ABSTRACT: This is a brief report on a Multiproblem Neighborhood project in a moderate size metropolitan community. It presents the conceptual frame of reference of the project and some of the tangible organizational outgrowths of the research penetration into the complex community structures enclosing the neighborhood.

This paper is a conceptual analysis of a research demonstration project which explored and attempted to influence the human-trouble handling machinery of a community. The project, which focused upon a multiproblem neighborhood, served as the behavioral science resources of the university and the human-disruption control machinery of the community. However, in addition to its transmission function, the project had a significant generative function in both of these separate systems. The project pivoted around a demographic data-gathering effort which was an important aspect of its existence. This data will be published separately in a later report; our purpose here is to set forth a conceptual model which has generality beyond the project itself.

Conceptual Overview
A Macrosystem Model

The project was based upon the concept that community agencies and human-service programs function not only to help people in...
trouble but also to protect the community against the perceived threats of problem-producers. The agitated encounters between stress excitors and strain-respondent segments of the community were our subject matter in a macrosystem that involved a number of different components:

1. Enclaves of psychocultural stressors or threat-elicitors in the larger community; that is, the multiproblem neighborhoods;
2. A community interlace of specialized threat-respondent units (the community agencies) that act in concert with;
3. The power structures of the community (governmental and specialized human-service agencies) in behalf of the general public who constitute the strain-respondent groups of the community.

This self-maintaining macrosystem of community threat and response may be construed as resulting from the gradual institutionalizing or hardening of a widening cleavage between the life history of individuals and the cultural history of the community. In order to clarify the elements of this conceptual model and the linkages among them, it is necessary to offer a brief description of each of the three units.

*The multiproblem neighborhood.* This consists of area clusters of threat-elicitors who are inadequate, emotionally disturbed, economically deprived, or who have frequent physical health emergencies or difficulty with the law, etc. The major groups of the community respond to personal-social disruptions in these areas as though a strain was being placed upon the collective community. Thus, the threat elicitors constitute a catabolic force in community living that heightens cleavages within the community.

*The culturing institutions.* In this particular model of ecological disruption-response, the disruption-handling elements of the culturing institutions constitute the defense machinery which is erected against a perceived danger. Operational patterns of social welfare, legal-correction, mental health, public health, education, housing, recreation, and religion all contribute their share to this defensive array. Varying portions of the resources and culturing forces of these social institutions are devoted to the defensive task.

*The power structures.* All of the defensive patterns of the community interlock with the power structures of the community to prevent major disjunctions between the individual and collective living. Some of the personal social disruptions to which this machinery responds, such as mob violence, may constitute real dangers to group living. Others, such as homosexuality, may be remnants of a past historical period. For the latter, the actual threat may not justify the institutional response.

*Linkages in the Disruption-Handling Machinery*
Since the executive direction of the trouble-handling