——
> rather than avoiding —— an issue.[3]

6. **What are the implications of funding sources for approaches to
problem-solving?**

A final issue in area service centre operations is funding. Money

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, p. 34.

[2]Kenneth Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

[3]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, pp. 33-34.

is an institutional need that affects the service versus social action question. Generally speaking, an agency with a social action orientation will be harder to finance successfully. Pressure from funding sources can mean a predisposition toward services rather than clamorous social action. Private appeal funding tends to be concerned about the public image of the agency. Corporate donations are still the major sector from which such funds are drawn in voluntary appeals. This sector happens also to include the decision-makers of the private welfare industry. It also has many vested interests in perpetuating the status quo.

Government funding of the welfare industry has been on the increase during recent years both in Canada and United States. However, the extent to which it makes good political sense for a government to fund community action programs that expose its shortcomings can be debated. What little literature exists on the subject reveals that:

> The agencies which can best afford action programs
> are those with politically liberal and geographically
> distant sources of money. Thus an agency which
> receives substantial funds from the national office
> of a religious denomination is more likely to allow
> its staff freedom for organizing on controversial
> matters than one which is entirely dependent on the
> community church or other local sources. However,
> there are indications that this kind of conservative
> control is lessening as business leaders recognize
> the need for change, or at least accept orderly
> kinds of protest as healthy expressions. Moreover,
> staff members may restrain themselves unduly at
> times and exaggerate the seeming constraints.[1]

Whatever the source of funds, whether they be voluntary, government church, or foundation in origin, the effect on strategy decisions and social action is considerable. The political relevance of social action for area

---

[1] Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighborhood Organization, pp. 36-37.

service centres is well summed-up in this statement, "Any public issues
of consequence have some political significance".[1]

   7. **How do area service centres propose to achieve a terminal
relationship with the communities they serve?**

   The terminal relationship of an area service centre is as important
a variable to consider as the beginning relationship. Unfortunately, this
matter has not been dealt with in the literature, as far as I know, despite
the sober observation of Alvin Gouldner.

> It is not simply that community needs give birth
> to organizations and programs, it is also true
> that organizations and their personnel, having
> a vested interest in survival search out needs,
> the servicing of which enables them to survive.
> In short it is or should be a rather open secret
> that welfare agencies, like other groups, resist
> their own dissolution; they do not simply exist
> in order to satisfy needs, they seek needs so
> they can remain in existence.[2]

The same concern has been voiced, with more specific reference to neighbor-
hood organizations by Hillman and Seever.

> Neither the need for services nor the relationship
> between agency and neighborhood is static, yet
> despite changes over time a relationship continues
> as long as there is a commitment to serve the
> community. The agency, sensitive to its commitment
> and responsible to changing conditions, will modify
> its services and help redefine its relationship
> to the community. While in most cases the need for
> some kinds of staff continues, the kind and amount
> will vary over time. As neighborhood groups develop
> and mature, the need for staff services from the
> agency will diminish and much of the responsibility

---

[1] Hillman and Seever, _Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization_, p. 88.

[2] Alvin Gouldner, "Secrets of Organizations", _Social Welfare Forum_,
1963, p. 164. See also a similar discussion in Howard Becker, _Outsiders:
Studies in the Sociology of Deviance_.

can be carried by the local members or by those
they hire. This is the basic drive of neighborhood
organizations; namely, increased competence of the
local group. Staff service, viewed as a necessary
ingredient toward the development of an independent
citizen organization, or as a resource used by a
neighborhood organization at its own discretion,
is consistent with the goal of maximum autonomy
for the organization. Responsible citizen part-
icipation requires their independence at the
policy-making level.[1]

Termination of an area service centre or one of its programs raises
the question of the nature of such decisions. Are they professional and
hence based on professional expertise, or are they lay decisions within the
domain of the citizens through their own organizations be they community
corporations or some other? Or for that matter, are they the decisions
of the funders of the services? The literature does not spell out these
decisions and how they are taken. However, Lippitt[2] has made an effort
to spell out the issues involved for the question of how the change agent
proposes to achieve a terminal relationship. He suggests the following
possibilities.

1. By reaching a point where the client system is
   prepared to handle changeability.

   For example: By giving training in "problem
   solving methodology" —— self-
   survey.

2. By incorporating the role of the change agent
   in the client system.

   For example: By making self-diagnosis and
   problem-solving a regular part
   of the group's routine.

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, pp. 43-44.

[2]Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley, Dynamics of
Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958), pp. 233-
238.

3. By conducting periodic examinations

   For example: Periodic check-ups.

4. By imparting learning when and how to ask for
   further help.

   For example: By teaching appropriate attitudes
   toward seeking help —— what kind
   of help is needed for what kinds
   of problems and where it can be
   obtained.

8. How successful are area service centres in terms of the goals they pursue?

Effectiveness studies on area service centres are not numerous. Social work agencies generally set the goal of helping people or seeing that they are better off. But are they better off? How does one know? These questions point up the need to evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts or their desirability in terms of the stated goals. The following discussion is based on a review of certain criteria of success as found in the literature.

Measures of effectiveness are particularly hard to come by in the case of this type of organization because the area service centre has multiple goals which are not necessarily complementary. Therefore, the effectiveness of any program must be seen in terms of the goals that are set for that program. However, competing goals may complicate the task of measuring overall success. A cautionary note is found in the literature which warns that efficiency is not effectiveness. The frequent emphasis on work sheets, number of clients served and the like are measures of efficiency reports on what happened rather than measures of effectiveness or judgments on the desirability of what transpired.

9. **What are common criteria of success for area service centres?**

The area service centre is implicitly accepted as an improvement

over the deficiencies of traditional social agencies. Its approaches and

orientation through a decentralized delivery system as well as the emphasis

placed on involvement of the people affected is defended in the literature

as inherently sound. The question which has not been covered in the

literature though, is which services should remain centralized and which

ones are more effectively delivered through decentralization. One criterion

of success in service delivery of the area service centre has been referred

to as the "unbiased doorway".

> .... the kind of doorway that can be entered,
> by anybody, all social classes, all ethnic
> groups, and is reachable by anybody, but it
> also must be the kind of doorway that can
> open into anything in the service system.
> It must not be biased at the point of
> admission, biased in the sense of closing
> people out or not attracting some people
> who might need it, but it also must not
> be biased at the other end. In a sense
> one ought to have equal chances at getting
> to any service that he needs when he leaves
> that doorway.[1]

To the extent that such an unbiased doorway exists the service delivery

goals discussed earlier may be viewed as having been achieved.

The neighborhood organization component in the pursuit of insti-

tutional change has been described in the literature as having only

limited success. George A. Brager says that power redistribution "suggests

more widespread and basic alternation than is within the capacity of most

---

[1] Alfred J. Kahn, Organizing Services in a Complex Urban Community
(Toronto: A Record of the Kahn Institute for Social Planning Council of
Metropolitan Toronto, 1967), p. 19.

social work organizations".[1] Arthur Hillman and Frank Seever feel Brager's

observation is realistic given the experience and actual accomplishments

of community action programs to date. They add, in relation to community

action programs generally, and settlement-related community action programs

in particular,

> There are some with a reputation for militancy that
> can point only to changes in the delivery of services
> as a result of their efforts, but the statement of
> broader or radical goals may be functional in building
> the strength of the organization. Whether such
> statements actually impress or even frighten the powers-
> that-be in the community, or whether they are dismissed
> as mere verbal assaults, depends in part on the
> astuteness of the people who exercise most power. The
> kind of goals stated has an effect on participation,
> both by organizations and individuals, and most
> obviously, as will be noted, on strategy. In fact,
> the creation of a radical image whether reflected
> in practice or not, may be an important part of
> organizational strategy.[2]

It is suggested that social action may in itself be regarded as

therapeutic. From this standpoint, success can be measured in terms of

involvement in action programs. Moreover, action is also goal-directed.

The criteria of success then, can be whatever tangible evidence exists

that the community is better-off. One can say that community organizers

are just as concerned about what happens to people in the social process

as they are in the tasks performed through neighborhood organization

efforts.

> In the final analysis, success must be judged in
> terms of definite outcomes, including what happens

---

[1]George A. Brager, "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the
Possible", Social Work, XII, No. 1 (January, 1967), p. 61.

[2]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, p. 26.

>to participants in the process. It is an over-
>simplification (however) to focus solely on out-
>comes. Some attention must be given to the
>methods or means employed to achieve them ....
>The most relevant strategies or methods are those
>within the resources of the group, consistent
>with its values and most directly related to the
>organization's goals.[1]

The assessment of the service component of area service centres

is still at an early evolutionary stage. We are reminded of this in the

following injunction:

>Despite the impatience of those who would like to
>move as quickly as possible into studies of outcome
>and effectiveness, our main progress for a time
>will probably be in studies of process and of
>limited effects ..... our major tools are still
>the group record, the life-history, the critical
>incident, and other techniques for codifying
>and conceptualizing the experience of practice.[2]

A neighborhood organization program, to be effective must rest

squarely on the following three points namely: relevance, goals and

direction and process of work. These criteria for the social action

component are elaborated on below by Arthur Hillman and Frank Seever.

The meaning of relevance for neighborhood organization efforts is spelled

out as follows.

>The program should be clearly and currently related
>to the physical, social, and economic problems of
>the community. The stronger the relationship of
>the neighborhood organization activities to the
>community's problems, the greater the likelihood
>of some significant impact being made in the
>community.[3]

---

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, pp. 78-79.

[2]William Schwartz, "Toward a Strategy of Group Work Practice", Social
Service Review, vol. 36, no. 3 (September 1962), p. 278.

[3]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, p. 85.

One must be alert to the needs of all those living within the territory encompassed by the area service centre. It might comprise several communities such as an Italian community, a Greek community and so on. A program may be valid in terms of relevance for one group but not the other and vice versa.

A second factor in a neighborhood organization program is its goals and direction.

> A clear statement of goals by both the agency and neighborhood organization is helpful in order to establish bench marks to determine what progress is being made. Long-range goals of agencies and organizations are less likely to change. They embody the values and philosophical position of the program providing thereby the framework for judging if progress is being made in the desired direction. Periodic evaluation with previously established criteria for success helps to determine if the rate of change is moving at a realistic pace. Short-range, time limited goals represent the criteria or bench marks leading toward the more long-range objectives. They represent the tangible concrete results being sought. As such, these subgoals will necessarily be specific and tend to be reflective of local conditions. As these goals are attained, or as circumstances change, they may be replaced or modified.[1]

Thus if one goal of the area service centre is power redistribution, a tangible expression of this would be how many citizens are on agency boards.

The third factor related to the effectiveness of any neighborhood organization program is the process of work.

> The third factor determining effectiveness ties the other two together and sets in motion the dynamic interplay between them. The process of work, the

---

[1]Hillman and Seever, _Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighborhood Organization_, p. 85.

substance of day-to-day operations, the strategies,
tactics, and methods of the organization tend to
represent choices made from among a range of
alternative actions. Some of the decisions as to
the actual content or activity of the neighborhood
organization program should reflect a relatedness
to the community's problems and resources as well
as to the goals of the organization. To the extent
that the actual work reflects this dynamic inter-
play and changes in response to it, the more
efficacious the program is likely to be. Flexibility
and alertness are parts of effective styles of
work under rapidly changing urban conditions.[1]

It is suggested that these criteria can provide useful tools on

which to base research on the effectiveness of the area service centre.

---

[1]Hillman and Seever, Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighbor-
hood Organization, p. 86.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Following a review of the literature, it is concluded that it is
meaningful to talk about an area service centre as a distinct social agency.
It is argued that the characteristics differentiating the area service
centre from other types of social agencies as well as agencies subsumed
under this label are basically those which have been discussed in the text
under the heading of innovative goals or innovative means.

The antecedents of area service centres have been discussed under
two main headings, unorganized or individual efforts on the one hand, and
organized or formally constituted efforts on the other. The former included
charity workers, "lady bountifuls", political ward leaders and heelers.
The latter included neighborhood associations or councils, and settlement
houses.

Modern area service centres date from the Arden House Conference
of 1958. They constitute, from an organizational standpoint an adaptation
on the part of settlements to the War on Poverty as well as an adjustment
on the part of several traditional agencies to the deficiencies of urban
welfare systems.

It is argued that this type of social agency has adapted to the
realities of poverty both in terms of its philosophy, and in its orientation
to problem-solving at a time when private welfare has tended to abdicate
its responsibility in this area. Its services are tailored to the
expectations and needs of low-income groups principally through strategies
such as "maximum feasible participation" of the people served, and the

utilization of indigenous non-professionals. Its neighborhood organization
efforts seek various goals appropriate to disadvantaged groups such as
the basic redistribution of power in society. Its philosophy centres
around advancing the cause of the poor by altering their opportunity
structure through militant social action whenever necessary. Certain
strains associated with the area service centre are explored. The degree
to which it can function as an organization without jeopardizing its
institutional maintenance needs or invoking problems of overlapping systems,
is discussed. It is suggested that the neighborhood organization should
have complete independence from the area service centre if radical goals
are being pursued through militant means. Other types of relationships
such as sponsorship, and nominally independent association have been
explored in relation to the pursuit of moderate goals and the deployment
of less controversial means.

The area service centre has ramifications and implications for
the social work profession. It has been suggested that few professionals
are prepared to function in the area service centre as a work setting
because of status-reversal, absence of colleagues, open hostility from
indigenous staff, and location outside the mainstream of social work.
It might follow from this that social work education should be altered
in order better to prepare its graduates for such practice demands.

The profession of social work is commonly carried out through social
agencies. How much professional behavior directed at the private, govern-
mental and institutional centres of power in the community can be tolerated
without jeopardizing the viability of the agency or the position of the
organizer on its staff is an open question. The behavior of the social

worker when operating outside the counselling realm, and away from the agency itself becomes increasingly visible to the public. A crucial question for the profession as a whole is the degree to which this new, more active role can be incorporated into professional practice and suitable organizational structures developed to support it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banfield, Edward C., and Wilson, James Q. City Politics. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Barr, Normandia, Piven, Schorr, Shea, Slavin. Personnel in Anti-Poverty Programs: Implications for Social Work Education. Lebanon, Pennsylvannia: Sowers Printing Co., for Council on Social Work Education, New York, 1967.

Beck, Bertram. "Neighborhood Organizations In The Delivery of Services and Self-Help". A paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Dallas, Texas, May 25, 1967. (mimeographed)

Becker, Howard. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Bernard, Sydney E. and Kurtagh, Emerie. "The Neighborhood Service Organization: Specialist in Social Welfare Innovation," in Social Work. XIII No. 1 (Jan. 1968).

Berry, Margaret. "Settlements And Neighborhood Centers". Social Work Year Book, 1960. Edited by H. Kurtz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1960.

_____. "Mr. Gans Is Challenged", in Social Work. X No. 1 (January 1965).

Brager, George A. and Purcell, Francis P., (eds.). Community Action Against Poverty. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967.

Buell, Bradley, and Associates. Community Planning For Human Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Carter, Genevieve W. "What Is The Future Focus for Settlements"? in Social Work. VIII No. 2 (April 1963).

Cloward, Richard A., and Epstein, Irwin. "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies". Community Action Against Poverty. Edited by George A. Brager and Francis P. Purcell. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967.

Cohen, Albert. Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Gans, Herbert J. "Redifining the Settlement's Function for the War on Poverty". Social Work. IX (October 1964).

Ganter, John. Standards for Neighborhood Centers. Chairman, Membership Standards and Admissions Committee. National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Service Centers, January 1968.

Geismar, Ludwig L., and Krisberg, Jane. The Forgotten Neighborhood: Site of an Early Skirmish in the War on Poverty. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1967.

Grosser, Charles F. Helping Youth: A Study of Six Community Organization Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1968.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.

Hillman, Arthur. Neighborhood Centers Today: Action Programs For A Rapidly Changing World. New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1960.

Hillman, Arthur, and Seever, Frank. Making Democracy Work: A Study of Neighborhood Organization. New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centres, 1966-67.

Maas, Henry S. (ed). Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Marsh, Michael S. "The Neighborhood Center Concept", Public Welfare. XXVI No. 2 (April 1968), pp. 97-111.

McRae, Robert. "Community Welfare Councils", Social Work Year Book, 1957. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1957.

Miller, S.M., and Riessman, Frank. Social Class and Social Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

Montreal Council of Social Agencies. Neighborhood Service Centers: An Innovation in the Provision of Social Services. Montreal, Quebec: A working paper of the Research Department, 1968.

Moynihan, Daniel P. "The Professors and The Poor", in Commentary. XLVI No. 2 (August 1968).

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood Centers Serve The Troubled Family. New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, report of a conference held March, 1964, in Chicago, Illinois.

"The War on Poverty", Newsweek. September 13, 1965, pp. 22-29.

Noyes, William M. "Institutional Peril of the Settlements". Readings in
the Development of Settlement Work. Edited by Lorene M. Pacey.
New York: Association Press, 1950.

O'Donnell, Edward J. "An Organizational Twiggy: A Review of Neighborhood
Service Centers". Welfare in Review, V No. 8 (October 1967).

Pacey, Lorene M. Readings In The Development of Settlement Work. New York:
Association Press, 1950.

Perlman, Robert and Jones, David. Neighborhood Service Centers. Washington,
D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

Polansky, Norman. Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1960.

Rein, Martin. "The Social Service Crisis". Transaction, I No. 4 (May 1964).

Rieff, Robert, and Riessman, Frank. "The Indigenous Nonprofessional".
Community Mental Health Journal, Monograph Series, No. 1.
Massachussetts: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1965.

Rosebrugh, Eleanor. Huntington: A Neighborhood Center For Young Families
of Low Income. Syracuse, New York: United Community Chest and
Council of Onondaga County, Inc., 1967.

Schneiderman, Leonard. "Can a War on Poverty Be Won"? Public Welfare,
XXVI No. 2 (April 1968).

Shaw, Clifford, and McKay, H.D. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Tangedahl, T.N. "Area Social Service Centers". Children, XV No. 3
(May-June 1968).

United Community Services of Greater Vancouver, The Red Door: A Report
on Neighborhood Services, 1968.

Wilensky, Harold L., and Lebeaux, Charles N. Industrial Society and Social
Welfare. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Woodroofe, Kathleen. From Charity to Social Work In England and the United
States. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Woods, Robert A., and Kennedy, Albert J. The Settlement Horizon. New York:
Russel Sage Foundation, 1922.