

Ch. 2 (pp. 24-46) Conceptual Frameworks and Models for Community Practice

**Dorothy N. Gamble
and Marie Weil**

COMMUNITY PRACTICE SKILLS

LOCAL TO GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS ■ NEW YORK



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Publishers Since 1893

New York Chichester, West Sussex

Copyright © 2010 Columbia University Press

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gamble, Dorothy N.

Community practice skills : local to global perspectives / Dorothy N. Gamble and Marie Weil.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-231-11002-0 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-231-11003-7 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Community-based social services. 2. Community organization. 3. Community development. I. Weil, Marie, 1941— II. Title.

HV40.G346 2009

361—dc22 2009027820



Columbia University Press books are printed on permanent
and durable acid-free paper.

This book is printed on paper with recycled content.

Printed in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

p 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS AND MODELS FOR COMMUNITY PRACTICE

One is not born into the world to do everything but to do something.

HENRY DAVID THOREAU

*How wonderful it is that nobody need wait a single moment before starting
to improve the world.*

ANNE FRANK, *THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK*

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we present an updated version of the eight models of community practice we first introduced in the nineteenth edition of the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Weil and Gamble 1995), along with the rationale for their organization. We also discuss three “lenses” that we believe will significantly influence the contexts of community practice in this century, and we examine the primary and related roles community practice social workers must adopt to engage in these eight models.

Many models and approaches are available for understanding community practice, historical and current, both from academic colleagues and from skilled practitioners. Currently, a number of authors present different frames for engaging with ideas related to macro practice, community practice, community organizing, community development, and social planning. William Brueggemann (2006) takes a wide view in describing how to work at social change with communities and with organizations at national and international levels. Michael Jacoby Brown (2006) and Mark Homan (2008) provide very practical guides to those wishing to engage in community, or even global change, by proposing frameworks for analyzing dimensions of power, guidelines for mounting a lobbying effort, ideas for how to mobilize resources, and a variety of nuts-and-bolts advice for grassroots community work. David Hardcastle, Patricia Powers, and Stanley Wenocur (2004) unravel the complexities of community-based social problems and pose a variety of strategic approaches using agencies, boards, committees, marketing, assertiveness, and advocacy as well as social casework

to solve social problems. Dennis Long, Carolyn Tice, and John Morrison (2006) emphasize the strengths perspective of macro practice, with a focus on building strong community-based organizations prepared to engage in social planning and policy practice, all for the purpose of promoting social justice. Ellen Netting, Peter Kettner, and Steven McMurtry (2008) emphasize the change process and the way to engage with organizations and communities to plan for and monitor intended change for solving community and organizational problems. Herbert and Irene Rubin (2007) focus their work on organizing and development for progressive change, identifying twenty-two submodels of organizing and development that will defend the weak, diminish hardship, and work toward an equitable society. Jack Rothman (2007) has modified his three community intervention approaches—now called *planning and policy*, *community capacity development*, and *social advocacy*—showing that each of the three dominant modes is influenced by the other two, so that nine variations evolve that represent basic strategies for engaging with communities. Building on the work of these colleagues and our own experience, reading, and research on North American and international community practice, we have refined and updated our framework of eight dominant models currently applied in community practice.

EIGHT MODELS OF COMMUNITY PRACTICE, REVISED AND UPDATED

Since 1995 our table of community practice models has been presented in a variety of publications, the latest being in the twentieth edition of the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Gamble and Weil, 2008). Table 2.1 represents the most recent modification resulting from our effort to describe the major ways community work is now likely to be practiced in the United States and across the globe.

In addition to the five characteristics identified for each model, the table has two important side borders. The left border represents the values and purposes that we define as the application of social justice and human rights to the improvement of social, economic, and environmental well-being. The border on the right side represents the “lenses” we believe will significantly affect the contexts of community practice in this century: globalization, the increase in multicultural societies, and the expansion of human rights, especially rights for women and girls. Imagine that attached to these side borders are thin sheets of cellophane paper, each a different color, each an overlay influencing the work of community practice as it covers the whole table. The values and purposes “sheet” must cover all eight models all the time as a reminder of the fundamental

TABLE 2.1 Eight Models of Community Practice with Twenty-first-Century Contexts

COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS	NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZING	ORGANIZING FUNCTIONAL COMMUNITIES	SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	INCLUSIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	SOCIAL PLANNING	COALITIONS	POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ACTION	MOVEMENTS FOR PROGRESSIVE CHANGE
Desired Outcome	Develop capacity of members to organize; direct and/or moderate the impact of regional planning and external development	Action for social justice focused on advocacy and on changing behaviors and attitudes; may also provide service	Promote grassroots plans; prepare citizens to use social and economic resources without harming environments; open livelihood opportunities	Expansion, redirection, and new development of programs to improve service effectiveness using participatory engagement methods	Neighborhood, citywide, or regional proposals for action by (a) neighborhood groups (b) elected body, and/or (c) planning councils	Build a multiorganizational power base to advocate for standards and programs, to influence program direction and draw down resources	Action for social justice focused on changing policies or policy makers	Action for social, economic, and environmental justice that provides new paradigms for the healthy development of people and the planet
Systems Targeted for Change	Municipal/regional government; external developers; local leadership	General public; government institutions	Banks; foundations; external developers; laws that govern wealth creation	Financial donors and volunteers to programs; beneficiaries of agency services	Perspectives of (a) neighborhood planning groups (b) elected leaders (c) human services leaders	Elected officials; foundations; government policy, and service organizations	Voting public; elected officials; inactive/potential participants in public debates and elections	General public; political, social, and economic systems that are oppressive and destructive

Primary Constituency	Residents of neighborhood, parish, rural community, village	Like-minded people in a community, region, nation, or across the globe	Low-wealth, marginalized, or oppressed population groups in a city or region	Agency board and administrators; community representatives	(a) neighborhood groups (b) elected leaders (c) social agencies and interagency organizations	Organizations and citizens that have a stake in the particular issue	Citizens in a particular political jurisdiction	Leaders, citizens, and organizations able to create new visions and social structures
Scope of Concern	Quality of life in geographic area; Increased ability of grassroots leaders and organizations to improve social, economic and environmental conditions	Advocacy for particular issue or population (examples: environmental protection; women's participation in decision making)	Improve social, economic, and environmental well-being; employ equality, opportunity and responsibility to guide human behavior	Service development for a specific population (examples: children's access to health care; security against domestic violence)	(a) neighborhood level planning (b) integration of social, economic, and environmental needs into public planning arena; (c) human services coordination	Organizational partners joining in a collaborative relationship to improve social, economic, and environmental conditions and human rights	Building the level of participation in political activity; ensuring that elections are fair and not controlled by wealth	Social, economic, and environmental justice within society (examples: basic human needs; basic human rights)
Social Work/Community Practice Roles	Organizer Facilitator Educator Coach Trainer Bridge Builder	Organizer Advocate Writer/Speaker Facilitator	Negotiator Bridge Builder Promoter Planner Educator Manager Researcher Evaluator	Spokesperson Planner/ Evaluator Manager/ Director Proposal Writer Trainer Bridge Builder Visionary	Researcher Proposal writer Communicator Planner Manager Evaluator	Mediator Negotiator Spokesperson Organizer Bridge Builder Leader	Advocate Organizer Researcher Candidate Leader	Advocate Facilitator Leader

Source: Gamble and Weil (2008):355-68.

reasons we social workers engage in community practice. These values and purposes guide our choices of work and our practice behaviors. The “sheets” identifying the three contexts will shade the models as one or the other context becomes more or less influential with time and location. The context sheets remind us that global events and movements, larger than any community, will affect the work of community practice and the people with whom community practitioners engage. Each practice model interacts with the “lenses” in somewhat different ways. Although these contextual overlays have been important in the past, they will become even more significant in community practice in this century.

In order for you to incorporate the “lenses” and use knowledge about the models in practice, you need to understand the basic definition and essential purposes of models as ideal types.

As originally defined by Max Weber (1903–1917/1997), an *ideal type* (model) combines concepts (related to social actions and social structures) to form a “unified analytical construct,” employed to study and understand social phenomena; it is an abstraction used to represent and explain reality. Although ideal types, or models, do not exist in their pure conceptual form in reality, they are intended to represent and explain the essential and most salient aspects of complex phenomena that combine behavior patterns, interactions, and social structures. The analytical constructs—ideal types/models—therefore enable us to compare complex and combined sets of actions and social structures, identify how they operate, and show how they are similar to and distinct from each other. Models provide condensed and simplified images and depictions of “types” of practice illustrating different emphases, purposes, scopes, and strategies for action. By gaining an image of a model’s simplified form with related elements or characteristics, a community practice worker can differentiate among approaches and make sound decisions about which approach is most appropriate in specific contexts and situations. Understanding the differentiations among the models assists practitioners in comparing the possibilities for engaging in community work in actual practice.

We identified eight models in our first publication on this subject; in this volume we have retained the same models, updated them, and provided more current and specific names. We believe these eight types are the dominant, current models that encompass a wide variety of community work subtypes in many parts of the world. For example, *neighborhood and community organizing* can encompass grassroots organizing in diverse local settings (e.g., urban and rural). *Functional community organizing* can be related to various feminist, union, ethnic, spiritual, antipoverty, or antislavery causes or to any of the wide variety of organizing issues taken up by communities of interest. *Social, economic, and sustainable development* can be local or global but would tend to encom-

pass any aspect of human development and community development, with the added concern to preserve and restore the environment. *Inclusive program development* relates to planning, implementation, and management of any type of program with a strong directive to engage with those who will benefit from the planned program. *Social planning* can have a focus, for example, on planning for public health outcomes, improved transportation, accident prevention, child protection, adult education or green building, and can encompass a neighborhood, region, or even a worldwide issue. *Coalitions* are groups of organizations that come together for short- or long-term goals around a range of social, economic, or environmental needs and can be local or global in their reach. *Political and social action* recognizes the need for policy change, or change in policy makers, in order to improve a whole range of social, economic, and environmental conditions. *Movements for progressive change* can also be local or global, working to engage with wide individual and institutional support throughout society. From our research, teaching, and experience in community work, we determined that employing this set of eight models was the most useful framework to introduce community practice students to the range of opportunities available in this rewarding work.

Our set of eight models differs from other established sets and recent presentations, while also drawing on earlier work. One of our sources is Canadian community practice pioneer Murray Ross, a scholar and researcher who played a major role in delineating community organization methods and workers' roles, as well as developing theory-based literature to guide curricula (Weil 1996). His first book, *Community Organization: Theory and Principles* (Ross 1955), centered on work processes and provided the first use of a range of social science concepts as central features tied into the achievement of practice goals. Ross held that practice methods were co-determined by useful theories from the social sciences and by social work values (Schwartz 1965). He specified three major approaches in community practice—reform orientation, planning orientation, and process orientation. Process remained central for Ross: he held that individuals and groups thrive through active participation. In *Case Histories in Community Organization*, Ross (1958) stressed workers' roles and activities in engagement with individuals and community groups using eleven well-developed case studies of work with different types of communities engaged with different types of problems, including a strong focus on international community development.

Our approach also bears similarities to and significant differences from Jack Rothman's earliest configuration of three community intervention approaches, for each of which he described twelve characteristics (Rothman 1968; 2001). Rothman's original approaches, which have had major influence on generations of U.S. social workers, were *locality development*, *social planning*, and *social*

action. His locality development model comes closest to our model labeled *neighborhood and community organizing*. Our configuration and Rothman's each have a model or approach whose shared characteristics we have labeled social planning. In his latest iteration Rothman (2008) links planning with policy change, whereas we link policy change with social action. Our model of social planning in this volume is focused on planning at the community level. Rothman's third mode of intervention is labeled social action. Our combination of political action with social action is based on our experience and research, which indicates that one rarely engages in social action without also needing to change policies or try to change those who make policies (Jansson et al. 2005).

While some of our models are similar to Ross's three approaches and Rothman's original three modes, we also developed five additional models to encompass the breadth of community practice as we know it. Our model for *organizing functional communities* grew from our work and experience with feminist organizers, people organizing with families of the developmentally disabled, community leaders organizing for peace, groups organizing for Native American, African American, and Asian American rights, local farmers and consumers organizing for sustainable agriculture, and many other such efforts that grow from communities of interest. Although a number of our colleagues have provided excellent conceptual frameworks for social development (Midgley 1995), economic development (Johnson and Farrell 2000), and sustainable development (Estes 1993), we became interested in combining *social, economic, and sustainable development* in an effort to more vigorously link social, economic, and environmental well-being. The social work profession has tended to focus on social development, but we believe progress in human development requires the simultaneous incorporation of livelihoods and economic opportunities with the strengthening of social networks and institutions as well as the protection and restoration of the environment. Social workers may not have the requisite technical skills to accomplish all the work in such a complex model, but we do have excellent assessment, team-building, planning, and facilitation skills that are essential for this combination of human development activities.

Our *inclusive program development* model grew from combining two of the five original models presented in the work edited by Sam Taylor and Robert Roberts (1985)—“program development and service coordination” developed by Paul Kurzman (1985) and the “community liaison approach” written by Sam Taylor (1985). Inclusive program development emphasizes our belief that good community practice involves grassroots stakeholders who will benefit from engagement in all phases of the program from the beginning of plan-making to the evaluation stage. The *coalitions* model developed from our work with coalitions against domestic violence, for adolescent pregnancy prevention, campaign finance reform, changes in state policies, peaceful resolution of conflict and

against war, and a clearer understanding of interorganizational dynamics that contribute to the success of coalitions (Mizrahi and Rosenthal 2001; Roberts-DeGennaro 1986). Whereas all models may incorporate aspects of *social planning* and *coalition building*, both of these models have generated significant bodies of literature, identifying sufficient characteristics to be labeled a discreet model in its own right. The *movements for progressive change* model came from our experience with the civil rights, women's, peace, and environmental movements as well as understanding of the history of social work and the need for fundamental changes in institutions and priorities to significantly reduce oppression, discrimination, and violence (Fisher and Karger 1997; Reisch and Andrews 2001; Rubin and Rubin 2007; Van Soest 1997). Although we recognize that social workers in these times are often not the leaders of social movements, we wonder why they could not more frequently take positions of leadership in promoting the values that are the foundation of our profession.

Our eight models comprise discrete types of community practice that can be examined through comparative analysis and that can help expand the understanding of intervention approaches. For additional comparison we identified five characteristics that apply to each model. Our interest was in providing sufficient descriptors to gain an adequate understanding of the model type, keeping it sharply focused, more easily understood, and therefore more easily compared. The five characteristics are: desired outcome, systems targeted for change, primary constituency, scope of concern, and social work/community practice roles. In part II, we describe and discuss these five characteristics for each model, with increased emphasis on the scope of concern and the primary roles engaged in by community practice workers for that model. We also explore the basic process, theoretical and conceptual understandings that inform the model, and significant skills and competencies we believe are important for community practice workers engaged in the particular model. Finally, we illustrate each model with several real-world examples, drawing on the work of colleagues and practitioners from across the globe. These real-world examples will demonstrate some mixing of models because, unlike ideal types, they represent the complexities of human engagement, community contexts, and change opportunities. A number of the real-world examples we introduce contain overlapping aspects of model types, which we will identify.

THE "LENSES" INFLUENCING COMMUNITY PRACTICE CONTEXTS IN THIS CENTURY

Earlier we identified the three lenses that will influence community practice in this century—globalization, the increase in multicultural societies, and the

expansion of human rights, especially rights for women and girls. We describe each of these lenses in turn and discuss their influence on community practice models.

1. **Globalization:** The International Federation of Social Workers has defined globalization as

the process by which all peoples and communities come to experience an increasingly common economic, social and cultural environment. By definition, the process affects everybody throughout the world. A more integrated world community brings both benefits and problems for all; it affects the balance of economic, political and cultural power between nations, communities and individuals and it can both enhance and limit freedoms and human rights. Social workers, by the nature of their work, tend to meet those who are more likely to have suffered the damaging consequences of some aspects of globalisation. (IFSW, International Policy Statement on Globalization and the Environment, 2008)

If globalization is understood as the exchange and integration of culture, technological innovation, travel, models of barter, and economic exchange, then it can be said to have ancient origins. Specifically, globalization might have been ongoing with the Mayan civilization stretching across Mesoamerica, with the Roman Empire, with the Han Dynasty and trade across Asia on the Silk Road, and with the intellectual and cultural centers of the Islamic Golden Age. In recent years, however, globalization has come to be identified with the Bretton Woods Conference, which created the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) following World War II. These institutions were intended to promote growth and minimize disruptions and barriers to financial integration across national borders. In the years since, those who promote globalization, or more specifically those who support the parts of globalization identified with neoliberal free trade and free market policies, proclaimed major economic successes. Fewer people, they say, are now living in poverty in the world, except for sub-Saharan Africa, and the regions that have embraced global free trade such as East Asia and the Pacific have shown significant economic growth (Sachs 2005; World Bank 2006).

There is a negative view, however: some see the growth of enormous wealth for multinational corporations as paving a path of destruction for vulnerable populations. When farmers are left poorer in the developing world because they cannot compete with subsidized crops coming from agribusiness in rich nations, and when cheap labor and cheap natural resources in the developing world have been exploited, questions are raised about the so-called benefits of these policies and practices (Hurst 2006; Korten 2001; Stiglitz 2003). Furthermore, when the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, following

policies they labeled “structural adjustment,” called for cutting poor countries’ investments in education, health care, food, and fertilizer, global free trade and the international policies supporting its free rein looked more like a destructive force with no limitations (Cavanagh and Mander 2004; Klein 2007; Prigoff 2000).

While the economic implications of globalization are still being debated on both sides, the United Nations Development Program has been raising alarms about the growing gap between the rich and poor in the world. The *Human Development Report* for 2007/2008 indicated that the richest 20 percent of the world’s population controlled 75 percent of the world’s wealth, while the poorest 40 percent controlled only 5 percent of the world’s wealth (UNDP 2007). Although newer methods are being developed to measure the disparity, more recent indicators seem to show an even greater gap between the world’s richest and poorest populations. The effect of this diverging income gap focuses significant concern on how and to what degree globalization affects inequality in the world’s populations and exactly what should and could be done to reverse the gap (Milanovic 2006).

In the end, the people who could benefit greatly from the work of community practitioners are those affected negatively by globalization factors such as multilateral and bilateral trade agreements, amassing and transfer of huge financial resources, or decisions by the World Trade Organization (WTO). These are the people who will need the involvement of a facilitator to help grow their capacity and empower their neighborhoods and community organizations to prevent additional negative effects on their local resources, livelihoods, social networks, and environmental quality. These are the people trying to save the special community services their disabled children need when those services are threatened by cutbacks because of the economic downturn. These are the people who, as their social and economic safety nets begin to crumble, will need assistance from an educator, promoter, and researcher to help them develop microcredit institutions and solidarity economics from the ground up. These are the people who will look for help from a social planner to measure the extent of local resources that can be applied to restore the social, economic, and environmental well-being of their communities and change policies to help them do it. These are the people who will need the help of a mediator or negotiator as they build coalitions across communities, regions, and continents to lobby and vote for positive local and global policies where global exchange and integration can be regulated to aid the most vulnerable populations rather than the richest ones. Finally, these are the people who will need advocates and leaders to move programs and policies toward progressive outcomes in social justice and human rights efforts. Understanding how international events can affect local conditions—whether wars, economic shocks, public health crises,

political oppression, or natural disasters—is the first preparatory step for a community practice worker as he or she responds to the negative effects of globalization. In the chapters that follow, we describe how to build the skills to engage effectively with the available resources, often using the positive elements of globalization, and how to ameliorate or eliminate the negative effects of globalization. We use examples from Brooklyn to Bangladesh, from New Mexico and North Carolina to South Africa, and from Brazil to China, where we identify successful efforts that provide a window to community practice grounded in social justice and human rights (ASHOKA 2008; Cavanagh and Mander 2004; World Social Forum 2008).

2. The increase in multicultural societies: Nearly all of the world's societies are becoming more pluralistic in the sense that populations are becoming ethnically, racially, and culturally more mixed. The United States population, for example, was 83 percent white in the 1980 census but 75 percent white in the 2000 census. In New York City in 2004, 48 percent of the people said they spoke a language other than English at home (Hacker 2004). In the 2000 census of the United States, it was possible for the first time to identify oneself as a mixed-race person: 7 million people took advantage of the category to identify themselves as such (Orenstein 2008).

International migration accounts for nearly 3 million migrants moving from poor countries to wealthier ones each year. At the same time, migrations are increasing *between* developing countries such as from India, Egypt, and Yemen to the Persian Gulf States, from Bangladesh to India, and from Guatemala to Mexico (Population Reference Bureau, 2006). Although many cities, states, regions, and countries remain identified with a particular racial, ethnic, or cultural group, the populations in nearly all nations are more heterogeneous now than they were two decades ago. These changes are the result of both voluntary and forced migrations. Voluntary migration is often driven by economic factors. People immigrate to countries where there is a shortage of both skilled and unskilled workers. In addition, for those living in countries where wages are meager for both professional and unskilled positions, greater economic opportunity is a strong motivator to migrate.

Involuntary immigration, in contrast, is most often the product of war, genocide, famine, or natural disasters that force populations into refugee status. While recent and current refugees are primarily the result of wars, concern is growing for the number of refugees that may result from global climate change (UNDP 2007). During the Balkan wars in 1992, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) provided assistance to 17.8 million refugees worldwide. Although that number steadily decreased to a low of 8.4 million in 2005, by 2007 it had increased to 11.4 million refugees outside their countries and 26 million displaced internally (UNHCR 2008). The

United Nations reported that the increase was largely due to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq causing 3 million Afghans to seek refuge in Pakistan and Iran and 2 million Iraqis to flee to Syria and Jordan (Cumming-Bruce 2008). It should also be noted that there are ever-increasing numbers of people who cross borders for safety but are not considered official refugees. The UN estimates that beyond official refugees an additional 11 million people are *stateless*, meaning they have settled in a country where they are not recognized as citizens and have no legal rights (UNHCR 2007). Most of these refugees seek safety in a developing country near their country of origin, contradicting the misconception that Western countries provide most of the protection for refugees fleeing their own countries (Cumming-Bruce 2008).

The varied reasons driving the mobility and migration of people continue to bring people of different nationalities, races, cultures, and ethnic groups in closer contact with each other. To the extent that immigrants are welcomed, the opportunities for exchanging valuable cultural attributes over several generations are significant. When immigrant groups are large or easily identifiable because their dress or skin color is different from the dominant cultural or ethnic group, the blending of cultural aspects may be slower and fraught with discrimination. In addition to its damaging personal affects, discrimination militates against melding valuable cultural aspects from the two groups, and the dominant group has the power to exclude, diminish, and withhold resources and opportunities that would provide for continued human development for both groups. Each country and community struggles with the acceptance of cultural and ethnic diversity in different ways.

In the 1980s, Canada and some European countries adopted national policies supporting multiculturalism that legislated the acceptance of the cultures and subcultures that contribute to the whole society (About Canada 2008; Peninx, Berger, and Kraal 2006). These policies and legislative mandates promoted a kind of cultural pluralism allowing people to keep their cultural traditions while at the same time contributing to the whole country. As immigrant groups increased in size and visibility, however, the dominant population groups tended to exhibit less tolerance for the newer immigrants. In many cases, although the growth of immigrant groups was often fueled by the dominant group's demand for labor, the decreased tolerance led some European countries to retreat from their national multicultural policies, which drew criticism from both ideological extremes. Some making the case against multiculturalism are opposed to acceptance of cultural groups if it also means acceptance of all the cultural practices they bring with them, particularly those that restrict individual freedom and human rights, and that compromise the rule of law in their newly adopted country. This argument views the Western Enlightenment as the guide to values that support human rights and the rule of law (Cliteur 2007).

Feminists also criticize granting rights to cultural groups that would limit universal rights, especially if they restrict women from enjoying the full spectrum of human rights (Hirsi Ali 2007).

South Africa is a good example of a country struggling with the guarantee of human rights for its multiple cultural groups. Neither its African nor its white population is ethnically homogeneous, and the country recognizes eleven different official languages. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, adopted in 1996, is one of the world's most progressive and admired constitutions because of its broad human rights guarantees and its efforts to blend the strengths of its cultural mosaic. It is, for example, one of only six nations in the world that grants same-sex marriages. The Constitutional Court is gradually working through the application of this new Constitution and its Bill of Rights as the people explore its meaning for them as individuals and as groups (Constitutional Court of South Africa 2008).

The Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSV), based in Johannesburg, South Africa, has prepared excellent workbooks for use in youth discussion groups to explore the meaning of their diversity and rights (CSV 2004). Working on training, consultation, research, and publications, CSV provides opportunities for communities across the globe to make use of their experience in building a reconciliation and human rights culture wherever multicultural and multiclass issues threaten progress toward creating and maintaining democratic institutions.

Discussions of the kind promoted by CSV (2008) are important in developing an appreciation of difference and diversity. Without question, because of our increasing migrations and mobility, most of the world's population will be living in communities where diversity of all kinds is common and continues to increase. We argue that community practice should encourage and facilitate discussions of the meaning of multiculturalism as well as the acceptance and appreciation of differences. Unfortunately, such reasoned discussion can always be thwarted and threatened by violence. Therefore, we must work to enhance the multicultural discussion and prevent violence through the promotion of normative behaviors based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and through legal prosecution of discrimination and hate crimes. The Southern Poverty Law Center in Montgomery, Alabama, provides educational material through its program "Teaching Tolerance" for schools to engage in multicultural discussion (Southern Poverty Law Center 2008). The center has also been involved in the tracking and successful prosecution of active hate groups (SPLC 2008).

In 2007 the National Association of Social Workers in the United States published *Institutional Racism and the Social Work Profession: A Call to Action*. The publication presents a clear definition of how structural situations trap all

of us in racist behaviors, and it also provides multiple resources to guard against and change racist practices that are part of our everyday lives. The report's call to action states:

The responsibility of individual social workers is to recognize that structural racism plays out in their personal and professional lives and to use that awareness to ameliorate its influence in all aspects of social work practice, inclusive of direct practice, community organizing, supervision, consultation, administration, advocacy, social and political action, policy development and implementation, education, and research and evaluation. (NASW 2007a:3)

Community practice workers should recognize their role in celebrating diversity and promoting collaborative efforts among different cultural groups and organizations in every one of the eight models of community practice we described earlier in the chapter.

3. The expansion of human rights, especially rights for women and girls: The discussion of diversity merges into the discussion of human rights, especially the rights of women and girls. As described in chapter 1, human rights is a major focus in the IFSW/IASSW "Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles" (2008), and it will continue to have prominence in this century. Social workers, as both scholars and practitioners, should embrace three particular human rights issues, as solutions are found for their application: (1) finding ways to ensure that cultural, social, and economic rights, especially the right not to starve or die from preventable diseases, have the same importance as civil and political rights; (2) helping neighborhoods, regions, and countries pull back from the extremes of cultural relativism and universal rights to a middle space where conflicting rights can be mediated; and (3) actively working for the rights of women and girls throughout society.

The history of the exclusion of women's voices is thousands of years long in both Western and non-Western societies. Women and girls who are excluded from participation in the issues that affect their lives are not only deprived of their human rights and the benefits of community resources, but they are also excluded from contributing in equal measure to the development of humanity (UNICEF 2006; Wetzel 2007). In its report, *The State of the World's Children 2007: Women and Children. The Double Dividend of Gender Equality* (2006), UNICEF calls for equality in the household, employment, politics, and government. When countries move to provide equality for women in these arenas, they reap a "double dividend" because of the significant effect these measures have on improving the lives of children. "For children to reach their fullest potential and to grow up in families and societies where they can thrive, gender discrimination must be banished once and for all" (UNICEF, *State of the*

World's Children 2006:69). Great gains have been made since 1945, with the election of increased numbers of women to political offices, more parity in girls' education, and even positive change in general attitudes toward women and girls. All the same, much more work is needed in this area. As of September 2006, the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had been completed by 184 countries—not, however, by the United States. The promises of this Convention will require more work to ensure that girls are included in equal educational opportunities, to prevent violence and death from sexual abuse and from the lack of reproductive health provisions for pregnancy and childbirth, and to eliminate gender discrimination throughout the lives of women and girls (UNICEF, *State of the World's Children* 2006).

Women are working in all parts of the globe to identify strategic areas of action where social justice and human rights can have a gender focus. In the area of microfinance, for example, currently women make up approximately 85 percent of the poorest borrowers across the globe, in their effort to improve the economic prospects for their families (Daley-Harris 2007).

The Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation in South Africa, which publishes the *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, joined with the Human Rights Center at the University of California at Berkeley for their recent special issue, *Gender and Transitional Justice*, with a focus on the role of women as decision makers and strategists in the aftermath of sexual violence as a tool of war (Pillay 2007). These and many more lessons from the developing world are necessary for a full discussion of what women are thinking in a range of cultures and experiences outside of Western perspectives.

As with the two previous lenses, we know issues surrounding the rights of women and girls will be part of every one of the eight models described in our configuration. If they are not, the community worker should be prepared to integrate gender issues into the work so that they are not ignored or diminished. In an earlier work, we provided questions relevant to a feminist application for each model (Weil, Gamble, and Williams, 1998). These questions, as well as questions relevant to raising multicultural issues, are part of the companion *CPS Workbook*. They can be used with exercises in class or as relevant personal questions for assessing one's readiness for community practice.

PRIMARY AND RELATED ROLES ASSOCIATED WITH THE EIGHT MODEL STRUCTURES

One of the comparative characteristics we have developed to help shape the values, attitudes, behaviors, and engagement strategies of community practice

social workers involves the identification and definition of roles. Table 2.2 describes the primary and related roles we have linked with the models.

The primary roles for these eight models are advocate, leader, organizer, planner, and researcher/assessor. These terms are relatively familiar, but we have given them more specific definitions as they are applied to the models. Sometimes the primary role will be found in several models. A related role with some variation in meaning will also be linked to several models. For example, being an *advocate* and thereby engaging in purposive change activities toward a more just social order is a role clearly linked to *organizing functional communities*, *political and social action*, and *movements for progressive change*. However, related roles such as *promoter*, *spokesperson*, or being a *writer or speaker for advocacy* definitely have a place in the models we identify as *inclusive program development* and *coalitions*. Consequently, advocacy and roles related to advocacy are related to at least five of the eight models we have identified.

Being a *leader*, or engaging in a role related to leadership such as a *visionary* or a *candidate* for public office, are roles related to the models we identify as *coalitions*, *political and social action*, *movements for progressive change*, and *inclusive program development*. Leadership—that is, serving as the initial director of a group that organizes to identify conditions of social injustice and human rights abuse, lack of opportunity, or unequal access to services or resources at a local, regional, national, or global level—has a primary place in at least four of the models we identify. Clearly, however, it is not a primary role in the model *neighborhood and community organizing* where the community social worker is trying to identify and build leaders among the grassroots participants who are seeking to improve their community or neighborhood. In the latter case, if the community social worker becomes the leader, he or she is likely to subvert the development of local community leadership. The role of visionary might be a common one in a number of models such as social planning and social, economic, and sustainable development; however, the role of candidate for public office would only be found in the political and social action model.

The role of *organizer* is perhaps the most common role for a person working in community social work practice. We define this role as systematically planning and working with individuals and small groups on community issues so that their efforts coalesce to form a whole organization to initiate change, improve the quality of life, and solve problems. In addition to the primary role of organizer, we identify seven related roles that are very closely associated to the work of an organizer. These roles are: *bridge-builder*, *coach*, *educator*, *facilitator*, *mediator*, *negotiator*, and *trainer*. Among these related roles, the work of a *facilitator* is perhaps the most skillful and useful in helping to ease the building of organizations by sharing techniques for communication, decision making, goal setting, strategy analysis, analysis of social, economic, and environmental conditions, and outcome

TABLE 2.2 Primary and Related Roles for Social Workers/Community Practice Workers in the Eight Models

PRIMARY ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	RELATED ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	MODELS RELATED TO ROLES
<p>Advocate Researches and engages in purposive change activities toward a more just social order and/or supports and helps others to speak for and be able to take action and make changes on their own behalf that could result in more inclusive and equitable social and economic outcomes, with investments in improved human development, increased social capital, diverse economic opportunities, and recovered and protected environments.</p>	<p>Promoter Works actively in support of an idea and speaks about it positively and persuasively to multiple constituencies to gain resources and support from others.</p> <p>Spokesperson Literally, <i>spokesperson</i> means speaking for a project, program, or cause. It is a basic component of <i>advocacy</i>. Within community practice, <i>spokesperson</i> connotes the worker actively and directly speaking out for or representing a program or issue.</p> <p>Writer/Speaker for Advocacy Effectively makes the case in writing, speaking, and presentations for social, economic, or environmental justice and policy changes that could result in more inclusive communities and more equitable social and economic outcomes. Speaks and writes for development that emphasizes expanding livelihoods and restoring environments, especially for the most vulnerable populations and for species that cannot speak or write for themselves. Supports and coaches community members to expand their own writing and public speaking skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing Functional Communities • Political and Social Action • Movements for Progressive Change • Inclusive Program Development • Coalitions
<p>Leader Guides or serves as the initial director of a group that organizes to identify conditions of social injustice and</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalitions • Political and Social Action

human rights abuse, lack of opportunity or unequal access to services or resources at local, regional, national, or global levels. Works to promote policies that increase social justice and human rights. While a community worker may take on a long-term formal leadership role, more likely at the policy level, a central goal for a community practitioner is to strengthen groups and engage in systematic leadership development so that members will learn to take on various leadership roles.

Candidate

Chooses to stand for an elective office in order to speak, advocate, and legislate for community needs, sustainable development, supports and services for vulnerable populations and the poor, strengthening of human rights protections, and expansion of social justice.

Visionary

Being able to perceive solutions to problems and to conceive program goals and designs from a holistic standpoint. Having the foresight to identify potential barriers and identify solutions. Communicating and translating these perceptions into a clear vision with specific goals and measurable objectives

- Movements for Progressive Change
- Political and Social Action

- Inclusive Program Development

Organizer

Brings people together by systematically planning and working with individuals and small groups on community issues so that their efforts coalesce to form a whole organization to initiate change, improve quality of life, and solve problems. Bringing people together also enables grassroots leaders and organizations to improve social, economic, and environmental conditions through collective action.

Bridge-Builder

Helps an organization to identify potential allies and resources outside their immediate geographic or network area so that they can collaborate, compare, convene, and connect with these allies. This process enables enlarging and tempering the group's analyses of social/economic/environmental conditions and refining their plans of action. This role is sometimes referred to as boundary spanning, and these skills are specifically intended to help grassroots groups engage in community collaborations, connect outside their area to other organizations from whom they can learn, locate organizations with whom they might negotiate a loan, find potential allies who can vouch for their approach, program model or evaluation plan; and identify and successfully connect with potential grant makers.

- Neighborhood and Community Organizing
- Organizing Functional Communities
- Social, Economic, and Sustainable Development;
- Inclusive Program Development
- Coalitions
- Political and Social Action
- Movements for Progressive Change

TABLE 2.2 (Continued)

PRIMARY ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	RELATED ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	MODELS RELATED TO ROLES
	<p>Coach Identifies and calls attention to the strengths of individuals, groups, and organizations through supportive comments and communication.</p> <p>Educator Assists groups and individuals in locating information and resources regarding issues they want to learn about. In community practice, the educator role is always reciprocal with the worker learning from the community's history, vision, goals, strengths, and needs; and, in turn, sharing with community members the worker's knowledge and skills. The effective educator is always a co-learner with community members—each sharing his or her expertise and wisdom to co-produce new knowledge and understandings.</p> <p>Facilitator Makes the work of forming a purposeful organization easier and more systematic by sharing techniques for communication, decision making, goal setting, strategy analysis, social/economic/environmental analyses, and evaluation. In addition, the facilitator helps the group to think through and discuss their issues and analyses in greater depth, helping them to make shared decisions by raising critical questions (i.e., the <i>why</i>, <i>how</i>, <i>what if</i> questions).</p> <p>Mediator Works with members of an organization, or of multiple organizations, to resolve differences or conflicts by helping them hear each other and helping them move forward on an agreed plan. Mediators have an essential responsibility to hear the positions of each party, represent them accurately, and refrain from taking sides.</p>	

Negotiator

Helps members of an organization or members of different organizations or groups come to an agreement satisfactory to both regarding a contested issue; works to identify a middle ground in the contested issue(s) that allows for win/win solutions; also coaches community members in learning negotiation skills.

Trainer

Provides information and demonstrations of skills and techniques, and tests the use of concepts and strategies useful to the group in forming their organization and carrying out action. The trainer also uses anticipatory guidance in the use of strategies and provides opportunities to practice the techniques so that individuals and groups develop comfort in using the techniques.

Planner

Using a range of technical and process skills, works with problem definition, problem solving, program or plan implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In community practice, the planner's role is multifaceted and may be carried out at several levels from grassroots community groups to international development and service groups. In grassroots community practice, the planner works conjointly with community members, assisting them in meeting their goals for program and community development through a process of problem/need identification and documentation, problem solving, planning, program implementation, monitoring, and outcome evaluation.

Manager

Works with the members of an organization to carry out policies and plans to successful operation. Major tasks to meet organization goals include planning innovative efforts, organizing people and resources to achieve goals, leading, guiding and coordinating implementation efforts, engaging in community liaison with external constituencies, monitoring implementation, and evaluating outcomes.

Proposal Writer

Works with others to develop an idea to respond to a community need, concern, or interest. The written proposal will document the *why, what, who, when, where*, and *how* the organization or community will implement and evaluate the process and outcomes of the proposed project.

- Social, Economic, and Sustainable Development
- Inclusive Program Development
- Social Planning

TABLE 2.2 *(Continued)*

PRIMARY ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	RELATED ROLES AND DEFINITIONS	MODELS RELATED TO ROLES
<p>Researcher/Assessor Provides expertise for systematic inquiry in order to help organizations describe as fully and accurately as possible the extent of the impact of a social justice or human rights issue. The inquiry should include data collection as well as first-person accounts, in the words of those affected, showing the detail and nuances of social injustice, abridgment of human rights, and conditions of domination, exploitation, and discrimination. And when policies change, the inquiry should show if and how social justice and human rights have improved.</p>	<p>Evaluator Works with others to identify and solve problems in implementation (formative evaluation) and to assess the outcomes of a program, intervention, or plan in accordance with the goals and objectives of the organization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social, Economic and Sustainable Development • Inclusive Program Development • Social Planning • Political and Social Action

Source: Dorothy N. Gamble and Marie Weil.

evaluation. The role of *organizer*, and the additional seven related roles, are associated with at least seven of the eight models we identify—all the models except social planning. Clearly, organizing activities is part of the social planning model; in our elaboration, however, it is not a primary role.

The role of *planner*—a role requiring a range of technical and process skills to engage groups in problem definition, problem solving, program or plan implementation, monitoring, and evaluation—figures prominently in three of the models. Obviously, planning as a skill is practiced in all eight models, but as a primary role it is linked to the *social planning*, *social economic and sustainable development*, and *inclusive program development* models. The role of planner can be found in these models at a very local grassroots level, as well as at a community, regional, national, or international level. Different skills will be required of planners working at different levels. In this volume we focus on the role of planner at the community level. Related to the principal role of planning are the roles of *manager* and *proposal writer*.

The role of *researcher*, *assessor*, and the related role of *evaluator* are found primarily in four of our eight models: *social, economic, and sustainable development*, *inclusive program development*, *social planning*, and *political and social action*. We would argue that research and evaluation skills are required in all eight models, though serving in the role of researcher, assessor, or evaluator could be a primary role in the four models we identify. Systematic inquiry carried out by a designated person or persons in an organization can help the organization describe as fully and accurately as possible the extent of the impact of a social injustice or human rights abuse. At the same time when policies, programs, and practices change, systematic research can show if and how social justice or human rights has improved or not. Equally important, an evaluator can work with members of an organization to identify and solve implementation problems and to assess program outcomes in accordance with the organization's goals and objectives. Special skills are required of persons in these research and evaluation roles.

In the eight chapters describing the models in greater detail, we will not reiterate the definitions we have presented in table 2.2. We will, however, describe how these roles are applied in the various models, and how community practice social workers can prepare themselves to be ready to engage in the roles demanded by the particular condition and context of their practice.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we presented the most recently revised table representing our eight models of community practice. We also introduced the three lenses that

we believe will significantly color the work of community practice in the twenty-first century. Further discussion of these lenses will be introduced as we cover each model in turn in part II of this book. Finally, we defined the principal roles related to the eight models to provide direction for social workers and community practice workers as they sharpen their values, attitudes, behaviors, and engagement strategies in preparation for this work. We hope this beginning framework will help the reader better understand our perspectives and at the same time encourage you to examine your own standpoint. We encourage you to apply critical thinking to all aspects of these models, lenses, and roles as you prepare for work in community practice.