



KAPPA OMICRON NU FORUM

Volume 8, Number 2 Fall, 1995

4990 Northwind Drive, Suite 140
East Lansing, MI 48823-5031

EDITOR

Dorothy I. Mitstifer

GUEST EDITOR

Yvonne S. Gentzler
University of Maryland

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Sharon K. Nickols, *Chair*
University of Georgia

Karen G. Arms
*University of Connecticut-
Stamford*

Wilma P. Griffin
Baylor University

Francine Hultgren
University of Maryland

James D. Moran, III
*University of Tennessee-
Knoxville*

Gwendolyn Newkirk
Lincoln, Nebraska

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHAIR

Carol E. Avery
Florida State University

CHAIR-ELECT

Anne M. Weiner
*Central Missouri State
University*

VICE CHAIR/PROGRAM

Carol B. Meeks
University of Georgia

VICE CHAIR/FINANCE

Julia M. Dinkins
USDA

SECRETARY

Ann Vail
University of Idaho

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Elizabeth A. DeMerchant
Virginia Tech

Scott Ketring
Brigham Young University

Jill N. Robinson
University of Arizona

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dorothy I. Mitstifer
East Lansing, Michigan

*Official Publication of Kappa Omicron
Nu, Inc., National Honor Society—
Member, Association of College
Honor Societies. Copyright 1995.
Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM is a
refereed semi-annual publication
serving the profession of family and
consumer sciences. The opinions
expressed by authors are their own
and do not necessarily reflect the
policies of the society.*

Contents

Guest Editor's Message	2
<i>Yvonne S. Gentzler</i>	
Call for Papers	5
The Concept of Community	7
<i>Marjorie M. Brown</i>	
Transformative Professional Practice: Overcoming Ambivalence, Building Community	21
<i>Edith E. Baldwin</i>	
Community: What are the Factors that Make it Possible?	39
<i>Paula R. King</i>	
Building Professional Learning Communities: Ohio's Teacher-Leader Institute Model	47
<i>Janet F. Laster Heather Boggs</i>	
Building a Sustainable Profession	57
<i>Elizabeth A. DeMerchant Leslie Y. Johnson</i>	
Editor's Message	64
<i>Dorothy I. Mitstifer</i>	



Guest Editor's Message

Yvonne S. Gentzler

As a small child I wondered why most of the otherwise knowledgeable accomplished adults who surrounded me seemed to have almost no idea about how to live a satisfying life. It was clear to me that the answer wasn't money or power but the ability to control and enjoy one's experience. (Csikszentmihaly, 1990)

This issue of *FORUM* is designed to explore the concept of community building and how it can be fostered to enable people to "control and enjoy one's experience." Human society, especially in the United States, is increasingly segmented. Individuals and families regularly find that they are identified and differentiated by age, race, religion, social class, or by educational, mental, and physical ability rather than as individuals with real values and goals. Although many identifiers have evolved as a result of community and societal attempts to address various unmet needs, the unintended consequences are separation and/or disconnection.

From its earliest days the stated mission of the profession, which has come to be known as Family and Consumer Sciences, has focused on the well-being of individuals and families in community settings. Despite significant changes in emphasis as a response to dramatic societal developments, the profession as a whole has maintained an intention to address a common body of knowledge generally oriented to a better understanding of how to benefit from and enjoy life in families and in communities. This need to synthesize and evaluate new knowledge is continuously and endlessly challenging. Specifically, the role of a professional organization involves efforts to enhance communication between and among individuals who represent diverse units which make up the complex components of a field. This publication represents one effort to clarify issues and roles that are of fundamental concern to the profession as well as the Association known as Family and Consumer Sciences.

Brown suggests a theory explaining the significance of the sociocultural world in her article "The Concept of Community." Her theory shows how culture, society, and personality are interrelated and how each is manifested in human affairs. She advocates examining the meaning of a body of people.

What do those people, along with their interests, hold in common? Is there a common character? What, then, is the nature of joint participation within a community? Looking through Brown's lenses helps us to define and understand the nature of community.

Baldwin, in "Transformative Professional Practice: Overcoming Ambivalence, Building Community," explores ambivalence and the consequences individualism plays in the disintegration of community. She develops a case that family and consumer scientists could foster democratic participation to nurture human autonomy and healthy family life. Thus, she suggests that through grassroots communities, family and consumer scientists can generate a family rights movement involving the profession in the political struggle toward human freedom.

Once the issues in both the Brown and Baldwin articles are explored and debated it seemed natural to follow with a paper that explicates factors central to making community possible. King wrestles with these issues in "Community: What are the Factors that Make it Possible?" She contends that social interaction, common ties, and geographic location are three elements necessary to the successful functioning of groups and ultimately the building of community.

Another aspect of community building is accomplished through establishing systems of action or models. Laster and Boggs describe a conceptual model that emphasizes the transformation of teachers in their article, "Building Professional Learning Communities: Ohio's Work and Family Life Teacher-Leader Institute." The integration of specific skills such as critical learning methods, team building, peer teaching, action research, and critical moral reflection are described as part of this model.

In "Building a Sustainable Profession," DeMerchant and Johnson stress the importance of maintaining professional community in order to collaborate with other groups in fulfilling our mission. Examples are drawn from housing and provide ways in which family and consumer scientists can integrate knowledge and expertise to work with other disciplines to improve the human condition and ultimately build community.

Each paper in this issue of *FORUM* addresses *building community* from a different perspective. Each informs the

“
... building
community
contributes to
the struggle of
producing a
more promising
tomorrow.”

**Dr. Gentzler is
Assistant
Professor,
Department of
Curriculum and
Instruction,
University of
Maryland.**



debate and contributes to the dialogue needed for dealing intelligently with our evolving professional self-concept. In essence, building community contributes to the struggle of producing a more promising tomorrow. Derived from the mission of family and consumer sciences, this professional vision instills hope in those whom we serve. As such, we become leaders in efforts to improve the quality of life. Kouzes and Posner (1993) asserted, "Credible leaders demonstrate their faith and confidence by first accepting responsibility for the quality of their lives and for those of their constituents" (p. 221). The articles herein provide evidence that family and consumer sciences professionals are wrestling with the ideas, concepts, and consequences of building community. We recognize that to attain our professional mission, we must first conceptualize a vision of what the quality of living *could* be like for individuals and families. Further, we sustain hope in our collective struggle by encouraging our constituents to share that vision, recognizing that working together creates a greater possibility of attaining our professional aspirations. Thus, we continue in our efforts to fulfill our professional mission by envisioning a better life through building community. ❧

References

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). Flow. In W. Gallagher. *Power of place* (p. 1). New York: Harper/Perennial.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Call for Papers

for publishing in
Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM
the journal of Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society

Topic—Making Community

Dr. Yvonne S. Gentzler, Guest Editor

Objective: This issue of *FORUM* will give attention to exemplary programs, models, and action plans which reinforce our understanding of community as an essential component of civilized life.

Overview: The gratifying response to the first call for papers on the topic *building community* has encouraged *FORUM* editors to invite additional discussion of this compelling issue. It is particularly important that authors read Volume 8, No. 2, *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM* in order that papers extend and/or expand on the discussion.

Discussion: As summarized by Baldwin in the above publication, "The profound importance of interrelationship and interdependence is increasingly evident in today's world, and the need for community is apparent in both international and domestic spheres. Widespread participation in public dialogue and collective action is at the core of healthy community and strong democracy, and ideally the individual and family contribute to and benefit from such participation."

She argues that family and consumer scientists who are concerned about the human condition should (a) help people to understand the destructive consequences of individualism and social fragmentation; (b) promote and become involved in building community both within our own profession and in the wider society; and (c) transform social conditions which have a negative impact on family life through the formation of a family rights movement, thereby involving the profession in the wider emancipative struggle toward human freedom.

Recognizing that "involvement in public life can be difficult and demanding," Baldwin concludes her argument by claiming that "if we can promote the idea that private and public life are complementary in that they interact dialectically to help develop and sustain each other, we may overcome ambivalence and build community."

Information and Deadline: *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM* is a refereed publication outlet for both members and nonmembers. Manuscripts are due July 30, 1996. For further information or to obtain a copy of "Guidelines for Authors," contact—

Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM
4990 Northwind Drive, Suite 140
East Lansing, MI 48823-5031
Telephone: (517) 351-8335; Facsimile: (517) 351-8336



The Concept of Community

Marjorie M. Brown

In order to clarify the rationale for the characteristics of community, a theory is presented to explain the significance of the sociocultural world. This theory shows how the components of the lifeworld (culture, society, and personality) are interrelated and the roles they play in human affairs. From this theory and the existing conventional uses, the concept of community is examined.

The meaning of the term *community* is sanctioned by established linguistic conventions. Logically, it is possible to ignore these conventions but when we do so, communication breaks down. An ordinary English dictionary defines community in terms such as a body of people having common organization and interest, joint participation, and a common character. The term community shares a Latin root with other terms, e.g., communal, communication, commonness, and common sense, indicating a relationship among them (Partridge, 1959, pp. 112-113). In examining the concept of community here, the intent is not to offer a new definition but to attempt to remove ambiguities in it. What is meant by a body of people? What organization and interests does this body hold in common? What is the nature of joint participation in a community? What is its common character?

In addressing questions such as the above, we arrive at a description of community. The characteristics which describe community serve as multiple criteria by which we identify a social organization which is a community. These characteristics or criteria are embedded in a conceptual framework which gives attention to the individual who is part of a community and to the social-cultural world in which she lives. We need to make explicit the theoretical orientation we bring to conceptualizing community. Here I have drawn from a number of theoretical perspectives which are synthesized in Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action* (1984, 1987).

The Individual and the Social-Cultural World

There are different positions to take in conceptualizing the individual. There are those who hold that the individual is molded by the sociocultural world as a supraindividual force.

*Dr. Brown is
Professor
Emerita,
University of
Minnesota.*



This view is rejected here in according a more creative role to the human being and the possibility of autonomy or self-determination in participating in collective life. Another view commonly held is that the individual is born free and autonomous, self-formed, self-contained, independent of the society and the culture in which she lives. This view also is rejected here in recognizing both that (a) the individual *develops* the self in the process of communicative interaction with others, and (b) the development of autonomy and individuality is dependent upon the patterns of social relationships and cultural practices in that interaction.

In each society, life is made possible by certain patterns of ideas and values by which members interpret objects, situations, and events as well as the symbols by which they communicate. Serving as a stock of knowledge, shared however imperfectly, reciprocal expectations in speech and action are made possible. These patterns of ideas and values (the lifeworld) are reproduced through communicative interaction in which language plays a central role.

There have been different theoretical analyses of the sociocultural lifeworld. Some place emphasis on the role of culturally transmitted knowledge, e.g., Schutz & Luckmann (1973). Others place emphasis on the lifeworld as consisting of the social institutions by which social organizations are ordered in a society, e.g., Parsons (1960). Still others conceive of the lifeworld as the socialization of individuals (i.e., as social-psychological process in the formation of personality), e.g., interaction theorists. Here I have chosen a theoretical analysis which is more comprehensive in that culture, society, and personality are all considered interrelated components of the lifeworld (Habermas, 1987). This theoretical approach also draws upon the role of communication as upheld by Dewey (1927), Mead (1934), and Habermas (1984, 1987). According to this theoretical approach, participants in the sociocultural world draw upon cultural traditions for ideas and values. However, at the same time they are members of social groups where there are patterns of interpersonal relationships and of norms regulating rights and obligations, powers, and responsibilities. Through socialization by competent adults in a group, children learn cultural traditions and internalize the norms of interpersonal relations upheld in the group (Habermas, 1987, p. 137).

Culture

Culture has been defined by Geertz (1973) as “inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life” (p. 89). As inherited conceptions, such knowledge is transmitted as cultural traditions which have been examined and worked at over generations. Traditions of the culture serve as *valid knowledge* to provide meaning by which members of a society reach understanding of their world. Thus, traditions are more than mere custom whose significance is forgotten. Cultural traditions include conceptions by which we come to understand certain ideas (including certain basic moral ideas), certain symbols (e.g., linguistic, behavioral, religious), certain ways of validating beliefs (e.g., argumentation procedures), certain intellectual attitudes (e.g., reasoned dissent).

Cultural tradition assures a cohesiveness to social life in that it provides common interpretations to participants in interaction. Cultural tradition also serves as authority by which beliefs and norms are judged for their validity. Arendt (1961) has distinguished between authority and authoritarianism: “Since authority always demands obedience, it is commonly mistaken for some form of power or violence. Yet authority precludes the use of external means of coercion; where force is used authority itself has failed” (pp. 92-93).

The anti-tradition position which rejects the role of cultural traditions in individual and social life amounts, as Bowers (1987) points out, to baseless new beginnings. We would have a new language unlinked to the old, a new basis for technology unrelated to empirical science, new morals unconnected to traditional basic moral ideas. Nichols (1977) refers to ignoring cultural traditions as playing the part of a buffoon. Without the memory provided by cultural traditions, mistakes of the past are repeated, and efforts at innovation are stumbling in that they lack direction.

To draw upon cultural traditions is not to be tradition-bound or traditionalistic. Lasch (1988) refers to our relationship with cultural tradition as “a conversational relationship with the past, one that seeks neither to deny the past nor to achieve an imaginative restoration of the past but to enter into a dialogue with the traditions that still shape our view of the world, often



in ways in which we are not even aware” (p. 178). This means that in considering cultural traditions, we simply recognize how our present interpretations are influenced by the past. Traditionalism, however, is reactionary and authoritarian, concerned with forcing present circumstances into patterns of the past and foreclosing both innovation and reconsideration of our interpretations.

Cultural traditions are used, renewed, and transmitted in social groups. Sometimes transmitted as taken-for-granted knowledge, a particular tradition may, on the other hand, be explicitly transmitted and explained rationally. Similarly, a particular tradition may be explicitly critiqued and reaccepted, revised, or abandoned altogether in light of new knowledge and other accepted traditions.

Society

Society is made up of a variety of social groups or organizations recognized as legitimate and through which members “regulate their memberships . . . and thereby secure solidarity” (Habermas, 1987, p. 138). There are immediate groups such as the family, friendship groups, and work groups. However, there are collective forms of life which go beyond the immediate group, e.g., political, legal, economic.

Although renewal and critique of cultural traditions go on in social groups, members at the same time regulate interpersonal relations through norms. The group develops a group identity, i.e., a collective consciousness which defines the circle of those in the same group. Members of the group refer to themselves as we. This collective identity is not purely descriptive but is normative in that it embraces the norms of the group with respect to interpersonal relations. Collective identity of the group is reflected in the personal identity of the individual member. The process of socialization of members, however, has a double structure in that it both develops solidarity in collective identity and promotes individuation of each member. The norms of the group are not accepted because they are connected with sanctions which would force submission; rather, they are accepted as obligations recognized as having moral authority. Linguistic communication serves in a mediating role in the group to clarify and legitimate norms. In this communication, members draw upon cultural traditions, e.g., basic moral ideas (such as justice, freedom, responsibility) and a mode of argumentation by which norms are validated.

Shared activity in the group as social practice is engaged in as a “coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity” which is undertaken because of goods or values inherent in the activity itself rather than as a means to an end (MacIntyre, 1984, p. 187). Thus, the *norm-orientation* of practice in integrated social groups differs from the *goal-orientation* of special interest groups formed in pursuit of self-interest.

Activities of a socially integrated group, i.e. one with solidarity, are coordinated through rational agreement of its members. This agreement on activities may occur in either of two ways: (a) the activity is consistent with norms of the group or (b) agreement regarding the activity itself is reached through communication. A group in which agreement on activities cannot be reached without violence or coercion loses its solidarity.

Just as society is not a mere collection of individuals, neither is it a random collection of social organizations. Society has a structure, i.e., an order, by which various forms of social life are organized. Although groups’ norms of interpersonal relations drawing upon the culture contribute to the lifeworld, this stock of shared patterns of beliefs and values is influenced also by social institutions. These social institutions publicly delineate the order by which social life is organized and understood. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton (1991) define a social institution as “a particular historical pattern of rights and duties, of powers and responsibilities, that make it a major force in our lives” (p. 11). Each social organization (e.g., the family, the state, the economy, education) is institutionalized in society according to a pattern of ideas with publicly binding sanctions and authority which serve to identify and regulate the particular social organization. For example, the family is institutionalized with certain value-laden conceptions of its obligations and powers. However, the family may be institutionalized differently (i.e., with different normative conceptions of its powers and responsibilities) in various societies or in the same society at different points in history.

Although the culture provides interpretive schemes to the lifeworld and society provides norms for regulating social life, individual personality is also a component of the sociocultural lifeworld.

Personality

By personality is meant the competences which make a human subject capable of interaction in communication to reach

“
...culture
provides
interpretive
schemes to the
lifeworld... ”



mutual understanding, of interpretation based on meanings in the culture, and of responsibility in speaking and acting according to norms. Through developments of these competences, the subject expresses her personal identity. In the development of human capabilities, there are two aspects of ego identity of concern: self-determination (autonomy) and self-realization.

Autonomy does not refer to a negative independence from others but it does mean that the individual is not subordinated to social and cultural forces. The position that communication theory takes on the individual as a social-cultural being rejects giving a *central* role to isolated individual reflection. However, in participating in her sociocultural world, the individual has self-respect only when she arrives at her own ideas rationally rather than being forced to conform to prevailing ideas or custom and tradition. This means that she is free to question the ideas of others, as well as custom and tradition, without fear of sanctions. Further, although she can defend her own ideas with reasons, she is open to the same questioning of her own views and her reasons. In the process of reaching beyond immediate social roles and customs and provincial knowledge, the individual comes to see herself as part of a universal framework. Thus, with the aid of universal principles which go beyond the immediate group, there are times when the individual can preserve her self-respect only by acting in moral opposition to other participants in her group. Thus, there is an appeal to the larger community as well as to the larger self.

Development of self-realization is oriented toward what Mead (1964) has called "(t)hat capacity for exhibiting one's own peculiarities . . . that which individualizes him" (p. 326). Feelings of self-worth (which are subjective) develop in confirmation of the individual's own special talents or personal qualities. Although this confirmation may come from others, it is realized also by the individual through her own autonomous action: she realizes her own sense of accomplishment as an individual competence or quality. This is an expression of the "I" which differs from the "me" in the process of socialization. Both dimensions are important in the development of personal identity.

Ego identity is stabilized in the ability to be consistent in facing the conditions of recognition "in the face of incompatible role expectations and in passing through a succession of contradictory role systems" (Habermas, 1987, p. 98). Thus, the growing child begins to develop self-determination and self-

realization as she participates in her groups which present a series of incompatible role expectations over time. The adult's ego identity proves itself in the ability to build new identities out of previous ones and to integrate the new and the old in the individual's life history.

Individual personality draws upon the culture for meanings which provide interpretive orientation to the world. This dependence on the culture is met through the individual's participation in social groups where socialization patterns and education occur. Adult personality uses and renews cultural traditions through child rearing practices and education. Individual personality is formed in learning the norms of social groups through communication; thereby action is motivated by norms rather than self-interested goals. Interactive competences are developed. However, as an adult, these competences enrich the interaction within social groups with respect to renewal of cultural traditions and the critique of norms (including those of social institutions).

Criteria for the Concept of Community

From the above conceptual framework outlining the relations among the culture, society, and individual personality and in light of linguistic conventions, we can arrive at certain interrelated characteristics of community.

1. Community as a *body* of people having *common organization and interests* implies interdependence and solidarity. There are several characteristics which contribute to interdependence and solidarity.
 - a. A community shares or comes to agree upon common meanings as moral understandings and commitments. As a social organization, it is concerned for the public good, i.e., the good of the whole community or all who are affected by the life and decisions of the community. Thus, a community is not merely a collection of individuals who are brought together geographically or on some other chance basis of association. Nor is a community a special interest (or self-interest) group; here the purpose(s) of the group are private interests and not concerned with the general or public good.

The community's concern for the public good and adjustment of conditions, activities, and structures accordingly also points up shortcomings in the nostalgic conception of the small neighborhood community. The conception of community as a small face-to-face association meeting under

“

. . . *society provides norms for regulating social life . . .*

”

“

Individual personality draws upon the culture for meanings which provide interpretive orientation to the world.

”



one roof is upheld by some. Nostalgic for the conditions of a century or more ago, such a conception ignores the larger structure of interrelationships in the modern world. Dewey (1927) writes of the need to enlarge community by infusing the principles of democracy in public consciousness throughout society. Bellah et al.(1991) argue the need to generate democratic community as the Good Society. Although the small face-to-face community remains important, Pitkin and Shumer (1982) point out that “one single assembly of all [citizens] is not essential to democracy” (p. 50). There are forms of organization and styles of leadership that sustain public participation of people in activities that enlighten their decision making about national and world concerns (p. 51). Interaction between the local community and the national community is an example of both more enlightening and more active participation than mere voting, protest, or polling.

Interdependence and concern for the public good in a community introduces a reciprocal vulnerability in its members. This is a vulnerability that calls for the community’s guaranty of the preservation of individual integrity and an appropriate net of interpersonal relations and mutual recognition in which individuals form and maintain their identities. Thus, purposes of the community extend to protection of individual integrity and fostering the development of identity and personal excellences of all its members. Desirable human life and a healthy social order provide for the development of autonomy or self-determination as well as self-realization in particular excellences in the individual. This is done in the community, not for certain individuals but for all.

- b. A community’s solidarity rests on participatory involvement of its members. A community, as a collective, takes on form and meaning through public discourse in which members are participants. The formation of public opinion on which the community’s decisions are based is dependent on this participatory involvement. Because the *form* of this participation is so important, more will be said about it below.
- c. Because solidarity in the community rests heavily on public discourse, participants must share a language to participate in communication (Bowers, 1987). It is through language in communication that otherwise self-enclosed individuals become a community; through language they come to understand one another, to examine publicly situations that are faced, and to evaluate proposed decisions in the interest of the general good.

- d. Solidarity in a society also is built upon a shared stock of knowledge: both cultural traditions and social institutions. Such knowledge provides the conceptual foundation for competence in communication. Although knowledge of cultural traditions and social institutions is likely to be shared imperfectly, the community makes a deliberate effort to bring relevant knowledge to bear in understanding and decision making in concrete situations.

- 2. The *form* of participation identifies a community: a public sphere of communication where moral questions and other concerns are deliberated rationally rather than relegated to private life (Lasch, 1988). This formulates the concept of community politically in that it takes a political position on the form of organization and of leadership considered necessary for a community. Although a community is characterized by solidarity, this does not mean that its members do not have diverse opinions and talents. Public life, however, can nurture diversity, but at the same time the community’s leadership and procedural organization can bring diverse views into rational deliberation. In contemporary life, there are conflicting views about a way of life, including the morality of certain social institutions and norms. An apolitical or neutral concept of community provides no way by which these conflicts can be publicly resolved. Individuals are left to work out moral principles on their own and public life is devoid of moral content. Yet, as already pointed out, a community’s solidarity is dependent on the moral understandings and commitments publicly agreed upon. Furthermore, the community is concerned with protecting personal integrity of individuals and promoting development of personal excellences. The form and practices of participation in community must serve these interests.

- a. Participation in the community is in the form of rational discourse which fosters insight and a reasoned mode of resolving differences. Discourse consists of argumentation in which any participant who makes a claim to truth or rightness gives reasons to support that claim, and other participants agree or disagree with the claim and reasons given and provide reasons for agreeing or disagreeing. The procedure is a cooperative one: what is not understood is questioned for clarification; taken-for-granted beliefs are made explicit; assumptions are critically examined; the right of other participants to state their views and make criticism is recognized; the argument is kept on the issue; and uncoerced agreement is sought on the most rationally convincing argument. What is true or right is not true or right because it is agreed upon; rather what is agreed upon is true or right because participants are rationally convinced of its truth or rightness.

Concept of Community

Criterion 1—

“

... common organization and interests ...

”

Criterion 2—

“

... form of participation ... a public sphere of communication where moral questions and other concerns are deliberated rationally ...

”

Criterion 3—

“

... The public interest [rests] ... on a moral perspective ...

”



Deliberation is rationally motivated in that participants jointly seek what is true or right rather than seek to have one's own view prevail. Watt (1975) refers to the principles underlying the practices of formation of rational public opinion: "commitment to them is rationally inescapable because they must, logically, be assumed if one is to engage in a mode of thought essential to any rational human life" (p. 40). In referring to discourse in a community where there is a specific conflict, Mead (1964) writes: "*Rational procedure* . . . sets up an order within which thought operates. . . . It sets up an ideal world, not of substantive things, but of proper method" (p. 405). Two conditions prevail in public discourse: impartiality and the expectation that participants will transcend their original views (Habermas, 1990).

Certain standards or norms govern participation in public rational discourse: equality, freedom, and responsibility.

- b. Equality is defined as equal opportunity to participate in the community's decision making. Fox and Lears (1983) refer to equal opportunity in public participation as having equal "access to knowledge, to the means of decision making, to the means of communally grounded fulfillment" (p. 249). Equal access to knowledge provides a basis for equal enlightenment regarding the issue discussed. Otherwise, even with access to decision making, decisions are made without being sufficiently competent conceptually and informationally. Of course, knowledge pertaining to the issue can and should be shared and explored in communication among participants. This is central to public opinion formation. But the implications can be interpreted in more far-reaching terms, e.g., equality of opportunity for education.

Equality of access to the means of decision making takes place when all citizens can enter into the process of public opinion formation. Thus, the process does not exclude people on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, income level, education level, or other discriminatory exclusions. (It is to be remembered that the process of decision making as public opinion formation differs from merely voting on an issue. Democratic participation in decision making differs from purely individual decision making.) A community calls upon the contributions and the rational participation of persons with diverse backgrounds, and the participation of all is valued positively.

Equal access to the means of communally grounded fulfillment refers to the satisfactions derived in communal decision-making. There is a sense of belonging to the community and of satisfaction in having participated in the communal process. But it also means that, having had opportunity to

express one's own needs and to understand the needs of others, there is moral fulfillment that justice is done for the larger community in the communal decision.

From the above explanation of equality as political and moral equality, it is clear that equality is not defined in terms upheld by competitive special interest groups: equal opportunity to make one's own interests prevail.

- c. Freedom as a standard for public participation is conceived as having two dimensions: internal and external. Defining freedom as doing as one pleases limits freedom to certain external dimensions as absence of restraint. There can be internal constraints on freedom in decision making and action: ignorance, compulsiveness, lack of critical reflection about one's own beliefs, lack of standards for sound judgment, habit. Internal freedom exists as these constraints are removed, i.e., as the character or disposition of the person is transformed. External constraints on freedom to choose reflectively and act according to those choices occurs through social intervention or control. These constraints may come from within the group in the form of manipulation, ridicule, or force. However, external constraints may come from broader social sources (e.g., morally faulty social institutions) and even be hidden forms of constraint. These may be social institutions that are oppressive, e.g., in the distortion of political participation as mere voting or economic institutions which value only the monetary value of work. External constraints may lie in certain power structures in society which seek to prevent rational public opinion formation. Freedom in participating in rational public discourse exists when there is both internal freedom and external freedom.
- d. Equality and freedom in public discourse are balanced by responsibility. In the communicative rationality of participating in community, responsibility means orienting one's actions to claims of truth, rightness, and truthfulness that are criticizable. That is, the participant is rationally motivated toward the critical examination of claims that are made and the reasons supporting or negating them. There is in this orientation a recognition of one's own fallibility as well as that of others and an openness to considering opinions other than one's own. Thus, responsibility leads to effort in developing communicative competence. This entails holding oneself and others accountable in knowledge and in reason, in knowing what one does and the reasons for doing it. Such responsibility requires looking beneath surface interpretations of what one does to possible unintended meanings and consequences.

There is also a responsibility to others to see that they are fully members of the community. The National Council of Catholic Bishops (1986) write:



Basic justice demands the establishment of minimum levels of participation in the life of the human community for all persons. The ultimate injustice is for a person or a group to be actively treated or passively abandoned as if they were non-members of the human race. (No. 77)

The opposite of participation in the community is marginalization. There can be political marginalization as in exclusion from decision making and the concentration of power in the hands of an elite. There can be economic marginalization, e.g., in unemployment, homelessness, and poverty. Marginalization also may be social in that some people may be classified inferior as human beings on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, age, or economic level.

There is also responsibility to other participants in the community: to put oneself publicly into the shoes of everyone else in discussion to arrive at a moral judgment. Such perspective taking involves encouraging, clarifying, and considering the positions of others as well as their criticisms. In this atmosphere of encouragement, there is responsibility to expect rational communication and to respect the personal integrity of others. Thus, criticisms of others' positions are directed at the claims they make and their arguments rather than being personal or arbitrary. Participation in public opinion formation is a form of socialization; as such it influences the development of autonomy and personal excellences of participants.

Responsibility to others also exists in the decision reached publicly: the decision should be morally just in that it serves the good of all who are affected by it. Because there are likely to be different conceptions of justice, effort to agree on its meaning may well be in order. In the particular norm being questioned, "its consequences for the satisfaction of everyone's interests must be acceptable to all as participants . . ." (McCarthy, 1990, p. viii). This brings us to examine the public interest (or public good).

3. The public interest does not rest on identity of interests among its members (which are diverse) but on a moral perspective within which "competing normative claims can be fairly and impartially adjudicated" (McCarthy, 1990, p. viii). This adjudication resolves the issue of "How should we as a community live?" and is tied to the process of reasoned agreement described above as the form of participation.

To meet the needs of all who are affected by the decision does not mean that it must affect all in the same way. Just as parents cannot treat a disabled child in the same way as their other children

for the good of all concerned, there will be some members of society who, in the cause of justice, will be treated differently. Paraphrasing an idea of Erikson's (1964) regarding the parent's identity and ethical happiness in securing to the child its future identity and its ethical development, justice in public decision-making recognizes that some members of a community benefit morally in contributing to the identity and needs of others. The decision, however, will be based on a norm rationally agreed to as binding on everyone alike. For example, in an issue regarding educational opportunity, the needs of some educatees for special treatment is recognized at the same time that there is a norm of equal opportunity for all to be educated to the best of their ability. No member of the community is to receive advantages at the disadvantage of another's identity or development of excellence.

The above principles are based upon Habermas' (1990) theory of discourse ethics. Each participant in discourse regarding a concrete case seeks to move beyond an egocentric perspective to consider the interests of others and weigh them as equal to her own. The issues or problems requiring moral judgment in a community arise in everyday life. They are not artificially created or merely hypothetical. Because interests in the community are diverse, there are often competing views of what is moral or just in the life of the community.

A number of communitarian authors draw upon the work of MacIntyre (1984) who distinguishes between *internal goods* and *external goods*. Internal goods are found in social activity which is good in itself, i.e., human capacities are developed and standards of excellence extended by engaging cooperatively in the activity. Stout (1981) points out that what the particular goods are can be "specified only in terms drawn from the activity itself," recognized by those experienced in the activity, "realized only by participating in the activity well, as judged by its standards of excellence" (p. 142). There are many such activities whose internal goods are possible: teaching, medicine, architecture, law, parenting, politics, sports, cooking, music, drama, etc. External goods are external to the activity itself: the activity is engaged in mainly, if not exclusively, to acquire power, status, money, or other material goods. Lasch (1988) argues that, in the public interest, the community needs to attack the problem of external goods dominating social activity. This problem has arisen because social institutions (e.g., in medical practice and in university organization and policies) *build in* external goods in the way the activity is practiced. Others, e.g., Bellah et al. (1991), argue for a communitarian



approach to changing social institutions that are contrary to the moral good or public interest.

In conclusion, a community is a special form of social organization. Its organization and procedures are directed toward the general interest of humanity. Its members participate equally, freely, and responsibly in the organization's decision making. Community gives attention to moral ideas and issues and not merely material ones. Although the concern is for the general good, the orientation is also to the protection of individual integrity and the development of personal autonomy and personal excellences in individuals. A community draws upon the diversity of views to inform public opinion but seeks to agree upon the most rationally compelling view in each concrete issue discussed. It is this method of rational public discourse which creates its solidarity. **KJ**

References

- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future*. Cleveland: Meridian Books.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1991). *The Good Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bowers, C. A. (1987). *Elements of a post-liberal theory of education*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Dewey, J. (1927). Search for the great community. In J. Dewey, *The public and its enemies*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 143-184.
- Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Insight and responsibility*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Fox, R. W., & Lears, T. J. J. (Eds.). (1983). *The culture of consumption*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action, Vol. 2: A critique of functionalist reason*. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. (C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lasch, C. (1988). The communitarian critique of liberalism. In C. H. Reynolds & R. V. Norman (Eds.), *Community in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 173-184.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. (1984). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McCarthy, T. (1990). Introduction. In J. Habermas. *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. (C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, vii-xiii.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1964). The philosophical basis of ethics. In A. Beck (Ed.), *George Herbert Mead: Selected Writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 82-93.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1986). *Economic justice for all Catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy*. Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Nichols, R. J. (1977). Rebels, beginners, and buffoons: Politics as action. In T. Ball (Ed.), *Political theory and praxis: New perspectives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Partridge, E. (1959). *Origins*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pitkin, H. E., & Shumer, S. M. (1982). On participation. *Democracy*, 3, 43-54.
- Schutz, A., & Luckmann, T. (1973). *The structures of the lifeworld*. Evanston, Northwestern University Press.
- Stout, J. (1981). *The flight from authority*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Walt, A. J. (1975). Transcendental arguments and moral principles. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 20, 111

Transformative Professional Practice: Overcoming Ambivalence, Building Community

Edith E. Baldwin

Ambivalence resulting in an individualistic withdrawal from community life leads to the isolation of individuals and families and destructive social fragmentation. Home economists should help to build communities which foster widespread democratic participation in nurturing human autonomy and healthy family life. Grassroots communities can and do evolve into new social movements concerned with quality of life, human rights, equity, and participation. Becoming active in the affairs of grassroots communities, home economists could generate a family rights movement, thereby involving the profession in the wider political struggle toward human freedom.

The “ambiguity and ambivalence of American individualism” was drawn to our attention by Robert Bellah and his colleagues throughout their social analysis, *Habits of the Heart* (1985). This study showed that although Americans have a deep desire for autonomy and self-reliance they hold an equally deep conviction that life is meaningless unless shared with others in community. “We strongly assert the value of our self-reliance and autonomy. We deeply feel the emptiness of a life without sustaining social commitments” (p. 151). The authors point out that tensions created by this ambivalence would be even greater if people did not engage in practices that limit the isolating effects of individualism on their lives. But the language of individualism contributes to a false preoccupation with private life as a means of fulfillment—to an illusory quest often ending in emptiness. And it “often implies a negative view of public life” (p. 163), thereby reinforcing the dichotomy between public and private life. Although we do not want to sacrifice our independence, we are not happy with social isolation; yet the language of individualism is devoid of concepts that would promote community and shared responsibility for the common good.

Without community and without a healthy concern for the common good, all forms of conflict increase; neighborhoods degenerate into places of violence and fear—places that are unsafe for families. Social solidarity is necessary for personal safety and property protection, and it can prevent the isolation

Dr. Baldwin is Instructor, College of Home Economics and Education, Oregon State University.



of families and loneliness in individual lives. A community agenda can bring individuals together to determine their common needs and decide upon the most appropriate actions toward fulfilling them.

Communities also can become involved in broader social issues that ultimately affect all of our lives. Social problems, such as crime and violence, poverty and unemployment, homelessness, and environmental degradation, can be addressed in the public sphere of community life. The grassroots community can become the intermediate sphere between the private sphere and the more distant public sphere. Furthermore, grassroots communities can evolve into “new social movements”—single issue movements directed toward protecting citizens’ rights to self-determination. As “campaigns of resistance” such movements are raising the consciousness of growing numbers of people concerning ways in which they are depoliticized by the concentration of decision making in the hands of experts who seek to legitimate the existing systems of power (Gorz, 1989, p. 232).

Grassroots communities provide opportunities for home economists to raise consciousness of family issues. The family, too, has an interest in self-determination; too often family life is fragmented and relationships are impoverished by conditions in society beyond the individual family’s control. Families could benefit from the evolution of a new social movement—a morally concerned social movement directed toward family well-being (Baldwin, 1990). By generating such a movement, home economists would involve the profession in the wider and more fundamental emancipative struggle toward human freedom.

It is argued here that as home economists we should (a) raise consciousness of the ambiguity and ambivalence of individualism, (b) promote and become involved in building community, and (c) engage in transformative practice by generating a new social movement interested in family well-being.

Ambivalence and Consequences of Individualism

Ambivalence is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary (1989, p. 387) as “the coexistence in one person of contradictory emotions or attitudes (as love and hatred) toward a person or thing.” It means that a person experiences uncertainty, an inability to make a choice because of simultaneous desire to do

two opposite things. Many of us are ambivalent in our attitude toward involvement in community life personally and professionally. Yet, social critics argue that it would be beneficial, both for the psychological health of individuals and for the society as a whole, if we would turn from individualism toward building democratic community in American society (Reynolds & Norman, 1988).

Community disintegration and individual alienation have become increasingly evident throughout this century. Oldenquist (1991, p. 94) states, “Alienation implies a weakening of social identity and a failure of commitment, an individualist pulling back from collective involvement—an emotional withdrawal from the group and its values, a retreat from ‘us’ to ‘me’.” A number of interwoven factors have contributed to this rupture, e.g., capitalism’s promotion of migration of labor, the availability of rapid transportation and communication, and the growth of mass media. A rich urban culture develops as a result of migration to cities, but it is a culture that promotes anonymity and bureaucratic impartiality, a resentment of charity yet insistence on welfare financed by strangers and administered by officials (Raz, 1994). As participants in this culture, we feel more at home in crowded public places observing and being observed by strangers than in places of quiet solitude—we want to be alone but not physically isolated. We feel comfortable living in social isolation in apartment buildings surrounded by strangers but feel stifled in closely knit communities where everyone is known and daily activities are noted. There are crowds of strangers on main streets, but in many places cities are empty and silent. As Maxine Greene (1988, p. 19) laments, “There are few places where people are impelled to come together in speech and action, few arenas where . . . freedom can sit down.” Although this culture of anonymity has been embraced by many, it has brought subcultures of “anomie, alienation from society and its institutions, and the emergence of a growing underclass” (Raz, 1994, p. 68). The culture of anonymity is simply not adequate for today’s world, yet we remain ambivalent in our attitude toward community.

We may theoretically accept the idea of community, but we seem to shrink from it in practice. We fear that community involvement would take precious time restricting our capacity to pursue our own interests. We are afraid that we would be

forced into relationships with people whose values, interests, and goals are different from ours or that an emphasis on community would result in a uniformity of values, interests, and goals homogenizing society, stifling the expression of individuality, and inhibiting progress. Yet, homogeneity of values is not necessarily an outcome of community; and although we may not want to form close relationships with people who are different from ourselves, this should not prevent us from being concerned about their well-being. After all, “[c]ommunity is not about sameness but about cooperation and mutual aid” (Loewy, 1993, p. xiv). In today’s world, the ethics of interrelationship and interdependence is of profound importance in terms of how both individuals and collectives relate to and depend on each other. We need to understand the meaning and significance of interdependency—of the interdependency of individual and community, and of the dependence of various collectives on each other.

Preservation of cultural uniqueness is a major issue for some groups of people. But even if we insist on this, we must at least acknowledge that some values, interests, and goals are held in common. For example, *well-being* is a value that we all share even though we may interpret well-being somewhat differently according to cultural background; and we are all interested in gaining fair access to the necessities of life as well as in having opportunity to select and pursue individual goals. Regardless of how we may otherwise differ, we must share at least some goals if we are to achieve our ends, including the goal of community itself.

We must remember also that community is a form of social organization that provides for its members, not just what they have as fellow citizens but also a sense of who they are and what they stand for. Individuals cannot develop their talents and lead fulfilling lives without the support that community affords. Self-knowledge and self-respect are generated through interaction with others in community. Individuality develops and is shaped in the context of community. Mansbridge (1993, p. 352) points out that “[t]he easily accessible idea that autonomy requires nurturance in a web of relationships undermines the either/or character of parts of the individualism/communitarian debate.” Fundamentally, we become who we are through participating in community life; personality is built and maintained through a process of social interaction (Hurrelmann, 1988). Moreover, without appropriate social support and interaction, moral

development is frustrated or distorted (Selznick, 1992). Communities, however, cannot develop and thrive without drawing upon the unique talents of individual members; healthy communities demand the involvement of people who care about their community. As professionals claiming to promote individual and family well-being, we need to work with ordinary citizens to overcome ambivalence and to develop social policies to prevent alienation and promote community.

Building Community

It would be to our advantage both personally and professionally to participate in the development of community life. Questions of interest to us would be, What are the elements of community? and What is the role of the home economist in building community in a “democratic” society?

The Elements of Community

Selznick (1992, pp. 360-365) identifies seven key values or interacting variables essential for the development and nurturance of community life: historicity, identity, mutuality, plurality, autonomy, participation, and integration. Although the work of Selznick contributes to what follows, other theorists have examined these concepts in some depth.

Historicity. Shared history and culture strengthens the bonds of community. A community’s character is a reflection of the particular customs, language, and institutional life embedded in it as well as the significant events and crises in the shared experience of its members. Differentiating between genuine communities and lifestyle enclaves, with reference to the former, Bellah et al. (1985) use the term “communities of memory,” i.e., communities that remember their past. Continuity and shared history enable communities to understand their own possibilities and limits. The sense of history, rootedness, belonging, and commitment to others, characteristic of strong communities, contribute to individual well-being and to sound collective judgment concerning goals for the evolution of community life.

Identity. A shared history also contributes to distinctive individual and group identity and to a sense of group loyalty. Individual identity develops through the socialization processes experienced in families and other social institutions, and effective socialization results in the individual’s identification with others and with the locality. Hurrelmann (1988)

“ . . . community . . . provides for its members, not just what they have as fellow citizens but also a sense of who they are and what they stand for.”

points out that although identity is related to continuity of self-experience, its formation and maintenance is more difficult for many people than it was a few generations ago; society and social roles are more subject to rapid change. Because socialization is strongly influenced by social context, the outcomes are highly variable. Sometimes particular groups or organizations (political, religious, ethnic) generate conditions leading to insularity and withdrawal. The parochialism resulting in the development of narrowly formed and fixed identities leads to antagonisms which can be destructive of community.

Mutuality. Healthy communities generate feelings of trust, empathic understanding, and a sense of mutual obligation among members. Although community develops from and is largely maintained by interdependence and reciprocity, and it is not likely to emerge if people do not understand what can be gained from their involvement, it is more than carefully balanced reciprocity. Contributions made by individuals in a diverse society may not be equal, and mutuality must not be reduced to contract principles of limited obligation. Elshtain (1982, p. 446) argues that the concept of "social compact" is more appropriate than "social contract" for community building. She points out that the "compact ideal revolves around the varying needs of human beings over the span of their life cycle;" but the social contract view of the world is one in which "[c]hildren, old people, ill and dying people who need care are nowhere to be seen." Social compact moves beyond mere exchange to create more enduring ties of interdependence, caring, and commitment. And as Selznick (p. 362) puts it, community based on such ideas promotes "a transition from reciprocity to solidarity and from there to fellowship."

A community based on these ideas is very different from an interest group that people might form to oppose a proposed tax levy. Although there may be a spirit of mutuality among participants, the interest group has an instrumental value in that it promises to be useful. The interest group may be a temporary affiliation that simply dissolves when it achieves (or fails to achieve) its goal. Interest groups are usually loose associations of people that coalesce and later break apart; communities exhibiting characteristic cohesiveness and solidarity break apart less easily.

Plurality. The vitality of a community is often attributable to intermediate associations or subcommunities which protect

and provide for the meaningful participation of its members while at the same time preventing the development of any single power bloc. The individual's relation to the larger community can be extended and enriched through participation in subgroups. The health of subsidiary groups (family, ethnic, occupational) depends on the capacity of each to legitimately preserve itself without fragmenting the wider community of which it is a part. Pluralism brings a richness to the sociocultural context; and it should be supported, provided that it does not prevent common agreement on core values, i.e., a shared broad set of values and goals in which the value and goal of community itself play a central role (Bernstein, 1987). Strong communities are morally worthy in that they nourish and protect subgroups and generally provide settings within which people grow and flourish. Communities that are inadequate from the standpoint of morality are those that are insular or too narrow and rigid to provide adequately for common life. A healthy pluralism allows members of a community to work together as equals to create their present and shape their future.

Autonomy. The concept of autonomy has significance for both individuals and subsidiary groups. Although individual autonomy should be promoted, we must not confuse autonomy or freedom with unconditional opportunity and choice; freedom interpreted as license often results in personally or socially destructive behavior (Greene, 1988). As an attribute of self-identity and self-affirmation, autonomy involves social responsibility and moral commitment in addition to freedom of choice; this is also the case with respect to group autonomy. Individuals need nurture, support, and group protection against external domination. Subsidiary groups can meet these needs; but because history shows that they also can be oppressive, the assumption that individual well-being is guaranteed by subgroup autonomy needs to be questioned. Selznick (p. 363) states, "The worth of community is measured by the contribution it makes to the flourishing of unique and responsible persons." The same can be said regarding the worth of subgroups.

Participation. The nature and quality of social participation are the most important aspects of the human condition (Habermas, 1987). Although individual autonomy is developed through social participation, not all kinds of participation promote autonomy. Some kinds encourage rational argumentation and collective action, others undermine them; some forms



of social participation are egalitarian, others insist on subordination and are oppressive. The most fundamentally important sphere of participation is family life, but other environments such as the classroom, the workplace, and community sub-groups also contribute to the development of participatory skills. The nature of these experiences affects the individual's ability to participate fully in community life; and if skills are not developed adequately, participation in community life may be difficult or avoided altogether. Ideally, participatory competence developed in other spheres continues to develop as the individual becomes involved in community life.

There is an intimate connection between democracy and community; community life should be based on the ideals of participatory democracy. Dewey (1927, pp. 148, 149) states, "[D]emocracy is . . . the idea of community life itself. . . . The clear consciousness of a communal life, in all its implications, constitutes the idea of democracy." Democracy is often conceptualized merely as a system of accountability in which elected representatives govern while citizens adopt passive voter and watchdog roles. However, a strong democracy is a process of shared learning, and it demands that citizens play a much more meaningful role in public affairs—that every member of the community participate in self-governance (Barber, 1989).

Full participation in community life is multifaceted. As Selznick (p. 364) points out, "A flourishing community has high levels of participation: people are appropriately present, and expected to be present on many different occasions and in many different roles and aspects." People find fulfillment in social roles, group loyalties, and cooperative efforts toward a common good; this does not mean, however, that they must sacrifice their most important private concerns and relationships.

Integration. According to Selznick, a strong community is a rich and balanced composite of these seven elements. All of the elements need to be supported by social norms, beliefs, and practices, and they must come together as a coherent and integrated foundation to common life.

The Role of the Home Economist in Building Community

All of the above values: historicity, identity, mutuality, plurality, autonomy, participation, and integration are fundamental elements of a strong community. Each one of us can participate in the development and maintenance of community based on

these values within our professional organizations as well as in the wider society.

The Professional Community. Space does not permit a detailed discussion of the issue, but in her critical analysis Brown (1993) contends that although home economists have thought of themselves as a professional community since the Lake Placid meetings, "lack of solidarity in shared beliefs, concepts, and values indicates a failure to meet the social criteria of community. This failure carries over into lack of shared commitment to the political-moral norms that characterize a democratic community" (p. 177). Brown's analysis suggests that we should "get our own house in order" if building democratic community is a desirable professional goal.

A professional community cannot be made or engineered by its administration but must grow naturally from already existing social relationships. Bernstein (1983, p. 226) argues that a community "that can strengthen solidarity, public freedom, a willingness to talk and listen, mutual debate, and a commitment to rational persuasion" can only evolve through "incipient forms of communal life." If we respond to the challenge as Bernstein (p. 228) suggests, we must "seize upon those experiences and struggles in which there are still glimmerings of solidarity and the promise of dialogical communities in which there can be genuine mutual participation." If there are any "glimmerings of solidarity" in home economics we must nurture them as best we can. Brown (1985, 1993) has argued for many years that we should be prepared to engage in rational public argumentation for the development of shared understanding of concepts fundamental to professional practice. Those of us who do belong to some form of professional collective could enhance solidarity by finding ways of developing professional dialogue on, for example, the concept of community. This could be a useful starting point. Brown has argued also that home economics should be an integrative, interdisciplinary field addressing complex practical-moral problems of the family in ways that would overcome the destructive fragmentation existing in the field. To move in this direction also would be a move toward community. The insights and skills developed through dialogical participation within the professional community would ideally carry over into participation in the wider community as family advocates.

Professional Participation in the Wider Community. Everyone in the hustle and bustle of everyday life should have



access to and participate in community life. Community membership should be open to all as a matter of right and entitlement, and we could help people to understand how to claim that right. A strong community is alive with all of the resources, the richness, and the possibilities that a culturally diverse society has to offer. It is not merely a marketplace in which competitive individuals seek to maximize self-interest, but a vibrant and vital sphere of multiple perspectives in which everyone has a voice in the shaping and reshaping of their lives. As professionals interacting in community life, we would work with colleagues and ordinary citizens to forge agreement in pursuit of individual and family well-being.

We gain important insights from the traditions of our culture, many of which have to do with community, e.g., traditions such as barn raising which epitomizes the strength of nineteenth century rural communities. The effort of coming together to build a neighbor's barn required strong common bonds and it resulted in the strengthening of community. The interdependence of families became apparent through their engagement in a common effort which resulted in the strengthening of bonds. The lesson to be learned here, is that strong communities grow out of shared experiences, and they are grounded in an ethic of caring. We form bonds with people around us and strengthen relationships as we work together toward common goals. Rational, critical-minded participation generates knowledge, thus community building is an educative and empowering process for those involved.

Engaging in Transformative Practice

As professionals we should work to develop shared experiences—to create settings in which bonds form, people gain new insight into their everyday lives, and community flourishes. As history shows, grassroots communities provide vibrant settings for learning to participate and for the development of social movements which ultimately transform the conditions of everyday life.

Conditions Impacting Family Well-being

Conditions negatively impacting the family in contemporary society are indicative of the need for a family rights movement. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine conditions undermining family life such as poverty and homelessness

(Kozol, 1988, 1991; Pear, 1993, Polakow, 1994), marginalization of minorities (Jenks, 1992), family violence (Gordon, 1988), divorce (Furstenberg & Churlin, 1991; Wallerstein & Blakeless, 1989), loss of family authority (Donzelot, 1979; O'Neill, 1985; Lasch, 1979), and conflicting work and family roles (Coontz, 1992; Hochschild & Machung, 1989). Many studies uncover the roots of family issues through critical analysis of oppression and domination in society. As McLaren & Lankshear (1994, p. 1) point out, "everywhere oppression has been experienced as a constraint to living more fully, more humanly: constraint born of social contingencies of power; of discursive regulation through interested and contrived social practices carried out so as to privilege some at the expense of others." It is important to realize that oppression is related to the ordinary, ongoing processes of everyday life: it is embedded in the assumptions of ordinary people, the media, bureaucratic hierarchy, and market process. Young (1992) discusses "five faces of oppression" affecting various groups of people in North America, such as women, racial minorities, homosexuals, the poor, and the physically or mentally impaired: (a) *exploitation* of working class people whose labor benefits the wealthy and reproduces class divisions and inequality; (b) *marginalization* of a growing underclass who suffer unemployment, material deprivation, and denial of opportunity to participate usefully in social life; (c) *powerlessness* of people who have little or no work or technical expertise, are unable to express themselves adequately in public settings, lack authority, and generally do not command respect; (d) *cultural imperialism* or the domination of one group's experience and culture as the norm; for many, this results in the paradoxical experience of being invisible yet viewed as different; (e) *systematic violence* directed toward specific groups of people and viewed as legitimate because most people in the dominant group accept it as common occurrence and do little about it. Conditions have been such that, over the last thirty years, conflicts emerging in advanced Western societies are indicative of a "silent revolution" in values and attitudes.

New Social Movements

According to Habermas (1987, p. 392), people joining social movements as "extraparliamentary forms of protest" in recent decades have been concerned with a "new politics" of human rights, quality of life, equality, and participation. Issues such as environmental protection, AIDS, abortion, and the rights of



women, gays, the handicapped, the homeless, and racial and ethnic minorities have resulted in many forms of protest, grassroots community building, self help, and insurgency—all sending ripples throughout the entire society.

From Habermas' perspective, new social movements are reacting against the increasing invasion of the human life-world by the economy and the state (money and power as "steering mechanisms" replacing rational public dialogue). This invasion or colonization has led to cultural impoverishment (loss of shared meaning) and loss of freedom, with responses ranging from anomie, alienation, and pathology on one hand, to resistance and conflict on the other. Habermas believes that an important intellectual and political task for social movements is to work out an adequate relationship to the *two-sided* character of developments within major social institutions such as the legal system, mass culture and publicity, and the family (Cohen, 1985). For example: on one hand, legal regulation has expanded to protect the rights of individuals and associations from invasion by the state although ensuring that the state is controlled by formal democratic institutions. But on the other hand, regulations increasingly penetrate areas formerly free from state control (e.g., family life), exposing them to bureaucratization and manipulation. "The empowering dimension of legal regulation thus conflicts with the authoritarian bureaucratic dimension of state intervention created by legislation itself" (p. 713). Conflicts and contradictions affecting families in contemporary society cannot be adequately resolved through government regulation and bureaucratic intervention. Nor can they be resolved by a complete withdrawal of support by the state in an effort to consolidate and protect a more restricted sphere of authority from responsibility overload (Offe, 1985).

Habermas argues that, in a democracy, the human life-world must have priority over the subsystems of state and economy. However, in contemporary *representative* democracy, administrative decision-making replaces public rational dialogue concerning human needs and need fulfillment. Although people are denied genuine participation in the political process, welfare policies are needed and cannot be eliminated. A family rights movement could examine this dilemma and emphasize the essentiality of rational public discussion concerning the needs of families and how they should be met

so that the inadequacies and destructive elements of welfare might be overcome.

On one hand, manipulation of the mass culture has contributed to the distortion of communication and disintegration of the public sphere, but on the other hand there are still possibilities for the development of a mass media based on democratic principles. Habermas argues that the mass media has not only authoritarian but also emancipatory potential; for although it is open to manipulative interests it is a means of communication by which participants can and do disagree. A family rights movement could examine ways of using the mass media in its effort to raise public consciousness of conditions impacting family well-being, including the impact of the media itself.

Although subject to paternal power and authority, the modern nuclear family was once responsible for the well-being of its members; but it has been increasingly relieved of its functions as a private institution. Habermas disagrees with the thesis that the loss of the father's authority and the increased role of schools and the mass media in socialization necessarily results in the loss of adult ego identity or autonomy for family members. He argues that modern developments have the potential to promote more favorable forms of socialization, egalitarian interpersonal relations, and increased individual autonomy. However, he does point to the possibility of pathological development when demands of the economy and state lead to passive adaptation, thereby undermining the development of higher level competencies and moral capacities that change can promote. Habermas conceptualizes the family largely as a communicative sphere, but notes that in capitalist systems it has always been "shot through with the media of money and power" which undermine or distort communication (White, 1988, p. 142). Participants in a family rights movement could critically analyze this situation, and through the development of educative and political programs seek to promote communicative competence leading to intellectual and moral growth.

Seeking to promote needed social change, participants in a family rights movement would need to understand the two-sided character of developments in major social institutions. Insight into the general characteristics of new social movements also would be useful.

Characteristics of New Social Movements. For Offe (1985), the main characteristics of new social movements can be understood in terms of the actors, the issues, values, and mode of action.



Although they can only be briefly touched on here, it would be useful to draw these characteristics into the conceptualization of a family rights movement:

The actors do not rely on any particular political party or socioeconomic class for self-identity, but come together because of and identify with the issues of the movement. A family rights movement, therefore, would bring together people of all political persuasions, from all professional and occupational categories (as well as students and the unemployed), from rural and urban environments, and from working and middle class backgrounds.

The issues usually relate to the human life-world, the material conditions of life, and the survival of humankind in general. A family rights movement would focus on conditions negatively impacting the health and well-being of the family as an essential unit for cultural reproduction, socialization, and personality formation. For example, issues relating to the impact of the mass media, government regulation, and the work sphere could be embraced.

Values most prominent in new social movements are autonomy and identity (with the related values of decentralization, self-government, self-help) in opposition to manipulation, control, dependence, and bureaucratization. Values promoting family empowerment would be dominant in a family rights movement.

Mode of action comprises internal action (informal, ad hoc, egalitarian) through which individuals come together forming a collective for engagement in *external action* to confront political opponents. With reference to the former, Offe (1985, p. 829) states, "while there are at best rudimentary membership roles, programs, platforms, representatives, officials, staffs, and membership dues, the new social movements consist of participants, campaigns, spokespeople, networks, voluntary helpers, and donations." The external mode of action involves making use of large numbers of people in legal though unconventional ways such as in public demonstration. These modes of action would be appropriate for a family rights movement. Members of the movement would not engage in negotiation because (a) there would be nothing to offer in return for the conditions sought for families; and (b) the central concern (family well-being) would be considered of such major importance that activists would be unwilling to back away from their demands.

Participation in a Family Rights Movement. Why are so many people involved in this form of political action? is a question

which might be asked by those concerned with family well-being. According to Rochon and Mazmanian (1993), people feel a sense of empowerment as they participate as members of small groups engaged in political struggle; and "[p]articipants in political protest frequently see their involvement as a defining moment in their lives, after which they come to live differently" (p. 76). Furthermore, although the influence of social movements may be indirect and there may be a time lag in policy response, they can and do have a significant effect on the wider political system.

A family rights movement could have a significant effect on policy outcomes by winning access to the policy process through collective action. For this to occur, members would need to ensure that the movement gained public acceptance as a valid representative for family interests and that the issues raised were seen as legitimate. Because the changing of social values would be an important element, the society would be a target of movement activity. Ultimately, the movement, by changing general perceptions concerning the most important political problems, would affect politics by redefining the political agenda in ways that would result in family empowerment.

Conclusion

The profound importance of interdependence is increasingly evident in today's world, and the need for community is apparent in both international and domestic spheres. Widespread participation in public dialogue and collective action is at the core of healthy community and strong democracy, and the individual and the family contribute to and benefit from such participation. It has been argued here that as home economists concerned with human well-being we should (a) help people to understand the destructive consequences of individualism and social fragmentation, (b) promote and become involved in building community both within our own profession and in the wider society, and (c) transform social conditions which have a negative impact on family life through the formation of a family rights movement, thereby involving the profession in the wider emancipative struggle toward human freedom. Involvement in public life can be difficult and demanding. Yet if we can promote the idea that private and public life are complementary in that they interact dialectically to help develop and sustain each other, we may overcome ambivalence and build community. ■

“

A family rights movement could have a significant effect on policy outcomes by winning access to the policy process through collective action.

”



References

- Baldwin, E. E. (1990). The home economics movement: A "new" integrative paradigm. *Journal of Home Economics*, 83(4), 42-48.
- Barber, B. R. (1989, October). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education*, 355-356, 370.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart. Individualism and commitment in American life*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1987). The varieties of pluralism. *American Journal of Education*, 95(4), 509-525.
- Brown, M. M. (1985). *Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Our practical intellectual heritage*. Vols. 1 & 2. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, College of Human Ecology.
- Brown, M. M. (1993). *Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, College of Human Ecology.
- Cohen, J. L. (1985). Strategy or identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements. *Social Research*, 53(4), 663-716.
- Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Holt.
- Donzelot, J. (1979). *The policing of families*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Elshtain, J. B. (1982, Fall). Feminism, family, and community. *Dissent*, 442-449.
- Furstenberg, E., & Cherlin, A. (1991). *Divided families: What happens to children when parents part*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, L. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence*. New York: Penguin.
- Gorz, A. (1989). *Critique of economic reason*. (G. Handside & C. Turner, Trans.). New York: Verso.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action. Vol. 2. Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hochschild A., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking.
- Hurrelmann, K. (1988). *Social structure and personality development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenks, C. (1992). *Rethinking social policy: Race, poverty, and the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kozol, J. (1988, February 1). The homeless and their children. Part 2. *The New Yorker*, pp. 50-51
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown.
- Lasch, (1979). *Haven in a heartless world*. New York: Basic Books.
- Loewy, E. H. (1993). *Freedom and community. The ethics of interdependence*. New York: SUNY Press.
- McLaren, P. L., & Lankshear, C. (1994). Introduction. In P. L. McLaren & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation*. New York: Routledge.
- Mansbridge, J. (1993). Feminism and democratic community. In J. W. Chapman & I. Shapiro (Eds.), *Democratic Community. NOMAS XVI*. New York: New York University Press.
- Offe, C. (1985). New social movements: Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social Research*, 52(4), 817-868.
- Oldenquist, A. (1991). Community and de-alienation. In A. Oldenquist & M. Rosner (Eds.), *Alienation, community, and work*. New York: Greenwood.
- O'Neill, J. (1985). *Five bodies: The human shape of modern society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Pear, R. (1993, October 10). Poverty 1993: Bigger, deeper, younger, getting worse. *New York Times*, E-5.
- Polakow, V. (1994). *Lives on the edge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Raz, J. (1994, Winter). Multiculturalism: A liberal perspective. *Dissent*, 67-79.
- Reynolds, C. H., & Norman, R. V. (1988). *Community in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rochon, T. R., & Mazmanian, D. A. (1993). Social movements and the policy process. *THE ANNALS*, 528, 75-87.
- Selznick, P. (1992). *The moral commonwealth: Social theory and the promise of community*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Simpson, J. A., & Weiner, E. S. C. (1989). *The Oxford English dictionary (2nd. ed.)*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wallerstein, J., & Blakeless, S. (1989). *Second chances: Men, women, and children a decade after divorce*. New York: Ticknor & Fields.
- White, S. K. (1988). *The recent work of Jurgen Habermas*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1992). Five faces of oppression. In T. E. Wertenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.



Community: What are the Factors that Make it Possible?

Paula R. King

Social interaction, common ties, and geographical location have been identified as common elements of community. Different types of communities are examined relative to the three elements to determine the importance of each element to the development and successful functioning of the group.

The human ecological model that provides a theoretical framework for the field of home economics stresses the interdependence of humans with their environment (Bubolz, Eicher, & Sontag, 1979). Human ecologists state that individuals live from birth to death in relationship with the world around them; they have no existence apart from the larger whole (Hawley, 1950). The importance of the individual in society varies with time and location, but the search for unity in the collective life of individuals, community, has remained a constant since prehistoric times. Thousands of religious communities, sects, cults, neighborhoods, retirement villages, and schools (to name a few) have been established in an effort to find ideal community life.

Home economists recognize the importance of the environment to human development. Children learn and become socialized in relation to characteristics of specific environments which supplement, enhance, or diminish their ability to learn and perform, thus impacting society's future (Villaruel & Lerner, 1994). The lack of community attachment has the most dramatic negative impact on the mental and emotional health of the homeless. Because community is of importance to human beings, an examination of the factors which promote and those that prevent the connection of individuals to each other may be useful to home economists in their efforts to enhance human well-being.

Literature on the subject of community is plentiful, as are definitions of the concept. Hillery (1955) reviewed ninety-four definitions available at the time and identified three commonly mentioned elements: social interaction, common ties, and geographic area. These designations are a useful framework within which to consider what factors are important in the creation of community. This paper contains an examination of

**Dr. King is
Chairperson,
Department of
Human Environ-
mental Studies,
Southeast
Missouri State
University, Cape
Girardeau.**



the elements of community as set forth by Hillery, using examples of specific types of community to illustrate important forces in community development.

Social Interaction

Social interaction refers to patterns of relationships within the community and between the community and the larger society. Classic human ecology theory proposes two descriptions of the nature of interactions that produce social unity: consensus and differentiation (Hawley, 1950). Consensus refers to common interests and possessions that hold people together—likenesses that contribute to mutual support. Differentiation refers to the relationship of interdependent individuals, each with separate, specialized functions. Durkheim (1966/1933) combined both descriptions into one developmental theory of social unity. He felt that small, less-developed communities operate well with consensus, but larger more complex communities progress to more interdependent relationships. Several types of communities offer examples of consensus-based interactions, differentiated interactions, and combinations of the two.

For many, the consensus community is the ideal. The small town of late 19th century America is seen as the model of democratic community life. A small 19th century town featured intimate face-to-face relationships, often family based, as well as relative self-sufficiency, set within small geographical boundaries (Franklin, 1986). Common values, attitudes, and standards of behavior were thought to produce stability, order, and progress.

In urban areas where a more differentiated societal structure prevails, neighborhoods may be equivalent to the small town. The neighborhood is a small local group united by some type of consensus such as ethnicity, socioeconomic level, or work, formed within the larger more differentiated society. When declining inner-city neighborhoods are renovated, the attempt is often made to transplant the small town ideal to the urban center.

Separation from the larger society is the basis for the formation of many intentional communities. Religious communities which originated in Europe during the middle ages are typical intentional communities, as are communes of the 1960's and 1970's (Bouvard, 1975). In each instance, a group of individuals perceived a gap between its moral or social values and those found in mainstream society and withdrew to practice its ideal of daily life. Such communal societies generally offer a

benevolent, protective environment for members, much as a family might. Most are consensus groups that aim at homogeneity in their members' behavior; dissent is handled within the group by division or departure of the dissenters.

Bouvard (1975) equates success of intentional communities with their endurance as economic units. The ability to tolerate some diversity within the group helps to maintain or increase membership. Sufficient membership helps the group avoid economic vulnerability. Intentional communities that are somewhat differentiated with links to the broader society, according to Bouvard, have kept the greatest vigor. Religious communities have been uniquely durable; their shared goals and commitment produce a dedication which fosters continuity.

Modern retirement communities have developed in response to perceived social problems. They provide for the needs of elderly persons in a youth-oriented, often violent society. Retirement communities offer secure, orderly, respectable surroundings in which behaviors are monitored and outsiders are easily identified. Such communities are usually based upon personal ties: networks of friends, relatives, former coworkers, or members of the same church. Although economic ties are maintained to the outer environment, many retirement areas are so self-sufficient that residents lose interest in the larger society (Johnson, 1971).

Another uniquely modern example of community occurs in areas united by environmental disasters. Edelstein and Wandersman (1987) describe the community affected by the Love Canal disaster in 1978 as having been unified by shared social problems and isolation from mainstream society, but not by its own choice.

Residents of the Love Canal area experienced what the authors termed "turbulence": disruption of everyday life and unpredictable responses from the environment. They were further isolated when the outside community stigmatized them, blaming the victims for their predicament. In addition, resources with which to find a solution were scarce. Edelstein and Wandersman (1987) state that community problems of such magnitude may result in therapeutic community development, or degenerate into internal conflict. "For community organization to be therapeutic, there must be a shared sense of concern and a consensus around goals" (p. 105). There is also a need to have some power, usually political, and to wield it effectively.



Studies of the homeless reveal these individuals also to be separated from social networks and stigmatized by the larger society, but very few of them form communities. There is no evidence that groups of homeless persons perceive themselves as a unit, and economic resources are very limited. They have no privacy, no familiar places, and no opportunity to develop community ties because having one's needs met is based on the ability to negotiate space, food, and resources on a daily basis (Rivlin, 1987).

Isolation and shared problems or experiences are not sufficient, then, to generate a spirit of unity in a group of individuals. The examples listed suggest that economic resources, some ties to the wider society, and shared goals are necessary before individuals begin to form a cohesive unit. Isolation or separation (physical or social) may be enough to begin a community, but will not sustain it.

Common Ties

Religious beliefs, social goals, shared values, standards of behavior, age, occupation, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and shared problems have all been mentioned as the bases upon which people form groups. It is natural for people to seek out those with whom they have something in common, but how much homogeneity is necessary for community? As with social interaction, the relationship of the group with the larger society, the ties within a community, may be discussed in terms of consensus versus differentiation. Friedman (1983) distinguishes between two types of community: a community of affinity or like mindedness (consensus) and a community of otherness (differentiation).

All communities are composed of individuals with differing points of view; as the number of individuals increases, the potential for disagreement increases. Friedman (1983) says that all groups of free people struggle with issues of tolerable and acceptable limits of behavior within the group. In extreme cases, communities of affinity may tolerate no deviation from a prescribed pattern of thought and behavior. Cults and some religious orders are examples. They function best in almost total isolation from the larger society and exclude those who do not share all of their beliefs. Bouvard (1975) argues that such exclusivity eventually destroys the community through declining membership and degenerating links to the larger society.

Friedman (1983) endorses the community of otherness in which everyone does not do the same thing nor do they do

things from the same point of view. "What makes community real is people finding themselves in a common situation—a situation which they approach in different ways yet which calls each of them out." (p. 135) Friedman calls the community of affinity ultimately a false community; the community of otherness is a way of being faithful to a common goal while still fostering individuality, a unity that is voluntary rather than imposed. His example of a community of otherness is the learning community: scholars from many different fields with shared goals. (Friedman does note that community of otherness is not an achieved ideal, but a direction in which to move.)

Naisbitt in *Megatrends 2000* uses a movie production company as an example of a functional community: a group of specialists who come together for a specific period of time to achieve a particular goal. A movie production company would fulfill Friedman's definition of a community of otherness. The company would be somewhat separate from mainstream society while still interacting with it; common ties would include shared goals, common situation, and related occupations. Permanence, however, is not desired.

Likewise, in the instance of Love Canal, the community organization disbanded once the group's common problems were solved. Edelstein and Wandersman (1987) state that in some instances community development may never broaden beyond the original focal issue nor persist beyond the achievement of a specific goal. The community formed may be genuine even though it has a limited life span.

Geographic Area

The importance of including geographical location as an element of community is a subject of controversy (Unger & Wandersman, 1985). It is true that one constant location is not necessary for community development. Gypsies and nomads are mobile communities, although they generally do follow familiar repeated routes. Rivlin (1987) notes that Americans are also very mobile. People move yet maintain contact with society because of their preexisting group affiliations such as age, interests, or religion. Relatives, friends, workplaces, and voluntary associations are often located away from one's immediate neighborhood (Keller, 1968).

The significance of neighborhoods as geographical settings is diminishing as people develop social networks in the wider

“
an examination of . . . three identified elements—social interaction, common ties, and geographical location—indicates that the relationship elements are more important to community development than the geographical element.
”



community (Wellman & Leighton, 1979). However, place does still have importance. Rivlin (1987, p. 9) says that "... every relationship is inextricably a component of a complex environmental system in which the human process and the setting define the meaning of the experience to the person." The human process, or relationships, may be more important than the location, but the place makes its own contribution.

For children especially, the neighborhood is a major site for socialization. For adults, the selection of a place to live is a statement of values and status. Communities that are totally place bound exhibit extreme cohesion: commonality of dress, language, behavior, religion, ethnicity (Rivlin, 1987). For retirement village residents, the physical layout of their community facilitates social interaction (Johnson, 1971).

Hunter (1987) sensibly suggests that location itself is not as important as how closely individuals identify with it. The homeless, for example, may stay within shelters or other designated spaces, but by doing so may be further isolated from the larger society (Rivlin, 1987). The homeless are perpetual travelers without alternative social structures. They form no attachments to temporary shelters nor to the communities which furnish the shelter.


Conclusions

An examination of different types of community using Hillery's (1995) three identified elements—social interaction, common ties, and geographical location—indicates that the relationship elements are more important to community development than the geographical element. Location makes an important contribution, but individuals with strong social networks may move from place to place using those networks to establish connections within a new group.

Human ecologists identify two types of interactions that promote social unity: consensus and differentiation. Extreme consensus—shared ethnicity, religion, social status, values, attitudes, behaviors, and goals—produces strong community ties. However, community is possible, some would say preferable, with more diverse groups of people. Shared situations and shared goals appear to be particularly important.

Communities often originate with viewpoints, aims, or locations that separate a group from the larger society. Communities that remain separate, with little contact with the outer world, tend

to be self-limiting through lack of new members or lack of resources. Such limitation is not necessarily a mark of community failure.

An interesting item to note is how many times the word small appears in the literature relative to the concept of community. This suggests that there may be an optimum size for a human group functioning as a community. Other limitations appear to be relevant also. Some communities have geographical boundaries; others are limited by time, especially the length of time taken to accomplish a particular goal. The possibility exists that one individual will be part of a growing number of communities in his lifetime. Technological changes are sure to alter the forms of new communities. Knowledge of the relationship skills needed to build, rebuild, and maintain connections between people will be of increasing importance. Home economists with their background and expertise in human ecology are uniquely suited to the task of helping people keep in touch with each other. 

References

- Bouvard, M. (1975). *The intentional community movement*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press Corp.
- Bubolz, M., Eicher, J., & Sontag, S. (1979, Spring). The human ecosystem: A model. *Journal of Home Economics*, 71, 28-31.
- Durkheim, E. (1966). *The division of labor in society* (C. Simpson, Trans.) New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Edelstein, M. R., & Wandersman, A. (1987). Community dynamics in coping with toxic contaminants. In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments: Vol. 9. Human behavior and environment. advances in theory and research*, (pp. 69-109). New York: Plenum Press.
- Franklin, B. M. (1986). *Building the American community*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Friedman, M. (1983). *The confirmation of otherness, in family community and society*. New York: The Pilgrim Press.
- Hawley, A. H. (1950). *Human ecology: A theory of community structure*. Ronald Press Co., New York.
- Hillery, G. A. (1955). Definitions of community: Areas of agreement. *Rural Sociology*, 20, 111-123.
- Hunter, A. (1987). The symbolic ecology of suburbia. In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments: Vol. 9. Human behavior and environment advances in theory and research*, (pp. 191-219). New York: Plenum Press.
- Johnson, S. K. (1971). *Idle Haven: Community building among the working-class retired*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Keller, S. (1968). *The urban neighborhood: A sociological perspective*. New York: Random House.



- Merry, S.E. (1987). Crowding, conflict, and neighborhood regulation. In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments: Vol. 9, Human behavior and environment, advances in theory and research*. (pp. 35-67). New York: Plenum Press.
- Naisbitt, J. (1990). *Megatrends 2000: Ten new directions for the 1990's*. New York: Morrow.
- Poplin, D.E. (1979). *Communities: A survey of theories and methods research* (2nd. ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Rivlin, L.G. (1987). The neighborhood, personal identity, and group affiliations. In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments: Vol. 9, Human behavior and environment, advances in theory and research*. (pp. 1-34). New York: Plenum Press.
- Unger, D.C. & Wandersman, A. (1985). The importance of neighboring: The social, cognitive and affective aspects of neighboring. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 139-169.
- Van Vliet, W. & Burgers, J. (1987). Communities in transition: From the industrial to the post industrial era. In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments: environment theory and research*. (pp. 1-34). New York: Plenum Press.
- Villaruel, F. A., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.). (1994). Promoting community-based programs for socialization and learning. *New directions for child development*. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wellman, B. & Leighton, B. (1979). Networks, neighborhoods and communities: Approaches to the study of the community question. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 14, 363-390.

Building Professional Learning Communities: Ohio's Teacher-Leader Institute Model

Janet F. Laster
Heather Boggs

This article proposes that professional learning communities can support and facilitate the professional development required for instituting change. Ohio's model for professional community building involves a 3-year Teacher-Leader Institute with a combination of traditional and critical learning methods, team building and learning, peer teaching and critical friends, action research, and critical moral reflection.

Increasingly complex society. Diverse student needs. Limited resources. Revolutionizing school reform. Conflicting values and expectations. Increasing competition for elective enrollment.

Decentralizing control. Local autonomy, leadership, and responsibility. New critical science Work and Family Life Curriculum paradigm and program.

With these accelerating and revolutionizing changes, Ohio Work and Family Life teachers were feeling overwhelmed and anxious as the 1995 implementation date approached for the critical science-based Work and Family Life Curriculum. State department supervisors and teacher educators recognized an acute need for work and family life teachers to see themselves as local and state teacher-leaders who would transform their own professional practices and reach out to other teachers to facilitate program development.

Transforming Teacher-Leaders

To survive in the current educational milieu, Ohio Work and Family Life teachers, like other educators, must be transformational leaders¹—not simply managers—of their own programs and classrooms. *Transforming teacher-leaders* are continuously changing themselves *from within*—recreating themselves to continuously revitalize and transform their practice to meet the needs of those they serve. They create change themselves rather than be controlled and oppressed by change. Used this way, *transforming* is an adjective, describing teacher-leaders and their way of being and doing. Transforming teacher-leaders also facilitate the metamorphosis of their colleagues who, in turn, must *be* transforming teacher-leaders. Used this way, *trans-*

Dr. Laster is Associate Professor, Department of Home Economics Education, College of Human Ecology, Ohio State University.

Ms. Boggs is a graduate associate in the Department of Teacher Education, Ohio State University.



forming is a verb, describing the actions of teacher-leaders as teacher educators.

What are the characteristics of transforming teacher-leaders?

Even in the midst of change, they create new visions with others and mobilize commitment to those visions. New visions begin by recognizing the need for revitalization, by recognizing and critiquing current paradigms and practices, and by shifting to new paradigms to create new practices and norms—which must be continuously critiqued and again transformed within a continuously changing milieu (Tichy & Devanna, 1992). Such *reflection-in-action* is critical for gaining and creating the knowledge needed for the “transforming-practice . . . that is dynamic, unfolding, and . . . embraces both our doing and our being in the classroom” (Peterat & Vaines, 1992, p. 246). Each day, transforming teacher-leaders renew and reconstruct their programs as they create learning environments *with* their students.

However, creating new visions and transforming these visions into practice requires a pioneering spirit. Risk taking and having the courage to fail are personal qualities necessary when using new paradigms and transforming practice. Even the bravest pioneers experience mixed and conflicting “personal feelings of fear and hope, anxiety and relief, pressure and stimulation, threats to self-esteem and challenges to master new situations” (Tichy & Devanna, 1990, p. 31). Because all individual transitions begin with endings, resistance to change, and a sense of loss, all the accompanying feelings of denial, anger, and uncertainty must be addressed. Transformational leaders provide themselves and those they serve with the support they need to disengage from the past and “replace past glories with future opportunities” (Tichy & Devanna, 1990, p. 32). This support is crucial during new beginnings.

A New Professional Development Paradigm for Ohio

Ohio state supervisors and teacher educators recognized that a strong professional learning community was needed to support work and family life teachers during and beyond this time of change. To meet these needs, Ohio began to develop an ongoing teacher-leader program to establish a statewide network of teacher-leaders that would (a) provide opportunities for teachers to critique their own practice and design ways to create and achieve program goals and (b) provide experience in a learning environment like that envisioned for work and family life students. The network of teachers would develop over time

with cadres of 25 to 30 teacher-leaders forming each year. Each cadre would learn and work together for three years. Program delivery plans used recommendations by Zimpher & Howey (1992): more than one activity over an extended period of time, readiness activities at the beginning of the program with complex new material presented incrementally, variety of instructional modes and activities, and opportunities for teachers to learn from each other.

This professional development idea represents a shift from the traditional professional development inservice education approach: one-way communication through newsletters and by authority figures with quick-fix presentations to large transient groups of teachers at conferences. As indicated by Smylie and Conyers (1991), such one-shot inservice presentations to hundreds of teachers at a time with little or no follow-up activities would most likely be insufficient to facilitate the transforming change that is needed.

Professional Learning Community

The concept of a professional learning community was developed from a variety of sources (see for example, Bellah et al, 1985; Brown, 1993; Lickona, 1991). A community has a limited number of people who know everyone else, who have long-term interdependence rather than temporary encounters, and who share common beliefs, concepts, values, goals, and a common culture, including shared practices. As a professional community, family and consumer scientists view themselves as holding democratically oriented cultural norms, such as caring for one another as moral and political equals, achieving meaningful goals with cooperative mutual efforts, and taking action within and outside of the community for the “common good of humanity,” not just for the good of the community (Brown, 1993).

The distinguishing characteristics of a learning community have been described by Jalongo (1990) and others. Our community development was characterized by members (a) exhibiting mutual trust and respect, (b) taking responsibility for their own actions, (c) learning through interaction with colleagues, (d) freely exploring alternatives and interacting creatively and innovatively, and (e) taking opportunities to deal with ideas, values, and personal theories of practice. A learning community is like an extended family composed of students, teachers, administrators, and others who share this common culture and are co-learners and co-leaders.



Professional Development Program Assumptions

This Ohio Work and Family Life professional development program is based on several assumptions. Family and consumer sciences professionals view themselves as being part of a professional community but have not critically examined the meaning of being in a professional community (Brown, 1993). Learning and change come from within through deep, elaborative processing, but learning and change are stimulated by external factors (Fedje, 1992). Work and family educators, like all learners, are capable of self-direction, self-education, and shared leadership with other family and consumer sciences educators. Yet these professionals, like all learners, need the support and encouragement of a learning community: critical friends who collaboratively examine and develop the complex concepts necessary to guide their lives as educators (Copa, 1988). Transformational processes can be enhanced through a professional learning community. Such processes include on-going community building; critical moral reflection and examination of lived experiences; paradigm critiquing—examining values, beliefs, assumptions, and meanings held by self and others; plus paradigm pioneering to meet new challenges and needs.

Ohio's Model for Professional Community Building

The mechanism for establishing and developing a work and family life professional community in Ohio involves a three-year Work and Family Life Teacher-Leader Institute. The Institute is designed to

1. Facilitate the development of the complex critical science and related concepts and skills needed by work and family life teacher-leaders in the continuously changing social contexts of families, schools, and the greater community, and to
2. Enhance the self-transformative, self-sustaining processes of these educators in a democratic professional community: democratic community building, critical moral reflection, paradigm critiquing, paradigm pioneering, peer teaching, and critical friendships.

State supervisors and curriculum project leaders select regional Institute teachers because of their leadership or potential leadership in their regions and/or across the state. Teachers are asked to make a three-year commitment to the professional development activities. As planned, Institute activities include a three-day summer seminar-workshop and two one-day seminar-workshops in November and February. Teachers may choose to receive continuing education units or graduate credit for their participation.

Although the participating teacher-leaders are actively involved in deciding what topics will be examined, and the conditions under which they will learn, the following concepts are emphasized during the three-year experience: first year—change process and alternative curriculum paradigms: instrumental/technical, interpretive, and critical/emancipatory paradigms; second year—action research and authentic assessment; and third year—critical, transforming-practices. Critical, transforming practices will be emphasized during the third year, but these practices are introduced the first year and used throughout the Institute.

Many challenges are presented in building a professional community among teachers who do not work in the same building, who will only meet several times each year, and who are not familiar with each other. Professional development guidelines and experiences of Zimpher and Howey (1992); Fedje (1992); Cunningham, Johnson, & Carlson (1992); Morgaine (1992b); and others were used to develop the community building model. The Institute activities include the following five key interacting elements.

A combination of traditional and phenomenological and critical learning methods. A variety of methods is required to encourage deep, elaborative thinking as well as to enhance connections with personal and professional lived experience. To develop the needed concepts for change, traditional methods are included: readings² with study questions and/or comparison chart creation as well as lecture-discussions using advance organizer and concept attainment strategies (Joyce, Weil, & Showers, 1992). To develop the means for change, phenomenological and critical methods are used: reflection on lived experiences in their classrooms and in their experiences as peer teachers and critical friends as well as critical questioning of self and others through peer dialogue, story telling, and writing-to-learn journaling and admit/exit slip writing activities (see for example, Fedje, 1992; Cunningham, Johnson, & Carlson, 1992; Morgaine, 1992a, 1992b; Gere, 1985).

Team building and learning. Learning communities need a supportive trusting environment with opportunities to work, learn, and play together. When those in a community have a sense of being part of team, there is support for change and for risk-taking in trying new curricular approaches (Maeroff, 1993). Consequently, cooperative learning groups and regional teacher leader teams are established during the summer seminar-workshop and continue throughout the year. Numerous learning



activities of varying group sizes and structures support interaction with colleagues. For example, small cooperative groups work together to design lesson plans for their students. The teachers then use the plans with their students and make videotapes or collect student work for reflection and sharing at the next Institute community meeting. As part of the team building process, the regional teams design plans of action to extend and create local learning communities. Collaborative group process skills are directly taught, modeled, and reinforced to help teachers learn and work together and implement cooperative learning in their classrooms. Group processing assessment helps teachers reflect on their lived experience in their groups and on the processes used.

Peer teaching and critical friends. Support through collegial discourse and inquiry (Darling-Hammond, 1993) is one of the most important factors in fostering the transformational change needed in classrooms and across educational programs. Peer teaching activities offer meaningful engagement with ideas, practices, and beliefs. Peer teaching involves teachers observing one another teach, giving feedback to one another, and working together to develop plans for improvement. For example, after teachers work cooperatively to develop lesson plans, they videotape those lessons. Videotapes are then viewed by group members who serve as critical friends, working with each other to continually improve instruction. Keeping company with a critical friend is described by Copa (1988) as creating places and times to help each other look more critically at thoughts and actions in a caring, constructive way. In addition to experiences at the Institute seminars, teachers are encouraged to connect with other teachers in their schools, school districts, and region to share their successes and struggles as they implement the Work and Family Life Curriculum.

Action research. Action research is an effective strategy for engaging teachers in the change process, because it “encourages risk-taking, provides a safety net for failure, and raises the status of the educator to scholar-practitioner” (McKay, 1992, p. 21). The Institute provides many of the conditions supporting action research: a forum in which to share findings; time to rethink, reexamine, and relive the principles that underlie learning activities; and supportive colleagues. The action research process is introduced, and teachers are presented with theories and research about effective learning and teaching practices as well as curriculum materials and

resources. From these, they design plans for creating learning environments. They then interact with students to reflect on their experience and plan for further learning.

Critical moral reflection. From a critical perspective, reflection is action to transform the thinker (Cooner, 1989). According to Fedje (1992), this represents “a deliberate, conscious process involving an individual’s thoughts about values, beliefs, intentions, meanings, and points of view related to practice. This kind of reflection reconstructs experience so that the thinker can identify new possibilities for action” (p. 96). Reconstructive reflection is encouraged *during* seminar-workshop activities and professional practice and *after* these lived experiences through journal writing and discussions with a critical teacher-friend or Institute group members. Teacher-leaders ask themselves and others practical reasoning questions to foster this critical moral reflection on their lived experiences and to experience the critical science paradigm of the Work and Family Life Curriculum (Kister, Laursen, & Boggs, 1993a, 1993b, 1994a, 1994b, 1995a, 1995b):

- What paradigms (e.g., beliefs about learners, learning, the ideal society, family and consumer sciences education) guide our teaching?
- What values and goals support and refute our actions?
- What are the consequences of taking action based on these values and goals?
- What is meaningful learning? How do our actions in the classroom facilitate meaningful learning?
- Are our actions as teachers in the best long-term interests of all our students—regardless of gender, ethnic origins, abilities? Are our actions morally defensible?
- What teaching practices are needed to empower and free students to continuously transform themselves?
- What actions could we take to enhance meaningful and worthwhile change in teaching practice to support the implementation of the Work and Family Life Curriculum in Ohio?

Reflective processing not only puts the professional development emphasis appropriately on reflection rather than replication (Smylie & Conyers, 1991), but it fosters a substantive discussion of educational issues surrounding the implementation of a particular curricular focus. Through reflection, teachers can find a balance between trying to implement the *conceptual public curriculum* (as revealed in outcomes, standards, and curriculum documents) and the *lived curriculum* as created by teachers and their students in the classroom



learning community (Aoki, 1983). Such a balance is necessary to overcome the oppression and powerlessness teachers feel when implementing curriculum guides and lesson plans. As Peterat and Vaines (1992) point out, an unbalanced emphasis on the conceptual curriculum "diminish[es] the caring and passion that originally inspired [them] to be teachers," and causes them to lose themselves and to lose sight of students and their needs (p. xiii). Finding a balance frees teachers to be open to the needs of their own students, society, and self in the on-going renewal and transformational growing process.

Ohio's Model in Action

Ohio's Teacher-Leader Institute was begun August, 1994. The first teacher-leader cadre has finished its first year as transforming teacher-leaders and is continuing to meet together three times per year. The second cadre has begun its learning and working together. Although the details of the lived experience of these teacher-leader communities are beyond the scope of this paper, teacher-leaders and Institute facilitators have learned together through dialogue and through reflective reading, writing, teaching, and leading. Retreats for community building among teacher-leaders and as a model for community building with their students and other teachers were renewing for all participants. Institute experiences have evolved as Institute facilitators and teacher-leaders have gained new insights. There is evidence of personal paradigm shifts and transformed practice of the work and family life teacher-leaders and Institute facilitators. Work and family life teacher-leaders have provided state and regional workshops for their colleagues and supported teacher colleagues through telephone and other contacts. Some learning-support groups have been formed, and one teacher-leader secured financial support from her city to organize an institute for teachers.

Presently, financial support for state leadership and for Institute community building retreats for teacher-leaders is uncertain because of limited state and federal resources. Therefore, the need for these teacher-leaders to transform personal practice and inspire others to transform the Work and Family Life Program is greater than ever before. Our current challenge is to find ways to extend and sustain our professional community. ■

Notes

¹ Transformational leadership was found by Tichy & Devanna (1990) to be imperative for the survival and creation of healthy business institutions in an environment of accelerating change. They provide examples of "real leaders involved in the tough, grueling, gut-wrenching challenge of trying to transform companies, save employee jobs, and strengthen the fabric of society" (p. xiii) and their characteristics and practices.

² Readings include Baldwin (1985), Copa (1988), Eisner (1985), Fedje (1992), Kowalczyk, Neels, & Sholl (1990), Morgaine (1992a, 1992b), and Wogensen (1989).

References

- Aoki, T. (1983). Towards a dialectic between the conceptual world and the lived world: Transcending instrumentalism in curriculum orientation. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 5(4), 4-21.
- Baldwin, E. F. (1985). Home economics curriculum: Political-moral aspects. *Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education*, 3(3), 3-17.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Brown, M. (1993). Home economics as a professional community. In *Philosophical studies in home economics: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves*, pp. 149-194. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Coomer, D. (1989). Introduction to critical inquiry. In F. Hultgren & D. Coomer (Eds.), *Alternative modes of inquiry in home economics research* (pp. 167-184). Peoria, IL: Glencoe.
- Copa, P. (1988, July). Keeping critical company: Finding enriching communities to enrich our orientation to ethical action. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Thinking and Problem Solving, The Ohio State University.
- Cunningham, R. Johnson, J., & Carlson, S. (1992, December). *Curriculum orientations of home economics teachers*. Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1993, June). Reframing the school reform agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(10), 753-761.
- Eisner, E. W. (1985). Five basic orientations to the curriculum. *The educational imagination* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Fedje, C. G. (1992). Toward a new view of inservice education. In L. Peterat & E. Vaines, *Lives and plans: Signs for transforming practice*, Home Economics Teacher Education Yearbook 12. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe.
- Gere, A. R., (Ed.). (1985). *Roots in the sawdust: Writing to learn across the disciplines*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Jalongo, M. R. (1991). *The role of the teacher in the 21st century: An insider's view*. Bloomington: National Educational Service.
- Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Showers, B. (1992). *Models of teaching*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1993a). *Personal development resource guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.



- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1993b). *Resource Management Resource Guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.
- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1994a). *Life planning resource guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.
- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1994b). *Nutrition & Wellness Resource Guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.
- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1995a). *Family Relations Resource Guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.
- Kister, J., Laurenson, S., & Boggs, H. (1995b). *Parenting Resource Guide*. Columbus, OH: Instructional Materials Laboratory, The Ohio State University.
- Kowalczyk, D., Neels, N., & Sholl, M. (1990, May/June). The critical perspective: A challenge for home economics teachers. *Illinois Teacher*, 174-177, 180.
- Lickona, T. (1989). *Educating for character*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1993, March). Building teams to rebuild schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 512-519.
- McKay, J. A. (1992). Professional development through action research. *Journal of Staff Development*, 13(1), 18-21.
- Morgaine, C. A. (1992a). Alternative paradigms for helping families change themselves. *Family Relations*, 41, 12-17.
- Morgaine, C. A. (1992b). A phenomenological approach to transforming perceptions of self in teacher education. In L. Peterat & E. Vaines, *Lives and plans: Signs for transforming practice*, Home Economics Teacher Education Yearbook 12. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe.
- Peterat, L., & Vaines, E. (1992). Transforming practice. In L. Peterat & E. Vaines, *Lives and plans: Signs for transforming practice*, Home Economics Teacher Education Yearbook 12. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe.
- Smylie, M. A., & Conyers, J. G. (1991, Winter). Changing conceptions of teaching influence the future of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 12(1), 12-16.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wogensen, C. (1989, January/February). Teaching home economics in an age of transition. *Illinois Teacher*, 103-106.
- Zimpher, N. I., & Howey, K. R. (1992). *Policy and practice toward the improvement of teacher education*. Oak Brook, IL: The North Central Regional Education Laboratory.

Building a Sustainable Profession

**Elizabeth A. DeMerchant
Leslie Y. Johnson**

This article proposes that building a professional community that collaborates with related disciplines will position the family and consumer sciences profession in the 21st century for its mission of empowering individuals, strengthening families, and enabling communities (Proceedings, 1993).

Individuals who are socially interdependent, participate together in discussion and decision making, and share practices (that both define the community and are nurtured by it) make a community (Brown, 1993). Since the early Lake Placid Conferences, home economists have thought of themselves as a professional community. However, Brown asserted that home economists as a whole do not share common values, beliefs, concepts, and expectations. From this perspective the profession fails to meet the above criteria for being a community.

Other leaders have urged community building. Deacon (1987) emphasized the need for horizontal integrity—to bind the field together. Hawthorne (1984) called for a unified voice or a cohesive profession. Caplow (1954) identified steps in professionalization as (a) creation of a professional organization, (b) name change, (c) development of a code of ethics, and (d) prolonged political agitation. As a profession we are currently struggling with the development of a code of ethics. The American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) Ethics Committee is in the process of revising a code for the members of the profession and of AAFCS (1995). Without continuing initiatives to build a community, the profession of family and consumer sciences will be in a weak position for maintaining a viable future.

In order for the profession to develop a sustainable position we should (a) build a community of family and consumer scientists, (b) mentor the next generation of professionals into and through professional tracks, (c) collaborate within the profession, and (d) collaborate with other disciplines. Building a strong community as a sustainable profession necessitates integration of knowledge, skills, and resources across specializations. This has been difficult due to the dramatic increase in the quantity of information available in the public domain and the decrease in available resources. Davis (1993) outlined each area of specialization with

DeMerchant and Johnson are Doctoral Candidates, College of Human Resources, Department of Housing, Interior Design, and Resource Management, Virginia Tech.



family as well as business and industry applications. Her detailed outline provides a wealth of ideas, a springboard for possible collaboration.

The purpose of this article is to suggest ideas for collaboration among family and consumer sciences and related disciplines. Many areas for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research have been identified for complex human and environmental problems (Baldwin, 1991; Davis, 1982; Honey, 1959; McGrath, 1968; Pou, 1978; Schlater, 1970; Vincenti, 1990). Schlater, in 1970, proposed research goals that continue to be relevant. The ideas introduced in this article target three of those goals: (a) to improve the conditions contributing to human psychological and social development, (b) to improve the physical components of the near environment, and (c) to improve the quality and availability of community services which enrich family life. Housing as an area of specialization will be utilized as an example of how collaboration among family and consumer sciences and various disciplines can take place.

Housing Challenges

The study of housing has been a component of family and consumer sciences since its inception. Housing is a good example of a specialization that depends upon multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary efforts for professional undertakings (White, 1986). The quality of life related to housing is largely dependent upon family climate, although external forces (e.g., service, aesthetics, crime) also have marked effects (Schlater, 1970).

The United States is facing a crisis in its rural and urban communities. The onset of crack-cocaine, the decline in economic conditions for many families, and the increased incidence of crime have combined to limit the quality of life in many communities (Wise, 1992). Between 1983 and 1992, the country experienced a 9.4 percent increase in the crime rate (U. S. Census, 1994). Moreover, drug trafficking is believed to affect our communities by increasing the amount of violence and vandalism, the number of people who are addicts, the number of children who are abandoned, and number of youth who drop out of schools (Dembo, Hughes, Jackson, & Mieczkowski, 1993). Furthermore, computer and embezzlement schemes have plagued our society. But the most sickening crimes are those that transpire in and around our homes (Kornblum & Boggs, 1984). Rainwater (1966) and Pacione (1990) contend that the most basic necessity of our homes and

respective neighborhoods is protection from the environment, and the necessity for protection may increase due to both social and natural environments. Rainwater's seminal article further emphasized that our homes and surrounding environments should be "safe havens" from society's ills; but if drugs, poverty, and crime continue to exist, our homes will no longer be considered retreats from these negative externalities.

Through building community and fostering individual and family empowerment, we can network with different disciplines for the benefit of the common good. Creekmore (1968) asserted that the unique concern of the profession is "the effect and influence of both the near environment and the people on each other" (p. 94). Hawthorne (1984) added that the unique contribution of the field is its "perspective of prevention, education, and development in its commitment to the improvement of the quality of life for families and consumers" (Hawthorne, 1984, p. 181). Three possible approaches for curbing the aforementioned problems include technological innovations, defensible spaces, and neighborhood watch programs. Through collaborative efforts with diverse disciplines, family and consumer scientists can undertake initiatives to improve the state of our communities.

Collaboration Across Disciplines

Schrage (1990) defined collaboration as the creation of shared meaning or collective creativity. Using processes such as the Forsythe, Meszaros, and Turner (1994) multistep conceptual framework for interagency collaboration, the profession can collaborate with various disciplines or agencies on any number of issues. Following are examples of how consumer and family scientists can collaborate with other housing specialists to improve communities.

Technological Innovations

Family and consumer scientists can work collaboratively in the public or private sectors with engineers, computer scientists, and electricians to ensure the availability of consumer information, education, safety, and "user friendly" products for consumers—all toward the desired *end* of safety. For example, Klien, Luxenburg, & King (1989) describe a number of alternative measures to secure safety from criminal victimization. Security systems are an example of how home automation technology enhances safety and lessens criminal activity. Home automation is not a new concept; however recently there have been significant technological innovations. A consumer electronics bus (CEBus) and X-



10 are examples of wiring used for home automation (Day, 1995). CEBus spearheaded by the Electronics Industry Association is a standardized wiring protocol that enables many different electronic products to communicate with one another. X-10 is a less sophisticated wiring system used in specific products. Home security systems are only one example of how CEBus wiring may be used (Butler, 1995). Technological innovations developed through collaboration of family and consumer scientists and diverse disciplines are more likely to serve the interests of consumers, the environment, and business.

Defensible Spaces

Oscar Newman's (1972) classical article proposed an alternative strategy to police protection for controlling our environments so that they are safe and livable spaces. Newman's model for controlling residential environments is termed *defensible space*—a residential living environment that enhances a family's life while providing security. Herbert and Davidson (1991) expanded upon Newman's work when studying lighting as a means of deterring crime.

Defensible spaces are created through design, and Newman offered four ways to protect a community from crime. First, residential environments should be subdivided into zones which provide distinguishable spaces—defined territories. Newman suggested the use of shrubs and trees to define these territories. Second, windows should be strategically placed so that residents can naturally survey the exterior and interior living environments. Third, buildings should be designed in ways that limit peculiarity or isolation to an observer. Fourth, buildings should be located in areas without perceived threats.

Consumer and family scientists can work with architects, engineers, landscape architects, and urban planners to accomplish a defensible space. Architects and engineers would facilitate building design, urban planners would assist with the location of the buildings, and landscape architects would provide input on how to define the territory through landscaping. Family and consumer scientists are most familiar with family needs and wants and, therefore, can recommend realistic living scenarios.

Neighborhood Watch Programs

According to an African proverb, "It takes a whole village to raise a child." Similarly, it takes a whole community to effectively combat the social ills that are pervasive in and around our homes; individual efforts are often ineffective (Harris, 1995; Newman, 1972).

Empowerment as a sense of control over one's destiny has application here. In a community, its premise is to turn individual defeats into victories through collaborative efforts (Schechter, 1982). Neighborhood watch programs exemplify the concept of empowerment; they are designed to provide an organized communal approach to combat neighborhood crime (Bennett & Lavrakas, 1989; Darian-Smith, 1993; Hourihan, 1986; Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Rosenbaum, 1987; Rosenbaum, Lurigio, Lavrakas, 1989). The purpose of each program is to induce individuals and businesses in the neighborhood to exercise some degree of control over their community. This is accomplished by involving citizens in crime prevention activities—for example, neighborhood watch, organized surveillance, and self-defense programs or seminars (Garofalo & McLeod, 1989).

Cooperative Extension professionals are especially qualified to work along with other community service organizations and criminal justice professionals to educate community members and to develop community watch programs. Collaboration among public schools, human service agencies, and Extension agents could provide a support system so that communities are empowered to provide safe environments especially for children, youth, and the elderly.

Conclusion

Setting a goal of *building community* within family and consumer sciences is only the first step in ensuring a sustainable profession. Professionals will need to take a lead in interacting with various disciplines to improve the quality of life of families and communities. It appears that the trends of smaller government, decreased resources, and increased information are not likely to diminish. And because families of tomorrow will face many demands on their resources, the continuing development of the profession will enable it to deal with the challenges and changes in society. The examples of collaboration suggested in this article are among countless possibilities available to family and consumer scientists.

With the many changes in the public and private sectors, family and consumer scientists are currently experiencing as radical a transformation as the founders of the profession once did. In her historical study of women scientists, Rossiter (1980) described one who having outgrown her position did something about it. And when no one would hire her, she made her own opportunity instead. Society is currently shifting into the third wave—the

“
Building a professional community with commitment to collaboration with related disciplines will help the profession create a sustainable position in the 21st Century.
”



information age (Toffler & Toffler; 1995). The unique perspective of family and consumer sciences will be of interest to industry, business, service agencies, and academia. Because it is likely that positions supported by public funds will diminish with smaller government, the profession will need to continue to develop private sector positions that offer family and consumer services similar to those currently provided by the public sector.

Family and consumer scientists will need common values and goals in order to have a unified voice. Building a professional community with commitment to collaboration with related disciplines will help the profession create a sustainable position in the 21st century. ❏

References

- American Association of Family & Consumer Sciences. (1995). *Code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA.
- Baldwin, E. E. (1991). The home economics movement: A new integrative paradigm. *Journal of Home Economics*, 83, 42-49.
- Bennett, S. E., & Lavrakas, P. J. (1989). Community-based crime prevention: An assessment of the Eisenhower foundation's neighborhood program. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 345-364.
- Brown, M. M. (1993). *Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves*. East Lansing: College of Human Ecology, Michigan State University.
- Butler, D. (1995, January 10). Home control standard finally begins to bear fruit. *Roanoke Times & World-News*, EXTRA 3.
- Caplow, T. (1954). *The sociology of work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Creekmore, A. M. (1968). The concept basic to home economics. *Journal of Home Economics*, 60, 93-99.
- Darian-Smith, E. (1993). Neighborhood watch—Who watches whom? Reinterpreting the concept of neighborhood. *Human Organization*, 52, 83-88.
- Davis, E. Y. (1982). *Home economics in the future*. Paper presented at the Northern Region of the Virginia Home Economics Association, Annandale, VA.
- Davis, M. L. (1993). Perspectives on home economics: Unity and identity. In *Proceedings of the Scottsdale Meeting: Positioning the Profession for the 21st Century* (pp. B113-129). Scottsdale, AZ: American Home Economics Association.
- Day, R. (1995, March). Home tech. *Home*, 48-50.
- Deacon, R. A. (1987). Visions for the 21st century. *Journal of Home Economics*, 79, 63.
- Dembo, R., Hughes, P., Jackson, L., & Mieczkowski, T. (1993). Crack cocaine dealing by adolescents in two public housing projects: A pilot study. *Human Organization*, 52(1), 89-96.
- Forsythe, H. W., Meszaros, P. S., & Turner, R. M. (1994). Conceptual framework for interagency collaboration: A Kentucky case study. *Home Economics FORUM*, 7(1), 29-34.
- Garofalo, J., & McLeod, M. (1989). The structure and operations of neighborhood watch programs in the United States. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 326-344.
- Harris, S. (1995, Winter). Crime affects family, vice versa. *Virginia Tech Research*, 4-5.
- Hawthorne, B. (1984). *Definitive themes in home economics and their impact on families: 1980-1984*. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.
- Herbert, D., & Davidson, N. (1994). Modifying the built environment: The impact of improved street lighting. *Geoforum*, 25, 339-350.
- Honey, R. R. (1959). The new directions for research. *Journal of Home Economics*, 51, 761-762.
- Hourihan, K. (1986). Local community involvement and participation in neighborhood watch: A case-study in Cork, Ireland. *Urban Studies*, 24, 129-136.
- Lavrakas, P. J., & Herz, E. J. (1982). Citizen participation in neighborhood crime prevention. *Criminology*, 20, 479-498.
- Klien, L., Luxenburg, J., & King, M. (1989). Perceived neighborhood crime and the impact of private security. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 365-377.
- Kornblum, W., & Boggs, V. (1984). New alternatives for fighting crime. *Social Policy*, 14(4), 24-28.
- McGrath, E. J. (1968). The imperatives of change for home economics. *Journal of Home Economics*, 60, 505-514.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space: Crime prevention through urban design*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pacione, M. (1990). Urban livability: A review. *Urban Geography*, 11, 1-30.
- Pou, E. Q. (1978). *Identifying with the profession*. Paper presented at the Association of Administrators of Home Economics in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Scottsdale, AZ.
- Proceedings of the Scottsdale Meeting: Positioning the Profession for the 21st Century*. (1993). Scottsdale, AZ: American Home Economics Association.
- Rainwater, L. (1966). Fear and the house-as-haven in the lower class. *The Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 32(1), 23-31.
- Rosenbaum, D. P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: Is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33, 103-134.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Lurigio, A. J., & Lavrakas, P. J. (1989). Enhancing citizen participation and solving crime: A national evaluation of crime stoppers programs. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 401-420.
- Rossiter, M. W. (1980). *Women scientists in America: Struggles and strategies to 1940*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered women's movement*. Boston: South Bend Press.
- Schlater, J. D. (1970). *National goals and guidelines for research in home economics*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Schrage, M. (1990). *Shared minds: The new technologies of collaboration*. New York: Random House.
- Toffler, A., & Toffler, H. (1995). *Creating a new civilization: The politics of the third wave*. Atlanta: Turner.
- U. S. Department of Commerce, Economics, and Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census. (1994). *Statistical abstracts of the United States* (114 ed.). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Vincenti, V. B. (1990). Home economics in higher education: Communities of convenience or purpose? *Home Economics Research Journal*, 19(2), 184-193.
- White, B. J. (1986). Housing as a field of study. *Housing and Society*, 13, 188-204.
- Wise, B. (1992). *Take back your neighborhood: Police and citizen partnerships in confronting* (No. 67-745 CC). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.



Editor's Message

One of the benefits of community has not been discussed by the authors in this issue. Genuine communities have a healing power that changes lives forever. The joy of experiencing a healing community is a scarce commodity in these days of harsh rhetoric and cultural discrimination. Although community generally has responsibility for the public good, it may need to attend to the health of individuals within if it is to have the resources—energy, commitment—to consider the greater good.

The present era challenges each of us, as well as our profession, to take responsibility for joining with other individuals and organizations to deal with complex public problems. Like it or not, if we lack the initiative we will live with the consequences when others who take the lead have values and goals in opposition to ours.

Community making is hard work, and the outcomes are slow to emerge. I use the word *make* intentionally. Actually, the metaphor of *building* in our theme should be changed to accommodate the notion that communities are not rigid structures that operate according to linear, predictable, and controllable principles. Instead, communities are ever-changing, fluid, and dynamic; they are characterized by interdependent and transient patterns that reconfigure with new information, energy, or events.

Peck in *The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace* (1987) discusses the value of crisis in creating community. It need not be a manmade or natural disaster, a difficult illness, or even alcoholism to make *community* a useful notion. (AA is probably the most successful community ever—perhaps because it holds that crisis is omnipresent.) Humans have everyday events that could be managed more successfully in community, whether it be the family, work teams, or interest groups. There are usually some issues and opportunities that could be handled routinely in community; if ignored or left to escalate issues can become big dangers, and opportunities can wane or disappear. “Contrary to what many might believe, the healthy life is hardly one marked by an absence of crisis. In fact, an individual’s psychological health is distinguished by how *early* he or she can meet crisis” (p. 79).

As I was thinking about how I would conclude this message, I opened the November issue of *Educational Leadership* (1995). I’m not sure why I was drawn to the article, “On Restructuring Schools: A Conversation with Fred Newmann.” When asked by Editor Brandt to summarize the value of his recent research, he was able to say that it wasn’t structures and tools that made the difference in learning but rather the culture—“adults’ depth of concern for the intellectual quality of student learning” and “the extent to which the school creates a *professional community* that harnesses and develops individual commitment and talent into a group effort that pushes for learning of high intellectual quality” (p. 73). The would-be redesigners of education at both the public school and university levels don’t mention the value of community. Instead they remake structures, add techniques and tools, or create new rules. Although most professionals intuitively know that community makes a difference, here’s some qualitative research that supports it.

When will we have enough evidence to practice what we know in our souls? And when will we have enough courage to act according to our convictions? Community making as a facilitation process ought to be in every professional’s inventory of skills. Because there is so little emphasis on professional development in the ordinary academic program, each professional will have to search out that opportunity to learn. I’m proud to say that *FORUM* has contributed to the knowledge base. Now. IT’S YOUR TURN. ❏

—DM