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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Subject and purpose of study.-- The writer undertook this study because of a deep concern for the individual's participation today in community life. National trends of industrialization, urbanization, centralization, and improved systems of communication have had tremendous implications for community and neighborhood life.

They have led to the rise of deprived urban neighborhoods, abounding with social, economic, and political problems. Yet, they have weakened geographical neighborhood bonds and sometimes, though not always, have substituted ties of interest to individuals and groups in other geographical areas. There has often been bewilderment, discouragement, and apathy about community problems and a loss of a feeling of community spirit and responsibility. There has been a failure in the democratic political process in the local community, and less and less participation by citizens in expressing opinions and in decision-making. The majority of individuals living in urban communities, particularly in deprived areas, seem no longer to feel any appreciable power and responsibility for their total community life. The effect
of this on individual personality and on democracy in the United States is of crucial significance.

Since the settlement house- or neighborhood house-movement has always in the past been concerned with the strengthening of neighborhood and community life, particularly in deprived urban areas, the writer looked to Boston neighborhood houses to see how they perceive their role in neighborhood development work in the current scene.

The study was approached with several research questions in mind:

1. Do neighborhood houses nationally today still state a concern for neighborhood development work?
2. Do Boston neighborhood houses profess an interest in and perceive a role for themselves in neighborhood development work?
3. What are neighborhood houses in Boston doing today in this area of service?
4. If there is a discrepancy between interest and practice by the agencies, what are the reasons which neighborhood house executives give to explain this discrepancy?
5. Which of these reasons, if any, necessarily do limit agency practice?

Research design and methodology.-- The research was designed to answer these questions by first trying to define
and see neighborhood development work as an area in which the social work community organization process can be used by neighborhood houses. A study of the literature in the area of community organization in social work and of neighborhood development work by neighborhood houses was made, and a definition of community organization and of neighborhood development worked out on the basis of this study of theory and practice.

Then a study of the philosophy of the settlement movement at the present time was made, particularly concerning neighborhood development work and leisure-time services. This was done by a survey of recently published statements by national figures in the neighborhood house field and a few preliminary interviews with Boston and New York neighborhood house executives.

A picture of current neighborhood development work and of future plans in this area of Boston neighborhood houses was derived from a survey of a sample of Boston neighborhood houses. One was chosen from each of the eight Health and Welfare Districts in Boston which has any such agencies plus one agency from Cambridge. These were chosen on the recommendation of the president of the Settlement Council as representative houses which were founded on the settlement tradition of neighborhood focus and service. Six of the executives answered a questionnaire (see Appendix A) about...
their neighborhood development services and three replied to the same questions in an interview.

Since a discrepancy between theory and practice was found, a study of the reasons given by neighborhood house executives as limiting their neighborhood development work was made. The nine executives included in the general survey plus two others included because of their thinking on the subject, were asked to state and discuss the factors they saw as relevant. Fifteen other social workers were also asked to list the factors as they saw them, and to judge their validity. The interview guide used can be found in Appendix B.

These fifteen social workers were chosen because their backgrounds, interests, and positions made them the most important and perceptive analysts of the role and functions of Boston neighborhood houses in neighborhood development work. Three are on the staffs on neighborhood houses and are currently involved in community organization work, including neighborhood development work. One is employed by another agency, but is doing neighborhood development work for a neighborhood house. Three had in the past had community experience in the neighborhood house field in responsible positions, and still are aware of current practices and trends and concerned about them. One is director of an agency not affiliated with the Settlement
Council which has neighborhood development work as its only purpose and major function. Another is teaching community organization at the Boston University School of Social Work, and had past experience in community organization. One is an executive of a recreation agency who is also a sociologist and has done considerable thinking about the role of neighborhood houses today. Four hold positions in United Community Services which are related in some way to the neighborhood houses: the Secretary of the Budgeting and Allocating Division; the Director and the Assistant Director of the Recreation, Informal Education, and Group Work Division (RIG); and the Secretary of the Local Representation Division (LRD). And one is a field representative for the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

**Limitations in this research.**—This study is exploratory with some diagnostic implications. The information about current activity by Boston neighborhood houses in the area of neighborhood development work is not a complete picture of that done in Boston, but only that of a sample of Boston neighborhood houses. The work of those houses included in the sample is not reported in any further detail than necessary to get a general impression of the amount of staff time and effort involved, and the amount of service the house offers and plans to offer in the immediate future.
This study also is not an attempt to study the process of neighborhood development work. This is an important field for research. However, since so many of the Boston neighborhood houses do little neighborhood development work and many have not given much thought to the process involved, a study of the role of neighborhood development work as a neighborhood house service would seem to merit prior consideration.

Since this study does not present a detailed picture of the neighborhood development work done and the process involved in it, it can not include data useful for evaluating the effectiveness of the work done. This is an important area for research, but is not essential for the purpose of this paper.

Finally, the study cannot be a detailed analysis and evaluation of the validity of reasons given for the current level of neighborhood development work. It is only an attempt to learn the limitations which neighborhood house executives feel- or were willing to state in these interviews that they feel- and point to certain ones which seem crucial. Although this may lead to some diagnostic implications, further research around the most significant factors might well be undertaken.
CHAPTER II
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT WORK

Neighborhood development work will be considered an area of community work having two main aspects: 1.) the improvement of the environment by the handling of certain specific physical and social problems within it; and 2.) the development of the neighborhood residents into more responsible and capable participants in community life.

1. By Agencies Other than Neighborhood Houses

Some significant neighborhood development work has been undertaken by a number of agencies other than neighborhood houses. Sidney Dillick in his book, Community Organization for Neighborhood Development, Past and Present, presents in some detail the role of the school centers, defense councils, community councils, Block-Aid, the Social Unit experiment in Cincinnati, area councils for juvenile delinquency and public health, and the Back-of-the-Yards Neighborhood Councils developed by Saul Alinsky. Herbert

Thelan in his book, *Dynamics of Groups at Work*,\(^1\) summarizes the significance and accomplishments of the Community Conference program in Chicago, adopted in seven areas of the city. And the federal government has sponsored urban renewal demonstration projects in Boston which could be and are being carried out also in other cities.\(^2\)

Some of the sponsoring agencies of these neighborhood development plans have been temporary in their interest or support—school center, defense councils, community councils, or, despite some exceptions, have basically had specific foci in their work—councils for juvenile delinquency, public health, and urban renewal. These agencies as well as the Industrial Areas Councils program may but do not necessarily use a social work process in their neighborhood development work.

2. By Neighborhood Houses

**Functions.—** What is neighborhood development work as engaged in by neighborhood houses? The writer chose to isolate certain functions of the neighborhood house and call them by this name. The following group of functions appear to be distinct enough from the rest of neighborhood house

\(^1\)Herbert A. Thelan, *Dynamics of Groups at Work*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1954.

\(^2\)For further information see the Housing Association of Greater Boston, Mr. William Loring, Director. Also, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has published brochures on Urban Renewal obtainable from U.S. Government Printing Office.
work to warrant consideration as a unit; social workers interviewed agreed with this grouping:

1. Encouragement and professional help given to neighborhood civic improvement groups.

2. Enabling citizens as individuals or in temporary groups, in established local organization or House clubs, to take social action.1/

3. Enabling neighborhood individuals and groups to relate to the larger community through ties with the district council.

These functions are undertaken for the two goals stated earlier: the improvement of the environment and the development of the residents as responsible members of their community. The neighborhood house executives and other social workers interviewed generally regarded the second goal to be the most important in this area of work. When individuals develop the capacity and interest to become responsible members of their community they are then more mature people and better able to handle their present and future problems. The second goal is achieved, however, through the process used in achieving the first.

What is this process? While a description and analysis of process

---

1/Social action is defined in this thesis as action taken by individuals or groups to obtain certain goals of civic improvement. The action usually involved political or social pressure upon those in power-holding and policy-making positions.
of process is not the subject of this thesis, it seems important to identify it, at least, as an application of the process of community organization in social work on the neighborhood level.\footnote{Further clarification of community organization in social work as structure and process can be found in Appendix C.}

Community organization process used in neighborhood development work.-- The community organization process in social work is defined by the writer as a composite drawn from many previous definitions\footnote{The writer draws particularly from: Murray G. Ross, Community Organization Theory and Principles, Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1955, p. 39; and C.F. McNeil, "Community Organization for Social Welfare", Social Work Yearbook, 1954, American Association of Social Workers, N.Y., 1954, P. 181.} She found no one definition which she considered could apply to all kinds of community organization in social work, from the coordinating level to neighborhood committee work, from the functional to the geographic community.

Definition and analysis.-- Community organization as a social work process is a democratic process by which people of geographic or functional communities, as individuals or as representatives of groups, join together to determine their welfare needs or objectives, develop the will and confidence to work to meet these needs or objectives, plan ways of meeting them, and mobilize the necessary resources to take action. It is a process which, aided by the skill of
the social worker, enables a development and extension of cooperative attitudes and behavior in the community.

"Community organization as a social work process" implies the movement from the identification of a problem to the attainment of the objective, during which the capacity of the community to function as an integrated unit grows. The social worker uses certain methods to facilitate this process. Neither the dynamics of the process as a social work or a democratic one, nor the methods used by the community organization worker will be discussed here since the focus of this thesis is more general— the significances and role of community organization in total neighborhood house functioning.

However, it should be stated that community organization as defined and described here is one of the basic social work processes, based on assumptions similar to case work and group work, used to attain the same basic objectives, and employing many of the same methods. The basic assumptions on which community organization is founded are: respect for the worth and dignity of man; recognition of the significance of psychological, social, cultural, and economic factors in men's lives; and belief in the capacity of individuals to develop, though they may need help in the process.

The basic objectives of all social work methods are similar. All are concerned with the fulfillment of
individual potential through removal of blocks to growth and full use of internal and external resources. The community organization worker is especially concerned with the individual in his relation to his community and with community factors affecting the lives of individual members.

The term "community" refers to two major groupings of people. The geographic community refers to all the people in a geographical area—from the size of an apartment house to the whole world. A functional community is used here to refer to groups of people who share some common interest or function. These interests do not include everyone in a geographical community and are not limited by geographical boundaries.  

It is important for a social worker to recognize within which community he is working. He is, as a neighborhood house worker a part of the social welfare functional community, but he is concerned in his work with a geographical community, and concerned with it as a whole.

A neighborhood, a geographical community, shall be here defined as a geographical area with certain common characteristics which do or potentially could cause the residents to consider it unique from other geographical sections. These characteristics could be physical or social. A neighborhood can range in size from part of one block to an area as large as that served by a grammar school. A neighborhood house can

\[1\] For a thoughtful discussion of geographic and functional communities see Ross, op.cit., pp. 40-44.
serve many small neighborhoods within a given geographic area.

Since it is important as in case work and group work to begin helping the community where it is, a community organization worker in neighborhood development work enables the residents to determine their "welfare needs and objectives" as they see them. This calls for a broad definition of community welfare, in terms of community values—cultural, social, economic, and political—and a willingness of the neighborhood worker to work with people to achieve goals in any area of welfare. The term "social welfare needs" in the literature has too often been considered to mean only those needs which could be met by the extension of social services.\footnote{Campbell G. Murphy in summarizing the thinking of social workers who are outstanding students of the theory and practice of community organization, presents this point of view in \textit{Community Organization Practice}, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1954, p. 39.}

All the neighborhood house executives interviewed in this study held a broad view of community welfare.

People as "individuals or as representatives of groups" may participate in the community organization process. The "Pittsburgh school", notably Wilbur I. Newstetter, has advanced the conception of intergroup work as the unique feature of the community organization process in social work, and many other social workers have concurred in this.\footnote{For examples, see W. I. Newstetter, \textit{"The Social Inter-Group Work Process"}, \textit{Community Organization, Its Nature and Setting}, 1943, pp. 19-28; Helen D. Green, \textit{Social Work Practice in Community Organization}, Whiteside, Inc., N.Y., 1954, p. 23; Sidney Dillick, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 162.}
However, there are others who feel this is too limited a concept.¹ The writer's definition is in accord with the second school of thought. Community organization on a neighborhood basis often involves work with neighbors who as individuals may be helped to form into groups with a community improvement focus. These groups can form one of the most firm democratic bases for an intergroup level of structure and process.

In neighborhood development aspects of community organization it is particularly important to help the community develop the "will and confidence" to work to meet its needs or objectives, and the ability to "plan" and "mobilize necessary resources to take action." This increase in citizen self-respect and confidence and ability to participate cooperatively in community life is here considered a more significant focus of neighborhood work than the attainment of "a more effective adjustment between social welfare resources and social welfare needs" which writers such as Kenneth Pray have stressed.² This is comparable to the case work situation in which the growth of the individual

¹See Murphy, op.cit., pp. 16-24 for a summary of the views of Arthur Dunham, Arlien Johnson, C.F. McNeil, Ray Johns and David DeMarche.
in his ability to relate to others and his environment and to solve future problems, is as important as his immediate solution of the problem at hand, which brings him to request help. In fact, the process of gaining an adjustment between social welfare resources and social welfare needs, important as it is, might be accomplished better by methods other than community organization, i.e., persuasion and pressure.

The social worker in community organization uses methods similar to those used by all social workers to facilitate the social work process: primarily the conscious and skilled use of self in the personal relationships involved in community organization work. He also uses additional skills in such areas as intergroup work, research, administration, planning, and interpretation. The particular ways in which he employs "professional discretion" as he chooses and uses various methods in different situations will not be discussed, since this is not the main focus of this thesis. In neighborhood development work all these skills may be used.

Neighborhood development work by neighborhood houses is thus seen as a possible area of work in neighborhoods in which the social work community organization process may be used. Neighborhood houses also may use the social work community organization process in several functions besides

\[1\] Murphy, op.cit., pp. 24-27
neighborhood development work. These include research, social action by the staff or Board without involving the neighborhood residents, and participation in inter-agency councils for the coordination of services in the area the House serves.
CHAPTER III

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSES - CURRENT FUNCTIONS AND TRENDS

Neighborhood houses developed to meet the needs of individuals in a developing industrial and urban society, an environment which threatened economic survival, and opportunities for satisfying social relationships and responsible participation in community life.

From Toynbee Hall in London in 1883, the settlement idea was brought to America by Dr. Stanton Coit in New York in 1886, Robert A. Woods in Boston, and Jane Addams in Chicago. Lillian Wald, Mary K. Simkhovitch, Vida Scudder, Jane McDowell, and Graham Taylor were among other important figures in the early settlement movement. The movement in this country has spread until in 1954 there were 863 neighborhood houses in the United States and Hawaii. A National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Houses was founded in 1908 and an International Association of Settlements in 1926.1/

The social philosophy upon which neighborhood house work is based draws from some of the basic principles of the social work profession. There is a sincere belief in the worth and

dignity of the individual, of the potential for individual growth, and of the right of self-determination. There is a conviction that the family is the social unit most important in the early growth and development of the individual, and as such should be a positive influence and support. And there is a dedication to helping individuals realize their potentialities as individuals, family members, and community residents.

The broad social aims of the neighborhood house, as stated in the 1954 Social Work Yearbook are those common to all social work:

"Strengthening of family life and democratic society through helping individuals achieve happiness and security, developing satisfying relationships through group experiences, and organizing programs for the well-being of the total community."

A social settlement, or neighborhood house is founded to serve the people in a limited geographic community. Neighborhood houses have historically emphasized their close identification with the community as their reason for existence. The unique focus as a social service agency is upon the individual in his neighborhood environment and upon the neighborhood as a whole as a setting for the life of the residents. As the Cleveland Conference report states:

"The purpose of the settlement, i.e., to create a sense of community in the neighborhood it serves, and to

1/Ibid, p. 471."
develop a sense of responsibility in the neighborhood
toward the larger community, distinguishes it from
other education-recreation agencies whose purposes
relate them to a specific age, sex, or cultural group.1/

The writer is using the term "neighborhood house"
instead of the older term "settlement" because it seems to
convey more accurately the purpose of such an agency. When
settlements were first founded it was considered important
for them to serve as residences in which people from a
higher "class" could "settle" in deprived areas— for the
mutual benefit of settlement residents and community members.
Now, since this is no longer generally considered necessary
for agency staff, and since it has connotations of class
distinctions, there is a trend toward using the term
"neighborhood house". All the executives and other social
workers interviewed favored this designation.

The work of the neighborhood house is varied; a fixed
and predetermined program would not carry through its purpose.
In order to be responsive to neighborhood needs and conditions
it must be flexible. Also, neighborhood house programming
has been professed to be experimental to some extent; as soon
as other agencies, public or private, can be convinced of the
need and of their responsibility to meet it, a neighborhood
house may turn over such functions.

1/Cleveland Conference on District and Neighborhood Community
Organization, Conference Reports, sponsored by Community
Chests and Community Councils, Inc. and National Federation
The functions of neighborhood houses may be said to fall into three categories: group work and recreation services, personal services (including referrals) for individuals and families with problems, and community organization (including neighborhood development work.)

Though all neighborhood house workers have maintained that the uniqueness of their agencies lies in a neighborhood focus, there has been a lack of agreement for ideological or practical reasons upon the emphasis to be placed on its various functions.

Historically, particularly when there was much work with immigrants, there was a heavy concentration on personal services and social action. Then there was a shift to a house program of leisure-time services with a concentration in activities. Now activities are still predominate, but there is some serious rethinking of program emphasis. It is important to note, therefore, in a study of neighborhood development work, the relative emphasis given by neighborhood house workers to the activities and neighborhood development parts of their functions.

Role of activities.-- The activities part of neighborhood house service includes recreation, group work, and informal education offered to all neighborhood residents. The importance of activities has been highlighted in several recent neighborhood house statements and by many executives interviewed.
The latest official statement of the National Federation of Settlements, Inc. in 1950, states:\footnote{1}{Jean M. Maxwell, John McDowell, We Believe, A Tentative Statement of Desirable Standards for Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, National Federation of Settlements, Inc., N.Y., 1950, p. 17.} The focus of the work of a neighborhood center and settlement is community well-being. Its primary and most immediate concern is neighborhood community life." Also:\footnote{2}{Ibid, p. 1.}

"A settlement fulfills its purpose by providing the opportunity for a variety of individual, group, and intergroup experiences for people of all ages, regardless of race, creed, nationality or political belief, living together in a circumscribed geographical area."

Despite the breadth of concern thus expressed, the statement devotes most of its attention to recreation and group work services of the agency—eight times as much as to community organization service of all kinds. There is emphasis upon social action for a goal rather than a process-centered viewpoint; the focus is on development of people through individual and group services, and on community work mainly as involving social action. The exception is that encouragement of local organizations is urged to help them become more community-minded.\footnote{3}{Ibid, p. 10.}

The publication by the Settlement Council of Greater Boston in 1955 which included brief statements of the
functions of each agency emphasizes in these statements the activities functions. Only four houses refer specifically in their statements to any aspects of neighborhood development work, though many mention the goal of community improvement and better community life. An essay included in this publication entitled, "The Settlement Idea" is a more comprehensive approach.1/

One social worker interviewed maintained that the tradition of many houses despite the general acceptance of neighborhood house philosophy, has not emphasized neighborhood development. Some early wealthy leaders had a strong social action orientation but others did not. And the next generation of workers had less dedication to neighborhood work of this kind because they lacked experience and interest in it. Though there has generally been no strong feeling that recreation is the core of neighborhood house work, there has been a strong define of activities and resistance to giving them up entirely.

All executives whom the writer interviewed felt that the neighborhood house must be seen partly as an activities center for the community. All also felt that at least some of the activities program should be building-centered, since a building offers a possibility for growth of house and community spirit not otherwise possible. In general, they

1/ Settlement Council, 1955, Recreation, Informal Education, and Group Work Division, United Community Services, Boston.
felt there should be some happy medium of activities and community organization work. Two executives maintained that activities were theoretically the major part of their work; the others felt activities should be curtailed if they tended to cause community organization work to be slighted.

Activities were generally seen as providing opportunities for self-expression, socialization and preparation for community citizenship. However, two neighborhood house executives expressed some doubts as to the value of activities in a center in fostering a feeling of community in a neighborhood. One executive was not convinced that activities were the most effective means of creating a House that was a neighborhood center. Another thought that it would be well to examine the prevailing concept that children could gradually grow in community consciousness and concern through activity programs. She suggested that civic awareness and responsibility may not really develop meaningfully until a child becomes an adult and can see the community with more mature understanding and appreciate the effect of its conditions upon him.

Activities were seen by all executives in relation to neighborhood development work as: 1.) an opportunity for contact with the neighbors necessary before they could become aware of and involved in agency-sponsored civic improvement work; 2.) a positive program of service offered a community
which would alleviate any suspicions the residents might have about the motives, such as political power, of a staff solely interested in neighborhood development; and 3.) a program a neighborhood house could fall back on in case of a temporary set-back in neighborhood development work, giving the staff a continuing reason for existence in the neighborhood and an opportunity to try such community work again.

Role of neighborhood development work.-- Neighborhood development work, as described in Chapter II, includes several functions: 1.) encouragement and professional help given to neighborhood civic improvement groups; 2.) enabling citizens as individuals or in temporary groups, in established local organizations or House clubs, to take social action; and 3.) enabling neighborhood individuals and groups to relate to the larger community through ties with the district council.

Several statements, issued nationally and by Boston neighborhood houses, note the importance of neighborhood development work.

The Cleveland Conference on District and Neighborhood Community Organization reported an agreement by the National Federation of Settlements, Inc., and the Community Chests and Councils, Inc. that: 1/

1/ Cleveland Conference, op.cit., pp. 4-5.
"There is a need for community organization of a district and neighborhood basis to deal with conditions growing out of urban living... There is an overwhelming lack of neighborhood organization and a crying need to organize people for effective participation in community planning and action."

It also stated that neighborhood houses have special responsibility in their neighborhoods:

a. To help in the organization of groups for purposes of community improvement and needed social change, with special concern for neighborhoods where the factors of social disorganization are high, and the quality and amount of individual leadership limited.

b. To help neighborhood groups relate themselves to other groups in the community.

c. To keep the channel to Welfare Councils and other metropolitan agencies open through such devices as regular conferences in order to acquaint them with the progress of neighborhood organization work in the community served by the settlements."

Also, the official statement of the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Houses, as noted on page 21, points to the importance of social action by neighborhood people and groups undertaken with the encouragement of the neighborhood house, and the role of the neighborhood house in helping local groups become more community-minded.

The National Federation has recently compiled a Bulletin on Urban Renewal, which it has sent to member houses in urban renewal areas, explaining the program and the

1/Ibid, pp. 5-6.

2/Maxwell, op.cit.,

possible roles neighborhood houses can take, particularly in involving citizen participation in the program. 

In several cities\textsuperscript{1}/ neighborhood houses report their month's programs on a supplementary neighborhood house report which includes not only an activity report as does the regular Form G, but also calls for a report on development of neighborhood leadership, social action, and interracial relations. This emphasizes neighborhood development work of neighborhood houses. It has not yet been adopted by Boston neighborhood houses.

The \textit{Statement of Settlement Function} drawn up by the Committee on Statement of Function for the Recreation, Informal Education and Group Work Division of United Community Services in 1952, emphasizes in its enumeration of neighborhood house objectives, the neighborhood development aspects. The list of objectives is as follows:\textsuperscript{2}/

"To meet and deal with the social and material problems arising from city living, especially in crowded areas at 'points of stress'.

To cooperate with all constructive social forces in the area, such as churches, schools, civic groups and associations which are working for better living conditions in the community.

\textsuperscript{1}/One such form, \textit{Supplementary Settlement Report for Form G}, Sept. 1951, could be obtained from the Health and Welfare Council, Inc., Philadelphia, Penna.

To know the neighborhood thoroughly, its lacks and its resources, its characteristics and ethnic structure, especially those situations where possibilities for social improvement exist.

To demonstrate, through practice, the value of group effort to achieve better social conditions, These include maintenance of "good practices," provisions for improvements, combatting stagnation and deterioration, and developing a consciousness, both inside of and outside the area, that the neighborhood is a basic social unit effective in bringing better social conditions to the community.

To help neighbors to become articulate on matters which affect their lives and living and to help them express themselves both locally and in broader communities.

To provide a friendly, welcoming center where neighbors and others may meet to plan and to participate in social activities regardless of creed, class or color.

To promote and to recruit leadership, participation in civic affairs, community drives, 'civil defense,' and to find new techniques to meet social problems.

To provide a social laboratory where college students may learn social service through practice under the supervision of experienced and practical settlement workers.

To provide activities as a means of expression for individuals and groups through which they may develop in character and in social usefulness.

Also, in a series of papers presented at the Settlement Conference in 1952 and 1953, a number of neighborhood house leaders stressed the value of neighborhood development work:

"Our effort now is to guide and stimulate our neighbors to achieve social gains through their own organization and action. Our aim is to develop articulate neighbors

\[\text{1/ Neighborhood Improvement Projects, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, N.Y., 1953.}\]
in contrast to the previous attitude which resulted in the neighborhood being dependent for social action upon the settlement staff.¹

"I want to emphasize again and again the validity of block organization. Narrowing an activity down to a small geographic unit such as a block, gets to the core of need peculiar to that small area and arouses interest in those most immediately concerned. It is in line with sound settlement philosophy which implies an understanding of the unique characteristics of each neighborhood and working with it as a living entity. It is in line with a basic principle of good community organization, that of mobilizing neighborhood forces as an effective means of working on significant problems in neighborhood life."²

"It is my sincere belief that the settlement must become more active in the field of neighborhood and community problems... I believe it is more important to have neighborhood people questioning our pressure for community action, than to remember the settlement as 'a nice place to play basketball.'³/²

"Perhaps the idea of leisure-time work instead of leisure-time play is a good activity for settlement program."⁴/²

And the Director of United Neighbors in Philadelphia wrote in 1955,⁵/


"The objective worked out by our newly merged agency in 1946-1947 was very simply worded, 'to give our neighbors the opportunity to help themselves through group thinking, planning and action. The moment that you accept this philosophy the programs planned by the Board and staff go out the window. The four walls of a settlement house cannot circumscribe such an objective and the house becomes a stepping stone into the neighborhood.'

All the neighborhood house executives interviewed agreed that community organization in all its aspects, including neighborhood development was important. They stated that they were interested in helping people involve themselves in civic improvement for the improvement of the environment and for the growth of community identification and responsible citizenship.

United Community Services does not judge the neighborhood houses by any set of standards in its budget sessions; only in terms of the program each neighborhood house sets for itself. Perhaps some standards should be worked out, the Secretary of the Budgeting and Allocating Division stated. In the Division of Recreation, Informal Education and Group Work (RIG) there is concern as to what is the most effective role for neighborhood houses now that through increasing specialization other new services such as public recreation, Youth Service Board, and the Roxbury Special Youth Project have taken over some of their functions. The neighborhood focus involving case work, group work, and community organization is understood. Activities are seen as a
permanent part of a neighborhood house program, though it is recognized that no private agency should provide the minimum in services offered a community— that is the responsibility of the public agencies.

There is a recognition by social workers in Boston outside the neighborhood house field, of a confusion over the importance to be relegated to various areas of agency functioning. Three social workers who had worked previously in the neighborhood house field, expressed their opinions that community organization was the core of neighborhood house work, and that activities also were a necessary part of a total agency program. One felt that the activities portion of agency functioning could be reduced if, as in United Neighbors in Philadelphia, Wells Memorial in Minneapolis, and several agencies, other opportunities for contact with adults in the community could be found. Two of them felt that a completely detached group work and community organization program would be well worth consideration to do away with building problems and maintenance.

A community organization worker working with one of the civic improvement groups of a neighborhood house felt that the community organization and neighborhood work of a neighborhood house should be the last thing sacrificed when funds are cut; that it is the core of neighborhood house work.
All the above mentioned workers consider that it is a neighborhood house responsibility to spark neighborhood improvement committees and staff them, and that the neighborhood house may take initiative among agencies in a geographic area for coordinating services for the welfare of the community.

The Director of the Young Men's Christian Association is quite concerned about the neighborhood focus of neighborhood houses, and is not as convinced as are their executives and other social workers that it is feasible in the contemporary scene. His thinking is based on sociological factors which will be discussed further in Chapter V, page 47. Suffice it to say here that he maintains that though neighborhood houses have a responsibility and should continue to enable people to participate in civic life, they have overstated their role in community organization and never have nor will be able to fulfill it effectively. Their major functions as he sees them lie in two areas: 1.) accommodation functions (helping people adjust to their environment as it is) which include leisure-time activities, and 2.) integration of more specialized health and welfare services at the neighborhood level. Several neighborhood house executives also mentioned renewed interest in this integration function.

Previous studies of Boston neighborhood houses.-- There have been two major studies of Boston neighborhood houses in
the past which attempted to analyze and evaluate their functions. These studies were far more inclusive than this one; they studied all the houses and the total programming in each house— and were conducted by experienced people and under official auspices. Their conclusions as to program emphasis of neighborhood house seem important to note.

In 1934 a Survey of Boston Settlements and Neighborhood Houses was undertaken for the Committee on the Study of the Social and Health Agencies of Boston.¹/ In her conclusions, Grace Abbott points out that neighborhood houses have been pioneers in developing group work, but that a program of clubs and classes does not really fulfill the neighborhood house function.²/ She maintains that "The improvement of neighborhood conditions is a first objective."³/

Miss Abbott is thus concerned in 1934 with the concentration on group work, and considers that more community organization work should be undertaken. Her concept of community organization, however, does not include neighborhood development work, but rather social action by staff and Board, and inter-agency cooperation in the coordination of services.

¹/Grace Abbott, A Survey of Boston Settlements and Neighborhood Houses, for the Committee on the Study of the Social and Health Agencies of Boston, 1934.

²/Ibid, pp. 32-33.

³/Ibid, pp. 33.
The Greater Boston Community Survey, 1947-1949, deemed it important to study the role of neighborhood houses in the past and present, and make recommendations for future functioning. There was quite some concern about their proper role and how it was being carried out.

The report notes that:

"Settlements and neighborhood houses...have contributed a great deal in emphasizing the problems of neighborhood life in the poorer sections of the community and the values which can accrue to the total community through the development of a neighborliness among people. They have demonstrated the effectiveness of neighborhood organization in pressing for community improvements and in working with the whole family as the basic social unit. They have demonstrated values in using the neighborhood as a unit for the discovery of need and the organization of program..."

However, it goes on to say:

"The settlements and neighborhood houses of Greater Boston...today are primarily centers for play, recreation and group experiences for the children and young people in the neighborhood in which they are located. They have largely divorced themselves from program functions which they have pioneered and demonstrated, and which have come to be accepted as functions of specialized agencies."

The report recommends that: "They should relinquish these more recently acquired activities and return to a kind


of program more like that of their earlier days, adapted to
modern conditions."

It recommends that: 1/

"Neighborhood houses and settlements become agents of
coordination for programs of play, recreation and group
experience for children and youth; organizers of an
adult discussion program centered on civic responsi-
bilities and problems as a part of the Community Center
program to be conducted in school centers; providers
of opportunities for citizen participation in develop-
ment of programs in the Area; and sources of information
and referral to the people residing in the area in
which they are located. They employ an activities staff
to aid in programs of play, recreation and group
experience for children and youth, until such activities
can be fully carried by the proper agencies."

Some of the recommendations in this report have been
seriously questioned by neighborhood house executives, and
not all have been carried out or will be. However, the
Executive Committee of the Survey did consult with the
executives before endorsing the report. It stated that the
new role suggested for neighborhood houses by those studying
them in the survey, was a worthy objective towards which to
move. However, the Executive Committee maintained that
neighborhood houses should not in the foreseeable future shed
their activities program because of its value as a medium
through which to reach families, attract volunteers, and
improve community standards. 2/

1/ Barrett, op. cit., p. 129.

2/ Greater Boston Community Survey, Summary, 1949, conducted
by the Committee of Citizens to Survey the Social and Health
Needs and Services of Greater Boston, Boston, 1949, p. 129.
The functions of neighborhood houses are thus seen now as including group work and recreation, personal services, and community organization. There is some disagreement as to the emphasis various functions should be given.

**Trends for the future.**—Of the ten neighborhood house executives who expressed an opinion of the subject, eight of them felt that there was a trend on the part of neighborhood houses towards more community organization and neighborhood development work. One felt that United Community Services would soon be swamped with requests by neighborhood houses for funds to add community organization workers to their staffs—after more demonstrations of such work had been made. Two saw no change away from activities emphasis. Of nine social workers outside the neighborhood house field, four saw a trend to more neighborhood development by houses—these four were those who had had previous experience in the neighborhood house field. Professionals in United Community Services and the Young Men's Christian Association saw no significant shift in neighborhood house emphasis towards more neighborhood development work.

Though neighborhood house executives consider activities as an important function, they also consider neighborhood development work to have an important role in total services. Is the interest they express in it and their prediction of future expansion in this area reflected in their current
practice and future plans? The following chapter is an attempt to answer this question by presenting the results of a survey of a sample of Boston neighborhood houses.
CHAPTER IV

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT WORK -

SURVEY OF PRESENT WORK AND FUTURE PLANS

A survey of nine of the neighborhood houses in Boston was undertaken to learn the facts about the current work of the agencies in neighborhood development and their plans for future services in this area. An agency was chosen from each of the eight Health and Welfare districts in Boston in which such agencies are located: Dorchester, Roxbury, East Boston, South Boston, West End, South End, North End, and Jamaica Plain. Also, one agency from Cambridge was included.

The executives were asked to report on their neighborhood development work during the last year or so. It seemed difficult for almost all of them to state exactly the amount of staff time and effort involved in this kind of work. Therefore, this survey will be given in rather general terms. Also, the effectiveness of the work done will not be evaluated since this is a study in itself. This research is more of an effort to get a picture of the amount of work that is being done.

Current neighborhood development work.-- In two of the agencies there was a significant involvement by the staff in neighborhood development work, as stated by the executives—at least 1/3 of the time of one staff member. In six agencies,
little time and effort is now being devoted by staff to this work. In the ninth agency, a community organization worker from another agency is serving the local civic improvement group which meets in the neighborhood house. There is obviously a correlation between the amount of staff time devoted to neighborhood development work and the amount of it done by the houses. Neighborhood house executives, in general, declared it impossible to assess accurately the amount of time spent on neighborhood development work in relation to other services. However, except in one agency, it assumed a minor function.

One aspect of neighborhood development work is encouragement and professional help given to neighborhood civic improvement groups. Three of the agencies included in the sample are sponsoring such groups of some kind which are permanent groups; six are not. These groups represent only a small part of the population and the area which the agencies serve.

Another aspect of neighborhood development work is enabling citizens as individuals or in temporary groups, in established local organizations or House clubs, to take social action. Seven of the houses are involved in this in some respect, in general a minor one. In four of the agencies, executives stressed their work in involving residents in social action for improvement of their neighbor-
hoods. Seven of the houses work with groups of neighbors temporarily united to meet a certain problem—though this seldom occurs; two houses have not done so in the past year or so. In five of the houses, adult clubs, or more often, adult councils are encouraged in social action projects and are somewhat active in them; in two of the houses, although they are encouraged, they are not active; two of the houses did not report on this.

The third aspect of neighborhood development work is enabling individuals and groups to relate to a district council. Five of the houses reported somewhat successful efforts in this direction. However, the district councils are primarily made up of agency people and lay people who attend without need of agency support. One agency reported that neighborhood people very seldom attend council meetings though they are encouraged to do so. Three agencies reported that the only councils in their districts are either composed entirely of agency workers or agency workers plus lay professionals, and that other neighborhood residents are not invited to attend.

Future plans.—In their plans for the future, three agencies intend definitely to expand the neighborhood development aspects of their service. Since the Federation of South End Settlements plans next year to add two or three new workers to its staff to work with local improvement
groups, the South End agency closed in this sample will extend its services in this area.²/

In a second agency, the director plans to try to help five small civic improvement groups get underway in the spring clean-up campaign. He hopes also to involve a newly formed men's club in concern for civic improvement. He would also like to see a district council with "grass-roots" neighborhood representation, though there are no immediate plans for this.

A third agency will encourage lay people in this year's spring clean-up to organize a civic improvement organization with lay leadership of professional standing, i.e., public health nurse. It will not allocate funds or time for a staff person to work with it, but considers it important enough to attempt at least to handle in this manner. The executive would like to add a community organization worker to his staff, but sees no immediate prospect of doing so.

Four of the agencies hope to extend their neighborhood

¹/One of the two main purposes of the Federation of South End Settlements is community organization work in the South End. The Federation has hired a community organization worker who works with the South End Planning Council, the South End Businessmen's Association, and the Mayor's Rehabilitation Committee. The Federation has concentrated in building up the committee structure in the South End Planning Council, but, starting in the fall of 1956, more emphasis will be placed on building the strength of all the civic improvement groups in the area which are represented in the South End Planning Council.
development work and think it important, but have no definite plans or see no immediate possibilities of doing so. In one, the Board has refused to sanction extension of such work at this time. The director and his assistant are interested, however, and have formulated rather specific plans for a neighborhood worker which they would like to see approved.

In another, the director had not planned for future work of this kind, though he would like to see neighborhood people enabled to relate themselves to major community organization efforts already underway in the district.

The director of another hopes that perhaps one or more new civic improvement groups can be formed in the district beginning in the spring clean-up campaign, but has no definite plans now for working towards this goal.

And the director of one agency would like to do more of this kind of work if funds were available, though now has no plans for so doing, intending instead to expand the activities program.

The other two agencies do not plan to extend their service, though this is not because of lack of interest. One agency is already quite involved in it, and does not plan to extend it in service emphasis. The other will not expand its neighborhood development work because of city plans for redevelopment in the district. It is doing a great deal of interpretation of redevelopment to neighborhood residents.
In Chapter III we have seen that executives place importance upon the neighborhood development aspects of neighborhood house work as well as their activities program. In this chapter we have seen a picture of the work they are doing and of the plans they have for future services in this area. Why do such services form, in general, such a small proportion of total agency services? The next two chapters will present the reasons given by neighborhood house executives and other social workers for the level of neighborhood development work now practiced by Boston neighborhood houses. An analysis of their significance will then be attempted.
CHAPTER V
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PRACTICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT WORK: ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

When neighborhood house executives were asked to explain the limitations affecting their work in neighborhood development which could account for the small amount of emphasis given it in total agency services, a number of factors were given as relevant:

1. difficulties in involving citizens in such work;
2. great need for leisure-time services, a result of social and economic trends nationally and of city policies;
3. United Community Services policy, in the Budget and Allocating Division, Recreation; Informal Education and Group Work Division, and the Local Representation Division;
4. Boston's financial problems and conservative policies; and
5. executive and staff training and attitudes, and board policies.

It is important to examine these factors given by neighborhood house executives as influencing their neighborhood development policies. Their perception of the factors
has a definite effect on the way they carry through their service, whether or not it is an accurate picture.

It also is important to examine how realistic these perceived limitations are. If they do not necessarily limit agency practice, a way is open to more accurate appraisal of the situation and perhaps to change. This study cannot be a scholarly evaluation of all these factors; each in itself is a topic for extended research. This study is only intended to learn factors perceived as relevant by those in policy-making positions and to get a more objective view of the relevance of these factors by drawing on the understanding of social workers outside the neighborhood house field, including professionals in United Community Services and a field representative of the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Houses.

The first two factors cited are related to social, economic, and political trends in the country as a whole which have affected significantly the neighborhoods in which the agencies studied are located. These environmental conditions and their effects will, therefore, be presented and analyzed in this chapter, and the last three factors will be discussed in the following chapter.

National trends.-- National trends of industrialization, urbanization, immigration, centralization, and improved systems of communication have affected community life in
ways significant for neighborhood house functioning. They have led to the rise of deprived neighborhoods which neighborhood houses are largely serving, abounding with social, economic, and political problems. Yet they have weakened geographic neighborhood bonds and sometimes, though not always, have substituted ties of interest to individuals and groups in other geographic areas. There has often been bewilderment, discouragement, and apathy about community problems and a loss of feeling of community spirit and responsibility. There has been failure in the democratic political process in local communities, and less and less participation by citizens in expressing opinions and in decision-making. And there has been an increase in leisure time.

1. Difficulties in Involving Individuals in Neighborhood Development Work

These trends have affected adversely the capacity and the experience of individuals in involving themselves in responsible determination of their community life. It becomes, of course, difficult to help individuals involve themselves in neighborhood development work.

Neighborhood development work not feasible.-- Some sociologists, and one social worker interviewed in Boston, have, in fact, maintained that local community life has
disintegrated to such a degree that neighborhood development work is no longer feasible.

Queen and Carpenter in their book, *The American City*, maintain that neighborhood planning, though an attractive goal, is probably not practical for large numbers of city residents. Neighborhood units around neighborhood houses are considered more physical than social environments and the neighborhood house must become a service station rather than center of group life.¹/

Floyd Hunter, in *Community Power Structure*, demonstrates his concern about the lack of communication up from the mass of the citizenry and the professionals to the top leaders which results in fear on the part of the top leaders as to any change, pessimism among the professionals, and silence in the mass of citizenry.²/ He considers that only through civic associational groupings along interest lines can an effective channel for communication and participation in power decisions be built. He maintains that:³/

"It is a vain hope, perhaps, to expect to organize unorganized individuals on anything like a community-wide basis...and the possibility of the so-called 'face-to-face' relationship of city dwellers is an


illusion clung to by those who tend to speculate about community organization but who have not been actively engaged in organizing city groups."

He supports the existence of Community councils, though thinks they should be based upon interest groupings rather than neighborhood civic improvement groups.1/

Bryce Ryan in his consideration of the neighborhood as a unit of action even in rural areas takes a similar point of view as he writes:2/

"The natural subunit of a community is the institutional or service group, not the neighborhood, and if community organization is desired, it would seem more reasonable to work through the subunits of the community rather than through extraneous groupings which partially reflect them."

Ray Johns maintains that there have been such profound changes in neighborhoods that they are no longer the neighborhoods of neighborhood houses in their early days, and that such agencies can not fulfill effectively a role of neighborhood development now.3/

Neighborhood development work a challenge.-- Yet need these social, economic, political, and psychological handicaps to involving citizens in community life present a barrier to neighborhood development work which means that neighborhood houses should cease striving in this area?


2/Bryce Ryan, "The Neighborhood as a Unit of Action in Rural Programs", Rural Sociology, Vol. 9, 1944, p. 27.

3/Ray Johns, Executive Director, Boston Young Men's Christian Association, interview, Feb. 27, 1956.
Many social workers and neighborhood house workers see these handicaps as creating barriers but at the same time creating needs which neighborhood houses can and should attempt to meet.

In Boston, all neighborhood house workers interviewed see the difficulties as obstacles to neighborhood development work, but also as creating a need for such work. In sections of some cities, however, they see social problems as having such a debilitating effect that the people are incapable of mobilizing for action, and as being so great that they could not be handled on the neighborhood level, anyway. The executives consider that no such conditions exist in Boston— at least not in the whole of a neighborhood, except in the West End where plans for redevelopment of the entire area make neighborhood development not feasible.

The areas in which the Boston neighborhood houses studied are located have somewhat varying social and economic conditions but all are in deprived areas. Four are located in areas which the executives feel to be relatively stable with some community feeling; five are in districts with predominantly a transient population, high mobility, and significant lack of community feeling. In four of the areas, neighborhood house executives feel that there is significant positive feeling among the people towards the
future improvement of the area and their role in it; five reported an atmosphere of apathy and a general feeling of lack of control or responsibility for the future development of the area. There was no consistent configuration of economic, social, or psychological factors in neighborhood house areas; each of them is affected negatively in some aspects by contemporary social, economic, and psychological factors.

Neighborhood house executives found in several deprived areas a lack of experience among residents in cooperating with others in organizations, though Italian neighborhoods were mentioned several times as being highly organized. Especially in deprived areas, they considered that individuals have little opportunity to participate in decision-making and have seen corruption and graft in politics as the most effective means of getting things done. Defeats in attempts to reach the city power structure have occurred in some cases and resulted in disappointment and disillusion. This ignorance, apathy, and discouragement makes difficult any efforts to involve individuals in feeling community identification and taking community responsibility.

Social workers interviewed in Boston outside the neighborhood house field were concerned with the opportunities offered individuals for democratic participation in community life. They recognized the obstacles
to responsible citizenship on the part of the people in deprived areas. Yet all except one felt that this pointed to the need for service in this area by neighborhood houses as the most appropriate agencies in such areas to engage in this work.

Elizabeth Handasyde points out the difficulty of getting reasonable citizen participation because the social and geographic mobility of United States citizens hinders them from developing a strong community sense; citizen apathy in community life is prevalent. She sees the organization pattern of United States urban community life as almost always from the top down. However, she feels that for the individual, the community and the nation, the growth of a sense of community responsibility is of crucial importance, and that every means of stimulating it ought to be tried. To her, the method of the Neighborhood Council seems one of the most promising.1/ She writes:2/

"Does the neighborhood idea in itself have sufficient value to outweigh the great difficulty of developing it, or is it more reasonable to leave people to form their natural associations along the lines of income groups, business or leisure interests? The answer must surely be that the latter is not the way to create a cohesive community, especially when the elements of it are themselves, by nature, so discrete.

1/Elizabeth Handasyde, City or Community, National Council of Social Service, Inc., Publications Department, 32 Gordon Sq., London WC1, p. 76.

2/ibid, p. 83.
If one wishes to form an organization which will unite the dissimilar and lead to the development of a rich and varied community life, it is almost inevitable to begin from a geographic basis."

Violet Seider holds firmly to the importance of citizen participation in social planning, maintaining that despite the difficulties, if social workers really believe in people, they should "accept the challenge and put some responsibility in the hands of the folks at the grass-roots."[1] The inter-relatedness of social problems leads inevitable, she feels, to a broad or horizontal approach to planning in the neighborhood.[2]

Saul Alinsky who has been active in neighborhood development work outside the neighborhood house field, notes with gravity the devitalization of the local community in modern urban life. He points out that:[3]

"This devitalization of the local community as a medium through which citizens could actively participate; could assume the obligations, responsibilities, and rights of citizenship; could have roots of stability, and a sense of belonging; a feeling of status and identification as persons, has brought in its wake a host of problems which seriously concern the life of the city."

However, this presents to him not an impossible situation for neighborhood development work, but a challenge to treat


at the level of the local community the ills in modern society which have their origin there. The Industrial Areas Foundation which he has developed is founded on the principles that,\textsuperscript{1}

"...the residents of the local areas are definately more concerned about their problems than any outsider could possibly be, and that if given the opportunity there are sufficient resources in the local communities, in terms of leadership, ingenuity, and power, when mobilized, to solve their own problems. By the opportunity we mean the introduction of the skills, experience, and particularly the assistance of personnel committed to a faith in the above proposition."

And Mr. Alinsky goes on to say that his belief in the feasibility of community organization by his methods in urban settings has been justified by fifteen years experience in diverse situations.\textsuperscript{2}

Thus the widespread and serious effects upon community life of modern social, economic, and political trends are recognized by both those who advocate neighborhood development work and those who deny its feasibility.

However, it is when human values are thwarted that those in the social work profession try to make their contribution. If the purposes of a neighborhood house, to help neighbors build a sense of community and improve environmental conditions, are to be carried out, these trends would

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid, p. 4.
logically be seen as presenting a challenge to be taken up rather than as creating an impossible task. It seems at present as though most neighborhood house workers and other social workers in Boston and elsewhere see them as presenting serious difficulties— and also a challenge. The difficulties may have led some houses to shy away from neighborhood development work. They do not present a situation impossible to work with, since agencies in areas similar to those of such agencies, have become involved in such work.

Neighborhood development work has been and is being done; difficult environmental factors may limit the quality and quantity of the results, but according to the need and neighborhood house philosophy it would seem that these factors would not limit but rather encourage the amount of time and effort given it.

2. Need for Leisure-time Services

Neighborhood house executives pointed out many factors which have increased the need of their neighborhoods for leisure-time services.

Technical advances and social legislation have increased the amount of leisure time in the lives of community members. Also, after immigrants were largely integrated into American life, neighborhood house functions changed from strong emphasis on personal services and social action to more
focus on agency-centered activity functions. And the rise of juvenile delinquency during and after the wars led to community pressure for all youth-serving agencies to expand their services for young people.

In Boston, the public recreation facilities and schools did not respond adequately to the need for leisure-time activities, as will be discussed further in the following chapter. In response to this community need and community pressures by the public, boards, and neighborhood residents, neighborhood houses emphasized the activities part of their program to the neglect of neighborhood development functions.

Does such an increased need for leisure-time services justify a neighborhood house emphasis on filling it to the neglect of other functions as stated in neighborhood house philosophy? There was a division of opinion among executives in response to this. But all have pointed out that no private agency should attempt to provide a minimum of social services. Many executives and other social workers note that there are other community needs which neighborhood houses can and should try to meet; that emphasis on activities may not be the best method of fulfilling total neighborhood house objectives; and that neighborhood houses could better employ social action to influence other agencies, public and private, to expand their services in this area.
CHAPTER VI
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PRACTICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT WORK: UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES; CITY OF BOSTON; STAFF AND BOARD

In the previous chapter, environmental conditions which affect the potential for participation of individuals in neighborhood development and which gave rise to a need for leisure-time services were discussed. In this chapter the three other factors given by neighborhood house executives to explain limited neighborhood development work are presented and analyzed.

1. Policies and Practices of United Community Services

United Community Services (UCS) was founded in 1949, a consolidation of the Community Fund and the Community Council. It is divided into eight divisions; the two in which the neighborhood houses are most involved are the Recreation, Informal Education and Group Work division (RIG), and the Local Representation division (LRD). And neighborhood house budgets are also passed upon by the Budget and Allocating Committee.
The Settlement Council is a section of the RIG division and its members elect two people to represent them on the RIG division. The professional staff of the RIG division consists of a director and assistant director; the assistant is assigned specifically to work with the Settlement Council as well as to carry other responsibilities.

The LRD division has just recently been added to UCS structure as the eighth division. From 1949 to about 1952, a committee studied and explored methods of bringing geographical representation into UCS structure; UCS is organized with lay leaders of all divisions, but there previously had been no channels for citizen participation through geographic representation. Now it is organized with a professional secretary and community organization workers attached to Councils of all parts of Metropolitan Boston except the Boston Area Council. These community organization workers have a role in campaigns and in the geographic coordination of services in their area.

Financial.-- All the neighborhood house executives except the one most active in neighborhood development work expressed the opinion that the financial limitations of UCS placed severe restrictions on the amount of neighborhood development work they could do. They maintained that their interest in expanding such work could not be carried into practice to the extent it should be because of limited
budgets; UCS has consistently refused to raise budget allotments in response to requests (there have been several) for the addition of a community organization worker. This is recognized generally as a consequence of the total limited budget of UCS as well as a reflection of a lack of interest in neighborhood development work.

Several executives felt that UCS would increase budget allocations for neighborhood development work if neighborhood houses could demonstrate within their current budgets some successful examples of the feasibility and value of such work. And there was recognition by some that with different allocation of present expenses, houses could extend their community organization work at the expense of other functions, since UCS does not make policy decisions about how an agency should use its funds.

Social workers outside the neighborhood house field offered a few comments as to the general understanding and concern about neighborhood houses by UCS. A few felt that UCS considered the work of other services such as hospitals to be of more significance than neighborhood house work, and therefore, when they have had more funds, have increased the budgets of some services other than neighborhood houses. One felt that some people in UCS understood neighborhood house purposes while others did not. They all felt that there was no strong encouragement by UCS for neighborhood
houses to go into community organization work.

The professional secretary of the Budgeting and Allocating Division of UCS is interested in citizen involvement in community welfare planning and sees a role of the neighborhood houses in sparking neighborhood councils.1

He stated that possibly UCS might in the future consider financing professional people to work with District Councils after they were working effectively, had joined UCS in the LRD, and made requests for such help. Such staff people would not be attached to UCS but to the District Councils themselves since such Councils are interested in many things besides the health and welfare services focus of UCS.

Finally, he stated that UCS policy now considers basic health and welfare services to be more important recipients of UCS funds than are programs to develop citizen participation. In the future, there may be a different emphasis, and growing feeling that increasing involvement of citizens in welfare planning may supply an invaluable pressure for increase in public welfare services, not to mention its value for the growth of the individuals involved.

The perception by neighborhood houses of the general policy of the budget and allocating division of UCS seems thus to be accurate according to the exposition of this policy by the professional secretary of the division.

1/ Raymond C. Chase, Secretary, Budgeting and Allocating, UCS, interview, Feb. 29, 1956.
However, since there is no set of standards by which the budget committee judges the service emphases of the agencies (though the professional secretary thinks it possible that UCS may someday work out such a standard), there seems to be little justification for neighborhood houses to maintain that financial limitations determine a cut-back in one particular area of service. UCS does not encourage neighborhood development work, yet neither can it force an agency to cut services in this area.

RIG.-- Many of the neighborhood houses are concerned about their place in RIG; they feel some lack of understanding and support for their work. The most widely and deeply felt concern is over the representation in RIG of these agencies. In accordance with general UCS policy, two lay people chosen by the Settlement Council represent the neighborhood houses on the RIG division committee; most executives do not think they are able to do as an effective job of interpreting the neighborhood house philosophy as a team of one professional and one lay person could do. Because of what is considered poor interpretation, the executives feel that RIG does not support or encourage them in community organization functions nor impress other UCS leadership with the value and need for neighborhood work of various kinds. One executive, however, felt that RIG leadership was extremely interested in the neighborhood
development work of neighborhood houses and might try to encourage agencies to extend this kind of service.

The Settlement Council itself has never discussed basic problems of agency policy in its meetings. The executives, in February 1956, however, met together for the first time as a committee of the Council in UCS, and plan in the future to take up consideration of neighborhood house functions.

Several social workers outside the neighborhood house field stated that they felt these agencies had for so long emphasized the value of their work in activities, that they had influenced lay people in UCS to consider activities their major purpose.

The Director of the RIG division is himself very interested in and concerned about citizen participation in planning for community welfare.¹ He feels that District Councils can serve almost as another form of representative government; that members of a community have more power than do agency professionals in securing public services. And he considers neighborhood houses to offer the only concerted effort on the grass-roots level for helping individuals become involved in planning for improvement of the community.

¹/William D. Russell, Director, RIG, UCS, interview, March 1, 1956.
welfare. 1/

He stated, however, that he is afraid UCS is not in a position yet to encourage neighborhood work by neighborhood houses. It is not yet ready to assume financial responsibility for a broad program of citizen participation. He thinks UCS will eventually, however, recognize the value of a grass-roots base. Yet he has doubts as to whether such a foundation is really practical to envision, because of the difficulty of bringing community members to see that the general welfare is important for their individual welfare.

He is not sure in which of two ways neighborhood development work by neighborhood houses will or could best increase: 1.) by their demonstration to UCS of the viability of neighborhood development work, which would then gain it financial support, or 2.) UCS support and encouragement to the agencies to expand this area of work.

It thus appears that the neighborhood houses correctly understand that RIG at this point will not give them any immediate moral support in extending neighborhood development functions. RIG is now studying the role of the neighborhood house (though not questioning its existence.)

Because of the limitations in understanding by lay representatives and the current UCS thinking as evaluated at this time by the RIG Director, it seems doubtful that new encouragement of such work will be given. RIG is making a serious effort to be of more service to the neighborhood houses, however, as indicated by the re-planning of her work load by the Assistant Director of RIG.

Since neither RIG nor the Settlement Council can determine agency policy, anyway, they cannot have a determining role in the emphasis given to various services by an agency.

LRD.-- Since the neighborhood houses are the social agencies most concerned with the coordination of services within any given district, and are concerned that individuals assume responsibility in planning for their welfare, the LRD division is potentially of great interest and importance to them. It could provide a politically powerful structure through which the voice of the members of local communities could be heard.

However, it is now looked upon with general disappointment by all executives who expressed any opinion about it. They felt that it is a weak division because of its newness, and because of the lack of professional staff for the Boston Area Council—which appears to indicate a basic lack of serious concern for the Council.
Executives wondered if a professional community organization worker would be attached to the Boston Area Council, and, if so, when and what would be his functions. They did not see the need for a professional secretary to have campaign responsibilities. All expressing opinions about the Council hoped that someone would soon be appointed to the Boston Area Council, though one executive emphasized that care be taken so that such an appointment would not lead to planning from the top down.

Though LRD theoretically represents the community residents of various metropolitan areas, executives see it at this stage, as only the voice of some social agency professionals. The two representatives of the Boston Area Council to LRD are a neighborhood house executive and an ex-executive. They have been strongly urging LRD to hire a Boston Area Council secretary, and have been active in getting the Council underway without one. The Boston Area Council is the most active of all the councils in LRD.

The Secretary of LRD explained that the division hopes to hire within a year a professional community organization worker as secretary to the Boston Area Council who will have campaign as well as planning responsibilities.1/

1/George E. Kirkendall, Secretary, Local Representation Division, UCS, Mar. 7, 1956.
Campaign work is considered to be a useful entrée to a community and its leaders which arouses more interest at first than planning, and can be a means of developing leadership for future Council work, the Secretary maintained.

The LRD staff is still puzzled over the kind of service it should offer. The campaign part of its work is clear, but not the planning. Should the planning aspect involve only consultation to citizens about how to coordinate their welfare services within one area, or should it also involve direct help and guidance to various district councils asking for it? District councils are interested in many aspects of community welfare besides the health and welfare services; should LRD assume responsibility in thus assisting with its own staff an organization only partly concerned with health and welfare services?

The LRD Secretary recognized that the neighborhood houses have played the major role in activating the Boston Area Council. This Council is a functioning concern holding monthly meetings and active on several fronts—concern about Urban Renewal projects, liquor licenses, and the Roxbury Special Youth Project.

Other communities in Metropolitan Boston have less active councils because of less enthusiastic participation by citizens, and because the lay leadership of UCS has
discouraged them from growing strong and acting as regional pressure groups. This fear of an area forming a pressure group does not extend now to Boston since need is more serious, and since pressure has not previously been exerted to an inordinate extent at the expense of other areas.

LRD thus does not seem prepared in the near future, theoretically or practically, to give through the Boston Area Council help to district councils. Help does not seem to be forthcoming for community organization on a geographic basis from the top down.

Since neither help nor encouragement to the community organization work of neighborhood houses comes from any division of UCS—Budget and Allocating, RIG, or LRD—at this time or at the promise of any definite future time, it seems that neighborhood houses will have to go about the job of neighborhood development work, including the strengthening of district councils, without increased budgets for staff workers and without help of consultation and guidance.

Though such help from UCS might be an added impetus to neighborhood development service, it is not a determining factor. There are houses which have gone ahead without encouragement or added financial help. And several executives expressed the opinion that beginning of substantial work in this area would and should be done without UCS help, to demonstrate its value and feasibility to UCS.
Certainly the professional staff of UCS is aware of and concerned about citizen participation in welfare planning; it is one of the basic tenets on which UCS is founded. And UCS is also interested in studying the role of neighborhood houses in the contemporary scene.

2. Problems and Politics in Boston

Recreation services.-- A major concern of neighborhood house executives is over the failure of public resources to provide a satisfactory level of recreation services in Boston. The public recreation services do not provide a necessary minimum of recreation opportunities. Therefore, there is such community need for recreation services that every neighborhood house executive felt this influenced the expansion of the activities part of their agency's services. The reason for failure of public services to provide minimum opportunities is laid partly to the financial difficulties of Boston—many people with high taxable incomes have moved outside the city. Another reason cited is conservatism among those in power, which leads to weakness in social welfare provisions. However, inefficiency in administration is also suggested, with people appointed to responsible posts who are untrained and unable to think and act as public recreation workers. A city research agency has made a study published in March, 1956, of the public
recreation services in Boston which points to some grave weaknesses and makes suggestions for improvements.1/

Use of school facilities.-- The school system also in general does not have a policy of permitting after-school use of facilities for leisure-time activities. School policy is generally considered old and traditional. However, two executives point to definite plans for increased use of school facilities for meeting places- in one district in Boston and in Cambridge. It was suggested that perhaps the school authorities might begin to offer their facilities for use in adult education, which might eventually lead also to other leisure-time activities. Schools are caught financially between their first and second responsibilities. The weak financial structure of Boston has a serious effect on the quantity of public services offered.

However, because public provision of leisure-time facilities is inadequate, does this necessarily force neighborhood houses into the position of devoting all their efforts to fill this one area of need? Or have they been trying to meet it at the sacrifice of meeting some other community needs which no other public or private agency is interested in or able to handle?

1/Boston Municipal Research Bureau, Boston's Recreation Needs, Boston, 1955. (Mimeo)
All social workers even after mentioning inadequate public resources did recognize that neighborhood houses— and any private agency— should not attempt to provide a minimum of recreation services for the community. The job of the neighborhood house is rather to offer some recreation services and then through demonstration and social action try to influence public or other private agencies to assume responsibility.

Neighborhood houses have been doing this to some extent. Through RIG, they have been trying to persuade the city to release the report on Boston public recreation facilities which would lead to some re-evaluation and expansion of public services. Also, through RIG, they have been urging that public recreation workers be selected and placed to work in public housing projects. However, there is obviously a need for generally broad expansion of public recreation services.

3. Executive and Staff Training and Attitudes; Board Policies

Executive and staff training and attitudes. — Six neighborhood house executives briefly mentioned certain staff factors as affecting adversely their neighborhood development work. Training and interest in group work but lack of training and interest in community organization work
were noted. The time of the staff was felt to be limited in view of the necessity of keeping the agency program going for its benefit to the community. Several executives also mentioned that an activities program was easier to offer and showed quicker and more demonstrable results. Neighborhood development work was felt to be a long-term process which took more strength of conviction to keep working at.

Social workers currently outside the neighborhood house field placed more emphasis than the executives upon the attitudes of neighborhood house staffs and also executives in influencing the amount and quality of neighborhood development work. The UCS staff people interviewed noted that agency executives are free to undertake whatever kind of emphasis they wish, though they remarked on the difficulty of finding staff willing and capable of doing neighborhood development work.

Other social workers offered further analysis: the group work training of neighborhood house staff has caused this aspect of service to be emphasized; the staff may fear it will work itself out of a job if neighborhood development work is emphasized at the expense of activities; neighborhood development work is more difficult and hazardous than activities; greater numbers of people can be cited as being served directly in an activities program. One worker thinks that agency people have in the past under-rated the
contribution neighborhood adults can make toward improving community life, and that, therefore, neighborhood development work has been underdeveloped.

**Board policies.** When questioned about the policies of agency boards towards neighborhood development work, only one executive reported that his board was definitely against expansion in this service. While a few others were not sure their boards really understood the purpose of neighborhood house work or knew well the neighborhoods in which their agencies were located, they thought their boards might be interested in more work of this kind, or would be willing to go along with the best judgment of the staff.

Two executives said that their boards were extremely interested in agency community organization work. In one case it has approved after a period of experimentation and education by the staff, a request for two or three new workers in neighborhood development, and a cut-back in recreation and group work services. There was thus only minor expression of feeling that boards set limitations on neighborhood development work.

Of two boards composed largely of members living in the neighborhood, one is interested mainly in activities and one is much aware of community problems and understands the potential and actual role of the agency in trying to meet these problems through neighborhood development work. This
suggests that the perception of the role of a neighborhood house by board members does not depend on their residence in the neighborhood, though it may be an influence.

The other social workers interviewed expressed the opinion that policy of board members who live outside the neighborhood could be influenced by the efforts of the executive and staff to help them understand the neighborhood, its needs, and the variety of services an agency could offer. There was recognition of two possible negative factors: 1.) the charity approach of board members who might not really be interested in seeing people become enabled to help themselves; and 2.) a tendency to measure the effectiveness of the work of the agency by the number of activities offered and people coming to the agency.

In general, workers interviewed outside the neighborhood house field and at least two executives within it, feel that agencies are being unrealistic when they state that UCS or their boards or any other outside factors are mainly responsible for their poverty of neighborhood development services. They feel that the main reason is the executive's and the staff's own lack of interest in this area in relation to their involvement in leisure-time services.

Since the determination of agency services rests in the final analysis upon House policy as set by the executive,
staff and board, and since only one board has strongly come out against neighborhood development work, this suggests executive and staff training and attitudes as being crucial determining factors of policy in regard to neighborhood development work.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSIONS

Neighborhood development work is considered in this study as an application of social work community organization process on the neighborhood level. When used by a neighborhood house, the emphasis of community organization is on the process of enabling neighborhood people to develop, function, and cooperate as responsible community members in relation to problems in the community welfare of concern to them. The increase in self-respect and confidence and ability to participate cooperatively in community life is taken as a more significant focus of neighborhood work than the attainment of a "more effective adjustment between social welfare resources and social welfare needs." With increased ability to think and act as responsible community citizens, neighborhood people will have the means by which to handle future welfare concerns.

Such a focus on process does not negate the importance of welfare goals themselves; the process must be problem-oriented, and a change of environment is a significant feat in itself. However, environment changes could be made without using the community organization process; it is this process which enables the citizens to maintain changes made
and become able to initiate new ones.

The process of community organization was not studied in the field research of this thesis. Though such an empirical study is an important area for further research, it seemed to this writer that prior consideration should be given to factors determining whether or not such a process would even be initiated. Community organization process was considered theoretically, however, so an explicit definition of terms could be made, and neighborhood development work seen as a means of using the social work community organization process on the neighborhood level.

The writer defined such work as including several functions: 1.) encouragement and professional help given to neighborhood civic improvement groups; 2.) enabling citizens as individuals or in temporary groups, in established local organizations or agency clubs, to take social action; and 3.) enabling neighborhood individuals and groups to relate to the larger community through ties with the district council. Neighborhood house executives interviewed agreed that this was a unique focus of work which could be discussed as a unit, and was part of the total community organization work of an agency.

The survey of executives indicated a uniform belief in the importance of neighborhood development work for building community life and improving environmental conditions as a
service for neighborhood houses to offer. Statements by organizations of neighborhood houses on a city and national level also enunciate this position. And historically, neighborhood development work has been in theory and practice an important part of neighborhood house functioning.

Yet agency executives and staffs are also concerned with the activities part of their services, and a brief survey shows neighborhood development work to be definitely taking a small part in total agency services. Why is this the case?

Factors seen by agency executives as determining the amount of time and effort put into neighborhood development work were: 1.) difficulties in involving community members in such work; 2.) great need for leisure-time services; 3.) UCS policies; 4.) policies and problems of the City of Boston; and 5.) executive and staff training and attitudes, and board policies.

Though factors inter-relate and there is usually multiple causation, each factor was studied separately to examine its relevance. Executive and staff attitudes, as influenced by background of training and perception of need and difficulties in meeting that need seem to be indicated as the most crucial factors. In one case, negative board policy was the determining factor.
The other factors do not seem necessarily to be limitations, since those agencies which are involved to any degree in neighborhood development work perform this service under similar conditions of need, difficulties in helping citizens to feel and assume community responsibility, UCS policy, and Boston politics and policies as those who are not so involved.

This suggests that though the reasons given for relative inactivity by some agencies have validity, they can be met and overcome if the executive and staff are sufficiently trained and interested in undertaking neighborhood development work. The study seems, therefore, to indicate that further research concerning influential factors might well be done in this area.

If the conclusions of this research are valid, does this mean that Boston neighborhood houses generally do not stand for a total response to community need; that they do not believe in the possibility of their unique contribution through neighborhood development work on a major scale to help adults assume responsibility as community members? This could be one interpretation of the conclusions suggested by this study. It implies that the agencies really see the activities and other aspects of their program such as personal services, as more important and more feasible to carry out than neighborhood development work. It implies
that contrary to their expressed valuation of neighborhood
development work, they consider any such work now under
way or planned for the future to be merely a minor, secondary
service which is being adequately handled.

Another possible interpretation of the conclusions
suggested by this study is that the neighborhood houses have
become so involved in their leisure-time services that even
if they do think now that neighborhood development work
should be one of their major functions, they currently find
the obstacles in the way of it extremely difficult to over-
come. Particularly staff trained and hired for recreation
and group work may make any change of focus difficult to
achieve.

The writer considers that both these interpretations
may have some validity, and that there also may be a
variation in their applicability among the different
agencies.

Nine of the eleven executives interviewed predicted a
trend in the neighborhood house field in general, including
Boston, to more neighborhood development work, and this
implies some degree of serious interest in future changes
in this direction. The interest is not strong enough now
to have led to definite plans for implementing change in a
major way except among houses in the South End. It is
interesting to note, also, that all the other social workers
interviewed who had at one time worked in the neighborhood house field, foresaw a trend among such agencies toward more neighborhood development work. This is further indication suggesting the reality of such a trend.

Since the executives in the Settlement Council intend to give more serious thought to the role and function of agencies today, and since RIG intends to encourage more thinking along these lines, a reconsideration by agencies of what they are doing and where they are going seems to be developing.

In such an evaluation, it is important to judge realistically the factors promoting or limiting service in various possible areas of neighborhood house work. Since this exploratory study seems to indicate that the interest and training of executives and staffs are determining factors in agency involvement in neighborhood development work, this could, preferably after further research, have implications for future agency policy and planning in this area.

If executives are interested in expanding such work, it would seem that this may be a strategic time to reassert its value and their willingness to include it as a major function.

Neighborhood development work, for its value to the individual and for its value in building a firm basis for
democratic institutions, seems to this writer an extremely valuable service for any agency to offer—particularly in deprived urban areas. And no agency other than the neighborhood house is currently in the position with a tradition and philosophy of total community interest, to try consistently to help a neighborhood help itself through a democratic process towards goals of community welfare which it sets itself.

As Mary P. Follett wrote in the early twentieth century, and as appears just as true today:\footnote{Mary P. Follett, The New State, Longmans, Green & Co., N.Y., 1926, p. XII.}

"Neighborhood education and neighborhood organization is then the pressing problem of 1918. All those who are looking toward a real democracy, not the pretence of one which we have now, feel that the most imminent of our needs is the awakening and invigorating, the educating and organizing of the local unit. All those who in the humblest way, in settlements or community centers, are working for this, are working at the greatest political problem of the twentieth century."

And the problem is not only political. A social and economic environment must be created which is conducive to human values and democratic vitality.
APPENDIX
Appendix A

SETTLEMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(Please fill in as applicable)

Name of Settlement:

I. Please comment briefly on the types of community organization activities in which your settlement has been working during the past year, in the area which you consider your House to be serving.

1. Civic Improvement Groups: (name, purpose)
   A. Initiation and support of such groups by your settlement.
   B. Help or encouragement in some form to such groups organized with the aid of other agencies in the area (eg. Urban Renewal, church.)
   C. Other.

2. District Council: (if one exists)
   A. Does your agency make an effort to help neighborhood groups (not only civic improvement ones) relate to the District Council?
   B. What is the relation of your agency to the District Council? (eg. attendance by staff at meetings, participation in Council activities.)

3. Adult groups meeting in your agency: (Please name those, if any, with a partial focus on neighborhood improvement. To what extent do they carry out this interest?)

4. Social Action: (Please note issues.)
   A. Have you in the past year helped neighborhood residents, singly or as temporary groups, express themselves to the larger community in regard to social, economic, or political issues affecting the neighborhood?
B. Has your agency taken a public stand in the past year on issues which have significance to the neighborhood directly or indirectly?

C. Other.

5. Other: (Is there some type of neighborhood community organization work in which you are engaged that the above categories do not cover?)

II. Staff Involvement in Community Organization.

1. Which staff positions, if any, involve as part of regular job assignments, participation in any of the above community organization activities?

2. Do you feel that this aspect of your agency's work has a major or minor function in your total agency services?

A. In staff time devoted to it:

B. In significance:

III. Please give the names of any other social work agencies which are involved in community organization in your area and district (on the "grass-roots" rather than the coordinating level.)

IV. Comments, if any, which you would like to make before our interview.
Appendix A (Supplement)

Covering Letter for Questionnaire

January 27, 1956

Dear Agency Executive:

Thank you for arranging a time for an interview with me on ___ about one aspect of the neighborhood work of your agency.

I am enclosing the questionnaire which you kindly consented to fill out and return to me (envelope enclosed, also.)

During our interview I shall be interested in learning your thoughts about such things as what you feel a settlement's responsibility is in neighborhood community organization, formation of and work with neighborhood groups around a civic improvement focus, and some theoretical and practical implications of this area of settlement work.

From this questionnaire I should like to learn some of the facts about the neighborhood work of your agency which might be called community organization. I realize that a definition of community organization in a neighborhood is in order, but feel that this will be something to discuss at greater length in an interview. The questionnaire will help prepare me for our interview, and also contribute to a brief survey of the functioning of Boston settlements in this area of work in the contemporary scene.

Thank you for your cooperation. The questionnaire is brief, so it should only take a few minutes of your time.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy Baldwin
Appendix B

Interview Guide for Agency Executives

I. Area which agency serves: geographic; population groups, neighborhoods within the area; characteristics of the area which would affect the ability of the agency to involve people in community organization?

II. Role of agency in community organization work now:

A. Type undertaken? (same as questionnaire) What geographical areas and population groups have you reached through this work?

B. What are the issues current in your area? At what level can they be handled? By civic improvement associations or social action? Would you help neighbors work in regard to any issue which concerned them?

C. Staff involvement— which positions; percentage of time?

III. Future community organization work:

A. With your present funds, do you see the functions of your agency changing in a way which would affect the amount of time and effort put into community organization? Specific plans, feasible ones; how far in the future? Are you considering asking for a budget increase from United Community Services with which to expand community organization functions? Have you ever done so in the past?

B. If you had funds available, in what ratio would you expand community organization work in comparison with other functions; what type community organization work would you do? Who should finance a community organization worker on the neighborhood level?

IV. Limitations seen as affecting community organization work now: participation potential of neighborhood residents; interest and ability of staff; Board policy; United Community Services’ policy; policy financial structure of public departments— recreation and schools?

V. Activities program in agency: function, priority in relation to community organization work?
VI. Perception of role of settlements in community organization:

A. Has philosophy and practice changed; if so, how and why?

B. Is philosophy and practice now in transition; if so, why and to what?

C. What do you feel the current philosophy and practice should be? 1/

1/Social workers other than agency executives were asked to reply to questions in areas IV and VI.
Appendix C

Community Organization - Process and Structure

Community organization in its generic sense might be defined as "all deliberate attempts to assist groups or individuals in a community to achieve unity of purpose and action in behalf of certain general or specific objectives." There is much community organization outside the field of social work, and there has been for the past twenty-five years or so a determined effort by many concerned social workers to delimit community organization as an area in the field of social work and to define the social work processes involved.

Community organization in social work may be studied from two viewpoints: 1.) as a process and skill, and 2.) as an agency structure through which the process may operate. This latter viewpoint has been termed by some social workers, "community organization as a field". This writer, for the sake of clarity, considers social work as the field, and community organization, case work, and group work as processes within it.

Community organization as a process in social work.-- Community organization is now recognized as one of the three

basic processes of social work; case work and group work have been in the process of development for a longer time.

The community organization process as a social work process may be differentiated from the community organization process in general by its objectives and methodology. Its objectives are the improvement of communities and the welfare of the people in the communities. Welfare may be broadly defined to include psychological, social, economic, political, and cultural welfare. The methods used to fulfill these objectives are the methods of a social worker who consciously influences the community organization process by bringing to bear his professional knowledge, understanding, and skills. As a process, community organization would include the dynamics of participation by the community and the social worker in the determination of needs and the efforts to meet these needs.

Structure of community organization in social work.— The structure of community organization was set up in social work in response to the need for the coordination of social services which grew in number as a consequence of economic and social developments in this country. The structure of community organization agencies has developed historically from the Charity Organizations in the nineteenth century to the Chests and Councils which developed after World War I. Later the dynamics of organization and community participation
in the structure were more carefully considered.

There are two types of community organization agencies: 1.) agencies whose primary responsibility is to coordinate and promote the work of various social service organizations in relation to the needs of an area; and 2.) area councils whose primary responsibility is the determination of the area's welfare needs in the broadest sense and the meeting of these needs through bringing available resources (including the social services) to bear or promoting new resources. There are lay and professional people in such councils.

Community organization in social work is also carried on outside the community organization agencies, as part of the functions of direct service agencies. Neighborhood houses have been the social work agencies most concerned with community organization on a neighborhood and district level.
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