

Contemporary Perspectives on Planned Social Change: A Comparison

JAMES E. CROWFOOT
MARK A. CHESLER

This paper offers a typology of social change efforts based on an analysis of their divergent root assumptions about values and the nature of reality rather than a categorization of their various activities. Analysis of change agents' images of society and of the individual, their diagnoses of contemporary society, and their priorities for action yields three perspectives of planned social change: the professional-technical, the political, and the countercultural, which the authors discuss in terms of such issues as their varying kinds of constituencies, resources, roles, and institutional bases.

INTRODUCTION

All planned change efforts imply a commitment to certain ends, adherence to a certain view of reality, and acceptance of certain modes of realizing those ends. Those assumptions constitute the conscious or unconscious bases for selecting specific courses of action and thus they precede all tactical decisions. To the extent that change agents cannot identify those basic assumptions and their implications, they cannot explore the full range of effective strategies of change.

In this paper, we attempt to identify some presuppositions that undergird all change strategies and underlie all distinctions between person, organization, or system-oriented levels of analysis or intervention. The

James E. Crowfoot is an assistant professor, The School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan. Mark A. Chesler is an associate professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan. Both are Project Directors with Community Resources Ltd., Ann Arbor, Michigan.

innumerable discussions of strategy and tactics within the field of planned change are inadequate because they are seldom explicitly rooted in or derived from a basic philosophical and experiential orientation to the world. Many syntheses of planned change practice therefore seem to rely primarily on classifications of strategies and tactics alone. For example, Hornstein *et al.* (1971) organize their work on the basis of a categorization of activities: e.g., individual, technostuctural, data-based, organizational development, violence and coercion, and nonviolence and direct action. Olmusk (1972) likewise generates a set of descriptive titles of modes of activity: fellowship, political, economic, academic, engineering, military, confrontation, and applied behavioral science. On the basis of a consensus/dissensus dimension on issues, Warren (1971) distinguishes among consensus, campaign, and contest strategies of planned change. Jones's (1965) work uses three categories of strategies—normative, utilitarian, and "others," which, though instructive, also fail to focus on the theoretical and normative assumptions that guide the selection and development of strategy. Coleman (1973) does, however, attempt to synthesize approaches to planned social change which are directed toward increasing control over resources or the conditions of existence, and he distinguishes between theories that assume change occurs as a result of altered social conditions and theories that locate the origin of social change in personal change. Nevertheless, though his effort begins to uncover the underlying assumptions of change strategies, it does not go far enough.¹

Two of the best efforts to discover those root value assumptions and diagnostic orientations are Chin and Benne (1969) and Rothman (1970). The former identify three meta-strategies of or perspectives on planned social change: empirico-rational, normative-reeducative, and power-coercive. Rothman also uses three categories in his review of community organizing practices: locality development, social action, and social planning. Although their work reflects rich insights and considerable sophistication in change projects as well as in the theoretical literature, they do not deal with some of the perspectives and currents in planned social

¹ Several prominent writers collapse the differences in approaches to planned social change by defining the field in ways that considerably narrow legitimate alternatives. For instance, Bennis, Benne, and Chin state that "planned change is the only feasible alternative" to both radical interventionism and noninterventionism. "Radical interventionism" is then identified as Marxian analysis (Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1969, p. 2). But Marx, and especially Lenin and his followers, did deliberately "plan change," and they planned it on the basis of both moral values and their own system of intellectual and empirical thought, as do Bennis, Benne, and Chin.

change now at work in this society. Both writings appear to distort or to reflect important distortions in the field. The Chin and Benne emphasis on knowledge, and more particularly upon science, commits them to a professionalism that clouds the emergent power of scientific professionals in positions of technocratic influence. Both the normative-reeducative and empirico-rational approaches generally reflect strong elements of professional commitment in the language and analysis of consultants and clients. Cautions against social conflict and division are raised only in the context of the power-coercive approach, indicating the authors' priorities and preferences regarding social harmony and consensus. The Rothman typology, more circumscribed in historical origins, is more specific than Chin and Benne with regard to tactical and strategic implications. Rothman displays considerable acuity regarding the real nuances of power, with both his locality development and social action categories apparently of the power-coercive genre. The social planning approach, on the other hand, seems to combine broad aspects of the Chin and Benne empirico-rational and normative-reeducative approaches.

CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO PLANNED SOCIAL CHANGE

From our point of view, the contemporary field of planned social change may be divided into three perspectives, using criteria somewhat different from others reviewed.² One major segment of the field, represented by Rothman (1970) and Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1969) and their colleagues, is the "professional-technical" (PT) school of thought, which stresses the intellectual expertise of selected classes of people and their ability as well as their right to make decisions and plans for others in order to be "helpful."³ Another major segment, avowedly "political" (P), stresses the organization of mass power, legitimate office, and the mobilization of elites.⁴ The third major perspective is "countercultural" (CC); redemptive

² We wish to acknowledge the efforts of undergraduate and graduate students in our classes in social change at the University of Michigan for their help in developing and testing this typology.

³ Some of the key works in this perspective on planned social change include: Argyris (1962), Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1969), Likert (1961), Lippitt (1958), Schein (1969), Watson (1966), Zetterberg (1962). These works, and this perspective, often dominate the scholarly literature in planned social change, probably because these professional scholars write in the journals available to other scholars.

⁴ Seminal works in this perspective on planned social change include: Alinsky (1969), Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), Gamson (1968), Kahn (1970), Lenin (1943), Machiavelli (1957). Biographies and historical treatments of political leaders are also especially good sources of assumptive reflections and strategic insight to this approach.

in character, it stresses the unfolding nature of man and emphasizes communal organization as the building and rebuilding blocks of a new, unalienating society.⁵

Four questions permit us to identify and differentiate these approaches to planned social change, and thereby broaden our understanding of apparent tactical conflicts and basic strategic variations and choices:

1. What are their general images of society?
2. What are their general images of the individual?
3. What are their diagnoses of contemporary society?
4. What are their priorities with regard to change?

Professional-Technical Perspective

According to this perspective, society consists of many subsystems, which have complex interrelationships as well as differentiated internal structures and processes. Communities and organizations are functionally specialized structures geared to the division of labor necessary to achieve agreed-upon goals that fulfill a broader societal function (Durkheim, 1949). These collections of persons and social institutions are made interdependent by social and economic relations and moral obligations and their construction of a consensual ideology.⁶

The professional-technical perspective thus considers society, and most organizations, to be basically sound, although they need to cope better with ongoing change, which is inevitable and related to the imperative of progress—to a rapidly developing technology, to an ever larger scale of production, and to the increasingly complex and dynamic problems of administration (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Nevertheless, the bureaucratic press for organizational survival, usually translated into efforts to maintain an organization or community in its current form, may lead to dysfunctional adjustments to changing internal and external environments (Argyris, 1962; Katz & Kahn, 1966; March & Simon, 1958). Needs

⁵ Key works in this perspective on planned social change include: Buber (1949), Fairfield (1972), Fromm (1955), Nearing and Nearing (1970), Schutz (1971), Slater (1970), and the Bible (New Testament especially). The redemptive character of this perspective has lent it a religious orientation in sacred states, and a strong humanist and anarchist cultural thrust in more secular states or times.

⁶ This view of organizations has its scientific genesis largely in Weber's (1930) emphasis upon technical rationality. Bureaucratic authority, vested in key system decision-makers and managers, operates according to rules and regulations agreed to or followed by all. The operations of subunits are oriented to the survival of the total organization, and operations of organizations are tuned to societal integration. This diagnostic perspective is tied clearly to "functional" social theories and to the concern for inter-system equilibrium in the organization of society (Parsons, 1951).

for rationally organized change should be met with systematic planning, guiding, and direction by expert administrators, which often require professional consultant assistance.

Given this view of society and the individual, as well as its diagnosis of social problems, the PT perspective calls for constant planned incremental changes, a preference entirely congruent with its concern for stability and its belief in progress.

In working with social systems, this perspective usually emphasizes change within small working groups and organizations rather than change in individuals per se or change in society as a whole. Individuals are viewed as occupants of a role to which they are normatively committed and through which they perform rewarding social functions. They are dependent upon the receipt and manipulation of information, particularly of the kind which leads to coordination with others, for adequate role performance. The individual's resistance to change is usually explained in terms of his or her fear of risk, lack of adequate information, or absence of opportunities and rewards for creative problem-solving behavior. The individual is often viewed as unable to make rational decisions on his own, partly as a function of organizational role pressures and partly as a function of inadequate intellectual preparation and access to information.⁷

Thus, a popular change strategy for groups, organizations, or communities is the creating of more rational problem-solving systems through which groups of individuals establish new norms, role definitions, and operating procedures. Collective problem-solving efforts are undertaken to help develop new responses to changing situations and to provide individuals with more satisfactory socio-emotional settings in which to perform (Sofer, 1964; Davis, 1967). Emphasis is usually placed upon more informal and open communication patterns, which generate new forms of information transmission and social relationships; and functional face-

⁷ Bennis and others argue against change efforts that minimize the reality of organizational forces and contexts acting upon persons. Change in individuals would not necessarily alter embracing organizational or role parameters. Individuals are changed through alterations in roles, groups, and organizations. Such change efforts attempt to reduce anxiety and support persons against their "irrational" fears (Jacques, 1951). The involvement of supervisors and peers, as well as the individuals themselves, is used to create this supportive atmosphere and to overcome resistance (Watson, 1966). In addition, new information or revised aspects of old information systems are key inputs in individual change efforts (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971; Havelock, 1973). When it is necessary to focus on individuals, the most relevant aspects include their social views, skills, and role behaviors.

to-face groups, whose members reflect different levels of status or authority and engage in mutual problem solving, are preferred. Experts help the group become aware of its interpersonal processes and thus more rational about the social and technical issues to be solved. The development of good personal relations is considered to develop confidence and trust among organizational or community members and to overcome their resistance to change.

Although changing the society rather than the organization might seem a logical extension of this view, the PT perspective generally considers that objective beyond current scientific expertise and therefore an inappropriate focus of action. Nevertheless, social planning efforts or social policy formulations that emphasize diagnosis and prescription, but stop short of institutional and citizen mobilization, do represent efforts to apply this perspective at a macro-societal level. Here, diagnostic expertise and intellectual competence are considered applicable, without necessarily incurring the intellectual and operational risks and complexities involved in large-scale social action.

Political Perspective

The political perspective views society as composed of many different groups, each defined by the uniquely shared interests of its members. Groups may be defined on the basis of social function or role, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, political roles, sex, age, ideology, and so forth. They may be loosely organized or coherently integrated into social categories and institutions. These groups and institutions, with different and often competing interests or goals, are the social units of primary concern.⁸

To the extent that resources are perceived as scarce, groups will compete for their control. Thus, competition and conflict over access to and control of such commodities as material goods, dominant symbol systems and ruling ideologies, information, technical skill, respect, and status are inevitable (Coser, 1967; Dahl, 1967). One key to the mediation or resolution of such conflict is the status or relative power of the groups involved. Social systems are seen to contain not only multiple interest groups but also particular distributions of power among those groups. In some cases,

⁸ The very goals of social organizations are to generate collective effort to gain resources required for human fulfillment and to provide an arena for negotiations among different groups seeking similar resources (Dahrendorf, 1959). From the "political" perspective, this is the essence of the social contract.

cross-group understandings or norms concerning certain groups' rights to or claims on resources may exist. Although those understandings may have temporary authority, they are ultimately rooted in the power positions of the constituent groups and must be negotiated for the larger system to be integrated and stable.

Planned change originates in a group's discontent with the resources it is receiving or the way in which they are obtained (Gamson, 1968). Since resource allocation is a constant problem, so is relative discontent, and so is a press for change. To achieve change in the distribution of resources—whether in quality or quantity—always involves opposition by or resistance from groups that are satisfied with the pattern, typically elites or those groups currently in control.

The individual is viewed as necessarily interdependent with others. Essentially powerless to meet his needs alone, he must establish explicit interdependence with other individuals and groups in order to mobilize the power required to gain resources needed for survival and satisfaction and to advance common interests. Groups of individuals are, however, not always aware of their objective interests, which can be clouded by myths propagated by others—especially by elites. When a group acts on the basis of subjective interest alone its objective interests may not be realized and its members may be left with unmet needs.⁹

P proponents contend that the contemporary state apparatus opts for stability rather than equality in regulating the relations among groups and between groups and resources. The result is a high concentration of power in the hands of a few people or a few interest groups, which some advocates of the P perspective view as inevitable. Current patterns of resource allocation and regulation are usually seen as unfair and unjust by those who come from or are allied with a society's oppressed groups, but as fair or beneficial, though difficult to maintain, by those concerned primarily with the welfare of its elites. The oppressed are groups denied substantial participation or power in societal decision making, which typically reduces their share of the resources essential for their well-

⁹ Balbus (1971) discusses the concept of objective interests as something the individual (or group) "is affected by." Accordingly, the individual does not have to be aware of that interest for it to be potent and relevant. By contrast, Balbus sees a subjective interest as something a person or group "is interested in," regardless of its real potency or lack thereof. Accordingly, persons or groups can have subjective interests that are incongruent with their objective interests (i.e., false consciousness) and objective interests of which they are unaware (i.e., lack of consciousness).

being.¹⁰ Elite groups in society exercise their power to maintain control of the decision-making process, which in turn serves their self-interests. The decision-making system of any group at any moment may include laws, norms, and social intelligence systems (often referred to in this perspective as social science), all of which favor groups with high power over those with less power.

The political perspective's priorities for change diverge according to a concern for advancing the interests of either oppressed or elite groups. When the concern is for the former, gaining power to alter decision making and advance their welfare in political, economic, and social systems is advocated. A key prerequisite to the implementation of this strategy is that members of oppressed groups recognize their common character—their low power position or oppression—and see themselves as possessing objectively related interests.¹¹

When priorities center on direct or indirect service to elites, they usually involve increasing elite satisfaction with resources or with their power and control of the process of allocation. Tactics may include increasing communication among elite members, facilitating greater information and understanding of the social system,¹² and developing better managerial skills and increasing the manipulation of the subjective consciousness or material opportunities available to oppressed groups. If the ruling classes are seen as benevolent or valuable in themselves, or as essential components in social stability, increasing their satisfactions and skills may also be seen as in the interest of oppressed groups, by way of a "trickle down" or "hidden-hand" effect.

¹⁰ Typically, because oppressed groups such as the poor, blacks, or students are occasionally provided with substantial resources for their survival and material welfare (Cloward & Piven, 1971). Sometimes this serves to stabilize and harmonize an inequitable system. Receiving resources without the power to control the process is the mark of a paternalist system, albeit perhaps a benevolent one (Jordan, 1968; Rhea, 1968). The cultural control that reflects this political outlook is described for colonized third-world minorities in Blauner (1972) and Fanon (1966).

¹¹ Often called consciousness raising and discussed in Balbus (1971), Bradley *et al.* (1971), Freire (n.d.), Peslikis (1970), Shapiro (1972), *Women* (1972). For Balbus, true and effectively raised consciousness would mean the coming together of both objective and subjective modes of interests within the individual or group. The most progressive situation would be one in which members of oppressor and oppressed groups are involved in separate forms of consciousness raising. Thus, third-world minorities and whites (Terry, 1970), women and men (Krichbaum, 1974), young and old, and poor and rich may become aware of the existence of, and their roles in, racism, sexism, age chauvinism, and class discrimination.

¹² Including, especially, communication between members of scientific elites and public policy makers, e.g., "technical assistance" or "utilization of scientific knowledge."

Countercultural Perspective

The countercultural perspective views contemporary society and all relevant subunits as overtechnocratic and overbureaucratic (Slater, 1970). These institutional characteristics also define the individual, who generally conforms, in a Procrustean fashion, to this truncated definition. In its image of society, the countercultural perspective focuses primarily on the negative effects of social institutions and organizations on the individual. Most social change is held to result in more of the same, and not in alteration of these basically non- or anti-human characteristics. If anything, the effects of planned change, of social evolution or "progress," are considered to decrease social tolerance and initiative for creativity, individuality, and deviancy.

From this point of view, technological and social innovations overwhelmingly result in increased conformity to roles which further remove the individual from realizing his full human potential. Desirable change is infrequently achieved because of a lack of adequate models of change and inattention to individuals' need to escape traditional patterns.

This perspective assumes that the individual is innately good, and it defines goodness in terms of internal unity, primitive union with nature, a capacity for ecstasy and joy, as well as cultural creativity and a potential for loving and fulfilling relationships. Thus, the individual is seen as basically emotional and intuitive (spiritual) rather than intellectual and technocratic (rational). Contemporary humans do not realize their goodness, which is distorted and suppressed by social institutions, whose goals and procedures are antithetical to the individual, who is treated by them as a means rather than an end.

A diagnosis of contemporary society from this perspective follows quite directly from the above conceptions of society and the individual. The individual is seen as alienated from himself and the rest of society. Because individual worth is evaluated in terms of material possessions and the ability to produce and not in terms of innate human qualities, most individuals are more concerned with protecting and enhancing possessions than with developing and sharing self with others. Conceptions of oneself are likewise fraught with concerns about marketing or hoarding an identity, relationships, and so forth (Fromm, 1947).

Social institutions no longer meet basic individual needs: for example, needs for affection, freedom, wholeness. These institutions are anti-humanistic, racist, and sexist, and thereby prevent us from realizing our natural potential, individually or collectively. Public agencies as well as

private corporations operate in ways that destroy people, land, and natural resources. Wedded to an achieving ethic of Protestant sacrifice, Americans glorify technical excellence and bureaucratic order. The results include a stifling of organizational innovation and fluidity, and social control of spontaneous individual creativity, emotional expression, and personal relationships. This diagnosis is applied to bureaucratized churches as well as to secular institutions; even the sacred has become profane in its nonredemptive treatment of persons.

The CC perspective heavily emphasizes individual change. Change must begin with the self and result in new personal values translated into new life styles. Life styles should include acceptance of others and full participation in a community of others. Persons must develop these new life styles by living them, not by viewing them from the outside; then they can be shared as living examples to others. Changes in self and others must be reinforced and extended through alternative organizations based on humanistic values that include racial and sexual equality, consensual decision making, and interpersonal cooperation (Steiner, 1973-74).

These three approaches to planned social change are summarized in Figure 1.

PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICAL ISSUES

These three contemporary perspectives on planned change can be related to some familiar practical issues. The relationship between the divergent perspectives and issues wrestled with by practitioners, targets, and observers of change illumines how apparently technical matters or isolated value choices are in fact related to basic assumptions.

The Actors: Roles and Preparation

The very label "planned social change" implies the presence of intentional actors who alter social systems. Who are the actors initiating planned change? What do they do? And how are they prepared for their activities? The three perspectives tend to answer these questions differently.

The PT change agent. According to the PT perspective, the actor initiating change should be a specially trained expert whose role as citizen should be subsumed or separated from his role as change agent. Political neutrality is usually seen as an important component of the role of expert.

FIGURE 1.

Approaches to Planned Social Change

Key Questions	PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL	POLITICAL	COUNTERCULTURAL
<i>What are its general images of society?</i>	<p>Complex system with functionally specialized structure</p> <p>Organizations and communities based on technical rationality and bureaucratic authority</p> <p>Made up of consensually minded persons having interdependent economic relationships and moral obligations</p> <p>Conflict is dysfunctional; harmony and natural order of consensus and cooperation preferred</p>	<p>Society consists of many different groups, each defined by the shared interests or values of its members</p> <p>Competition and conflict over resources are basic processes</p> <p>Distribution of power among groups with different interests determinative of societal functioning</p>	<p>Society consists of organizations which are uniformly overtechnocratic and overbureaucratic</p> <p>Organizations result in individual conformity and dehumanization</p> <p>Basic trend of social change is more of the same</p>
<i>What are its general images of the individual?</i>	<p>Normatively committed role occupants</p> <p>Information processors and problem-solvers</p> <p>Responsive to system-controlled rewards</p>	<p>Powerless to meet needs by himself or herself</p> <p>Interdependence and group membership required to satisfy needs</p> <p>False consciousness frequently prevents individual from satisfying his or her needs</p>	<p>Innately good—capable of love, joy, and creativity</p> <p>More emotional and intuitive than cognitive and rational</p> <p>Goodness is distorted and suppressed</p>

What are its diagnoses of contemporary society?

Society, as managed by and represented by legitimate officials, is basically all right, although adjustments are needed. Change is inevitable. It arises from developing technology, larger scales of production, and administrative complexity. Maintenance of old bureaucratic patterns prevent adaptation to change.

State has failed in some of its regulatory functions. Power is concentrated in relatively small number of persons or organizations. Oppressed see resource allocation as unfair and elites see it as just but difficult to maintain. Laws, norms, intelligence systems, and socialization are seen as maintaining elite control: the powerless see them as oppressing them, and elites see them as not being effective enough.

Individual is alienated—evaluated in terms of material possessions and ability to produce. Society's institutions are repressive: anti-humanistic, racist, sexist, etc. Institutions operate to destroy people, land, and natural resources.

What are its priorities with regard to change?

Professionals need to plan and manage functional adaptations to change. Ongoing, incremental planned change. Target of change is small groups, organizations, and social roles, attitudes and skills of individuals. Social planning at societal level. Create rational, problem-solving systems

For oppressed it is altering consciousness and mobilization to achieve greater power and resources. For elites it is making their control more effective and more satisfying to exercise.

Individual change in self and life style, identity, and intimate relations. Life styles centered on individuality, openness, and full acceptance of and participation in a community. Alternative organizations based fully on humanistic values and new life styles

Professional change agents thus receive formal training in applied social science, especially the study of psychology, social psychology, and sociology. Particularly important skills include system diagnosis, especially of small-group and organizational processes; force-field analyses; communication techniques; management of human interactions in groups; process facilitation; personal role clarification; and an ability to enter systems as an outside consultant. Training usually includes supervised experience in applying this knowledge to the problems of individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.

Training is largely university-based; in nonuniversity settings, it is closely related to the university system through the credentialing of its teachers, the kind of role systems employed, and standards for performance. For the most part, such training employs the typical educational model of the expert and the nonexpert, although often in freer interactive settings than is the academic norm. Once trained, these experts are expected to adhere to a set of values and procedures developed, maintained, and revised by an overtly organized reference group. The structure of this professional reference system supports the content and organization of the training received; it also provides numerous jobs and social opportunities.

The role of change agent is broadly defined as providing assistance to a social system whose leadership expresses a desire to change. Experts who provide that assistance may be either members of the social system or outsiders. The professional usually helps the change target discover and use new information relevant to change goals, e.g., a new technology, curriculum, product, or market; or information of a process sort, e.g., concerning social relations among organizations, organizational subunits, or organizational roles and members. Specific tactics may involve analyzing a system's communication and problem-solving patterns, assisting members in using feedback and applying research findings to their situation, or developing a climate more supportive of increased communication and innovation.

The P change agent. There are more kinds of change agent roles in the political than in the professional-technical perspective. Unlike the latter, political actors do not constitute a distinct reference and interest group; they usually are seen as citizens, perhaps with certain expertise, operating out of an open and partisan political commitment.

Change agents who work full time with oppressed groups either volun-

teer or receive salaries that are usually well below the level of PT experts. The citizen-actor responds to the discontent of oppressed groups by helping them develop and use organizations and mobilize resources to gain the power necessary to achieve their goals.¹³ Political change agents who serve elite groups, on the other hand, may be very well recompensed. They may be elected or appointed public officials or technical advisers (of a clearly partisan nature) to such officials.¹⁴ Their roles may involve organizing other elites, appealing directly to the public for support, controlling the ships of state, or providing political advice to occupants of steerage positions in the political system.

For the most part, political change agents are not prepared for their roles in university settings. They usually attend the university, but primarily for broad socialization and access to mobility channels, not for specific role preparation. Their preparation is not marked by academic credentials nor based on uniform standards determined by an accrediting organization. Currently, however, elite managers often look to university settings for direct aid in the management or control of the political process. A key element in the elite socialization and social control system, the Academy is seldom able to prepare effective agents of change who will serve politically oppressed groups (although this has been tried several times).

Political actors typically intern in a variety of social movement organizations, e.g., the Democratic or Republican parties, the trade union movement, Chambers of Commerce, NAACP, the Grape Boycott; in quasi-independent organizations committed to assisting the powerless to change their situation, e.g., the Industrial Areas Foundation, Southern Conference Education Foundation, Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization, the Training and Organizing Collective of the Philadelphia Life Center; or with the powerful to consolidate their position, e.g., National Industrial Conference Board, The Brookings Institution, Systems Development Corporation.

¹³ Alinsky and others argue that indigenous leaders operating from within active groups are most likely to be successful (Alinsky, 1969; Brager, 1967). This view accounts for the tactic common among community organizers to expend effort training indigenous leaders to take over roles previously held by outsiders (Kahn, 1970, Chapter 5).

¹⁴ Technical advisers not avowedly partisan may feel they fall within the PT perspective. But providing technical advice to political actors is clearly a political act, and it clearly has partisan consequences, no matter how neutral an expert professes to be (Costello, 1971). The major outlines of partisanship, however, may be in the objective political environment rather than in the subjective consciousness of the change agent. Although intentions may vary, the consequences are still partisan.

The training of political change agents may focus on techniques of motivating oppressed people to take collective action to meet their interests, skills in analyzing social systems in terms of their power and resources and their points of vulnerability, skills in developing and operating organizations of the oppressed, and personal skills in strategy development and value clarification. Skills in social diagnosis and planning and the implementation of new political forms are also useful to political decision-makers. Tactics of negotiation, compromise, and coalition building are likewise relevant components of training for everyone.

The CC change agent. Change agents in the countercultural perspective are heavily committed to living new cultural patterns themselves and are usually identified by membership in or close relationship to communes, collectives, cooperatives, or associations with countercultural values and goals. Their role as initiators of change is defined by a personal struggle to realize new life patterns, efforts to share life patterns and skills in settings which provide for mutual growth among all participants, and the development of liberating organizations. In this perspective, the role of the actor includes as essential both the individual's "work" and "non-work" life; in their pursuit of wholeness, many CC actors would deny even the existence of such a distinction.

CC change agents often resist salary for their efforts, and at most accept subsistence remuneration on the basis of particular roles in networks of mutual assistance. For some, roles are rooted in tasks necessary to operate an organic homestead; for others, a food cooperative or alternative school; for still others, a commune. Preparation for those roles varies widely and generally includes: dealing with the self, e.g., personal values, physical health, and spiritual or psychological development; behavioral skills necessary to achieve new life patterns, e.g., the skills necessary in multilateral families, cooperative gardens, consciousness-raising groups; and skills in initiating and participating in organizations which support and extend new life patterns, e.g., starting a new macro-analysis seminar, developing a collective, operating a marketing cooperative.¹⁵

¹⁵ Examples of materials used in such preparation include: *Go Ahead and Live* (Loomis, 1972), *Self Therapy* (Schiffman, 1967), *The Basic Book of Organic Gardening* (Rodale, 1971), *Light on Yoga* (Iyengar, 1966), *No More Public School* (Bennett, 1972), *Working Loose* (Anderson et al., 1971), *The Community Land Trust* (R. Swann et al., 1972), *Foxfire One* (Wigginton, 1972), *Whole Earth Catalog*; and periodicals like *Prevention*, *Communities*, *Alternative Life Styles*, *The Green Revolution*, *Mother Earth News*, and more.

The pattern of preparation is informal apprenticeship; thus the neophyte, trainee, or disciple may enter a living commune, watch and practice with a master gardener, work under the supervision of a free-school leader, or begin the discipline of meditation with the guidance of a teacher. Generally the basis of such relationships is a teacher's commitment to share what is known as a part of an ongoing life pattern, and a learner's commitment to reciprocate with whatever skill or labor he can offer. Where such training occurs in formal organizations, it tends to be a short-term arrangement in a temporary organization, e.g., free universities, growth centers, or schools of living.

Resources

Each of the three perspectives uses particular combinations of resources to bring about change. Although almost any resource can be used by actors within any perspective, there are consistent—and consistently different—preferences and emphases.

The PT perspective regards the key resources for change to be commitment to change by social systems managers and expertise. Commitment to change by top leadership of a target system is also viewed as an article of democratic faith in growth benefiting all, as well as an analytic projection of effective strategies. Expertise, as embodied in recognized and legitimated professionals, is of both a procedural and substantive variety, and includes diagnostic techniques in system communication, skills in problem solving and team building, and knowledge of such problem areas as education, the environment, poverty, industrial production, and governmental operations.

A closely related resource is the trust of relevant members of the system undergoing change, for it facilitates the change agent's access to information and his efforts to persuade the client to use information in new ways. When persuasion is supported by system managers it uses the organizational power structure and support system, and so increases loyalty to the system as well as the effectiveness of the change agent's efforts.

The credentials and class background, frequently race and sex, and certainly interactional and life styles of the PT change agent result in a position of relatively high status, which he can use to establish personal as well as professional linkages with the leaders of important social systems. A related resource, quite relevant to the necessary commitment of institutional managers, is money.

In the political perspective, key resources for change from the bottom

are the discontent and time and energy of sizable numbers of individuals, along with the financial resources to support the organizer, establish an organization (office, telephone, etc.), and develop visibility (leaflets, advertisements, and so on). The requisite expertise is the ability to organize relatively powerless people to increase their power or to create new publics in order to further their interests. Knowledge comes in the person of someone who can build rapport with and be accountable to oppressed people, and who is willing to work at a subsistence level.

Resources for political change from the top include existing offices of legitimate power or well-developed organizations with economic, social, or cultural influence and control. Change agent skills useful in implementing those conditions include assisting already organized groups to work together or implement their powerful wills more effectively. The ability to motivate people is crucial, as are such activities as media presentation, policy formation, and the like. A personal style and social status compatible with effective social relations among elites is obviously helpful.

Countercultural resources for change include commitment to explore and realize a fuller human potential. Individuals who can invest large amounts of personal time and energy in gaining self-sufficiency and developing alternative organizations are the starting point. A key component of the necessary personal commitment is willingness to depart from traditional and popular standards of what constitutes a meaningful, successful life.

In a culture that represses efforts in that direction, the full liberation of individual creativity and consciousness is a vital source of insight and power. Individual growth experiences from encounter groups, radical therapeutic relationships, and the use of drugs, meditation, and dramatic forms help transcend the contemporary culture's boundaries of consciousness. Individuals who have attained the elements of such freedom or liberation are then able to begin collectivization of their activities through the development of consensual cultures committed to maintaining and advancing such growth. This collectivization process is reciprocal: the development of such forms provides an environment within which unliberated individuals may be helped to come to greater awareness and realization of their own potential.

The CC perspective stresses that individuals and groups concerned with change can and must develop skills that will allow them to be self-

sufficient, or nearly so. The call is to lessen dependence on the dominant culture, not only in regard to its norms and life style but also in the area of economic survival; e.g., basic agricultural and building skills are essential in developing communal social forms that can be rooted in the earth. A land ethic essential for economic independence also carries with it a critique of private property, which also has its origins in the desire to live a simpler life, one more distant from technologically overdeveloped living and working structures. The redemptive theme, so common in the CC perspective, often leads to a stress on sacred meanings of land and common humanity and of sacred symbols and forms in imagining and implementing change.

Who Is Served?—Clients and Constituencies

The PT perspective frequently claims it serves a total organization or social system. Often, however, a social system is defined by, or in terms of, the interests of its decision-makers. Typically, then, the actual constituency served is middle- or high-level executives—people in power positions who seek to alter particular policies or parts (frequently middle management or lower-level line officers) of the systems they manage.

Since many PT change agents operate from an academic base, they tend to assert value neutrality, argue in technical not political terms, and advocate standards of professional autonomy.¹⁶ They may therefore see themselves as accountable only to themselves, and not to any specific public; even their claim to represent an entire system ultimately rests on *their* interpretation of that system's common interests.

The P perspective claims it serves social system subgroups that desire a greater share of social system rewards or privileges. A group with objective interests and preferred values will ask for help in organizing a movement and in devising strategy to reallocate a system's power and social rewards. The change agent—as employee or servant—is seen as specifically accountable to that interest group, and it is assumed that other people may be working with other groups. There often is self-conscious criticism within this perspective regarding whether real service is to an oppressed group or to the broader social order. Debates over system loyalties vs. partisan commitments are more vigorous when leadership comes from outside the local community or from social, economic,

¹⁶ As Benne notes, there is often a fine line between technical and political, and “. . . the ethical dimensions of problems tend to be obscured when stated by consultants who are behavioral scientists” (Benne, 1969, p. 596).

racial, age, or sex groupings different from the oppressed constituency.¹⁷

Political change agents who elect to work directly with and for members of elite groups accept the elite as their basic constituency. Sometimes this is presented as service to a special-interest group in power, a group whose values are presumably congruent with the change agent's. Sometimes, however, it is explained in terms of a broader commitment to serve the entire social system by serving elites who will act in everybody's best interests. Obviously, this claim encounters some of the same solipsistic and partisan complexities as those advanced more subtly by members of the PT perspective.

The CC perspective claims everyone as its constituency and often refuses to categorize people. Frequently, however, its active constituents are relatively privileged persons—educated young whites, from middle class and upper middle class backgrounds, who have disengaged from traditional institutional membership. In fact, some counterculture critics regard its operations as serving ruling elites by siphoning capable leadership away from an active political challenge of the current order and into socially isolated, introspective searches for personal meaning and self-actualization.

On occasion, CC individuals and groups, or even whole movements, have sought to serve and influence wider social strata. By virtue of their attack on the American culture and economy, these groups have exerted leadership in the ecological movement and in the generation of hip cultures and life style alternatives for the not-so-young and not-so-middle class (Bookchin, 1971; Loomis, 1972; Bradford & Bradford, 1973). In a number of communities where their strength and number warrant, these groups have forged political coalitions with more mainstream political groups to exercise political power and gain office and legitimate influence. By virtue of their commitment to generate new institutions, these groups have designed and implemented alternative living and schooling structures, for example, which have now begun to be introduced into mainstream systems. Though their form may be altered, and perhaps operationalized, by consultants working from a PT perspective, their roots have often been in the counterculture.

¹⁷ A contemporary example of this debate is evident in the demands of third-world groups that leaders of change efforts in their community be from their community—geographically, ethnically, and ideologically (Karenga, 1969; Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967). Similar positions are now being debated on social research in the black community conducted by white members of the PT perspective (Billingsley, 1970; Blauner & Wellman, 1973; Merton, 1972; Thomas, 1971).

PERSPECTIVES ON POWER AND SOCIAL CHANGE: A SUMMARY

Any attempt to change social or individual systems requires the mobilization and application of some kind of social power, which we define as the capacity to influence the allocation of scarce (and valued) goods or the achievement of collective goals (Gamson, 1968). This capacity rests in the use of resources—sanctions, opportunities, material goods, etc.—to affect the behavior of a target—another person or group (Dahl, 1957). Mobilization is the process by which that power is activated, i.e., the process through which people, opportunities, sanctions, and objects become realized as resources.

As we review the way in which each of the three perspectives defines as well as uses power to bring about change, we focus on that perspective's self-consciousness about the generation and use of power, and the kinds of power utilized. Since we have already identified the stances of the three resources and constituencies, here we extend those discussions.

It is common to distinguish between coercive and noncoercive forms of power, although this distinction obviously means different things to different people. The PT perspective emphasizes a noncoercive approach, stressing the value of persuasion through trust and rational discourse. There is a concern that any power needs to be used carefully, lest it become coercive and thus constrain human freedom. Cherishing intellectual capacity and the life of the mind leads to a focus upon the evils of physical coercion, and thereby often leads to inattention to the coercive aspects or effects of dominant value systems and ideologies, to the potential tyranny of socialization expectations and informal persuasion. The CC perspective likewise rejects coercion, believing that in supportive groups an unfolding of man's true nature leads to consensus and commonality. Even persuasion is sometimes considered unnecessary: release from a divisive society may make differences less relevant than the realization of a common humanity. In this pursuit they often overlook the coercive aspects of high attention to individuals' needs and responses to others' feelings. People operating from this perspective are often very sensitive to the multiple forms of coercion or covert constraint, while those in the P perspective, top or bottom, generally appear comfortable with coercion when they feel it is needed. This latter perspective seems to assert the relativity of the distinction between coercion and noncoercion, stressing that one practitioner's noncoercion may be viewed by another practitioner, victim or target, as very coercive. The solution to

this strategic problem, for the political perspective, usually lies in the choice of the ends or goals of change, not in the question of coercive or noncoercive means of power.

We have identified the primary kind of power used by the PT perspective as the power of expertise, which refers to technical competence and is by no means to be identified with wisdom. By virtue of a common set of specialized skills and information and common training, PT change agents share a professional ideology and reference group, which, in turn, set "objective" limits on the definitions and behavior which constitute expertise.¹⁸ They most often work from an institutional locus of middle- or high-status management, but frequently without access to the pinnacle of organizational or societal power, because they are seen in staff rather than line functions, as experts in specific arenas of knowledge rather than movers of communities and organizations.¹⁹ The inability to connect consistently with cores of institutional power sometimes occurs out of sheer lack of access, lack of attractiveness, lack of forethought or planning, or out of ignorance. From a professionally trained diagnostician or planner, such ignorance or accommodation is clearly socially organized, and the benefits derived by the change agent probably are continued usage and reward by these power structures without overt commitment to the welfare of these partisan elites.

Change agents within the political perspective are more likely to stress manpower and material resources as the kinds of power required for social change. In some cases, the moral weight of the society's ideology is also seen as relevant. As we have indicated, change agents on either the top or bottom of the political structure may use very different kinds of power and have very different specific resources at their disposal.

Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) note that the mobilization of vast numbers of oppressed people represents a key resource in altering the social system, but agree that such mobilization is extremely difficult unless accompanied by resocialization or redefinition, whereby people, blacks in this instance, reclaim their history and their identity. The power of culture and ideology is seen here as one of the mechanisms by which the

¹⁸ These structures, and the accompanying class interests of professional change agents, systematically affect their provision of service (Bidwell, 1970; Friedson, 1971; Grosser, 1967; Haug & Sussman, 1969; Skrivaneck, 1972; Wagner, 1973; Wolfe, 1970).

¹⁹ On occasion, actors within this perspective may work at the very top of social systems when they form coalitions with change agents operating within an elite political perspective.

state or the society maintains its control: reversing the locus of ideology formation can turn this powerful instrument into a base of manpower mobilization.²⁰

There is seldom an assumption of consensus in the P perspective, and much of social life is seen as continual conflict for control of institutional life through the mobilization of powerful groups and the search for somewhat common interests. Persons operating from this perspective thus are quite cognizant of the workings of organizational and community power: those at the top know they and their clients want to keep it; those at the bottom know they want to get it.

The countercultural perspective typically avoids focusing on or discussing power. It emphasizes individual autonomy and self-discovery as the individual frees himself or herself from previously oppressive, constraining relationships. The CC perspective therefore calls for individuals to alter their needs and to lower their dependence on traditional sources of rewards. Although there often is inexplicitness regarding the new sets of needs and rewards which are to be put into place, some change programs do carefully plan ways for individuals to reduce their social and economic dependence on traditional structures (full-time jobs, nuclear families, public schools).²¹ When needs and rewards are so altered, many traditional social centers of power and control become inoperative; likewise, formerly effective rewards and punishments become ineffective. Small growth-oriented groups are an important and popular means of providing support for persons making this transition. Whether sensitivity or encounter is in focus, consciousness raising or rap in style, they provide important sustenance for people making changes.²²

Some elements of the countercultural perspective stretch into the political perspective and form organized political movements for change while realizing countercultural values. Where this has been attempted, political expression has run the gamut from electoral change to nonviolent

²⁰ This point, and the consequent need to generate new cultural and ideological symbols, is discussed in detail by Cox (1973), Etzioni (1968, Chapters 6-10), Lifton (1973).

²¹ Open marriages (Constantine & Constantine, 1970; O'Neill & O'Neill, 1972; Rimmer, 1971; 1973), communal neighborhoods and living arrangements (Fairfield, 1972; Kanter, 1972; Kinkade, 1973), and free schools (Kozol, 1972; Rasberry & Greenway, 1970) represent examples of this approach to combatting old forms and to mobilizing new forms of social power to model social reform.

²² Note that small-group work, like some other tactics, is used within all three perspectives—for different reasons with different assumptions, goals, and methods.

FIGURE 2.
Power and Social Change

Issue	Professional- Technical	Political	Counter- cultural
Constituencies/ Clients	Accepted system leaders who state need for help Middle-management staffs Total system	Members of elite groups Members of oppressed groups Groups congruent with one's own values	Everyone White, affluent, young
Resources	Information substantive procedural Trust Money	Person power Organization through mass mobilization or legitimate office and rules Symbols and ideology Money and material goods	Human potential and commitment Consensual culture and alternative systems Land Skills in working a new life style
Roles	Expert Facilitator	Citizen-actor Agitator or manager	Actor—self New being living out the changed life style
Institutional base	Universities or similar agencies Outsider to system	Legitimate office Staff aid Indigenous community agency Social movement or emergent collectivity	Alternative living-learning- working system Supportive "rap-growth" group

direct action campaigns.²³ Such efforts have necessitated a more explicit treatment of power and its dynamics than is generally characteristic of the countercultural perspective. CC members bring to political action an insistence on an immediate realization of objectives and a pressure for humane and open tactics. Clearly this sets up strong tensions within political action groups and creates strain among CC members as well. The attempt both to use and to avoid power represents a schizophrenia that generally prevents effective political action of this sort to date.

As the summary in Figure 2 indicates, the three perspectives view issues in social power and social change quite differently, in keeping with their diverse values and their conceptions of the nature of social reality and the character of our contemporary society (summarized in Figure 1).

Some change agents pursue their work with fairly coherent and integrated visions of their values and goals. Some do not. When unaware of the roots of their orientation, change agents are hampered in the development of strategies and tactics that truly reflect cherished beliefs, and their skills may be used in ways that oppose those values. Failure to be

²³ When actors from the countercultural perspective engage in coalitions with change agents from the political perspective it is usually with persons at or working at the bottom of social power systems. This is a coalition very different from that often developed between elites in the political system and change agents from the professional-technical perspective.

clear about social power, its bases and resources, and the constituencies available to challenge them predestines the failure of any attempt to reallocate key resources or alter established patterns of control.

REFERENCES

- Alinsky, S. *Reveille for radicals*. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Anderson, B., et al. (Eds.) *Working loose*. San Francisco: American Friends Service Committee, 1971.
- Argyris, C. *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962.
- Argyris, C. *Intervention theory and method*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Balbus, I. D. The concept of interest in pluralist and Marxian analysis. *Politics and Society*, 1971, 1 (2), 151-177.
- Benne, K. D. Some ethical problems in group and organizational consultation. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change*, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969. Pp. 595-604.
- Bennett, H. *No more public school*. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Bennis, W., Benne, K., & Chin R. *The planning of change*, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Bidwell, C. Students and schools: Some observations on client trust in client serving organizations. In M. Lefton and W. Rosengren (Eds.), *Organizations and clients*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970. Pp. 37-70.
- Billingsley, A. Black families and white social science. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1970, 26, 127-142.
- Blauner, R. *Racial oppression in America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Blauner, R., & Wellman, D. Toward the decolonization of social research. In J. Ladner (Ed.), *The death of white sociology*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- Bookchin, M., & Ecology Action East. *Ecology and revolutionary thought*. New York: Times Change Press, 1971.
- Bradford, D., & Bradford, E. A model of a middle class commune. *Communities*, 1973, 1.
- Bradley, M., Danchik, L., Fager, M., & Wodetzki, T. *Unbecoming men: A men's consciousness raising group writes on oppression and themselves*. New York: Times Change Press, 1971.
- Brager, G. A. The low-income nonprofessional. In G. Brager and F. Purcell (Eds.), *Community action against poverty*. New Haven: College and University Press, 1967. Pp. 163-174.
- Buber, M. *Paths in Utopia*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.
- Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Chin, R., & Benne, K. General strategies for effecting change in human systems. In W. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change*, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969. Pp. 32-59.
- Cloward, R., & Piven, F. *Regulating the poor: The functions of public welfare*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1971.
- Coleman, J. S. Conflicting theories of social change. In G. Zaltman (Ed.), *Processes and phenomena of social change*. New York: John Wiley, 1973. Pp. 61-74.
- Constantine, L., & Constantine, J. Where is marriage going? *The Futurist*, April 1970, pp. 44-46.
- Coser, L. *Continuities in the study of social conflict*. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Costello, T. Change in municipal government: A view from inside. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1971, 7, 131-145.
- Cox, H. *Seduction of the spirit*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- Dahl, R. A. The concept of power. *Behavioral Science*, 1957, 2, 201-218.

- Dahl, R. A. *Pluralist democracy in the U.S.: Conflict and consent*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- Dahrendorf, R. *Class and class conflict in industrial society*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Press, 1959.
- Davis, S. A. An organic problem-solving method of organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1967, 3, 3-21.
- Durkheim, E. *The division of labor in society*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949.
- Etzioni, A. *The active society*. New York: Free Press, 1968.
- Fairfield, R. *Communes, U.S.A.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Fanon, F. *Wretched of the earth*. New York: Evergreen, 1966.
- Freire, P. A conversation with Paulo Freire. *Perspectives on development and social change*, 1, 9, n.d.
- Friedson, E. Professionalism: The doctor's dilemma. *Social Policy*, Jan.-Feb. 1971, pp. 35-40.
- Fromm, E. *Man for himself*. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1947.
- Fromm, E. *Sane society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.
- Gamson, W. *Power and discontent*. Homewood, Ill., Dorsey Press, 1968.
- Grosser, C. F. Class orientation of the indigenous staff. In G. Brager and F. Purcell (Eds.), *Community action against poverty*. New Haven: College and University Press, 1967. Pp. 208-216.
- Haug, M., & Sussman, M. Professional autonomy and the revolt of the client. *Social Problems*, 1969, 17, 153-161.
- Havelock, R. G. *The change agents' guide to innovation in education*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
- Hornstein, H., et al. *Social intervention*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- Iyengar, B. K. *Light on yoga*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Jacques, E. *The changing culture of a factory*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1951.
- Jones, G. N. Strategies and tactics of planned organizational change. *Human Organization*, 1965, 24 (3), 192-200.
- Jordan, W. *White over black American attitudes toward the Negro 1550-1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Kahn, S. *How people get power*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Kanter, R. M. *Commitment and community*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Karenga, R. The black community and the university: A community organizer's perspective. In A. L. Robinson et al. (Eds.), *Black studies in the university: A symposium*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1969. Pp. 39-55.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Kinkade, K. *A Walden Two experiment: The first five years of Twin Oaks community*. New York: William Morrow, 1973.
- Kozol, J. *Free schools*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972.
- Krichbaum, D. Masculinity and racism. To appear in R. Terry and N. Sander (Eds.), In pursuit of white liberation. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, Fall 1974.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. *Organization and environment*. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1967.
- Lenin, V. *What is to be done*. New York: International Publishers, 1943.
- Lifton, R. The struggle for cultural rebirth. *Harpers*, April 1973, pp. 84-90.
- Likert, R. *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. *The dynamics of planned change*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1958.
- Loomis, M. *Go ahead and live*. New Canaan, Conn.: Keats, 1972.
- Machiavelli, N. *The prince*. New York: Mentor, 1957.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. *Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Merton, R. Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. In *Varieties of political expression in sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972. Pp. 9-47.

- Nearing, S., & Nearing, H. *Living the good life*. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.
- Olmusk, K. E. Seven pure strategies of change. In J. W. Pfeiffer and J. E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1972 annual handbook for group facilitators*. Iowa City: University Associates, 1972. Pp. 163-172.
- O'Neill, N., & O'Neill, G. *Open marriage: A new lifestyle for couples*. New York: Avon, 1972.
- Parsons, T. *The social system*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.
- Peslikis, I. Resistances to consciousness. In R. Morgan (Ed.), *Sisterhood is powerful*. New York: Vintage, 1970. Pp. 337-339.
- Raspberry, S., & Greenway, R. *Raspberry exercises: How to start your own school and make a book*. Albion, Calif.: Freestone Publishing Co., 1970.
- Rhea, B. Institutional paternalism in high schools. *The Urban Review*, February 1968, 34, 13-15.
- Rimmer, R. (Ed.) *You and I: Searching for tomorrow*. New York: New American Library, 1971.
- Rimmer, R. (Ed.) *Adventures in loving*. New York: New American Library, 1973.
- Rodale, R. *The basic book of organic gardening*. New York: Ballentine Books, 1971.
- Rogers, E., & Shoemaker, F. *Communication of innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- Rothman, J. Three models of community organization practice. In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman, and J. Tropman (Eds.), *Strategies of community organization*. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Publishers, 1970. Pp. 20-36.
- Schein, E. *Process consultation: Its role in organizational development*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Schiffman, M. *Self therapy: Techniques for personal growth*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Self Therapy Press, 1967.
- Schutz, W. *Here comes everybody*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Shapiro, D. On psychological liberation. *Social Policy*, 1972, 3, 9-15.
- Skrivanek, K. V. Contemporary 'isms.' *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 1972, 46 (1), 136-141.
- Slater, P. *The pursuit of loneliness: American culture at the breaking point*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- Sofer, C. The assessment of organizational change. *Journal of Management Studies* (G.B.), 1964, 1, 128-142.
- Steiner, C. Cooperation. *Communities*, 1973-74, 6, 40-46.
- Swann, R. S., et al. *The community land trust*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Community Economic Development, 1972.
- Terry, R. W. *For whites only*. Detroit: Detroit Industrial Mission, 1970.
- Thomas, C. (Ed.) *Boys no more: A black psychologist's view of community*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1971.
- Wagner, E. J. Political action for social change. *Child Welfare*, June 1973, 52 (6), 344-349.
- Warren, R. *Truth, love and social change*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971.
- Watson, G. Resistance to change. In G. Watson (Ed.), *Concepts for social change*. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1966.
- Weber, M. *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1930.
- Wigginton, E. *Foxfire one*. New York: Doubleday, 1972.
- Wolfe, A. The perils of professionalism. *Change*, Sept.-Oct. 1970, pp. 51-54.
- Women: *A Journal of Liberation*. Consciousness-raising. *Women: A Journal . . .*, 1972, 2, 18-21.
- Zetterberg, H. *Social theory and social practice*. Towata, N.J.: Bedminster Press, 1962.