This article looks at the transformation of Finnish community work in the Nordic context. The two-phase analysis of an intensive case study first presents a summary of the interpretation of interview descriptions by Finnish practical community workers, and the observations are then reflected on by myself and Swedish academic experts against the current situation and development trends in community work in Sweden. The paradigm change in community work has an impact on the organisation, expertise, goals and discourse on the work. In Finland, community work has all but vanished from the structure of municipal social work; in Sweden its position is stronger, but the trends of change are also visible there. The article concludes with an examination of the changes in community work in the contexts of both professional practices in social work and societal policy.
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Introduction

In the Nordic context, community work became societal work in the sense that, as a method of official social work, it represented society’s intervention in the local community. Unlike social work in general, community work was perceived to be a method whereby it was considered possible to have an impact on the interconnections between people’s problems and local structures. The goal was to prevent social problems in residential areas and to introduce ‘normal’ social services close to the residents by tailoring the services to their needs. (See, e.g., Lindholm 1995, 20–34; Ronnby 1995, 185–198; Turunen 2004; Wahlberg 1995, 35–47.)

The purpose of this article is first to briefly describe community work in Finnish municipalities as constructed by professional community workers. However, the focus of the article rests on a comparison of my interpretations of Finnish community work with the situation in Sweden, as described by academic community work experts. Thus, this is not a symmetrical comparison between two cases, but a comparison of the interpretations and findings made by myself of reports by Finnish community workers compared with the situation in Sweden. In conclusion, I will review the change of paradigm in community work from the point of view of Nordic community work tradition.

Method

The study could be characterised as an intensive case study. I have implemented a study on Finnish community work (Roivainen 2008 a and b) by interviewing, in the autumn of 2005, six key informants about community work, all of them experienced social workers in community work. The interviews were based on an unstructured set-up, in which experts on the practice of community work described their work during their long careers. The descriptions given by the interviewees were interpreted as constructions and categorisations of community work. What was shown to be essential in these descriptions was “change talk”, a data-driven analysis which is described in more detail in separate articles (Roivainen 2008 a and b). The main dimensions and contents of the “change talk” are summarised in Table 1, and my text focuses on a discussion of these observations.

Interviews with academic experts were conducted in Sweden in January 2006. The purpose of these interviews was to reflect with the Swedish colleagues on my interpretations concerning the current state of community work and its future development trends in Finland by comparing the situation with that in Sweden. Making comparisons with the Swedish situation is justified, on the one hand, because Finnish community work has received a great deal of input from Swedish community work. On the other hand, unlike Finland at the moment, there is still strong expertise in the academic teaching of and research into community work in Sweden, which provides a
good opportunity for a broader study of this domain, little researched in Finland.

The structure of the interviews was that shown in the summary in Table 1, but in addition to background information, I also asked more general questions about the current situation on community work in Sweden. The length of the transcription of the interviews made in Sweden is 86 pages (A4, double spacing). In reporting the results of the Finnish interview data (Roivainen 2008 a and b), I constructed a single-voiced model story with a plot out of the polyphonic descriptions by the interviewees, in which the descriptions by different speakers are intermingled. This solution was also influenced by the small number of interviewees and the risk of recognition caused by this. I also decided to adopt the same method regarding the Swedish material. Since, as far as the Finnish data is concerned, the article focuses on the analysis results, data extracts have been completely omitted from the text. As for the Swedish data, the italicised passages in the text are direct quotes from the speech of an interviewee, but some of the quotes are placed in quotation marks. Longer quotes are identified by codes.

The Transformation of Finnish Community Work constructed by community workers

As this research was started in the autumn of 2005, it became obvious that a profound change has taken place in community-based social work in Finland. There seemed to exist no reference whatsoever to community work on the websites of the largest city municipalities in Finland, with the exception of the capital Helsinki and the city of Tampere. At the same time there are clear references to a communitarian way of re-structuring community work within the NGOs’ community-based projects4.

In the interviews with the Finnish professionals, community work is constructed as a sort of unofficial way of practising social work as a counterpart to official social work. Where a social worker based in an office is a municipal authority and thus subject to statutory obligations in such areas as child protection or substance abuse work, the community worker has held a “dual role” in the territory between a public authority and field work. Because of this, it has been felt that the community workers are better able to enter the “same field with the clients” than the office-based social workers, and they are able to participate in the construction of client- and community-based processes “through human contact” (Roivainen 2008 a and b).

My interpretation starts out from the assumption that the changing position of community work has entailed a re-shaping of the whole mode of work, whether we look at the content, the goals, the target groups, the expertise or the ways of speaking. I will first present my detailed examination and conclude the interpretation in the form of a table.

As part of modern social work, community work was typically a public-sector activity, while in the context of post-modern society, community work is characterised
by communitarian strategies organized by NGOs and a wide range of actors from NGOs and the third sector.

The modern community work approach was characterised by profiling social work as a profession of its own. Balancing on the boundary between professional social work and other fields of activity has meant that a clearly delineated profession with a similarly delineated body of expertise has crumbled away. The emergence of new, more vaguely defined professional expertise is reflected in job titles such as family worker, community architect, community physical exercise instructor and community artist (see Karjalainen et al. 2002, 260–265). Not only the titles, but also job descriptions have changed. For example, the job description of a community family worker includes facets of the work of a child welfare officer, social worker, home help and community worker (Turtiainen 1999). A similar changing profile of occupational standards and titles has been described in both the British and the broader Nordic context of community work (see Turunen 2004, 116, 188–190).

The changing role of official community work is clearly visible in the interviews. As an example, the direction of activity and the goal of community social work in local communities is changing. Earlier, the community worker represented an expert in social welfare and a link between the communities and the local authorities. The direction of activity was system-oriented in the sense that community work represented a professional strategy of social work as part of the official welfare policy. In the context of traditional community work, there existed a clear discourse for adapting welfare services to the citizens’ needs. The role of community work was to act from the bottom up so as to support the community members in the use of the resources and services of society.

In these days, the direction of activity is expected to change from bottom-up to top-down, in order to control and make early interventions in different communities. Today, there are implications that community work in its modern form has been harnessed to support increasingly individually-targeted social work and its philosophy of target groups:

The individually-targeted social work carried out in an office is increasingly characterised by managerialism and the New Public Management (NPM) (see, e.g., Jordan 2003; Harris 2005). At the methods level in management-oriented Community Social Work (CSW, see Stepney & Evans 2000, 105–115), the basic methods of social work – case work, group work and community work – are integrated into a single model (see Turunen 2004, 60), but the operating philosophy is radically different from traditional community work in that its adopted programme is to develop work modes based on self-help and multi-provider models (ibid.).

The earlier starting point of community work stressed the activation of coping resources and networks in communities, the direction being from society to communities. In these days, official community work is expected to be more closely integrated
with the needs of official social work, which re-profiles its role into a more controlling and neutralizing direction. In recent years, suburban projects have focused on those excluded or what are called people at risk of exclusion – the long-term unemployed, potential child welfare families or mental health rehabilitees – and their relations with the rest of the population.

Earlier community work attempted to identify the problems in a community in order to empower local communities. At that time, community workers tried to affect the structures of society to help people to manage their lives better. The methods were to identify problems in a community and to empower local communities and to change features in the environment. The methods of community workers consisted of negotiation, empowerment and enablement. In these days, community workers attempt to affect individuals belonging to different marginalized client groups, with a view to identifying their individual resources and changing their life politics so that they can cope better in everyday life. The controlling methods (diagnosing, educating, socialising, etc.) are directed to certain groups that represent different categories of excluded clients. Community work helps people in networks and peer groups to encounter their personal problems and cope with them.

At the level of discourse, the change may be described as a movement from transformational empowerment to empowerment in the clients' personal lives and interpersonal relations. Unlike the radical interpretations of community work in the 1970s, where power and powerlessness were understood as a divisive policy issue associated with societal structures, the emphasis now lies on the residents' personal empowerment and the structural impacts of life-policy decisions on the community. (cf. Turunen 2004, 181–182).

Reflection on community work by Swedish academic experts

Community work in present-day Sweden
To begin with, the interviews with academic experts dealt with the current status of community work in Sweden. Following this, the change described in Finnish community work (Table 1) was compared with the development of community work in Sweden. The discussion revealed both similarities and differences.

On the basis of the interview data, community work in its traditional form is also on the wane in Sweden. Although social legislation still requires the professionals to work “with the structures”, the mode of work has hardly seen any development in the public sector in recent years. One of the reasons for this is taken to be the financial crisis of the public sector, due to which social work has increasingly less space for structural emphases. The consequence has been to prioritise traditional social work and to
focus “on dealing with acute business”, since in practice there is no time for anything else.

At the moment, this consequence is already reflected in education. In Sweden, various social work education units have provided community work teaching as separate courses and even as an option in master’s programmes. Currently, demand for these has, at least here and there, been decreasing, because

social workers with this interest have not felt confident that they could find work in social departments (Socialtjänsten), so that they may have to find other work, above all within the third sector or various projects. (I3)

*Traditional community work has been trying to connect to people in the role of inhabitants, in the role of neighbours*” (I1), and even today, the content of community work consists of neighbourhood work, but nowadays a substantial part of it is implemented in the voluntary sector. As an example, work with residents’ associations was previously the responsibility of municipal social workers, but today it is managed by volunteers.

At the moment, social workers have little chance of taking part in different projects, but certain extensive architectural projects may involve social workers. Similarly, the perspective of social planning includes some of the basic ideas of community work.
According to my interviewees, the concept of community work (samhällsarbete) is practically no longer used in Sweden, and it is associated with echoes of the 1970s. Instead, social mobilisation (social mobiliserings) is often talked about. Community-type activity is implemented in local and area-based development work, for example, in rural townships or city suburbs, in large-city work (storstadsarbete) projects. In Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö, a major city survey (see Lahti Edmark 2003) has been implemented, to also identify existing projects, an example of which is the inner city project (innerstadprojekt) in Stockholm. Area-based work is also carried on under the name environmental work (miljöarbete), especially among young people. In addition, there is preventive, pedagogically-oriented development project activity and co-operative activity associated with the women’s movement. Many local activity groups, such as action groups fighting against the closure of schools, have also organised themselves without actually having a community worker in charge (Ronnby 1995; 1999 a and b). The concept of community work has thus become fragmented into numerous other concepts (see Turunen 2004 and 2008). Many projects to develop residential environments (bostadsprojekt) are still linked with the activity of the social department. However, the housing companies (bostadsföretagen) have also begun to employ community workers in residential areas labelled as problematic, in order to promote the participation of residents.

According to my interviewees, community work lives on in a variety of contexts, but “its ideology and core are no longer extant”. In the 1970s, community work was radical and political in nature. However, elements of traditional community work are still embedded in current modes of work, although they are different in character. One type of community work is implemented in organisation work, in which the social workers attempt to organise people from the bottom up and to encounter them with their diverse needs.

Within social work, community-type activity may still be implemented within case management, for example, under such labels as “health coordinator” or “job coordinator”. Compared with traditional community work, however, the approach is different.

The traditional neighbourhood work approached all members of the neighbourhood as members of a large collective. Today, the approach may be more specific, because people have different cultural backgrounds, they may be poor or young, or have cancer. (11)

**Community work and trends of change in Sweden**

In the interviews, the experts were asked on the basis of Table 1 whether they could identify similar trends of change in Sweden as those seen in Finland. In the following I shall deal with the interview data according to the structure of the Table.

As regards strategy, the third sector is fairly strong in Sweden. While community work has lost some of its position as part of the structure of official social work, the
mode of work is implemented as social work in a range of development projects both in rural and urban areas, increasingly by volunteers, such as the City Mission, the Salvation Army or the Red Cross. The conditions of work of the voluntary sector have improved in that the municipalities have begun to purchase its services. In addition to social workers, local development, such as the thousands of co-operatives (see Ronnby 1999a and b), also involve workers who have a secondary-level qualification in social work.

As to method, according to my interviewees there used to reign a relatively wide unanimity, even though in practice the work was implemented in many different ways. In fact, the descriptions attempted to match these ways with the model. Although community work has always been one of the expressions of social work, the focal point of social work has always rested on case-specific client work.

A new type of community work is represented by active co-operation with the authorities, carried on by various groups. As an example, within immigrant groups co-operation is used to create contacts for the members, but there ethnic associations also exist which isolate themselves from the rest of society. In areas within large cities, new types of community workers are active in building bridges between resident groups and “established social groups”. “The element of community work is visible in that you learn how society functions, you find channels for activity through which you can promote what you feel is important.” (13) The task is not easy, for groups often have strong prejudices against would-be intermediaries.

The meaning of expertise has changed in project work, involving people with different professional backgrounds, though often largely responsible for similar tasks within projects. “No matter whether you’re a social planner or a social worker, you still work from the situation at hand, not in terms of your profession.” (15) Similarly it has been noticed that within different professional groups, such as architects, there has existed the same type of information-generation and work as in traditional community work, albeit without the focus on social development.

In the old tradition, as you started as community worker, you could not combine the work as community worker and the work as a “normal” social worker. Today, however, you might say that you’re partly a community worker, and work with the methods associated with community work. Today you might claim that community work is only one tool in your methods arsenal, which is full of different methods and things to use.” (11)

According to Päivi Turunen (2004 and 2008) social work has undergone a new kind of integration. In a way, an integration of methods has taken place in community social work. In the 1970s it was still usual in Sweden for community work to distance itself from both case work and client work in general, but today the practice of social work has both come closer to client work and may also include network-type client and
group work in residential areas and also elements of social work development. Even in the 1970s and 1980s, community workers may have carried on some client work in the field, such as with cases shared with social and educational authorities, but the actual focal point was co-operation with the various authorities in the area, not the client cases as such.

As for the direction and goal of activity, the process of community work is described in the interviews as top-down on the one hand, and as a both–and model on the other. “You could say that housing companies, for example, recruit a community worker because of their own interest, not because they want to be nice, but because they feel that that’s the way to win. Even if they say they don’t get any benefit from it.” (13)

On the one hand, the potential of a pure bottom-up perspective is viewed sceptically, for community work also involves an element of control. For example, in residential areas with very strong and strongly mobilised ethnic groups who have constructed institutions of their own, such as day care centres and schools. “From the mobilisation perspective you might say that that’s an excellent example, but from the integration viewpoint you’d say it’s a very segregated world.” (12)

In areas with groups who do not vote or become involved with democratic political bodies, and in the worst case construct separate “societies”, the social workers tend to work with individuals instead of with mobilisation. This is because it takes time to build trust. My interpretation of the building of networks receives cautious support. Networking is a modern concept, it was not spoken of in the 1970s or 1980s. Currently, the capabilities for network-building have improved thanks to partnership thinking and advanced strategies. There is a more conscious investment in different actors than before, such as in the case of a small municipality in Skåne, where a community worker involved with youth groups has co-operated extensively with local businesses and gained their sponsorship for youth activity.

As for the target group, the experts interviewed consider that community work cannot generally be regarded as targeted to marginal groups in Sweden. However, to the extent that we speak of community work produced by the social department (Socialtjänstens jobbar), it is directed to marginal groups in a way. While earlier even the social department’s projects worked with an entire residential area, increasingly now special groups and special problems are targeted (see Turunen 2004). It is considered that the 2001 reform of the social legislation also strengthened the focus on special groups. Currently, the social department primarily works with special groups, such as substance abusers or care for the elderly, instead of universal target groups such as accommodation projects with a preventive purpose.

When taking a broader view of community work within social work, the situation is considered to be the reverse, for area-based actions implemented by the state in particular have not been focused so much on people threatened by social exclusion as on areas and addresses in general. In practice, however, in many projects implemented in
the suburbs of large cities or in rural townships, the work in problem areas is focused on certain groups and smaller communities, such as young people, women and immigrants.

"The social department (Socialtjänsten) has come closer to its old role as an implementer of case work with individuals and families. Broadly speaking, community work deals more with structures and attempts to develop better residential environments, to create job opportunities and to improve services, structures so to speak." (13)

According to the interviewees, the change of discourse can be seen, among other things, in the fact that neighbourhood projects do not speak of community work, but of empowerment. Empowerment is a concept much easier to link with life management and dealing with a wide range of both actors and methods. In current debate, empowerment has become a concept which refers to a personal strengthening at individual, group and community level, whereas “in the 1970s we spoke of emancipation. Empowerment of that type, it was more a process of becoming aware and becoming stronger. I mean we were more like between social and political empowerment.” (15)

Despite the fact that in area-based work, for example, the focus has also in recent years clearly been fairly radical with its emphasis on empowerment and mobilisation, especially state-funded projects targeted at the poorest areas have aimed at improving people’s opportunities for having an influence. Projects in large cities (storstadssatsningar) aim at demolishing segregation and changing social structures, by working with different groups, such as immigrant women or groups of unemployed people. Local projects or small projects easily become fairly individual. They may bring significant benefits to the individual, but they do not affect structures. When this is the case, the problem may be transferred to a peripheral residential area, with the result that the ultimate cause of unemployment is seen to be the individual instead of the fact that there are no jobs. In this case, a structural issue becomes a personal problem. Nevertheless, the majority in society have defined those excluded as being excluded from the right to housing, education, etc.

The predominant focus on social problems in social work is also criticised; there is not much talk of resources.

They are discussing problems, problems, problems, oh here we have a lot of problems, in this area we have a lot of unemployed people, older people, drug users, criminals, poverty, but how about the resources of those people, have you seen any analysis of what type of resources you have in this area, physical and cultural and social and political? (14)
Conclusion and discussion

Compared with Finland, the position of community work in Sweden appears to have remained strong in municipal social work, even though the same trends are visible there in a weaker form. The strength of the institutional position of community work is also visible in social work education and in the different local variations of the mode of work.

The first cause of the marginalised position of community work in the structure of municipal social work in Finland is linked with the decreasing significance of community work as a regulator of the urbanising process (Roivainen 2008a). Today, the cultural gap between lifestyles has become considerably smaller, with the exception of multicultural ethnic communities, which pose significant challenges to community work and social work in residential areas, as may be noted from the basis for the Swedish data.

Another factor explaining the disappearance of community work from the structure of municipal social work is associated with its marginalisation inside social work (Burkett 2000; Turunen 2004) and its weakened status as an intervention of structural social work and welfare policy. As a result of the strengthening of bureaucratic social work, community work has become overshadowed by culturally powerful office-based social work (cf. Denvall 1997, 256-2576). The focal points of official social work and the predominant welfare policy have led to the outsourcing of this mode of work from the third sector. This development appears to have taken place both in Finland and in Sweden. At the same time, the development of methods within social work has had the result that community work as an independent method appears to have been integrated as part of the methods arsenal of basic social work (see Turunen 2004). In its turn, the development described here has contributed to the weakening of the expertise of community work.

The marginalisation of community work within the structure of municipal basic social work is, according to my interpretation, associated with a change of paradigm in Finnish social work. There is a move away from the national and international ideal of unified and area-based social work towards what has been seen in Sweden: a specialisation according to client groups (see Karvinen-Niinikoski et al. 2005, 81–82). In Finland the development towards specialisation can be seen to include two partly overlapping trends: on the one hand specialisation into client categories, on the other, there is organisation on the so-called life cycle model (see Roivainen 2008b). When working with communities, it has been customary to deal with the residents in a given area and their networks, which include people of different ages and in different situations (Ibid., see Matthies 2008; Olson 2005; Ronnby 1992). This mode of work is eroded by the new paradigm. Their activity is not based on “building bridges” between different groups, but on similarity and the shared objective of rehabilitation, such as finding a job and managing one’s own life.
The change also affects the nature and work process of the community-based approach. The ethical basis of traditional community work included the central idea of “serving the people” and constructing bottom-up activity at the grassroots level, starting from the citizens’ needs and the communities’ resources, instead of following, say, the interests of the social department (see, e.g., Ronnby 1992, 203). Office-based social work focuses on individual work, and community work in its current form is increasingly strongly made to follow the target group philosophy of official social work. The change is reflected in the principle of forming groups. Where in community work the tradition was to identify “natural groups” that the clients might have formed, in the new mode of organisation networks are constructed institutionally, on the basis of client groups identified by the department (Roivainen 2008b).

Under the pressure of cost efficiency, the resources of basic social work are currently insufficient for preventive work in the field. Understanding that individuals in need of help are also citizens, residents of a municipality and members of their local communities are becoming a challenge in social work. The community-based tradition in social work challenges municipal social work to ask whether it can afford to sacrifice the citizen-centred tradition of community-based social work to the “discourse of individual responsibility” (Juhila 2008, 49–60). Social work needs both individual and community-based approaches, and they need not necessarily be in conflict.
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1 Due to the small size of the sample and the wish of the interviewees, the interviews with Finnish community workers are reported anonymously.

2 All the experts interviewed also had professional expertise in community work in the field. During one week, I was able to reach and interview six academic experts in community work: Alf Ronnby and Björn Andersson in Gothenburg, Helen Lahti-Edmark and Verner Denvall in Lund, Päivi Turunen in Falun (Dalarna University) and Hans-Erik Olson in Stockholm. The interviews were conducted partly in Swedish, partly in English and - in the case of Päivi Turunen - in Finnish. At the time of the interviews, all interviewees were attached to a university, with the exception of the special expert on settlement work, Dr. Phil. Hans-Erik Olsson, who was attached to the Institutet för Fritidsvetenskapliga Studier/Fritidsvetarna.

3 The special education for Community Social Work was introduced in Finland in 2004.

4 The conceptual change from community work to community-based social work took place in the late 1990s, at which point it was also the name given to one of the professional specialization fields of social work. The backdrop to this conceptual change was the early-1990s recession and the related reinforcement of community-based strategies, coupled with the emergence of the third sector to complement and partner with the public sector.

5 A more precise concept than 'communitarian' could be a contractual model, in which the actor stands in a contractual relationship to an agent of government or municipality (see Lynn 2006), since by now, a number of the obligations of the welfare state and the municipalities have been delegated to NGOs.

6 According to Denvall, community work reports in the 1970s described conflicts between community workers and the social work departments acting as their employers. Even at that time, the central dilemma – in addition to and associated with issues of legitimacy and citizen orientation – consisted of the link of community work with the social work department. (Denvall 1997, 256–257.)
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Frá samfélagsstarfi til samfélagsskipulags: Breyting á félagsráðgjöf í finsku og sørnsku samhengi

Í greininni er skoðuð breyting á finsku samfélagsstarfi /community work í norrænu samhengi. Tveggja þrepa greining á öflugri case study kynnir fyrst samantekt á túlkun viðtalslýsinga finskra samfélagsstarfsmanna, og í samvinnu við háskólasérfræðinga eru athuganirnar súðan endurspegladur andspænis núverandi aðstæðum og framvindu þróunar samfélagsvinnu í Svíþjóð. Rammi breytinga i samfélagsstarfi hefur áhrif á skipulagið, sérfraðin, markmið og umfjöllun starfsins. Í Finnlandi hefur samfélagsstarf næstum horfið úr skipulagi félagsráðgjafar í bæjar- og sveitarfélögum; í Svíþjóð er staða þess stærðar, en stefnu-breytingar eru einnig þar greinalegar. Greininn líkur með rannsókn á breytingum á samfélagsstarfi í samhengi við þrönd fæðarstarf i félagsráðgjöf og stefnir í félagsmálum.

**Lykilorð:** samfélagsstarf, félagsráðgjöf, breyting, samfélagskipulag, norrænt samhengi

Yhdyskuntatyöstä yhteisöllisiin strategioihin: sosiaalityön murros suomalaisessa ja ruotsalaisessa kontekstissa

Tässä artikkelissä tarkastellaan suomalaisen yhdyskuntatyöön muutosta pohjoismaisessa kontekstissa. Intensiivisen tapaustutkimuksen kaksivaiheisessa analyyssissa esitellään aluksi suomalaisen käytännön yhdyskuntatyöntekijöiden haastattelukuvauksen tulkinnan yhteenveto, minkä jälkeen havaintoja reflektoidaan ruotsalaisten akateemisten asiantuntijoiden kanssa yhdyskuntatyöön nykytilaan ja kehitystreendeihin Ruotsissa. Yhdyskuntatyöössä tapahtunut paradigmamutostus heijastuu niin työn organisointitapaan, asiantuntijuuteen, tavoitteeseen kuin diskurssiinkin. Suomessa yhdyskuntatyö on lähestulkoon hävinnyt kunnallisen sosiaalityön rakenteesta, Ruotsissa sen asema on vahvempi, mutta muutostrendit näkyvät sielläkin. Lopuksi tarkastellaan yhdyskuntatyöössä tapahtuneita muutoksia yhtäältä sosiaalityön ammatillisten käytäntöjen ja toisaalta yhteiskuntapolitiikan kontekstissa.

**Hakusanat:** yhdyskuntatyö, sosiaalityö, muutos, yhteisöähtiset strategiat, pohjoismainen konteksti