

1953

How Norwood, Milton, and Needham use the Family Society of Greater Boston.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/16445>

Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository

Thesis
Reeves
1953

4402-5

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

HOW NORWOOD, MILTON, AND NEEDHAM USE
THE FAMILY SOCIETY OF GREATER BOSTON

A thesis

Submitted by

Mary Ann Reeves

(B.S., Cornell University, 1951)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1953

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>CHAPTER</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| LIST OF TABLES | ii |
| LIST OF MAPS | iii |
| I INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Purpose | 1 |
| Questions to be Considered. | 1 |
| Scope of Inquiry. | 2 |
| Sources of Data | 2 |
| Methods of Procedure. | 3 |
| Limitations | 4 |
| II BACKGROUND OF THE FAMILY SOCIETY IN THE SUBURBAN COMMUNITY. | 5 |
| <u>Section</u> | |
| 1. The Function of the Family Society of Greater Boston | 5 |
| 2. Comparison of Norwood, Milton, and Needham | 7 |
| 3. Background of the Family Society in Norwood. | 8 |
| 4. Background of the Family Society in Milton | 13 |
| 5. Background of the Family Society in Needham. | 19 |
| 6. Summary of the Development of a Family Agency in the Suburbs. . . | 22 |
| III ANALYSIS OF INTAKE | 25 |
| IV ANALYSIS OF SOURCES OF REFERRAL. | 34 |
| V CONCLUSION | 46 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 50 |
| APPENDIX | 51 |
| Tables. | 52-63 |
| Maps. | 64-66 |
| Pamphlet. | 67 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>TABLES</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| <u>In Text:</u> | |
| I Marital Status of Applicants to the Family Society. | 25 |
| II Number of Children in Each Family Unit | 26 |
| III Major Problems Considered. | 27 |
| IV Number of Clients (Families) Paying a Fee. | 29 |
| V Client's Expectation of the Time Involved in Help | 30 |
| VI Number of New and Reopened Cases | 31 |
| VII Referral Sources of Reopened Cases | 32 |
| VIII Sources of Referral. | 35 |
| IX Appropriateness of Type of Help Requested in Terms of Referral Source | 41 |
| X Who Referred the Appropriate Requests? | 44 |
| <u>In Appendix:</u> | |
| I Characteristics of the Population. | 52 |
| II Characteristics of Dwelling Units. | 53 |
| III Age and Economic Characteristics | 54 |
| IV Comparison of Norwood, Milton, and Needham Population Characteristics. | 55 |
| V Comparison of Norwood, Milton, and Needham Age and Economic Characteristics. | 56 |
| VI Comparison of Norwood, Milton, and Needham Characteristics of Dwelling Units | 57 |
| VII Catholic Population in 1950. | 58 |
| VIII Speeches and Family Life Education Discussions in Norwood. | 59 |
| IX Speeches and Family Life Education Discussions in Milton | 60 |
| X Speeches and Family Life Education Discussions in Needham. | 61 |
| XI Who Referred the Clients Who Came for Environmental Help? | 62 |

LIST OF MAPS

| <u>MAP</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|------------|-------------------|-------------|
| I | NORWOOD | 64 |
| II | MILTON. | 65 |
| III | NEEDHAM | 66 |

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to study the use of a metropolitan, general service agency by suburban communities. This is approached by studying the use of the Family Society of Greater Boston by the suburban communities, Norwood, Milton, and Needham. It is necessary for the agency to review its work at intervals in order to evaluate the extent to which it is fulfilling its function. It is hoped that such a study will help the agency in further interpretation to the communities in order that the use of the Family Society may be improved.

Questions to be Considered

In certain areas the characteristics of the specific communities studied may have some bearing on the development and use of a family agency in the specific community.

1. How do the three suburban communities chosen as possible examples of a "typical suburban community" compare with such pertinent areas as economic status, housing, education, etc?
2. How does a family agency develop in a suburban community, as exemplified by the three communities studied?
3. What kinds of problems does a suburban community bring to a family agency?

4. How are clients referred in a suburban community?

Scope of Inquiry

This inquiry attempts to study a current rather than a historical picture of the use of the agency made by suburban communities. Historical material is presented only as a background. All individual requests for casework service from September, 1952 to February, 1953 are studied. Requests for speeches and discussions through the Family Life Education Program from the fall of 1950 through the early spring of 1953 are considered primarily as means of interpretation. Consultation service to schools and other agencies and legislative work of the agency are not studied.

The suburban communities studied are Norwood, Milton, and Needham. These were chosen because they had the highest intake figures for suburban towns served by the Forest Hills Family Service Center. It is hoped that a study of how these three towns use the Family Society will throw some light on how a "typical suburban community" can use a family agency.

Sources of Data

Information was obtained from the case records of the Family Society, records of the speeches and discussions of the Family Life Education Program of the Family Society, the minutes of various meetings of the agency and of local committees, the reports of the workers, and from direct interviewing of workers and sources of referrals. The statistical

material about the towns was obtained from the United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston and were selected from the 1950 United States Census of Population and Housing for the tracted area of Metropolitan Boston. The information about the Catholic population was obtained from the Archdiocese of Boston, Chancery.

Methods of Procedure

Prior to the study of the clients themselves it was necessary to become familiar with the characteristics of the three communities. Population and sociological studies prepared by the Research Division of the United Community Services provided much of this background information. (See Appendix, page 52-4) These data were converted to a percentage of the population basis in order to facilitate a comparison of the data. Information pertinent to the development and use of a family agency is presented in Chapter II. The growth and the use of the agency is studied with regard to the local community committee of the local family agency, the office, relief policy, relationship to schools and other agencies, and general approach to the public including the Family Life Education Program. Information about the clients, the problems that they presented, and their apparent appropriateness of the requests are in the case records of the agency and were supplemented by interviews with the workers.

Limitations

In order to get a current picture of the three communities, the period studied had to be limited. It was limited to six months. However the number of intakes in this six months period was not high enough to permit any statistically valid conclusions to be drawn. At most a qualitative picture appears. The findings are applicable only to the communities studied.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE FAMILY SOCIETY IN THE SUBURBAN COMMUNITYSection 1: The Function of the Family Society of Greater
BostonObjects

In the exercise of its charter powers the Society aims to promote sound family life through two major functions:

1. Social casework available to individuals in the community who desire help in meeting problems within themselves, in their family relationships or in their adaptation to their environment.
2. Community leadership in the promotion of education for family living and in the improvement of social conditions directly affecting family life.¹

A family service agency offers casework help to individuals and families with a wide variety of problems, including: strained family relationships, behavior of children, illness and physical handicaps, economic difficulties, vocational choice, etc. Sometimes help consists in specific services such as relief, securing of a housekeeper, or referral to appropriate resources for medical care, employment, nursing homes, etc. At other times help comes through a continuing relationship with a case worker in which the client gradually comes to a better understanding of himself and his

1. Family Society of Greater Boston. Office Manual, 1953, p. 3.

attitude toward the people around him.

In any case, whether the service is specific or involves prolonged casework treatment, it should be based on a mutual understanding of the problems and situation involved. This means that the best help can be given when the client comes with a willingness to explore his situation with another person in order to find the best solution.

In cases of marital problems and parent-child relationships a continued casework relationship is usually necessary for any real help.

Family Life Education is a service that has the objective of preparing and educating groups for sound family life. Activities, consisting of talks and discussion series, are offered to groups that desire to increase their knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of family life. Speakers and discussion leaders are members of the casework staff, who have additional training in educative work with groups.²

Financial assistance is a part of the service of the Family Society of Greater Boston. However, its relief funds, like those of other voluntary agencies, are extremely limited and cannot be considered adequate to meet the unmet relief needs of the community. Therefore, the Society is obligated to follow a policy of selection.

To insure the wise and purposeful use of the money entrusted to it, the Society has adopted these principles:

1. Relief funds may be used appropriately to provide opportunity on a selective basis for development and growth, such as education and special training, recreational and group experience; and to meet other needs

2. Ibid., p. 41.

which are important in personality and family development.

- 2. Funds when available will also be used to meet economic need in certain situations in which the need is for a relatively brief period of time. Such cases are chosen on the basis that the giving of temporary help will enable the client to carry through a plan in relation to his or his family's situation which is sound and appropriate.
- 3. Relief may be given in instances of emergency when there is neither time nor facilities to evaluate a plan.

Any consideration of relief giving in a private family agency is based on the established principle that it is the responsibility of the Department of Public Welfare to meet basic relief needs. Duplication of the relief giving of the local Department of Public Welfare or assumption of their responsibility would serve only to obstruct the progress of the Departments toward the goal of adequacy in all categories of public relief.³

Section 2: A Comparison of Norwood, Milton, and Needham

The United States Census reports reveal that Norwood, Milton, and Needham have the characteristics of many suburban communities in the Boston area.⁴ However, they do have some individual differences that may have an effect on the development of a family agency within the community.

It is noted that the three towns have about the same population, although Milton has somewhat more. All three towns are fast growing communities, but Needham's rate of

3. Ibid., p. 50.

4. 1950 U.S. Census of Population and Housing for the Tracted Area of Metropolitan Boston.

growth is exceptionally high. Norwood has primarily an industrial population, while Milton and Needham have a large professional group. Most of Norwood, nearly half of Milton, and one-quarter of Needham is Roman Catholic.

These suburbs have a high educational level; Milton and Needham have an exceptionally high level. (See Appendix, Table I, page 52, "Characteristics of the Population", Item 13, for median school years completed.)

Milton is a wealthier-than-average community. Needham is a close second, financially. Norwood has a median income quite a bit lower than average for the suburbs near Boston.

None of these three towns is very overcrowded. Needham seems to be composed primarily of owner occupied single detached unit homes. Milton has the best housing conditions, while Norwood has the poorest.

Tables I to VII, pages 52 to 58 in the Appendix, give a more detailed picture of the sociological facts in Norwood, Milton, and Needham.

Section 3: Background of the Family Society in Norwood

As Norwood is approached from Boston, one is impressed with the activity of this city of sixteen thousand people. On the main street there are the common merchandising businesses of the town, set off by the usual New England Common, which occupies a fairly large space of land in the center of the town. Landmarks include the theater, a modern

and well-equipped City Hall, Public Library, General Hospital, and various Protestant and Catholic churches. Catholic churches seem to predominate. The principal industries are tanning and printing. Norwood is separated by the railroad into Norwood with the higher income groups and South Norwood with the lower income groups.

Norwood has its own Community Chest which is not a member of the Greater Boston Community Fund. The Norwood campaign is called the Green Feather and supplies funds to the following agencies:

1. Old Colony Council, Boy Scouts
2. The Norwood Girl Scouts
3. The Norwood Camp Fire Girls
4. The Milk Fund
5. Society of St. Vincent de Paul
6. The Salvation Army
7. Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
8. The Family Society
9. Norwood Community Council
10. The United Defense Fund (USO)⁵

There are of course many other organizations, including a Mother's Club, Women's Community Committee, Catholic Women's Club, and other societies organized on a private basis.

The Women's Community Committee plays an important and significant role in the community affairs. The membership is limited to about twenty-five members. This Committee is made up entirely of women and tends to include the wives of

5. Norwood Community Chest, Ten Campaigns in One. Norwood Community Chest, Norwood, Massachusetts, 1952.

prominent men in the town. The work of this Committee is divided into various sub-committees. Their main objective as a community committee has been to stimulate local authorities to take action on community problems.

In 1932

. . . at the request of Norwood, the Metropolitan Red Cross supplied a worker on a one day a week basis to give attention to problems of families of both service and civilian status.⁶

While this project was begun as an experiment and was intended only as a demonstration in social work to the community, it expanded each year.

In 1942, with the many war demands, the Red Cross service was being withdrawn. At this time the Norwood Chapter of the Metropolitan Red Cross and the Women's Community Committee requested an extension of the Family Society services to Norwood on the same basis as the Red Cross, that is one day per week.

It was agreed that

. . . the services of a worker should be supplied to Norwood without cost, but that funds for relief to families should be raised by the community whenever possible. . . . Desk space for the Family Society might be available in the branch library, South Norwood, which according to Red Cross experience, is the area of greatest need.⁷

6. Family Society of Greater Boston, Metropolitan Service Committee Minutes. Boston, Family Society of Greater Boston, July 21, 1942.

7. Ibid., October 6, 1942.

It was decided that the sponsoring committee should be representative of the various groups in Norwood. Reports of the workers who took the responsibility for community relationships from 1942 to 1953 indicate that there was always a problem about achieving broad representation from the community and of having the services of the agency understood by the community as a whole. To this end the Norwood Committee of the Family Society was reorganized several times.

As mentioned above, the first office of the agency was in the public library. This was soon transferred to the Town Hall where the Public Welfare Department had its office. This was unsatisfactory because clients who were also clients of the Public Welfare Department felt embarrassed about being seen coming to the Family Society. In 1950 the agency was given the use of an office in the Junior High School which offered the clients more privacy but had physical difficulties since it was next door to the school band and was filled with miscellaneous equipment stored by the school. Even the attempts of the Women's Community Committee to curtain off and decorate part of the room did not bring it up to the standards of a professional office. In 1952 the office had to be given up because it was needed by a school, and the agency has had to use a smaller, less adequate office which is used by the nurse for testing eyes.

There are no private relief funds in Norwood because the Community Chest in recent years has not allotted any to

the agency.

The Superintendent of Schools in Norwood has always been a strong supporter of the Family Society and was a member of various earlier committees. He encouraged the work of the agency in the schools. There is no guidance department, although there is a Dean of Girls in the high school with whom the agency has worked considerably. The agency has also worked with the principals of the junior high school. The latter and the guidance teacher from the same school have been members of the Forest Hills Area Conference. Through the guidance teacher a course in mental hygiene principles for teachers has been offered this winter by the Massachusetts Mental Health Department and the agency has been asked to participate in some of the sessions.

Attempts to increase cooperative relationships with other agencies have not yet been too successful. There is no Visiting Nurse's Association in Norwood.

Attempts to approach the general public have been made through newspaper articles and speeches and discussions under the Family Life Education Program and indirectly through the Norwood Committee of the Family Society.

By 1952 this Committee described itself as seeing:

. . . itself as a link between our agency and the community. They saw their jobs as one of increasing the community's understanding of the agency and its work and, in turn, bringing back to us the community's reaction to us as they saw or heard them. . . . They felt that they should have a voice in the

agency's policy, particularly as these policies might affect Norwood.⁸

A review of the speeches and discussions led by the agency during the period between the fall of 1948 and the spring of 1953 disclose that they were requested mainly by Parents-Teachers Association groups of mothers, clubs of non-Catholic churches, and by special groups of elementary school students. The topics varied widely and included discussions with no fixed topic, interpretations of the agency's functions, and various topics to do with interpersonal relationships and understanding children.

Section 4: Background of the Family Society in Milton

As mentioned above, Milton is the wealthiest of the three towns. It is more spread out and has more isolated neighborhoods. The part called East Milton has the poorest housing and the lowest paid workers in Milton.

Originally Milton was settled by a number of old Yankee families with large estates. Today Milton Academy reflects this old Yankee tradition of intellect united with social privilege. Today there are many sociological layers in Milton. Besides the original Yankee group there are a number of ex-servants and caretakers from the estates who have formed a substantial group of home owning Irish people, many

8. Ibid., October, 1952.

of whom own their own businesses. They are a solid self-respecting group. In the last decade the wealthier Irish from Dorchester have been moving into Milton. Today a number of Jews from Dorchester are starting to move into Milton.

While Milton solicits for the Red Feather Campaign, no money is allotted to Milton agencies, because if they accept money from the Red Feather, they cannot have their own fund raising campaign. Milton always had a sentiment that it should take care of its own people. Milton agencies include: the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and Milton Visiting Nursing Association and Social Service League, Inc.

The Visiting Nursing Association in Milton was first started in 1903, at which time it was privately supported. Social service work in Milton began with the Milton Social Service League in 1910. The Visiting Nursing Association was taken over by the Milton Social Service League in 1917, and the society changed its name to Milton Visiting Nurse and Social Service League in 1930.

In 1944 the Milton Social Service League arranged with the Family Society to pay for the part-time services of a professional worker who would be responsible to the Board and Case Committee of the Social Service League. After an experiment with a worker on a definite stated part-time basis the arrangement was modified so that the worker or workers gave whatever service was required, and the Family Society

was reimbursed on an hourly basis.

In 1949 the Social Service League had been considering establishing a mental hygiene clinic in Milton. Impetus came largely from the school nurse, but members of the Case Committee were interested. By the spring of 1951 a tentative plan had been evolved for the Social Service League to give the services of a psychiatric social worker and there was exploration of the possibility of securing a volunteer part-time psychiatrist. In April, 1951, at a meeting which included personnel from the Social Service League, a representative of the Massachusetts Mental Health Association, and a consulting psychiatrist, it was decided that such a clinic would not add to the psychiatric resources in the community and that it would be sounder for the Social Service League to make a more determined effort to publicize its preventive services in mental health. Plans were made for a two-year demonstration project to determine what the mental hygiene needs of Milton really were.

The Case Committee was established before the Family Society was invited to Milton. It is composed of twenty-five active women who attend remarkably well. It is composed of interested people and is not truly representative of Milton. Efforts are being made to make it more representative. Although a representative of East Milton, one Catholic and one Jew have been invited to be members, it is still primarily a professionally oriented middle and upper class group.

The Department of Public Welfare and the Visiting Nurses are represented.

Milton has supplied some relief to the community. In 1941 the Milton Visiting Nurse and Social Service League said of themselves:

In special cases various families were supplied with coal, provisions or milk. Transportation was furnished patients to hospitals, and clinics in Boston and vicinity. Thanksgiving and Christmas baskets are supplied, with the generous cooperation of other organizations.⁹

At present relief money is allotted by the Board of Directors of the Milton Social Service League with the following exceptions: the case worker may give up to twenty-five dollars at her own discretion or up to one-hundred dollars with permission of four designated representatives from the Case Committee. Each summer the Board allots a certain amount for camp expenditures.

At first the agency used a room in the public library as an office. There was a distinct lack of privacy since the Visiting Nurses had to go through it to get to their office. In 1951 the agency moved into a well furnished, private office in the new hospital.

The agency has been consciously developing better relationships with the schools. At first almost all the referrals were from a school nurse who is no longer with the

9. Milton Visiting Nurse and Social Service League, Inc. A Report of Our Work in 1941. Boston, p. 3.

school system. They were appropriate referrals, for she had a recognition of emotional problems. In 1951 a meeting of ten school administrators was held in order to help broaden the base that the agency had in the schools. Following this meeting the agency began to have referrals from three more school personnel. Of these the one who had the keenest sense of the preventive nature of the agency's work had had experience with mental hygiene services in another community.

The Milton schools have no guidance department in the elementary schools. Two guidance counselors in the high school do the whole job. The wife of the high school principal is an active member of the Case Committee. The relatively new superintendent of schools, with whom the agency has not worked out any definite working relationship, seems friendly to the efforts of the agency.

As mentioned above, in Milton the Visiting Nurses are part of the agency. Nevertheless, cooperation between the nursing and counselling departments is not close. On the other hand, the relationship with the Department of Public Welfare has always been unusually good because one of the founders of the Milton Social Service League was and still is an active member of the Board of Overseers of Public Welfare.

In order to publicize the agency's willingness to address groups either to explain the work of the agency or on a Family Life Education topic, the publicity committee of the Social Service League wrote to all the social, civic and religious

organizations. This was different from what happened in most other towns. Usually such letters have to be sent from the Central Office or District Office of the agency. Almost every member of the Case Committee belongs to some club in which she is willing to tell about the agency.

Most of the newspaper publicity was concerned with the project of determining the mental health needs of Milton, but the articles were infrequent. This included a pertinent article on how to choose a camp, which was a topic of real interest in the community.

The publicity committee wrote a useful basic pamphlet describing the work of the agency (see Appendix, page 67). This was sent to prospective donors, local physicians, schools, and is still distributed by the Welcome Wagon. The Welcome Wagon is a car that comes and greets each new resident in town. It contains complimentary samples from many of the businesses in town and descriptions of the resources available in town.

Table IX in the Appendix, page 60, lists the Family Life Education speeches in Milton from the fall of 1950 to the spring of 1953. It can be noted that speeches were requested by Parents-Teachers Association, a civic club, and church groups. A speech given to ten school administrators was helpful in interpreting the work of the agency to the schools. Interpretation of the agency and parent-child relationship problems seemed to be topics most requested.

Section 5: Background of the Family Society in Needham

Needham is a tree-shaded community of substantial but not ostentatious single dwellings. It has a good shopping center around a park in front of the Town Hall.

There is a great deal of community activity around the Protestant churches with all kinds of clubs, socials and Sunday Schools. Besides these, Needham has the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, and the Needham Visiting Nurses Association.

During the two and one-half years that the Metropolitan Service Department had been servicing Needham there had been only seven referrals. Because only one of these was a continued service case in which the client did not move from Needham, they offered very little opportunity for contact with the local people.

In 1942 the Extension Secretary of the Family Society gave a course to about twenty volunteers under the auspices of the Massachusetts Committee on Public Safety. "The members of this course were enthusiastic and some asked questions about our service."¹⁰ The visitor of the Department of Public Welfare seemed especially interested in the work of the Family Society. Later in the year she and the agent of the Needham Department of Public Welfare came to the Family

10. Family Society of Greater Boston, Report on the Family Society in Needham, Boston, Family Society of Greater Boston, p. 5.

Society. While the primary purpose of their visit was to refer a troublesome case, they wanted to learn more of the program of the agency and what kind of cases would be appropriate for referral. A slowly increasing cooperative relationship is developing with the Public Welfare Department.

Needham has had a Community Council since 1930. Since 1942 the executive secretary has been very cooperative and interested in the work of the agency. At present she helps the Community Council understand the agency and tries to do as much referring as possible.

At the invitation of the executive secretary workers have been invited to speak to the Community Council several times since 1945. "The Family Society's belief was that it needed a special committee of its own representative of the community in the local community who would sponsor the program."¹¹ This was brought up several times but not accepted too eagerly. However, in 1945 a temporary committee from the Needham Community Council was appointed to study the situation. This committee was never too active. At this time the Family Society has no local committee.

At first office space was a problem. The Community Council and the Visiting Nurses Association shared two gloomy offices on the ground floor of a house near the center of town. The Family Society was allowed use of these offices

11. Ibid., p. 6.

when they were free. This made scheduling appointments and privacy difficult.

A great deal of interpretation to the community has been done by the Director of Guidance of the Needham Schools, who has been interested in the Family Society for a long time. He had long recognized and accepted the value of a family agency. However, he was eager to establish a mental hygiene clinic. In 1950 he was instrumental in establishing one. The Family Society gave its services to the clinic. For the first year a psychiatrist was available as well as the case-worker from Family Society. After a short time, funds for the psychiatrist were no longer available, and it was decided that the community would use the services of the Family Society directly rather than through a clinic.

At this time the school gave the agency an office with adequate privacy. In 1951 the Community Council and the Visiting Nurses Association bought a house and the agency rented a room for twenty-five dollars per month. This office had dignity and privacy, and the agency was able to see more people than at school. The school office is still used when the main office is in use.

In Needham workers have access to the general relief funds of the Family Society; however very little relief is given and relief requests have always been few possibly because the Metropolitan District, which formerly covered this area, had given little or no relief.

There have been newspaper articles about the activities of the Family Society. Some interpretation has been made through speeches and discussions under the Family Life Education program. Most of the requests came from mothers organized in church clubs and Parents-Teachers Associations. These groups seemed to want information about children. One of the church groups requested and used a series of discussion sessions during two different years. A group of teachers had a series of discussions about the shy child. Through a doctor in the community who is actively interested in the agency, the agency had the opportunity to interpret its work to a group of the local doctors.

Section 6: Summary of the Development of a Family Agency in the Suburbs

It is seen that in each suburban town, the Family Society has tried to help the community form a broad representative committee whose purpose is to promote the agency in the community and to whom the agency would be responsible. This was difficult to do in Needham and Norwood. In Milton, on the other hand, there was a committee before the Family Society was invited to work there.

Establishing adequate quarters is always a problem in suburban communities. The type of office the community is willing and able to supply is an indication of its attitude toward the agency. In Norwood the agency has only a rather

inadequate office in a school building. In Milton, the community has given the agency a fine, well-decorated office in the new hospital. In Needham the agency rents adequate office space in a building owned by the Visiting Nurses and is given an extra room in a school.

The Family Society of Greater Boston does give special relief grants in certain types of emergencies (see page 6.). In Norwood there are no funds allocated for this. Milton does supply money when needed. Although Needham has access to the funds of the Family Society of Greater Boston little relief is given for historical reasons.

Attempts are usually made to establish cooperation with the schools. Some progress has been made with the schools in Norwood and a start has been made in Milton. In Needham cooperation is very well developed.

A very difficult, but important task is to develop cooperation with other local agencies. In Norwood success along this line is beginning. In Milton the relationship with the Department of Public Welfare has always been good, but with other agencies is just developing as it is in Needham.

The agency tries to publicize itself to the community through newspaper articles and through the Family Life Education Program. In all three suburban communities it seems that the schools and mothers, through the Parents-Teachers Association and through church groups, are making the most

use of the speeches and discussions that the agency is offering. Occasionally a professional group invites the agency to give an interpretation of itself as the group of doctors in Needham and school administrators in Milton.

CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF INTAKE

In order to get a picture of the type of clients that come to the agency and the type of problems they present various characteristics have been tabulated.

Table I shows the marital status of the forty-six cases studied:

TABLE I
 MARITAL STATUS OF APPLICANTS
 TO THE FAMILY SOCIETY FROM THREE TOWNS
 FROM SEPTEMBER, 1952 TO FEBRUARY, 1953

| MARITAL STATUS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|----------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Married | 10 | 13 | 12 |
| Single | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Separated | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Widowed | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Divorced | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 12 | 19 | 15 |

It may be observed from this table that in all three towns by far the largest number of applicants were from family units in which both parents were present in the units. While there were no single applicants from either Norwood or Needham, almost one-fifth of all the applicants from Milton

were single. There were no cases of unmarried mothers in any of the towns.

The number of children in each family is presented in Table II:

TABLE II
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN EACH FAMILY UNIT

| NO. OF CHILDREN | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|-----------------|---------|--------|---------|
| One | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Two | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Three | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Four | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Five | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Six | 0 | 1 | 0 |

The largest group in all three towns consisted of family units in which both parents were present and in which there were two children. In all three towns relatively few children came from broken homes.

Table III tabulates the major problems considered by the worker. Sometimes there is more than one major problem for a client's coming, so that the total number of problems does not necessarily equal the total number of clients applying. The categories presented are those used by the Family Society in compiling its statistics.

TABLE III
MAJOR PROBLEMS CONSIDERED

| PROBLEM | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Family relationship | | | |
| Marital difficulty | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Parent-child relationship | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| Individual personality adjustment | | | |
| Children (under 13 years old) | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Adolescents (13 through 20) | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Adults (20 and over) | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Planning substitute care of children | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Old age | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Physical illness or handicap | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Mental illness | | | |
| Diagnosed | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Suspected | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Economic | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Employment | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Educational and vocational adjustment | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Recreational | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Housing | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1 | 3 | 0 |

In both Milton and Needham the largest category of problems was concerned with family relationships and especially

parent-child relationships, while in Norwood this category was relatively low. The highest category in Norwood was economic. The second highest category in Milton was individual personality adjustment for adolescents (thirteen through twenty). There was a number of cases of physical illness or handicap in both Norwood and Milton. There was also a sizeable number of cases of individual adjustment of adults (twenty and over) in both Milton and Needham while there was none in Norwood. No cases of unmarried parenthood came to the agency in any of the communities. Problems of marital difficulty were the second highest category in Needham, and both Norwood and Milton also had some. All three communities presented a low number of educational and vocational problems to the agency.

The economic status of the clients might be reflected by whether or not they pay fees. The family society does not collect fees in Norwood; in Milton and Needham fees are on a voluntary basis and scaled to income. The following table shows the number of clients paying fees in the three communities:

TABLE IV
NUMBER OF CLIENTS (FAMILIES) PAYING A FEE

| FEE | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|-------|---------|--------|---------|
| None | 12 | 15 | 12 |
| Paid | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| | — | — | — |
| Total | 12 | 19 | 15 |

It is seen that in both communities where fees are collected, that is in Milton and Needham, about one-fifth of the clients pay fees. In Milton a fee payment is ignored unless the client brings it up. Because the agency works so closely with the school in Needham, asking for fees has been found awkward. Because so many factors are involved, the above table has very little significance.

Many of the clients and many of the people referring clients do not realize that much of the type of service that the Family Society offers is long term casework and not just brief contact advice. The clients' expectations were observed from their statements expressed in the case records. When this was not clear, interviews with the worker supplied the information. The following table indicates the number of clients who have brief and long term expectations of the time involved in help:

TABLE V
CLIENT'S EXPECTATION OF TIME INVOLVED IN HELP

| TIME | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|-----------|---------|--------|---------|
| Brief | 11 | 16 | 7 |
| Continued | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| | — | — | — |
| Total | 12 | 19 | 15 |

In Needham the clients seem to be the best informed, with over one-half of the clients understanding the need for time in casework help. In Milton a little less than one-sixth of the clients understood this. While in Norwood only one-twelfth of the clientele understood.

The client's understanding of the methods of the agency might be affected by the fact that some of them have had previous contact with the agency. The following table shows how many of the cases in the different communities are new and how many are reopened:

TABLE VI
NUMBER OF NEW AND REOPENED CASES

| STATUS OF CASE | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|----------------|---------|--------|---------|
| New | 7 | 13 | 14 |
| Reopened once | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| Reopened twice | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | — | — | — |
| Total | 12 | 19 | 15 |

From this table it is seen that nearly one-half of the cases in Norwood were not new, and nearly one-third of the cases in Milton were not new, while all but one of the cases in Needham for this period were new cases. When these data are compared with the data in Table V, it is seen that in Needham, although all but one of the cases are new, more than one-half of them have an understanding that time is involved in casework help. On the other hand, in Milton, where nearly one-third of the cases are not new, nearly one-sixth of the cases have the understanding about time. In Norwood, where nearly one-half of the cases are not new, one-twelfth of the clients understood the necessity of time. This might indicate that during the first contacts with the agency in Norwood the clients did not receive or were unable to accept an adequate interpretation of the agency. This might also

be true to some extent in Milton. On the other hand, in Needham it may be that the clients are getting a clearer interpretation of the agency during referral.

It would be interesting to look further into the type of understanding that the clients who are not new to the agency have of the agency. It would seem that a client who has had contact with the agency should have received some interpretation of the agency, and if he were able to absorb this, he would be able to reapply to the agency if he again has an appropriate problem. From this it might be inferred that the client could reapply without again needing to be referred. The following table shows whether this was so:

TABLE VII
REFERRAL SOURCES OF REOPENED CASES

| STATUS OF CASE | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Once reopened case | | | |
| Referred by self | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Referred by other than self | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Twice reopened case | | | |
| Referred by self | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Referred by other than self | 0 | 1 | 0 |

One-half of the reopened cases in Norwood did not return to the agency without a second referral. In Milton all of the cases that were reopened needed further referral to return

to the agency. Needham had one reopened case. It must be remembered that many contacts may have been very brief and around specific problems and there may not have been time or opportunity to give the client adequate interpretation of the agency's functions and methods. Moreover, if the first contact seemed unsatisfactory to the client, perhaps because his request was not in the area in which the agency could help, the client might not think of the agency as an adequate source of help in other areas either.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF SOURCES OF REFERRAL

In order to round out the picture of how a suburban community uses a family agency, it is important to study who does the referring of clients and how appropriate are the types of help requested. This chapter presents a description of this material for Norwood, Needham, and Milton during the period studied.

The following table lists the sources of referral in the three towns:

TABLE VIII
SOURCES OF REFERRAL

| SOURCE OF REFERRAL | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Church | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Medical | | | |
| Doctor | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Mass. Memorial Hospital, S.S.D. | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Visiting Nurses Association | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Personal ¹ | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| School | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| Social agency | | | |
| American Red Cross | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Department of Public Welfare | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Juvenile Aid Bureau of New York City | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Quincy Child Guidance Clinic | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Travelers Aid Society | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| United Community Services of Greater Boston | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Civic organization, local | | | |
| Women's Community Committee of Norwood | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 12 | 19 | 15 |

1. Personal referrals included people previously known to the agency, those referred by relatives and friends who were known to the agency, and some who learned of the agency and its services through the publicity that the agency uses to make itself known.

In Norwood

In Norwood, besides the personal referrals, the largest number came from United Community Services of Greater Boston. It is interesting to note that all three of these referrals came to United Community Services through the job which the husbands held in Boston. In two cases it was the employer who referred the client to United Community Services, and in the third it was the union. In all three cases interpretation was done through the Red Feather Drive and the clients, having contributed for years, felt they had a right to Red Feather help. They were very disappointed to find that they were not living in a Red Feather area and were not eligible for relief from a private agency. Norwood has its own fund raising system under the name of Green Feather and does not allot any relief money to the Family Society. In two of these cases the clients expected financial aid. They were very "disgusted" when they did not get it and it seemed that their respective firm and union might withdraw their Red Feather contributions in the future. The third client asked the Red Feather to find a school for his feeble-minded child.

The American Red Cross referred one client who expected financial aid. When he did not get what he wanted, he borrowed from his union.

The client referred through the Women's Community Committee of Norwood also wanted only financial aid and was disappointed.

The three personal referrals in Norwood consisted of two former clients which had returned of their own accord and one case referred to the agency by a neighbor who had used the agency. One of these self-referred cases was referred back to the American Red Cross where she had had a contact. The other reopened case and the case referred by a neighbor had some understanding of the casework function of the agency.

The two clients who heard about the agency through the radio broadcast seemed among the new Norwood clients to have the best understanding of the agency's casework function and ability to help in planning for children's care and seemed most ready to accept the agency's services.

In Milton

In Milton three people were referred by the United Community Services. One expected financial assistance, one wanted a quick easy solution to her marital difficulty, and one had some understanding of casework. This last client had already had a telephone contact with the Family Society once before her United Community Services referral.

One of the personal referrals knew of the agency through her occupation through which she, herself, had referred clients to the Family Society. She had a good understanding of the functions of the agency. The other two personal referrals were through people who had been clients of agencies, one of the Family Society and the other of a hospital in

Boston. These latter two clients had some idea of the agency's casework function but did not realize the length of time involved.

Of the four referrals from the school, three of the sets of parents were not prepared to use the Family Society help. Two of these three did make a contact with the agency, but primarily because they were complying with the wishes of the school. One of these two did not want anything done, but felt that the child would outgrow his difficulty. The third set of parents was not interested in any help but camp. The fourth client wanted help because the child's behavior involved danger, but wanted a quick easy solution.

One of the two referrals from the Visiting Nurses Association wanted the Family Society to help him find a housekeeper. The other referral wanted help in finding a social work job without a degree.

Both of the doctors' referrals had some idea of the use of casework and the agency. One wanted help in deciding whether to adopt a child as a solution to a problem with her own child, while the other wanted to use casework in a crisis situation.

The client referred by the Social Service Department of the Massachusetts Memorial Hospital wanted casework to help her with her problem with her daughter, and had some understanding of the kind of help available.

The client referred by the Quincy Child Guidance Clinic

had previously been referred by the local school. She wanted the agency to manipulate the school and thus alleviate her problem.

The client referred by the Department of Public Welfare was seeking help for her younger sister. The client had had long and fruitful contacts with both agencies and still knew a worker in the public agency. She had good understanding of casework help.

A church referred a disturbed epileptic woman who had had two previous contacts with the agency. The first two times she had been referred by the school nurse and a few years later by the Social Service Department of the Massachusetts General Hospital Nerve Clinic. At this time she wanted help in getting a job.

In Needham

In Needham, eleven of the fifteen clients applying to the agency were referred by the Director of the Guidance Department of the Needham schools. Six of these eleven clients had a good understanding of the nature of casework and the time involved. Three of these clients had had some treatment in their family. A guidance counselor was seeing the father of one of these three when he referred the mother and child to the Family Society. One of these three had been known to the James Jackson Putnam Children's Center. The third of this treated group had had contact with the Veterans

Administration Psychiatric Clinic, Social Service Department. The fourth client had been helped to gain her understanding through her work in the Red Feather Campaign and gained courage to come, re-enforced by a doctor in the community and by a worker in the Needham Community Council. The fifth client had some knowledge of the Family Society through three speeches by members of the Family Society that she had heard at her club and Parents-Teachers Association meetings. The sixth client seemed to have had no previous contact before the Director of the Guidance Department. Two other clients referred by the Director agreed that their children needed help but did not want to get involved themselves. The ninth client wanted the agency to change the child quickly. The tenth client wanted a short contact in which the agency would present a quick easy solution to the problem. The eleventh client was referred because the child refused to go to school, but the parents wanted no help.

The three personal referrals included one from a psychiatrist who was a friend of the family. This client was an extremely disturbed person who could not accept help from anyone. The second of the personal referrals came through a neighbor who had had some contact with Family Society. This client expected a quick easy solution for personality problems and housekeeper service. The third client referred himself. He had had previous contact when previously referred by United Community Services. He wanted financial aid.

The doctor referred a couple with a marital conflict. They had little understanding of casework.

An individual request for help is considered appropriate if the service requested falls within the functions of the agency as described on pages 5 to 7. Table IX classifies the requests in terms of the sources of referral.

TABLE IX

APPROPRIATENESS OF TYPE OF HELP REQUESTED
IN TERMS OF REFERRAL SOURCE

| MAJOR PROBLEM FOR WHICH HELP WAS REQUESTED | TOWN | REFERRED BY | WAS THE REQUEST APPROPRIATE? | |
|--|---------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----|
| | | | YES | NO |
| Marital difficulty | Norwood | Personal | 2 | 0 |
| | Milton | Medical | | |
| | | Local | 1 | 0 |
| | | Personal | 1 | 0 |
| | | Social agency Non-local | 1 | 0 |
| | Needham | Medical | | |
| | | Local | 1 | 0 |
| Personal | | 1 | 0 | |
| Parent-child relationship | Norwood | School | 1 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Milton | Medical | | |
| | | Local | 1 | 0 |
| | | Non-local | 1 | 0 |
| | School | 3 | 0 | |

TABLE IX (continued)

| MAJOR PROBLEM FOR WHICH HELP WAS REQUESTED | TOWN | REFERRED BY | WAS THE REQUEST APPROPRIATE? | |
|--|---------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----|
| | | | YES | NO |
| | | Social agency | | |
| | | Local | 1 | 0 |
| | | Non-local | 2 | 0 |
| | Needham | School | 10 | 0 |
| Individual personality adjustment | Norwood | Personal | 1 | 0 |
| | | Social agency | | |
| | | Non-local | 1 | 0 |
| | Milton | Personal | 1 | 0 |
| Environmental problems | | | | |
| Financial | Norwood | Civic organi- zation, local | 0 | 1 |
| | | Personal | 1 | 1 |
| | | Social agency | | |
| | | Non-local | 0 | 1 |
| | Needham | Social agency | | |
| | | Non-local | 1 | 0 |
| Other | Norwood | Social agency | | |
| | | Local | 0 | 1 |
| | | Social agency | | |
| | | Non-local | 2 | 0 |
| | Milton | Church | 1 | 0 |
| | | Personal | 1 | 0 |
| | | School | 1 | 0 |
| | | Social agency | | |
| | | Local | 2 | 0 |

TABLE IX (continued)

| MAJOR PROBLEM FOR WHICH HELP WAS REQUESTED | TOWN | REFERRED BY | WAS THE REQUEST APPROPRIATE? | |
|--|--------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----|
| | | | YES | NO |
| Other | Milton | Social agency Non-local | 2 | 0 |
| | | Needham | Personal | 0 |

Only five of the forty-six requests from these suburban communities were inappropriate to the function of the agency. All the requests for help with marital difficulty, parent-child relationship, and personality adjustment were appropriate. The five inappropriate requests were for help with environmental problems; three of these were requests for financial help. Nevertheless, among the requests for environmental help here were more than twice as many appropriate requests as inappropriate requests. Four of the five inappropriate requests were in Norwood, while the fifth was in Needham.

The inappropriate requests in Norwood came from a local civic organization, a personal source, a non-local social agency, and a local social agency; in Needham the one inappropriate request came from a personal source.

Table X reorganizes this same material in order to clarify which sources referred clients with appropriate types of requests.

TABLE X
WHO REFERRED THE APPROPRIATE REQUESTS?

| REFERRAL SOURCE | TOWN | NUMBER |
|-----------------|---------|-----------|
| Church | Milton | <u>1</u> |
| | Total - | 1 |
| Medical | | |
| Local | Milton | 2 |
| | Needham | <u>1</u> |
| | Total - | 3 |
| Non-local | Milton | <u>1</u> |
| | Total - | 1 |
| Personal | Norwood | 4 |
| | Milton | 3 |
| | Needham | <u>1</u> |
| | Total - | 8 |
| School | Norwood | 1 |
| | Milton | 4 |
| | Needham | <u>11</u> |
| | Total - | 16 |
| Social agency | | |
| Local | Milton | <u>3</u> |
| | Total - | 3 |
| Non-local | Norwood | 3 |
| | Milton | 5 |
| | Needham | <u>1</u> |
| | Total - | 9 |

It may be noted that most of the appropriate requests came from personal, school, and social agency sources. However, most of the referrals from local sources appear to come from personal and school sources. The exceptionally high

number of referrals from schools in Needham came through the Director of the Guidance Department of the Needham Schools, who is personally very interested in the agency as mentioned above in Section 5, page 21. The local medical referrals in Milton and Needham were made by doctors who are especially interested in the agency. One fact stands out that appropriate referrals come from people who understand, are interested in the agency, and who recognize problems, especially incipient ones.

Almost one-third of the referrals of appropriate requests are from non-local sources, primarily from central sources in Boston like the United Community Service. This is apt to happen in suburbs where a number of the population work in the city, and therefore may receive interpretation of social agencies in the city and make their initial applications for help near their work.

Interviews with the staff brought out that they felt that the speeches and discussions helped people to become aware of the agency so that when someone like the Guidance Director tried to refer them, the agency and its work were not new to the potential clients. At times people have come directly from hearing the speeches but this has not shown up in this study. It is felt by the staff that discussion groups were more effective than speeches and a series of discussions were more effective than single sessions as a means of interpretation.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study was undertaken to examine the use of a metropolitan general service agency by suburban communities, as exemplified by the Family Society of Greater Boston and the suburban communities, Norwood, Milton, and Needham. General conclusions are difficult to arrive at with so small an intake. However, trends can be observed and new questions can be raised as a result of this study.

The major questions that this study attempts to answer are:

1. How do the three suburban communities chosen as possible examples of a "typical suburban community" compare in such pertinent areas as economic status, housing, education, etc.?
2. How does a family agency develop in a suburban community, as exemplified by the three communities studied?
3. What kinds of problems does a suburban community bring to a family agency?
4. How are clients referred in a suburban community?

Norwood, Milton, and Needham have characteristics in common with many suburban communities in this geographic area and with each other. The three suburbs are fast-growing communities of about the same size. They have a high educational level and are not overcrowded. Norwood is composed

mainly of an industrial Catholic population, whose income is somewhat lower than average for suburbs about Boston. Both Needham and Milton have a large professional group and an exceptionally high educational level. Milton is wealthier than the average suburban community and has a tradition of local self-sufficiency.

In order for a family agency to have roots in and develop in a community, it is important that an active broad local representative committee sponsor the agency. It is important for the agency to have adequate office space, whether it is paid for or obtained free. Efforts are made to develop cooperation with schools and other agencies. Opportunities for interpretation are sought through means of public communication such as the newspapers and radio, and through speeches and discussions to interested groups through the Family Life Education Program.

It is noted that Milton, the wealthy, self-sufficient, civic minded community, had its own sponsoring committee even before it received service from the Family Society of Greater Boston. Milton offers an exceptionally fine office. The community seems to cooperate in furthering interpretation.

Norwood, the poorest community, offers a rather inadequate office, but it has offered outlets for interpretation.

Cooperation with the schools in Needham is exceptionally effective, because the Director of the Guidance Department of Needham Schools is especially aware of the need for mental

hygiene efforts.

By far the largest number of applicants were from family units in which both parents were present. The family with two children was most common, but many families had one and three children. Most of the requests in Milton and Needham were concerned with family relationships and personality adjustment, while Norwood had requested considerable help with environmental problems, especially economic. Many of the Needham clients understood the need for continued contact while in Norwood few understood this.

A large part of the referrals in these suburban communities were personal. In Milton, and even more so in Needham, many of the referrals came through schools. Occasional referrals came from non-local social agencies, especially the United Community Services. In general, the requests were appropriate; the inappropriate ones came largely to Norwood and were concerned with environmental problems, especially economic problems. Most of the appropriate referrals were from personal and school sources. One fact that stands out is that appropriate referrals came from people who understood the agency and who recognized problems, especially incipient ones. This develops best as a result of continued agency contact with the referral source. The staff felt that speeches and discussions did help, however, by helping the public become aware of the agency, although this could not be substantiated. At times people came to the agency directly

as a result of the speeches, but this is not reflected in this study. It was found that discussion groups were more effective than speeches, and that a series of discussions was more effective than a single one.

The casework function of the agency is to make casework available to individuals in the community who desire help in meeting problems within themselves, in their family relationships or in their adaptation to their environment. These communities seem to be using the agency in general according to this expressed function, where they are using it, but large areas of the communities are not as yet using it. This might indicate that effort ought to be continued to have interpretation reach more people and thereby make the service available to a larger area of the communities.

Approved:

Richard K. Conant
Richard K. Conant
Dean

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archdiocese of Boston, Statistics of Catholic Population.
Boston, Archdiocese of Boston, 1950.

Family Society of Greater Boston, Metropolitan Service Committee Minutes. Boston, Family Society of Greater Boston, 1941-1948.

_____, Office Manual, 1953. Boston, Family Society of Greater Boston, 1953.

_____, Reports on the Family Society of Needham. Boston, Family Society of Greater Boston, 1941.

Milton Case Committee, Minutes. Milton, Milton Case Committee, 1947.

Milton Social Service League, Annual Report. 1950-1952.

Milton Visiting Nurse and Social Service League, Inc. A Report of Our Work in 1941. Boston, 1942.

Norwood Conference, Minutes. Norwood, 1950-1952.

Norwood Community Chest, Ten Campaigns in One. Norwood Community Chest, Norwood, Mass., 1952.

Norwood Committee Meetings, Minutes, 1952.

United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Research Division, Social Facts by Census Tracts. Boston, 1951.

U.S. Census of Population and Housing for the Tracted Area of Metropolitan Boston, Report of the 17th Decennial Census of the U.S. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

APPENDIX

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION¹

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|---|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Population - 1950 | 16,636 | 22,395 | 16,313 |
| 2. Population - 1940 | 15,383 | 18,708 | 12,445 |
| 3. Per cent of change | ✓15.3 | ✓19.7 | ✓31.1 |
| 4. Male population - 1950 | 8,070 | 10,429 | 7,751 |
| 5. Non-white population | 19 | 57 | 23 |
| 6. Foreign-born white population | 3,137 | 2,783 | 2,020 |
| 7. No. of married couples | 3,840 | 5,155 | 4,015 |
| 8. Couples with their own household | 3,595 | 4,760 | 3,800 |
| 9. Households - total number | 4,578 | 6,142 | 4,686 |
| 10. Institutional population | 75 | 23 | 16 |
| 11. Persons one year old or over | 16,235 | 22,145 | 15,975 |
| 12. Item 11 - same residence in 1950 as in 1949 | 14,350 | 19,725 | 13,705 |
| 13. Twenty-five years or over - median school years completed | 10.8 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| 14. Total no. of families and unrelated individuals | 5,070 | 6,975 | 5,100 |
| 15. No. incomes under \$1,500 | 810 | 1,135 | 620 |
| 16. From \$1,500 to \$2,999 | 1,135 | 850 | 810 |
| 17. From \$3,000 to \$4,499 | 1,545 | 1,370 | 1,185 |
| 18. Incomes \$4,500 and over | 1,345 | 2,870 | 2,000 |
| 19. Median income - dollars | 3,458 | 4,234 | 4,195 |

1. Source: The United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Research Division, Social Facts by Census Tract.

TABLE II
CHARACTERISTICS OF DWELLING UNITS¹

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|---|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Total dwelling units | 4,739 | 6,248 | 4,821 |
| 2. Total occupied units | 4,599 | 6,146 | 4,678 |
| 3. Owner-occupied units | 2,786 | 4,879 | 3,833 |
| 4. Single detached units (including trailers) | 2,366 | 4,783 | 3,976 |
| 5. Median value of singles - dollars | 9,516 | 14,477 | 13,904 |
| 6. Total units in five or more structures | 314 | 10 | 44 |
| 7. Total units reporting condition | 4,676 | 6,177 | 4,753 |
| 8. Units with no private bath or no running water or dilapidated | 320 | 63 | 189 |
| 9. Units built 1919 or earlier | 2,860 | 2,320 | 1,750 |
| 10. Units built 1940 or later | 600 | 720 | 1,235 |
| 11. Median persons per occupied unit | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| 12. Units reporting 1.01 persons per room or more | 470 | 141 | 179 |
| 13. Units reporting central heat | 3,845 | 6,015 | 4,365 |
| 14. All units reporting rents (both rented and rentable) | 1,747 | 1,134 | 774 |
| 15. No. rentals under \$20 | 112 | 12 | 40 |
| 16. From \$20 to \$39 | 1,158 | 265 | 355 |
| 17. From \$40 to \$59 | 363 | 606 | 247 |
| 18. Rentals \$60 and over | 114 | 251 | 132 |
| 19. Median contract monthly rent - dollars | 33.14 | 49.57 | 39.55 |

1. Source: The United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Research Division, Social Facts by Census Tract.

TABLE III
AGE AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS¹

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|---|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Persons under 5 yrs. old | 1,558 | 1,655 | 1,640 |
| 2. Persons 5 - 13 yrs. old | 2,123 | 2,980 | 2,290 |
| 3. Persons 14 - 19 yrs. old | 1,264 | 1,807 | 1,190 |
| 4. Persons 65 yrs. old or over | 1,528 | 2,502 | 1,530 |
| 5. Persons 21 yrs. old or over | 11,508 | 15,684 | 11,032 |
| 6. Persons 14 yrs. old or over | 12,955 | 17,760 | 12,383 |
| 7. No. of Item 6 in civilian labor force | 7,323 | 9,046 | 6,560 |
| 8. No. of Item 7 employed in month of April, 1950 | 7,060 | 8,790 | 6,445 |
| 9. Professional, technical, and kindred workers | 734 | 1,644 | 1,195 |
| 10. Managers, officials, and proprietors (inc. farms) | 489 | 1,513 | 1,193 |
| 11. Clerical and kindred workers | 1,115 | 1,885 | 918 |
| 12. Sales workers | 415 | 960 | 802 |
| 13. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers | 1,277 | 1,124 | 836 |
| 14. Operatives and kindred workers | 1,971 | 606 | 781 |
| 15. Private household workers | 97 | 325 | 178 |
| 16. Service workers (except household) | 517 | 459 | 276 |
| 17. Laborers | 411 | 234 | 234 |

1. Source: The United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Research Division, Social Facts by Census Tract.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF NORWOOD, MILTON, AND NEEDHAM
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|--|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Per cent of change of population between 1940 and 1950 | /15.3 | /19.7 | /31.1 |
| 2. Per cent of foreign-born white population | 18.8 | 12.4 | 12.5 |
| 3. Per cent of population that is married | 46.2 | 46.0 | 49.2 |
| 4. Per cent of couples with their own household | 93.6 | 92.4 | 94.6 |
| 5. No. of households per capita | 0.274 | 0.274 | 0.287 |
| 6. Per cent of persons one year old or over | 97.5 | 98.0 | 98.6 |
| 7. Twenty-five years or over - median school years completed | 10.8 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| 8. Per cent of no. of families and unrelated individuals | 30.2 | 31.1 | 31.2 |

TABLE V
 COMPARISON OF NORWOOD, MILTON, AND NEEDHAM
 AGE AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|--|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Per cent of persons under 5 yrs. old | 9.3 | 7.4 | 10.0 |
| 2. Per cent of persons 5 - 13 yrs. old | 12.7 | 13.3 | 14.0 |
| 3. Per cent of persons 14 - 19 yrs. old | 7.6 | 8.1 | 7.3 |
| 4. Persons 65 yrs. old or over, per cent of | 9.2 | 11.2 | 9.3 |
| 5. Per cent of persons 21 yrs. old or over | 69.1 | 69.8 | 67.5 |
| 6. Per cent of persons 14 yrs. or over | 77.7 | 79.1 | 75.6 |
| 7. Per cent of professional, technical, and kindred workers | 10.0 | 18.2 | 18.2 |
| 8. Per cent of managers, officials, and proprietors (inc. farms) | 6.7 | 16.7 | 18.2 |
| 9. Per cent of clerical and kindred workers | 15.2 | 20.8 | 13.9 |
| 10. Per cent of sales workers | 5.7 | 10.6 | 12.5 |
| 11. Per cent of craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers | 17.4 | 12.4 | 12.7 |
| 12. Per cent of operatives and kindred workers | 26.9 | 15.1 | 11.9 |
| 13. Per cent of private household workers | 1.3 | 4.6 | 1.6 |
| 14. Per cent of service workers (except household) | 7.1 | 5.1 | 4.2 |
| 15. Per cent of laborers | 5.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 |
| 16. Median income - dollars | 3,458 | 4,234 | 4,195 |

TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF NORWOOD, MILTON, AND NEEDHAM
CHARACTERISTICS OF DWELLING UNITS

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|---|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Total dwelling units per capita | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.30 |
| 2. Total occupied units per capita | 0.276 | 0.274 | 0.286 |
| 3. Owner occupied units per capita | 0.167 | 0.218 | 0.234 |
| 4. Single detached units per capita | 0.142 | 0.213 | 0.244 |
| 5. Median value of singles - dollars | 9,516 | 14,477 | 13,904 |
| 6. Total units in five or more structure per capita | 0.019 | 0.0004 | 0.0027 |
| 7. Units with no private bath or no running water or dilapidated per capita | 0.019 | 0.003 | 0.016 |
| 8. Units built 1919 or earlier per capita | 0.172 | 0.100 | 0.107 |
| 9. Units built 1940 or later per capita | 0.036 | 0.032 | 0.135 |
| 10. Median persons per occupied unit | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| 11. Units reporting 1.01 persons per room or more per capita | 0.029 | 0.006 | 0.01 |
| 12. Units reporting central heat per capita | 0.0231 | 0.0268 | 0.267 |
| 13. No. rentals under \$20 per capita | 0.007 | 0.0095 | 0.002 |
| 14. No. rentals \$60 and over per capita | 0.007 | 0.011 | 0.008 |
| 15. Median contract monthly rent - dollars | 33.14 | 49.57 | 39.55 |

TABLE VII
CATHOLIC POPULATION IN 1950

| CHARACTERISTICS | NORWOOD | MILTON | NEEDHAM |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| No. of Catholics ¹ | 15,319 | 10,223 | 4,218 |
| Total population ² | 16,636 | 22,395 | 16,313 |
| Approximate percentage of Catholics | 92% | 45.5% | 25.8% |

1. Statistics compiled by the Archdiocese of Boston, Chancery, 1 Lake Street, Boston, Mass.
2. 1950 U.S. Census of Population and Housing for the Tracted Area of Metropolitan Boston.

TABLE VIII
 SPEECHES AND FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION DISCUSSIONS IN
 NORWOOD FROM FALL, 1948 - SPRING, 1953

| DATE | GROUP ADDRESSED | TOPIC | ATTENDANCE | PLACE |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| January, 1949 (series) | Girls | Personal relationships | 3 groups separated by age | Peabody School for Girls |
| January, 1949 | PTA | Parent-child relationships | 80 people, mostly mothers of grade 1-6 | Elementary school |
| February, 1949 | PTA | Father's job in the family | | Elementary school |
| October, 1949 | Young married couples' club | Meeting home problems | 30 people, age 23-35 | Unitarian Church |
| November, 1949 | PTA | Years 6-10 | | Elementary school in "better" section of town |
| November, 1949 | Young people's group | Getting along with others | | Congregational Church |
| November, 1949 | Graduate club | Family Society and its services | | Congregational Church |
| May, 1951 | PTA | Teen-agers, are they different | Parents of teen-agers(12) | Congregational Church |
| January, 1951 | | Discussion | 10 boys who attend Peabody School for Girls | Peabody School |

TABLE IX
 SPEECHES AND FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION DISCUSSIONS IN
 MILTON FROM FALL, 1950 - SPRING, 1953

| DATE | GROUP ADDRESSED | TOPIC | ATTENDANCE | PLACE |
|----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| October, 1950 | Milton Rotary Club | The work of the Social Service League | 100 | Rotary Club |
| May, 1951 | Principals of Milton schools | The work of the Social Service League | 10 school administrators | Social Service League Office |
| November, 1951 | Church of the Holy Spirit | Parent-child relationship | | Episcopal Church |
| January, 1952 | PTA | Parent-child relationship | 200 parents from 3 schools | School |
| April, 1952 | Milton Women's Club | The second forty years | | Congregational Church |
| April, 1952 | | Parent-child relationships | | Congregational Church |
| February, 1953 | | The work of the Social Service League | | Unitarian Church |

TABLE X
 SPEECHES AND FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION DISCUSSIONS IN
 NEEDHAM FROM FALL, 1948 - SPRING, 1951

| DATE | GROUP ADDRESSED | TOPIC | ATTENDANCE | PLACE |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------|
| October, 1948 | PTA | Understanding the child, yrs. 6-8 | 100, mostly mothers | Elementary school |
| May-June, 1949 (series of 6) | Needham teachers group | Shy child | Teachers (15) | School |
| October, 1949 through January, 1951 (series of 8) | PTA Child study group | Behavior of children | Child study group (14) | Unitarian Church |
| January, 1950 | Women's club | Understanding the child, (2-10) | Mothers (16) | Methodist Church |
| January, 1951 | Medical Society of Needham | Cooperative relationships with school guidance department | 20 Doctors | Hospital |
| January, 1951 (series of 8) | Child study group | Understanding the child (2-10) | Mothers (9) | Unitarian Church |
| March, 1951 | Rainbow Mothers Club | Teen-ager | Mothers (30) | Masonic Hall |
| April, 1951 | PTA | Teen-agers, are they different? | Mostly mothers (60) | School |

TABLE XI

WHO REFERRED THE CLIENTS WHO CAME FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HELP?
WERE THEIR REQUESTS APPROPRIATE?

| TOWN | REFERRED BY | TYPE OF HELP REQUESTED | WAS THE REQUEST APPROPRIATE? |
|---------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Norwood | UCS (through employer) | School for feeble-minded child | Yes |
| | UCS | Housekeeper (cannot pay) | Yes |
| | UCS | Money for milk and massage | No |
| | ARC | Housing | No |
| | Women's Community Committee | Supplementation of ADC | No |
| | Personal | Financial help for medical care or referral to proper source | Yes |
| | Personal | Financial help with debts because of illness | No |
| Milton | UCS | Finding and financing nursing home care | Yes |
| | Traveler's Aid Society | Employment for DP couple | Yes |
| | VNA | Housekeeper in crisis (could pay) | Yes |

TABLE XI (continued)

| TOWN | REFERRED BY | TYPE OF HELP REQUESTED | WAS THE REQUEST APPROPRIATE? |
|---------|---|--|------------------------------|
| Milton | VNA | Employment resources | Yes |
| | Church | Job for disturbed epileptic girl | Yes |
| | School | Camp | Yes |
| | Personal (contact through work) | Housekeeper and casework (can pay) | Yes |
| Needham | UCS (through employer) | Money for shoes, glasses, medical care, and camp because of wife's illness | Yes |
| | Personal by psychiatrist (friend of family) | Nursing home | No |



