THE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE

AS A

SOCIAL WORK AGENCY

by

SARAH LLEWELLYN BASSETT MELLOR

B.A., The University of Alberta, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

School of Community and Regional Planning

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October 1981

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for an advanced degree at the University
of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make
it freely available for reference and study. I further
agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis
for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my
department or by his or her representatives. It is
understood that copying or publication of this thesis
for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written
permission.

Department of _Community and Regional Planning_

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date _October 20, 1981_

ABSTRACT

Four of Vancouver's eight neighbourhood houses were studied to determine the extent to which they are social work agencies and to ascertain what types of social work each engages in. Related questions addressed include the roles of neighbourhood house voluntary boards of directors, the effects and implications of government funding of neighbourhood house programs, and the extent to which houses have departed from their historic roles.

The four houses studied were consciously chosen so as to represent two which belong to the Neighbourhood Services Association and two which are independent, in that they belong directly to the United Way. An old and a new house of each type was selected so as to provide a further basis for valid comparisons

Neighbourhood houses are clearly social work agencies. Programs of the casework and group work type are predominate. Two of the houses, in particular, also carry out extensive community organization work.

Volunteer board members play significant roles. However, the nature of their roles varies according to length of tenure of the director, their past or current involvement in house programs, and their perceptions of the purpose of volunteer boards. Generally speaking, the longer the director's term and the more board members participate in house programs, the less significant is their role in making important policy, programming, staffing and budget decisions.

Two of the four neighbourhood houses have departed from roles played by the early settlement houses. One reason for an increased emphasis on casework and group work programs at the expense of community organization is neighbourhood house reliance on government funding to provide direct services to target groups. The change in emphasis of house programming occurs, not through exercise of overt government control but, in part, because administration of publicly funded services takes time and energy away from community organization work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The purpose of the thesis is to determine the extent to which four Vancouver neighbourhood houses, Kiwassa, Little Mountain, Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver, are social work agencies, to ascertain what type or types of social work each engages in, and to draw policy oriented conclusions concerning the functioning of neighbourhood houses as social work agencies. Definitions and the most widely acknowledged divisions of social work will be part of the literature review in Chapter Two. Related themes covered include the roles of voluntary boards of directors in agencies and the effects and implications of government provision of social services and government funding of neighbourhood house programs.

Vancouver's first neighbourhood house, Alexandra House, opend in 1938. Today there are eight neighbourhood houses in the city. Listed in order of their appearance as neighbourhood houses they include Alexandra, now Kitsilano (1938), Gordon House in the West End (1942), Cedar Cottage (1963), Kiwassa in the Strathcona community (1966), South Vancouver (1977), Mount Pleasant (1978), and Little Mountain in Riley Park (1979). Each house is governed by a volunteer board of directors.

Six of Vancouver's neighbourhood houses, including Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver, belong to the Neighbourhood Services Assocation (NSA) which provides them with common administrative services. These include accounting, payroll, financial planning, budgeting assistance, personnel screening and referral, and overall planning and development advice. In return, NSA takes 3% of each house's total budget to pay for computer time and the preparation of financial statements by NSA's accountant. NSA requires a minimum level of staffing for its member houses which varies from two to three people, incluidng the Director, depending on

the size of the house's budget, the scope of its acitivities and how long it has been a member of NSA. Minimum salary levels are established for these staff. Core budget requests for NSA houses to both the City of Vancouver and to the United Way, of which NSA is a member, are channeled through NSA.

The Kiwassa and Little Mountain neighbourhood houses are independent in that they do not belong to NSA. Rather, they are member agencies of United Way and receive their core funding directly from it and from the City.

Although the four neighbourhood houses being studied receive their core budget money from United Way and the City, they obtain about 90% of their budget from the senior levels of government, particularly from the provincial ministries of Health and Human Resources. These ministries finance programs aimed at people with specific needs and characteristics. However, each house provides programs and events which governments neither do nor would fund. Examination of the types of programs governments both do and do not fund provides some interesting insights into the nature of neighbourhood house programming.

Method

As mentioned above, Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver neighbourhood houses belong to NSA, while Kiwassa and Little Mountain are independent. Cedar Cottage is one of the city's original houses while South Vancouver is of more recent origin. Kiwassa dates back a long way, whereas Little Mountain is the newest of Vancouver's neighbourhood houses. By studying two NSA houses and two independents, and by selecting both a new and long-established one of each type, it is felt there will be a valid basis for a comparative case study of the character- istics and nature of services provided by each.

The principal means of data collection was semi-structured, open-ended interviews with the directors of each of the four neighbourhood houses, many of their full-time staff, and most of their board members. Notes taken during each interview provided the data for the thesis. Open-ended interviewing is subject to manipulation by the interviewer in both the order of questions asked and the answers selected for analysis. However, it also allows the interviewer to delve further when opportunities present themselves for additional, pertinent information and, thus, to form a deeper understanding of the subject under study. The Appendix contains the interview schedules used and the Bibliography lists the people interviewed.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into six chapters. Chapter One, as is already apparent, outlines the purpose of the thesis, provides a brief introduction to neigh-bourhood houses, and introduces the method of investigation used.

Chapter Two reviews the literature to determine what others have found useful to say about the nature of social work, its divisions, assumptions and purposes; the motivations for volunteering and the roles and functions of volunteer boards of directors; and the implications and effects of government funding on social and community agencies.

The third chapter present summaries of the historical evolution of neighbour-hood houses in general and of NSA and United Way, and summarizes the history of each of the four neighbourhood houses being studied. These summaries will provide a context for the interview findings and will help to determine if there are historical reasons for the nature of the programming done by each house.

Chapter Four uses the interview findings to present a profile of each neighbourhood house in terms of the following elements: a summary of perceptions

of the purpose(s) of each house; a review and classification of the programs and activities each offers into one of the three categories of social work practice; an examination of the funding source and amount for each program; a discussion of the relative roles of the house directors and the boards with whom they work; and a presentation of board and staff perceptions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of each house as compared with that house's purpose.

Chapter Five synthesizes the literature review, historical summaries and interview findings so as to answer the following questions. What type of social work and other programs and activities do neighbourhood houses provide? Do volunteers play a significant role in neighbourhood house operations? What do staff and board members perceive that neighbourhood houses both do and should do? Have neighbourhood houses departed from their historic roots as both community organization agencies and providers of services? What are the policy implications of the current functioning of neighbourhood houses?

Chapter Six summarizes the conclusions as gleaned from the answers to the questions posed. It also indicates areas for further study which arise from the thesis investigations but which were not the central focus.

CHAPTER TWO

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Given the assumption that Kiwassa, Little Mountain, Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver neighbourhood houses are neighbourhood based social work agencies it was necessary to review the literature for definitions and typologies of social work. These, together with the ideological currents which underscore social work practice, will be summarized below. Community organization will be discussed both as a dimension of social work and as part of a broader category of interventions at the community level, including locality or community development, social planning and social action. Many social work institutions depend on government funding to operate many of their programs. The effects and implications of this reliance will also be reviewed. Finally, since neighbourhood houses are run by volunteer boards of directors, the motivations for volunteering and the role of volunteer boards, as presented in the literature, will also be reviewed.

The purpose of this chapter is to gain an understanding of the nature and ideological underpinnings of social work and its various divisions, the effects and implications of government funding of social work activities and programs, and the motivation and roles of those who serve on volunteer boards of directors. This increased understanding will provide a theoretical context for interpretation of the histories summarized in Chater Three and the interview findings presented in Chapter Four.

Social Work

Poverty and its attendant conditions are viewed by many as the most persistent of social problems. The attitude that poverty is the result of a flaw in character and is thus either a personal misfortune or something deserved leads to the development of charitable institutions and welfare organizations. The attitude that it is the consequence of injustice towards a particular class, race or group of people results in efforts to alter the structure of society so as to redistribute resources and opportunities. "Philanthropy and social reform are two organized approaches to dealing with social problems".[1] Traditionally, social work has been viewed as charity. However, now that institutionalized social insurance exists "the skill and energy of social workers can be increasingly turned from meeting the minimum subsistence needs of a segment of the population to the consideration of whatever factors impair personal effectiveness for any member of the population."[2]

In her book Social Work: An Introduction Elizabeth Ferguson quotes several definitions of social work. A classic definition calls it "those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment."[3] Another prominent social worker defines social work as "a process used by certain human welfare agencies to help individuals cope more effectively with their problems in social functioning."[4] Still another practitioner calls it

> an art in which knowledge of the science of human relations and skill in relationships are used to mobilize capacities in the individual and resources in the community appropriate for better adjustment between the client and all or any part of his total environment.[5]

The emphasis of all these definitions is clearly on the adjustment and change of the individual so as to better fit in with society.

Andrew Armitage observes that social work or social welfare programs exist in western countries characterized by industrialism, affluence, a capitalist

economic ideology, and a democracy based on universal franchise, i.e. a represen-
tative democracy.[6] They are a means of exerting social control in the face of
inequities. Armitage defines social control as "the process through which a group
influences the behaviour of its members towards conformity with its norms."[7] It
can be exerted through use of coercion, material power or the manipulation of the
ability to buy in the marketplace, and symbolic power through intangibles such as
acceptance and esteem.[8]

Social work can be, in Armitage's view, an instrument of social control in
that it works to redistribute money and goods from the rich to the poor who then
find the wealth of the rich more acceptable because they are no longer so badly
off. In addition, because they have more money the poor will be more healthy,
therefore, better able to work. Consequently, they will be able to earn more
money which contributes to the growth of the economy which further enriches the
wealthy. Therefore, it has been argued that philanthropy and social work are in the
best interests of the wealthy because they ensure the maintenance of the social
order.[9]

Communities exert social control over residents. They also provide residents
opportunities for social interaction, i.e. they "socialize" people. Armitage defines
socialization as the "process through which individuals, through learning, acquire
the knowledge, values and behaviour patterns of their society and learn behaviour
appropriate to their social roles."[10] Education programs, debt counselling, day
care centres and recreation programs are some examples of programs which
socialize people. Thus, social service agencies can provide ways in which deviant,
troubled or impoverished individuals and the rest of the community can co-exist
with the least disruption to the established way of doing things.[11]

Murray Ross, in a widely used textbook on community organization, is also
concerned about the community but from a different perspective.

In countries in which industrialization and urbanization are relatively well advanced, the focus of concern is the loss of community as a meaningful form of social and moral association. The urban center is impersonal, lacking in cohesion, an ineffective political or social unit which provides inadequate soil for full personality development. In metropolitan centres there is little sense of belonging or feeling of identification, or intimate association with others.[12]

Armitage credits industrialization with both the attainment of physical comfort and prosperity and the dislocation of people with a consequent breakdown of social patterns. He charges that Canadian economic growth is not planned with a view to its social effects on people and that many of the country's social welfare policies are a consequence of this inattention.[13] It can be argued that community services such as neighbourhood houses compensate for the dislocation of family and community life caused by urbanization.

Industrialization, urbanization and high levels of immigration created the social conditions to which social work was a response.[14] Social work in North America began at the turn of the century and was characterized by charities and the volunteerism of, primarily, the middle and upper classes.[15] However, the growth in government, the rise in unionism, and the unemployment created by the Depression all combined to emphasize the problems created by the social order and the need for government intervention to modify it if necessary.[16]

Psychoanalysis, the ideological current that emerged between the First World War and the Depression, had a profound effect on social work practice. Psychoanalytic theories, oriented toward the pathology of the individual, came to dominate social work practice. People were deemed responsible for their own failures and weaknesses, just as they were responsible for their successes and emotional health.[17] Ross wrote that the "objectives of all social work methods . . . are similar. All are concerned with removal of blocks to growth, release of potentialities, full use of inner resources, development of capacity to manage one's own life, and ability to function as an integrated unit."[18]

The two principal attitudes which social work practitioners have towards

consumers of social services can be summarized as follows. Some feel is that the

problems of social service clients are due to their personal weaknesses and defects

and to communication problems in their families. Clients are in some way sick and

must adjust to existing social and economic conditions to get well.[19]

> There is a perspective on social work which views it as highly individualistic.
> The concept of individual and family pathology dominates. . . the pathology
> of wider social and economic systems is ignored. The three common
> divisions: casework, group work and community work still concentrate on
> individual pathologies.[20]

The other principal attitude is that social welfare policies must address the

underlying causes of poverty and lack of skills, i.e. the way society is structured to

distribute money, opportunities and goods. Cloward and Piven maintain that to

argue otherwise is to engage in "psychological reductionism" which reduces poverty

and inequality to individual pathologies.[21] Armitage writes that there is a conflict

in western societies between welfare values and economic development processes.

"The values of equality and equity conflict with the propensity of Western societies

to create and maintain inequality through such mechanisms as inheritance, private

ownership, and the resolution of scarcity through competitive bidding."[22] The

effects of these conflicts are evident in social work programs whose objectives are

unclearly defined and which emphasize individual over community change.[23]

Wharf adds that society is structured so that nearly anyone can become poor or

unemployed. Therefore, prevention and social change should be the thrust of social

work.[24] Not all practitioners are caught up in either of these attitudes. Nina

Toren, whose writing on group work are referred to below, says

> "The reform approach, by itself, is as one-sided as the orientation that
> concentrates upon the adjustment of the individual to existing social
> and economic conditions. A redistribution of benefits always entails
> individual readjustment both on the part of those who are to gain, and
> those who are to lose by the new order. On the other hand, attempts to

produce normative change will not have lasting effects if individuals lack the instrumental and relational assets needed to implement and sustain newly acquired attitudes and patterns of behaviour."[25]

The dominance of concern for individual functioning in western societies having social welfare policies means that most social welfare programs are intended to respond to individual needs and to demonstrate a belief in human perfectability.[26]

The three major social work methods are casework, group work and community organization. Casework, the method most concerned with individual personality development, has dominated. "Social casework is directed toward fostering and releasing the indiviudal's abilities and, if necessary, attempting to reduce environmental pressures on him."[27] It emphasizes work with the family to improve the ways in which family members get along with each other. The role of casework in socialization is made explicit by Ferguson who says the family has tremendous value as a socializing agent in that children learn to subordinate personal wishes to those of their family and, eventually, to those of society. She adds that no democracy can exist if people are primarily motivated by self-interest.[28] Another approach to casework is to view the individual as the main target of change through education and psychotherapy.[29]

Group work, the second method of social work, "uses group experience to help individuals improve their social functioning."[30] Toren writes that group work developed as a social work method because most people function in groups of some kind be they at work, at school or when socializing. People are more likely to change while in a group than they are working alone with a caseworker. She adds that group work should not use the psychotherapeutic methods of casework, although this is not universally accepted. Group work is flexible in that it can be used in a variety of group settings.[31]

Group work can be traced back to the early settlement houses, the forerunners of today's neighbourhood houses, which were concerned primarily with improving urban social conditions. Although today used as a method of resolving

personal and interpersonal problems, group work can also be used as a means of training people for democratic action and leadership in that through it people can learn about collective decision making, cooperation, conflict and intra-group relations. For people with no confidence in their abilities, e.g. low income people, socialization and learning must precede efforts at desired institutional change. In other words, group work is not intended as a substitute for either casework or community organization, but rather as a link between the two.[32]

Benne and Culbert consider the small group to be a link between the indivi-dual and the larger social system.[33] It is a medium for influencing its individual members and the society of which it is a part. Even a small group is an organized social system from which its members can learn the workings of a larger system and, therefore, develop some of the skills necessary to modify or change it if they so wish.

Community organization, the third principal method of social work, is a fairly recent specialization. The first professional organization of practitioners was established in 1946. However, community organization practice has roots in the North American urban reform movement.[34] By the early 1920's its two primary emphases were to improve social service programs and to change social relationships. The first focused on professional determination of needs and the provision of quality services to meet those needs while the second emphasized fostering the capacity of community groups to form and work effectively toward desired goals.[35] Community organization practitioners tried to compensate for the increasing centralization and professionalization of decision making in the social services field.

Today community organization, and similar approaches such as community planning, planned change, community work and community practice, all describe efforts aimed at "intervention at the community level oriented toward improving or changing community institutions and solving community problems. This activity

is performed by professionals from many disciplines . . . as well as by citizen volunteers in civic associations and social action groups."[36]

Ferguson defines community organization as that part of social work in which "activities are directed toward improving the communities in which people live, and the services provided for them . . . ."[37] For her, community organization centres around a council of social agencies and is very much a matter of professionals determining and acting upon perceived community needs. Cox says that "community organization practice may be defined as the deliberate effort of a practitioner to influence the ties that bind individuals into small groups, relate two or more groups, connect two or more formal organizations, (and) relate groups to organizations."[38] He adds that helping community groups better relate to each other and achieve their goals is a chief concern of community organization. Ferguson emphasizes results while Cox places more importance on the process.

The concern with process is echoed by Ross who writes that "what community organization as a conscious process is directed at achieving is not simply a new nursery, water system or housing project but more important, an increased capacity to undertake other cooperative projects in the community."[39] He also speaks of the planning and integration aspects of community organization. By planning he means identifying a problem, developing solutions, choosing one and pursuing it using agreed upon strategies. Integration is more important but it can be facilitated through planning.[40] Garvin and Cox stress enhancing widespread participation in decision-making at the community level, obtaining minority rights, and securing changes in social institutions.[41] Even Ferguson says that "the aim of community organization social work is to render communities more capable of taking effective action with a maximum of citizen participation."[42]

Whether or not both the consensus implied in the undertaking of cooperative community projects and widespread participation are achievable depends on whether Canadians are fairly unanimous on basic values or whether the power

differentials that exist create conflicting values. Because of different perceptions of Canadian society, community organization practitioners have differing approaches to community organization. A number of writers have devised typologies of community organization which take into account wide variations in practitioner skills, roles and values, community needs, goals, arenas and methods. and Blake and Mouton, Crowfoot and Chesler, Perlman and Gurin, and Ross all put forward typologies.[43] But the most widely known and accepted typology of community work or organization is Jack Rothman's.

Rothman highlights two themes of social work, treatment and reform. "One dilemma in community organization is whether community intervention should stress the delivery of services to individuals in need or the modification of social conditions that predispose some people to inequity or dysfunction."[44] Casework and group work, with their emphasis on treatment, has dominated social work practice but current social conditions have strengthened the community organization, reform theme of social work. Rothman divides community organization into three categories: locality or community development, social planning and social action.

Rothman's typology is widely respected for the following reasons. It clarifies community organization practices. It matches the strategies and tactics to be employed by practitioners and residents with assumptions about society and the division of power within it. It emphasizes the importance of values and assumptions. Because they are important, strategies must be linked to specific goals which, in turn, are founded in a particular value orientation.[45] Because of its detail and widespread acceptance, Rothman's typology will be used as a basis for further discussion of the community organization stream of social work.

Among the most succinct definitions of locality[46] or community development is that of Perlman and Gurin who call it the attempt "to mobilize the people who are affected by a community condition . . . into groups and organizations to enable

them to take actions on those social problems and issues which affect them."[47]

Ferguson says that "community development involves the facilitation, direction, and fostering of processes of social change in the direction of greater well-being for the individuals of the community . . . tied together by some community of interest."[48] She adds that the "modern philosophy of community development emphasizes self-help and participation by as large a segment of the community as can be achieved."[49] Rothman also acknowledges the centrality of widespread participation to community development efforts. Community development involves goal determination, use of democratic procedures, volunteer effort on the part of community members, and the development of indigenous leaders.[50]

Many refer to the development of problem-solving skills in community groups who become more capable of working cooperatively to solve community problems and to achieve community improvements of mutual benefit.[51] Problem-solving involves detection and definition of the problem, careful diagnosis to determine appropriate solutions and strategies, selection of the right strategies, and collaboration to solve the problem identified using the strategy selected.[52]

Rothman warns that community development, as a community organization method, is most appropriate when the population of a community is homogeneous and when consensus already exists on the issues that really matter to most of its residents. He adds that it is the most useful method to use when the objective is the enhancement of civic responsibility and competence.[53]

Of course community development has it critics. Cloward and Piven note that it was heralded by social workers as a means of moving away from the client-changing orientation of casework and group work. However, they caution that the shift from working with individuals and their families to working with community groups does not necessarily imply a shift away from the traditional social worker-client relationship of domination and subordination.[54]

Others are far more critical. To them community development has been used to shore up mainstream values and economic institutions. It does not, in their view, unite a community but rather fragments it by isolating groups and issues. It can also be viewed by governments as a means of obtaining cheap, volunteer if possible, solutions to community problems thereby avoiding expenditure and responsibilty.[55]

Social planning, the second method in Rothman's typology, is a technical approach to solving social problems. It emphasizes rational deliberation and assumes that experts must guide social change by making use of technical skills and by manipulating bureaucracies. Enhancing community capacity to solve problems and promote change is secondary to social planning efforts and citizen involvement varies considerably. Instead, the planner provide services to those needing them.[56]

Perlman and Gurin define social planning as

"efforts directed toward integrating the different action systems of the community with other systems of the local community and/or with extracommunity action systems, and efforts aimed at bringing about reforms in the attitudes, policies and practices of large private and public agencies . . ."[57]

The emphasis is on improving social services. Lauffer writes that:

social planning activities are directed towards creating changes in service organizations and in service systems. In general, they do not aim their efforts directly at the amelioration or eradication of social problems and social ills. Instead, they attempt to deal with the effects of social problems by altering the processes of resource allocation, service delivery. and program development in those systems currently or potentially charged with supplying appropriate social provisions.[58]

According to Lauffer social planners are concerned with modifying, eliminating or creating policies, services, programs or resources in social service agencies. They may or may not be concerned with structural change. Social planning efforts are most appropriate when the object is resolution of a problem which is fairly routine and amenable to solution through application of factual information.[59]

Social planning activity began in Canada with lay social planning councils which were part of the volunteer sector of social service delivery. Their role was to identify needs which could be met by social service agencies. Many services were provided by government agencies and received much attention from social councils although the latter could not plan for them. Often research branches were added to councils to improve the quality of their planning evaluation functions. Many councils prepared briefs on such topics as housing and urban renewal. Today social planning efforts at the federal and provincial level are carried out largely by social workers and planners working for government departments,[60] although at the local level there are more voluntary than government agencies involved in social services delivery.

Social planning is akin to what Chin and Benne call an "empirical-rational" approach to social change [61] and Crowfoot and Chesler dub the "professional-technical" approach.[62] The first assumes people are rational and will act in their own self-interest if they but know how that interest can be served. Change proceeds through systems analysis and applied research. The work of researchers is then linked to that of field workers who incorporate the new information and approaches into their work, thereby disseminating it. The professional-technical approach views society as complex and functionally specialized. Communities and organizations are based on technical rationality and bureaucratic authority and are characterized by consensus, moral obligations and economic inter-dependence. People basically agree with the management and decisions of their elected and otherwise legitimate officials. Whatever change does occur is inevitable, techno-logically based, incremental and carried out by professionals. Change targets include organizations, social roles and the attitudes and skills of individuals.

Social planning has its critics. Planners are, for the most part, employed by government organizations and have little power to effect real change. Further-more, these organizations, which provide planners with legitimacy, staff,

information and a paycheck, have more influence and control over them than do the recipients of social planning programs and interventions.[63] Although social planners often have little status in government bureaucracies they cannot help but advance its objectives. "For this reason, planning efforts may be biased towards the provision of services and the establishment of programs aimed at changing individuals rather than changing the basic structural arrangements of society."[64] It is much easier and less risky to hold classes on inexpensive food preparation than it is to try to obtain a livable social assistance rate.

The third method in Rothman's typology of community organization is social action. It differs substantially from both community development and social planning in that it assumes conflict between different societal groups. The aim of social action is social change, i.e. the redistribution of power, resources or decision-making. It presupposes a disadvantaged population that must organize and find allies to achieve this redistribution. It is most appropriately used when the aim is to effect long-range and controversial institutional and structural change. It is most effective when there exist groups hostile to each other whose interests are dissimilar and cannot be reconciled through discussion.[65]

Again, Chin and Benne and Crowfoot and Chesler outline approaches to planned change which are identical to social action. Chin and Benne's "power coercive"approach[66] is based on amassing political and/or economic power to bring about a desired change. It tends to polarize communities as they line up to take sides. The "political" approach of Crowfoot and Chesler[67] assumes the distribution of power among groups is uneven, makes for continual conflict and competition over resource distribution, and determines societal functioning. It assumes that state regulatory functions are faulty, that power is concentrated in the hands of an elite and that the allocation of resources is seen as unjust by those without power and just but difficult to maintain by the elite. Existing laws, norms and socialization processes work to maintain elite control and are viewed as oppressive by

those without power. Individuals can have no influence unless they are part of a group.

A theme apparent in the social action literature is community control. The 1960's was a time of social upheaval as people demonstrated to wrest power over community institutions from those who held it. The demand for community control was raised in connection with the operation of schools, social agencies and welfare councils and the carrying out of physical and social planning for urban neighbour-hoods. The desire for control over such institutions and processes arises from a feeling of powerlessness on the part of community residents or agency clients who feel manipulated or exploited. Both the target and the trigger of such community anger can be distortions in resource allocation created by power differentials, gaps between values professed and those in use, and the dehumanizing effects of bureau-cracies on both workers and residents/clients. Of course, efforts to gain control over a specific institution or process do not, of themselves, imply an intrinsic political orientation. The direction taken depends entirely on those involved and on their analysis of the issues.[68]

In their criticism of social action Neil Gilbert and Joseph Eaton question the representativeness of social activists and the community groups they work with.[69] They argue that activists may simply be a new elite who are no more democratic or cognizant of real community or sub-community desires than are social workers working with no community input. On a related note, Lisa Peattie says there is the danger that the "community" with whom activists work is an artifact of the process and has no existence as a community, with accepted geographic and common interest boundaries, beyond the planning process.[70]

A serious problem for the survival of social action efforts is obtaining fund-ing. Communities find it difficult to raise money to hire an organizer. The resulting dependence on government funding puts social action groups in the anomolous position of 'biting the hand that feeds'. Funding for community

organizers and groups is frequently reduced or cut altogether once government officially realizes the aim is social change of some kind.[71]

It is difficult for social welfare institutions to respond to or sponsor change efforts.

> Existing social welfare institutions cannot sponsor organizational work in low-income areas because they cannot tolerate the conflict, because they define the problems of low-income people from outside rather than working with the definitions of low-income people, because they start from a position above the poor and reach down rather than starting with a working respect for low-income people.[72]

Before leaving the community organization stream of social work and its three major divisions, community development, social planning and social action, the themes common to all should be mentioned. Wharf maintains that all three imply decentralization of social service delivery, decentralization and encouragement of community involvement in planning and managing service delivery, and the encouragement of self-help and self-actualization. All tend to be preventive in several ways: community development practitioners, planners and activists identify and monitor community problems and statistics; they help to strengthen community environments by changing patterns of relationships among residents and between them and local institutions; and they tend to increase both people's perceptions of their choices and efficacy and their actual choices and efficacy thereby reducing the frustration and alienation that can lead to social problems.[73]

The conventional wisdom has been that an agency should not do both casework and group work and community work because direct service time would detract from organization efforts. However, the conventional wisdom is being questioned for several reasons.[74] First of all, there is a lack of money for community organization while many direct services are virtually assured of annual budgets. The former can "ride on the coattails" of the latter. Secondly, preoccupation with agency-centered, direct service may lead to irrelevant and inaccessible services. For direct services to be effective agency staff should

interact with other agencies, mobilize community support for various desired ends, identify unmet needs and develop programs to meet them. Thirdly, because community organization is preventive it can actually help reduce the number of people requiring casework and group work services. "It seems that direct service agencies can defend the right to and indeed assert the necessity for involvement in locality development social planning and social reform. The case can be advanced by connecting community work with prevention."[75] Wharf adds that "we may well see a return to the kind of generic practice formerly found in the neighbourhood houses (emphasis added), and in some rural departments of public welfare".[76]

Several authors emphasize the importance of offering programs even while organizing, planning or whatever. Irving Spergel notes that tying a service program to a community change effort helps develop competence and a group sense as well as meet a need.[77] Haggstrom notes the demonstration effect of providing a service in competition with those already provided which are considered inadequate.[78] A comprehensive statement of the importance of program development comes from Yeheskel Hasenfeld who is quoted in full below.

> Program development and implementation is a common and crucial task of community organization practitioners. . . There seems to be an implicit assumption that, once the community organization practitioner has success-fully mobilized action groups or planning task forces to grapple with important community issues, his function is essentially completed. . . Yet, the most critical element in any community organization activity is the emergence of some idea and design for a program. . . the program provides in very concrete terms, the outputs or services desired and needed by the community . . . the community organization practitioner has the dual role of action mobilizer and planner, and of organizer and program implementer.[79]

Social Service Delivery System

The translation of welfare values into welfare programs requires the exercise of power, among other things. Although other types of organizations provide social services, e.g. philanthropic, cooperative, and entrepreneurial or corporate organizations, the government increasingly holds a near monopoly on the delivery

of welfare services. In Canada, social welfare responsibility is shared by the

provincial and federal governments. Those who administer social welfare programs

have significant power and influence. Many decisions are made by them, not

elected officials. There is also increasing tension between the central planning of

social services arising from concern over their quality and universality, and the

local planning of services so that they may be responsive to the diversity of

Canadian communities.[80] "Accountability to whom?" is a perennial dilemma of

social work agencies.

Rothman feels the tension between centralization and decentralization of

social service delivery is caused by the dual concern for efficiency and account-

ability. On the one hand taxpayers and government leaders are concerned by rising

costs, inflation and higher taxes, while on the other hand client and resident groups

have a deep-seated mistrust of professionals and government bureaucracies.

> On the one hand, many governmental and voluntary programs call for
> increased client and community participation, a position that encourages
> flexibility, pluralism and the playing out of political and interest group
> forces. On the other hand, there are pressures for orderliness, predictability
> and administrative control in the running of programs.[81]

There is both the desire and the potential on the part of residents of

Canadian cities "to improve social service delivery, to gain some degree of

influence in controlling these services and to protest against unjust conditions."[82]

The democratic ethic of social work supports the participation of social services

clients in service planning and delivery, yet agencies and government departments

have thus far shown themselves incapable of or unwilling to accommodate partici-

pation. "Organizing the participation of the poor is well endorsed as an ideal but

effective participation involves the sharing of power. The readiness to share power

is much less evident than the platitudes of participation."[83] The fate of the

Community Resources Boards, established by the New Democratic Party in British

Columbia after its election in 1972, is an example of the clash between decen-

tralized participation and centralized accountability for social service delivery.

The Boards were composed of elected community representatives and resulted in a degree of decentralized decision making concerning use of distretionary money available to the Resources Boards. They were somewhat similar to the welfare councils of the 1930's, 40's and 50's.[84] However, they were dissolved in 1977 by the newly returned Social Credit government.

Formal organizations have been described by Cox as "patterns of social inter-action and shared perspectives that have been deliberately established for certain purposes."[85] Organizations exist to achieve certain objectives. Increasingly, specialization, bureaucratization and professionalism characterize social service institutions as services proliferate and as the money spent on them increases. "Agencies and programs are subject to the hazards of all bureaucracies in their tendencies toward rigidity and toward concern with the maintenance of the organi-zation sometimes at the expense of meeting the needs they were designed to serve."[86]

Armitage observes that social welfare agencies remain reactive to social change rather than initiating it on their own. He feels the rapacity of economic growth, with its negative effects and the possibility of its end, may result in social welfare agencies taking more initiative and becoming primary rather than secondary institutions, i.e. initiating rather than reacting to change.[87]

The above has been a brief introduction to some issues in the delivery of social work services. Several writers suggest future directions for social work. Ferguson feels social services will expand as the government assumes more respon-sibilitv for their provision and as voluntary associations continue to fill in the gaps. She adds that preventive work will become more important and that social services will be expanded to areas of anticipated need before that need becomes acute.[88] Wharf thinks the heretofore discrete areas of social work practice, i.e. casework, group work and community organization, will merge. His recent book, Community Work in Canada, includes case studies of child care workers and probation officers

"who have expanded their role to include activities aimed at improving neighbour-hood conditions."[89] Armitage believes current pressures to reorganize social services will lead to an emphasis on the concept of community with a resulting increase in the decentralization of social services as they are located closer to the people who use them.[90] Perlman and Gurin predict the increasing complexity and proliferation of social services will necessitate a new breed of professionals who plan and organize services and who incorporate ideas from education, health and urban planning fields.[91]

Government Funding of Social Services

Perlman and Gurin identify five elements necessary to the functioning of an organization. These include a mandate or legitimacy, consumers or clients, personnel (including volunteers), information and material resources, and finally money.[92]

> The giving or withholding of financial support becomes, in practical terms, an important means of endorsing, invalidating, or changing the mandate of a service agency. Maintaining and increasing the flow of funds to an organization is therefore one of the primary tasks involved in planning and organizing.[93]

Ferguson says that the predominant source of funds for community services reflects the social conditions under which community organization operates. Before the Depression, most relief and social work was financed by private donations. The Depression radically altered this situation. Today, tax money funds much social work activity. The widespread acceptance of government responsibility for social welfare is a revolutionary departure from the beginnings of social work. Ferguson sees an opportunity for private agencies, now freed of much responsibility, to develop supplementary and experimental programs.[94]

This is not to diminish the importance of such programs. On the contrary, private agency programs are viewed as important to the general welfare and they,

too, are increasingly funded by the government with the result that philanthropic and private agencies receive larger and larger percentages of their operating budgets from public money. In some cases, programs are actually taken over by the government.[95]

Private agencies can obtain funds through public or government funding made available through legislative or administrative action. Obtaining government funds requires both continued contact with elected representatives and administrators, and public relations work to "sell" the value of services to community residents in order to build local support. Another source of funding is the grant or special project funding, for both of which the agency must submit an application.[96] Agencies become skilled at obtaining government funds. However, as they develop into larger social agencies, which the increasing level of government funding permits, private agencies can become like bureaucracies which contributes to the "separation of helper from helped."[97]

Agencies which accept government grants all too often find them to be instruments of control. The increasing

> involvement of the several levels of government in community affairs has
> changed the financial base of almost all agencies. With this change in the
> base of support has come the greater insertion of government in the policy-
> making realm and few agencies are completely independent to make their
> own policy decisions so long as they share in government funds.[98]

Agencies are sometimes pressured by government departments with regard to service standards, program quality and agency fiscal responsibility. While this is fair enough "on some occasions serious conflicts arise over the fundamental control of the agency."[99]

For example, the prosperity of the 1960's permitted governments to experiment by hiring full time community workers to work with community groups. This was partly due to the social welfare ideals of democracy and participation in community affairs which were behind the demonstration grants of the Department of the Secretary of State and the social action goals of the government funded

Company of Young Canadians. Recipients of these grants were predominantly programs aimed at giving poor people a voice in community affairs. Some of the workers hired used the resulting spate of programs to agitate for social change and some were quite successful. However, threatened by such challenges to existing services and structures, government departments cut back or withdrew altogether program funding. Almost none of these programs exist today. The involvement of special interest groups often worked so that reform did not take place and there were few if any changes made to existing welfare programs.[100] "Even apparently secure and independent sources of funding may dry up if the planner appears to threaten entrenched and powerful institutions."[101] Lauffer adds that programs originally aimed at changing some aspect of the social order become programs concerned primarily with helping the individual adjust to that order to continue to exist.[102]

> There is widespread recognition among practitioners that the specific organization situation sets both the opportunities and constraints that govern the practitioner's operations. One example is the conclusion derived from the government financed community action experiments of the 1960's that militant social action directed toward changing the political power structure requires organization independence and autonomy on the part of the action group.[103]

There are numerous testimonies in the literature to the importance of a secure funding source for private, community intervention efforts. Douglas Barr, writing about the resident-controlled Regent Park Community Services Centre in Toronto, says it is critical for such a centre to have a stable source of funding if it is to do any long-range planning and avoid lurching from crisis to crisis.[104] Because governments constantly urge innovative programs to look elsewhere for funds they cannot be considered a stable funding source. Donald Keating writes that "it is not in the interest of funding institutions to underwrite programs aimed at changing conditions rather than providing services. . . Politicans at every level of government like service groups and their approach because they maintain the status quo."[105] Perlman and Gurin, who documented a threat to the continued

existence of Havilland House, a Toronto neighbourhood house, concluded that "control of financial resources is critical to the existence of such an agency."[106] Morris and Hess argue that community groups and agencies can only be truly independent and autonomous if they have a self-generating and internally controlled funding source such as a locally operated and controlled business.[107]

There are not many answers to the problem posed by the dilemma of continued existence as a non-threatening direct service program of the casework and group work type or the cutting off of funds for change oriented community intervention programs. Sahlein suggests both contracting out of services traditionally provided by the government to private agencies and the development of a voucher system which would enable people to go where they liked to get services, be it to a federal, provincial, municipal or private agency. These suggestions address the problem of quality rather than existence. Trecker suggests the banding together of private agencies and community groups to devise coherent policies of financial cooperation. "Finance committees of individual agencies must meet with their counterparts in their fields of service, and boards which heretofore thought about only their agency will have to think more about fields of service and the entire community."[108]

Since the development of the Toronto Family Service Agency in 1914, family service agencies have done primarily individual and family counselling (casework) and have been part of volunteer social service organizations governed by independent boards of trustees and supported by the United Way.

> Neighbourhood houses. . . provide such services. More recently there has been a trend towards government contractual purchase of services from voluntary agencies such as day care and homemaker services. In some centres (e.g. Vancouver), the family service agency (e.g. NSA) has assisted the development of such services.[109]

Clearly agencies such as neighbourhood houses will continue to rely, in part, on government funding for provision of specifc services.

Partially because of increased government funding of social service agencies
Wharf argues for the introduction of "participatory management schemes into
human service organizations (in order) to improve opportunities for consumers and
citizens to become involved in planning, managing and delivering services."[110]
Armitage also distinguishes between citizen and consumer participation. Local
welfare councils should be composed of not only consumers of social services but
also other community residents, businessmen and professionals who work in the
area, e.g. school principals. A consumer of services who criticizes them and
demands a voice in their delivery is confronting an organization popularly believed
to be doing good. This fact, combined with their stigmatization, presents major
obstacles to the effectiveness of their participation if not combined with that of
non-consumers.[111]

If social work practitioners cannot nor should make all decisions, if residents
are to play more active roles in the development of their communities and in the
provision of social services, then volunteerism, its motivations and functions should
be briefly reviewed. Neighbourhood boards of directors are made up entirely of
volunteers.

Volunteer Boards

Volunteers are people who do something for others, not for money or through
coercion, but because they want to. A recent national survey conducted by
Statistics Canada revealed that 15% of Canada's working age population spent an
average three hours a week doing some sort of volunteer work between February
1979 and February 1980. Contrary to popular belief they were by no means all
upper-income, middle-aged housewives. Most worked in social welfare, religious or
leisure activity organizations.[112] Increasing amounts of leisure time, greater

numbers of the retired, and a shortage of jobs for younger people have all combined to expand the volunteer labour pool.[113]

What motivates people to volunteer? Abraham Maslow's now famous hierarchy of needs serves as the basis for a general theory of motivation.[114] Briefly, Maslow's needs hierarchy says that once physiological needs for food and shelter, and safety needs for order, predictability and familiarity are satisfied, then the need for love, affection and a sense of belonging come to the fore. This includes friendly relations with people and a place within at least one group. Following these needs are the esteem needs including those for strength, achievement, adequacy, mastery, competence and confidence. Finally, Maslow speaks of an ultimate need for self-fulfillment and self-actualization.

David Smith says "the motivation of individual voluntary action is distinguished generally by the prominence of psychic benefits and a sense of psychological-philosophical meaning."[115] Miller adds that:

> However engrossing one's job, hobbies or spectator sports may be, individuals with a reasonable amount of free time often lack a sense of participation, lack the stimulation that comes from exchanging ideas, and experience frustration in being unable to resolve the myriad of societal problems affecting them and their families. Men and women, young and old and from all socio-economic levels, want a "piece of the action.[116]

Cause-oriented groups afford like-minded people a chance to meet each other, work together, and make a contribution to solving community problems. "Volunteering. . . offers a way for citizens to become true participants, not just spectators in the community's problem solving tasks."[117] Other authors cite the obligations of good citizenship and the responsibility of the citizen to provide service to the community.[118] Volunteerism enables people to be part of an identifiable, purposive group activity, to create something and follow it through.[119]

Voluntary associations cover a wide range of organizations whose primary purpose is to achieve some change or improvement in social arrangements, institutions and relationships. Perlman and Gurin identify two other kinds of community

organizations. These are social service agencies, and planning and allocating agencies.[120] Social service agencies are formal bureaucratic organizations that provide specific services to a particular population. Planning and allocating organizations determine how to organize and deploy resources to deal with social problems. According to this typology neighbourhood houses are both social service agencies and voluntary associations.

Perlman and Gurin outline the functions performed by voluntary groups.[121] First of all, voluntary groups can redistribute and broaden the social power base and the exercise of authority. By helping limit arbitrary use of power or exploitive practices, they increase tolerance for deviance. Secondly, they increase people's stake in the current social order by heightening their personal satisfaction. In other words they enhance social stability, control and morale. Thirdly, voluntary associations help recruit and train leaders for higher levels of participation. Finally, they promote a closer fit between the practices of major social institutions and community conditions.

> By facilitating such accomodations, indigenous organizations protect the heterogeneity and cultural rightness of the society and provide a broader base for cultural growth in many fields. By fostering the proliferation of subcultures or local styles of life, they furnish a buffer to the conformity demands of a mass society. By enlarging tolerance for certain forms of deviance, constructive channels are preserved for dissent.[122]

Of course, some voluntary groups are specifically change oriented, e.g. pressure groups.[123]

But what effect does the overwhelmingly public provision of social services have on volunteer efforts? Ferguson outlines the lack of dependence on centralized initiatives and directives in North America's past.[124] Many local problems were often tackled and solved by local volunteer initiative. However, as more social services came to be administered by centralized bureaucracies staffed by trained professionals, there seemed to be little left for volunteers to do beyond helping out with recreational programs, and volunteerism declined. Those who remained worked increasingly under the direction of paid professionals. Part of the

social services protest of the 1960's was a backlash against this trend and the resulting unresponsiveness of agencies to their clients, their elitism, and the lack of public participation in the direction of such agencies. Volunteers increasingly looked to be included in social service decision-making.[125] Consequently, the structure of some organizations, including community schools and health clinics, was changed so as to facilitate participation. Lay councils, review boards, and volunteer boards proliferated in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

John Cull and Richard Hardy point out that increasingly volunteers are not just restricted to voluntary associations. Social agencies do have volunteers who may also be clients. These volunteers interpret the effects of poverty and lack of opportunity to professionals, community leaders and politicians; call attention to needed services; identify and locate those in need of services; suggest ways in which services could be improved; and sometimes demand the improvements.[126]

Cull and Hardy assert that many social services could not be maintained at their present level without volunteers. They argue that "in order to maintain the current level of services without the integral input of volunteers, the social welfare budget within this country (the U.S.) would be increased astronomically."[127] Armitage considers how to supplement government provided social services to be the major issue confronting allocative committees of the United Way and administrators of social service agencies.[128] In 1973-1974, the money raised by the United Way and private campaigns was less than 1% of government expenditures for social services. Although there is a vast discrepancy in the amount of money paid out, private agencies do compensate for deficiencies in public programs.[129] Armitage refers to the Vancouver Chest and Council's Priorities Study of 1964 and other similar studies which concluded that voluntary organizations should design programs to

> supplement government activities: (i) by supporting services not receiving
> government support, e.g. the recreational programming of YMCA's, YWCA's,
> Boys Clubs, Neighbourhood Houses, etc.: (ii) by supporting services designed

to increase the responsiveness of services: and (iii) by pioneering new services to previously unserved problems and populations.[130]

Greater involvement in government decison-making, taxpayers revolts, etc., will likely result in more citizens sitting on lay boards and making decisions.[131] "The Citizen Board is one of society's most important instruments. It is used to determine social policy and is charged with the responsibility for providing all kinds of community services."[132] Elsewhere Trecker writes that "the board has a major role to play in community planning and in formalizing policy relations between agencies."[133]

Volunteer boards set policy for an agency, review and adopt budgets, review major programs, establish job classifications, and hire senior staff. Trecker outlines the specific duties of volunteers on policy-administative boards as follows. They identify local conditions and problems requiring social welfare services; they initiate and make policy; they contribute service and advice based on their knowledge, skills and interests; they solicit public and voluntary support; they interpret and speak for agency programs to local residents; they report community reactions to programs; and they collaborate in community planning activities so as to modify or design services to meet changing social conditions. Boards also have the responsibility to be accountable for the expenditure of funds, assume some fund-raising responsibilities, relate their agency's services to the work of other agencies so as to improve community conditions, conduct periodic agency evaluations and provide a continuity of experienced leadership.[134]

Trecker emphasizes the accountability of a policy board to the community it both serves and represents. A board should have a clear policy and strategy for establishing community relationships.

> To be sure, the first duty of a board is to see that the work of its agency is properly done. But its ultimate effectiveness as an agency depends in no small measure on the cooperative relationships it establishes with other agencies and upon the overall community planning that is taking place.[135]

Finally, Trecker presents six policy issues which he feels policy boards must address.[136] The first of these is the issue of agency control. Both agency clients and workers want more say in agency policies. The second issue is that of responsible participation. Assuming boards want to broaden involvement and delegate some power and responsibility to community residents and clients, the question is how to do so. A third issue is the fact that service organization, avail-ability and delivery is not properly organized, generally available or efficiently delivered. Trecker mentions that the neighbourhood centre or neighbourhood house concept, as developed by the National Federation of Settlement and Neighbourhood Centers, makes services more generally available by decentralizing them by community. A fourth policy issue is the increasing importance of recruiting volunteers and non-professionals to work in social service agencies. Financing and budgeting is the fifth policy issue which Trecker feels policy boards must face. Block grants and general support payments on a per capita basis would allow agencies greater flexibility. A final policy issue is that of central planning. Here the issue is not the need for planning, but rather the planning unit area. The trend is toward regional, state (provincial) and federal planning of social services into which the agency must fit. The dilemma is a familiar one: alleged economies of scale and orderliness on the one hand and democratic principles of citizen involve-ment and accessibility on the other.

The most common criticisms of volunteer policy boards is that they are elitist, not representative enough, too removed from the clients of their agencies, too parochial and conservative, and too meddlesome in operational decisions instead of sticking to policy decisions. Furthermore, Boards are often accused of merely rubber stamping staff decisions.[137] Governments "dismiss various forms of voluntary action as trivial ephemeral, non-essential or diversionary."[138] But perhaps the greatest problem faced by boards is their "inability to unlock a sufficent number of new sources of vitality in their agencies and in their

community. It is the job of the board to awaken the community to its potential for continuous growth."[139] Conversely, perhaps the greatest strength of the board system is the vast amount of highly motivated citizen energy which it releases and brings to bear on society's problems. "The men and women who give of themselves to community policy making are a rich resource."[140]

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORY

Introduction

As was mentioned in Chapter One there are eight neighbourhood houses in Vancouver. Each one offers a variety of programs and services appropriate to their neighbourhood. Six of these houses belong to the Neighbourhood Services Association (NSA), an umbrella organization of Vancouver area neighbourhood houses, and two are "independent" in that they do not belong to NSA. All receive more than half their core funding from the United Way.

In order to better understand the current functioning of neighbourhood houses it is important to determine their historical roots as well as those of their two sponsoring bodies, NSA and United Way. For this reason, summarized in this chapter are the histories of the neighbourhood house concept in general, and of NSA and United Way. Also provided are brief histories of the Cedar Cottage, South Vancouver, Kiwassa and Little Mountain neighbourhood houses.

History of Neighbourhood Houses

Neighbourhood houses, or settlement houses as they used to be called, are among the oldest of the community oriented social service agencies in North America. The first one, Neighbourhood Guild, opened in New York City in 1886. The early ones were called 'settlement houses' because relatively prosperous workers were intended to "settle" among the poor in order to better understand their needs.[1] The next step was for settlement workers to try to provide programs and services to meet those needs. They also sought to present these needs and their causes to those able to do something about them.

Therefore, the early settlement workers sought to help their neighbours on two levels - first, by providing immediate services, and second, by working to reform the physical and social environment of the slum.[2]

Reform activity sometimes got the settlement houses in trouble. For example, the pro-union stance of many of them at the turn of the century lost them donations.[3] More often it achieved concrete results. For example, the organizing ability and leadership of settlement workers contributed greatly to the founding of various reform organizations such as the Consumers League, the Women's Trade Union League, the National Housing Association, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in the United States.[4]

Judith Trolander writes that basic to the programming of most settlement houses were club and recreational activities, classes, nursury schools and day cares, and large group activities, the latter often involving units of national organizations such as the Boy Scouts. She notes that settlements were associated with the branch of social work known as group work but that all carried on casework as well.[5] However, it was not intended that these activities supersede what many felt to be the major function of settlement houses - social action and social reform.

> While recreational and educational activities, common to virtually all settlements, occupied the bulk of the settlement's space, a number of settlement leaders regarded social action and experimentation to be the major function of the agency. During the Progressive Era (early 1900's), settlements had served the cause of social action, first, by acting as advocates for their neighbours, and secondly, by serving as demonstration centers in the quest to find solutions to social problems.[6]

It would be useful to briefly examine the ideological currents at the turn of the century in order to better understand the context and thrust of settlement activities. Social Darwinists of the time of the early settlement houses believed that the inherent weakness and inferiority of some individuals was the cause of their social and economic failure.[7] Instead, settlement house workers drew on liberal and radical traditions. "Liberal ideas have been important in building support among the privileged for the right of the under classes to be heard in the

councils of government and ultimately to reap some of the benefits bestowed by government."[8] Radicals worked to organize society's 'underdogs' for collective action to bring about social change, e.g. the early labour union movement.[9] Settlement workers were typically middle class, educated people critical of the inequities they believed were created by the social system. However, their approach was pragmatic. They eschewed fixed principles and looked rather at the context of individual action as contributing to society's structure. They had no pre-determined schemes but responded to conditions as they found them.[10]

Settlement houses flourished in the 1920's, a time when casework and group work dominated social work. Both emphasized individual conformity to the dominant social class, i.e. the middle class.

> Community organization during this period was aimed largely at enhancing agencies oriented toward personal adjustment. Except, perhaps, for the workers in the settlement houses (emphasis added) . . . little thought was given to changing social institutions to meet the needs of individuals.[11]

The concentration of settlement workers' efforts on social reform activities under-scored their belief that social institutions should be changed to accommodate themselves to people, not vice versa. Settlement houses worked for legislative and administrative reforms at many levels.

> In the field of education, they worked for the development of vocational education and guidance in the public schools, as well as school nurses, hot lunch programs, an education for the retarded and handicapped. They urged . . . housing code improvements, reduction of congestion through city planning, and the transformation of public schools into neighbourhood social centres . . They organized such groups as the Immigrant Protective League to ease the immigrant's adjustment to the new world. Settlement workers fought for laws to protect employed women and abolish child labour . . . They were often involved in municipal reform activities, both at the ward and city wide level.[12]

In a word settlement houses worked to achieve equal opportunities for the economically deprived, the handicapped, the uneducated, and those discriminated against because of their race, nationality or religion.[13]

Settlement houses also provided direct services.

> While they were learning and teaching others how to participate in practical ways in the shaping of their urban environment, the settlements . . . were also service agencies. When specific needs seemed too pressing to be ignored, settlements tried to meet them temporarily in a local, neighbour-hood way meanwhile seeking a wider, more adequate, permanent solution. Often they treated symptoms while seeking causes.[14]

A wide array of services and programs were offered by the early settlements including kindergarten, children's clubs, recreation programs, night classes, public baths, art exhibits, industrial and homemaking workshops, libraries, playgrounds, health clinics, consumer education, and recreation for the handicapped and the aged.[15]

The urban reform movement worked to enable urban communities to deal more effectively with their problems. The settlement houses were an integral part of that movement in that they sought to educate and organize people for participation in solving community problems and determining future community directions.[16] Settlement house workers sought and encouraged resident involvement in house decisions so that the programs and services offered and the activities engaged in would be relevant to people's needs and wants. "One theme ran through both the service and reform efforts of the settlements - participation and democracy."[17] Many volunteers worked at settlement houses in a variety of capacities. The best of the houses fostered continual interaction with community residents and with other agencies.[18]

Before leaving this subject some of the difficulties for neighbourhood houses of being both reform and service agencies should be noted. Trolander writes that

> The basic settlement program of clubs, classes, and recreational required a substantial investment in building facilities and staff . . . It was this basic program and not the reform activities, which made settlement budgets substantial.[19]

Initially, each settlement house used to raise its own money. However, in 1913 the city of Cleveland in the United States began what came to be known as the Community Chest system. Many charities joined together to form the Community Chest so that there could be one large fund drive instead of many. The Welfare

Federation was the agency established to distribute among its member agencies the funds raised by the Chest. This system caught hold rapidly and became the fund raising vehicle in most American and Canadian cities.[20]

One result of this very efficient means of fund raising was that recreational and educational activities, common to nearly all settlement houses, came to dominate the houses' space even while many settlement leaders regarded social action and reform activity to be the agencies' most important function. Trolander quotes Lillie Peck, executive secretary of the National Federation of Settlements in the 1920's as saying "the fact that settlements have built up large institutional equipment which takes the major part of their budget limits what they can put into experimental work, which is their major reason for being."[21] Trolander adds that the settlements essentially mortgaged themselves to large contributors who donated money for specific services. By the 1930's apparently many settlement houses had abandoned social action.[22]

A number of reasons why this was the case have been put forward. These include the rise of professionalism among social workers through the establishment of social work schools and professional associations, the impact of Sigmund Freud's work which focussed attention on psychological rather than social problems, the resultant concentration on casework and group work by social workers, and the association of social work schools with private universities controlled by wealthy and conservative donors.[23]

History of Neighbourhood Services Association

Vancouver was incorporated in 1886. By 1911 its population had tripled to 100,000. The city's rapid growth and the aftermath of the First World War resulted in a sharp increase in the demand for various social services.[24] By 1925 many

social service and recreation agencies had been established in the city such as the Salvation Army, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and the YMCA.

The Alexandra Neighbourhood House, Vancouver's first, opened its doors in 1938 at 1762 West 7th in what had been an orphanage operated by the Alexandra Community Activities Society.[25] Alexandra Neighbourhood House functioned as a social and recreational centre for Kitsilano residents. In 1972, Alexandra House was sold and two other buildings purchased on West 7th six blocks to the west to become the Kitsilano Neighbourhood House. Gordon Neighbourhood House in the West End began operation in 1942. In 1963 what had been the Cedar Cottage Youth Centre expanded its activities to include families and joined the Alexandra Community Activities Society, to which both Kitsilano and Gordon House already belonged, as the Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House. The Alexandra Community Activities Society was a loosely structured umbrella group for the Kitsilano, Gordon House and Cedar Cottage neighbourhood houses. Although members of the Society, each house operated independently and approached separately the two principal funding sources, United Way (then the Community Chest and Councils of the Greater Vancouver Area) and the City of Vancouver.

In 1965 the Society hired a consultant to review its organizational structure. Together with committees of board members of each member neighbourhood house the consultant reviewed the Society's purpose and function, its personnel policy, finance arrangements, and programs and administration. He recommended reorganization to centralize accounting and administrative functions and establish City-wide priorities. Consequently, the Society became the Alexandra Neighbourhood Services Association (ANSA) in 1966 and hired an Executive Director. Both the City and United Way supported the reorganization and, subsequently, dealt with only one annual funding request from the Society on behalf of each neighbourhood house.

Two changes became apparent almost immediately. After the reorganization board members tended to be people who lived in the same community rather than the well-to-do from other communities. Furthermore, whereas prior to 1966 neighbourhood houses did primarily casework and group work, after the re-organization community organization also became important. This was due to a change in preference among social workers for community oganization. ANSA quickly hired a community worker and a youth worker to respond to needs of tenants of the Skeena Terrace Housing Project in the northeast part of Vancouver. These workers had office space provided by the British Columbia Housing Management Commission and later worked out of a trailer provided by ANSA. Soon thereafter the Frog Hollow Information Centre was established in another trailer at 1st and Renfrew near Skeena Terrace.

At the same time United Way hired five social planners in 1966 and 1967 to work in various City neighbourhoods as part of the Local Area Approach program. According to a 1965 press release the purpose of this program was to

> combine health, social welfare, education and recreation services in a concerted attack on social problems in selected areas of Vancouver . . . Emphasis will be on coordinated and integrated services in place of fragmented unilateral services. Local planning and self-help will be stressed.[26]

The United Way social planners worked with neighbourhood Area Councils established in the mid 1960's by the City and made up of elected local community residents. The planners' task was to work with the Area Councils to identify community needs, assign priorities to them, and devise ways to meet them. Local area service teams of service agency workers, whose job it was to coordinate public and private community services, were also established at the same time. Social planners were hired by the City's Social Planning Department to coordinate each service team and to ensure that it worked with the appropriate Area Council and United Way social planner.[27]

United Way and ANSA soon conflicted. Each was funding social planners and community workers, respectively, whose functions overlapped considerably. ANSA felt it was the appropriate agency to sponsor this sort of work. After discussion between the two and with the Social Planning Department it was decided the City would fund ANSA to do community development work in Vancouver neighbourhoods. United Way transferred their social planner functions to ANSA.

ANSA, by this time renamed the Neighbourhood Services Association (NSA), established a Community Development Department in 1968 with its own Board. The Department hired fifteen community development workers that year, including the person still working at Skeena Terrace, and provided staff and community organization services to groups in nine Vancouver communities. It functioned until 1974 when its funding was ended following a City Council review of its work. The review was precipitated by the success of the Broadway Citizens' Group, organized by an NSA community development worker, in halting construction of a senior citizens high rise on 7th Avenue near the Arbutus right-of-way. Enough people were disturbed by the group's success that City Council took action. According to newspaper accounts at the time community development workers were accused of inventing issues around which to organize people and of inciting local anger where there had been none. Apparently Social Planning Department staff were frequently at odds with the community development workers and an adversary relationship existed between the workers and residents with whom they worked and City Hall. Although the City withdrew funding for NSA's Community Development Department it continued financial support to NSA's neighbourhood houses. In the 1979-1980 fiscal year NSA received one-third of its total budget from the City's civic grant fund.[28]

In 1975 NSA property on 7th Avenue between Granville and Burrard Streets was sold to Chargex for $1.25 million. This money was used to endow the

Alexandra Foundation which has its own Board. The interest from the principal is used to fund NSA neighbourhood house programs and equipment purchasers.

One of the Area Councils with whom an NSA community development worker had worked was the Fraserview-Killarney Area Council. When community develop-ment funding was withdrawn the Area Council and NSA discussed the Council's continuing to function as an NSA neighbourhood house with the result that the South Vancouver Neighbourhood house, then the Fraserview Neighbourhood Centre, joined NSA in the spring of 1976. NSA purchased a storefront building on Victoria at 49th and the neighbourhood house moved there in November 1977.

When City funding for information centes was discontinued and the Information Centre at 1st and Renfrew was closed community residents asked for and got a neighbourhood house. NSA bought a building at the eastern end of Broadway, and the Frog Hollow Neighbourhood House opened its doors in February 1977.

In 1977 the City bought a building at 535 East Broadway with Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) funds. After extensive renovations, paid for by NSA, the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood House began operation in the spring of 1978.

Before leaving NSA it should be noted that the Association tries, where possible, to transfer funding reponsibility for its programs to other agencies or to government departments, thus freeing its resouces for other endeavours. In other words neighbourhood houses often define and organize needed programs, begin them as pilot projects and, if they are successful, obtain outside funding to enable their continuation.[29]

The above has provided a brief history of the evolution of NSA and its member houses. As background to the history of the two independent neighbour-hood houses, Kiwassa and Little Mountain, United Way's history will be summarized.

History of United Way

As noted above, many social service, recreation and welfare agencies had been established in Vancouver by 1925. As their number increased so did the need for their coordination. The result was the emergence of collective fund raising bodies or Community Chests.[30] Prior to this each agency was continually holding fund-raising drives to the point that residents and business people felt overwhelmed by requests for donations. In 1929 the Vancouver Board of Trade and other service clubs hired a consultant to study the feasibility and desireability of federated fund-raising.[31] He concluded that such fund-raising would be both possible and profitable. Consequently, the Vancouver Council of Social Agencies was formed in 1930 to raise funds collectively for a number of private agencies.

The Council, in addition to undertaking federated fund raising, wished to unite agencies and to integrate their programs with public ones, where possible. At the same time, the growing number of agency staff and board members saw a need for a more systematic approach to community welfare needs in order to better detect emerging problems, fill service gaps and plan for future needs. The Vancouver Welfare Federation was also formed in 1930 to work toward this end. Twenty-eight agencies joined the Federation including the Alexandra Non-Sectarian Orphanage, NSA's ancestor. The first combined fund-raising campaign of the Council and Federation was held in 1931 and raised a quarter of a million dollars.

The Council, Federation and hundreds of volunteers were active during the thirties in the documentation of social problems and the preparation of briefs outlining their solution. In addition, they exposed charity rackets, had a school dental care program reinstated, and supervised playgrounds in parks.

In 1943 the Board of Directors of the Vancouver Welfare Federation recommended the establishment of a trust fund. The Vancouver Foundation was incor-

porated that same year with an initial endowment of $101,000. Today the
Foundation has close to $70 million in endowments and makes grants to non-profit
organizations on an application basis. Although the Vancouver Foundation remains
independent of the United Way, it continues to make contributions toward United
Way's administrative costs.

In 1944 the Federation became the Community Chest and in 1946 amalga-
mated with the Council of Social Agencies to become the Community Chest and
Council so that service planning and fund-raising were integrated within the same
organization, a situation which continues today. By 1948 there were forty-four
member agencies. The Community Chest launched a consolidation drive in the
early 1950's in response to a proliferation of campaign appeals from independent
charities. By 1956 the Community Chest had a total of sixty-four member
agencies.

During the 1950's the Community Chest was instrumental in the establish-
ment of both private and public agencies designed to meet the needs of working
mothers and their children, those on social assistance, alcoholics and drug addicts,
and the chronically ill and convalescing, among others. The Community
Information Service was established and the Poison Control Centre set up at
Vancouver General Hospital. A Research Department was added to the Community
Chest which already had Campaign, Budget, Public Relations and Social Planning
Departments. One of its major projects culminated in the Area Development
project about which more will be said below.

In 1959 the name changed again to the Community Chest and Councils of the
Greater Vancouver Area in recognition of the Burnaby Community Council and,
later, the Richmond and North Shore Divisions. The name changed yet again in
1966 to the United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area and later
to the United Way of Greater Vancouver. In 1977 it amalgamated with the United
Way of the Lower Fraser Valley to become the United Way of the Lower Mainland

or simply the United Way as it is known today. As of September 1981 the United Way had eighty-four member agencies, providing services in eighteen municipalities.

The United Way Demonstration and Development 'D and D) Fund , set up in 1968 to give small start-up and pilot project grants to member agencies and other societies, has funded over two hundred feasibility studies and pilot projects. The Hear! Hear! program of Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services, a program for deaf children, received its start-up money from the United Way D and D fund, as did the South Vancouver neighbourhood house for a feasibility study of a cottage craft industry to be run by the house. The Hear! Hear! program is now fully funded by the Ministry of Human Resources and the City of Vancouver. More will be said about both in Chapter Four.

United Way continues to press for social changes it deems desirable. As an example, in the 1970's the Research Department, now called the Social Planning and Research Department, or SPAR, analyzed the reasons for Vancouver's shortage of rental housing, developed proposals to provide more, and continues to press for their implementation. A recent, very thorough study of the realities of living on Social Assistance money aroused the wrath of the Human Resources Minister even as many social service professionals judged it to be accurate.

In addition, United Way has embarked on a project to put on workshops for member agency board members and Executive Directors on a variety of topics including key responsibilities and functions of boards, problem solving and decision making, and planning and goal setting.

Two of the neighbourhood houses being studied, Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services and Little Mountain Neighbourhood House, are United Way agencies in their own right rather than through NSA. Their histories are summarized below, along with those of the Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver neighbourhood houses.

Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Services

The Cedar Cottage neighbourhood house began as the Cedar Cottage Boys Club in 1950.[32] In 1951 it had programming for girls as well and was called the Cedar Cottage Youth Club for the next nine years. The Club, under the volunteer directorship of local adults, offered softball, boxing, soccer and craft programs to local youth. In 1954, the Youth Club joined the United Way, then the Community Chest and Councils and hired a salaried Executive Director and Assistant with the resultant funds.

The Youth Club had been operating out of a school gymnasium as well as a small adjacent building, both of which it rented from the School Board. However, in 1958 the School Board reclaimed the gym for its own use and the Club faced the possible closure of its only remaining facility. Thus began discussions with NSA, then Alexandra Community Activities (ACA) with the result that the Cedar Cottage Youth Club joined ACA in 1960, changed its name to the Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House, and expanded its programs to include adults. In the 1960 Annual Report the Cedar Cottage Board President described neighbourhood houses as agencies which

> render services for the whole family, including group and case work services
> by qualified social workers. A Neighbourhood House, in short, is a place
> where families and people of all ages can go[33] for fun, recreation, education
> and help with personal or family problems.

For the next nine years Cedar Cottage continued to provide primarily recreation programs to neighbourhood residents. However, with the advent of the Grandview Community Centre nearby, now the Cedar Cottage Community Centre, Cedar Cottage phased out its recreation programs and began providing social work services of the group work type. Examples of such programming include out of school day care, the seniors program, and outreach work with local children and teenagers.

South Vancouver Neighbourhood House

In 1968 the Fraserview Action Centre, South Vancouver Neighbourhood House's forerunner, was started as an information centre sponsored by the Fraserview Area Society and funded by the City of Vancouver.[34] Through receipt of various Local Initiative Program (LIP) grants the Society was able to provide a transportation service for the area's seniors and handicapped as well as various youth programs. The Society raised enough money to buy a van in 1975 for the transportation service. Shortly thereafter the City withdrew funding for all information centres as noted above.

Consequently, in early 1976 the Society approached NSA concerning membership as a neighbourhood house and was able to hire a house Director. It actually joined NSA in the spring of 1976, became the Fraserview Neighbourhood Centre, and soon thereafter hired a secretary, community worker and a transportation worker who shortly thereafter became a volunteer co-ordinator.

The Neighbourhood Centre operated out of a building at 42nd and Victoria as had the Action Centre. The space included a small street level area and an apartment upstairs which served as a seniors activity area and the base of operations for both the day camp and the HELP (seniors Homemakers) services. The Homemaker seniors services got underway through various governments grants in 1976 as did the first day camp in the summer of 1977. Multicultural evenings were held at the Fraserview Boys and Girls Club due to lack of space at the Neighbourhood Centre.

In 1978 the Neighbourhood Centre moved into its present building at 49th and Victoria which had been purchased by NSA. At the same time it changed its name to the South Vancouver Neighbourhood House for several reasons. First of all, the transportation service now extended beyond Fraserview to Sunset and Killarney. Secondly, the agency wanted to reach out to and serve the East Indian community which at the time was concentrated between Fraser and Main streets, not just in

Fraserview. Thirdly, the Neightbourhood House wanted to distinguish itself from and avoid past and confusing association with the Action Centre.

Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services

Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services originated in 1949 when the Kiwassa Club, the women's counterpart to the Kiwanis, started a Girls Club in an old firehall in Strathcona.[35] The women taught sewing and cooking to local girls after school. At that time the work was completely volunteer; there were no paid staff. The work of these women proved so valuable to parents that they asked the Kiwassa Club to provide an after school program for their sons as well. Eventually, Kiwassa became Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services in 1966 and was operated jointly with the North Shore Neighbourhood House, a United Way agency that did not belong to NSA. The two houses shared an Executive Director until 1970 when they parted amicably and Kiwassa hired as its first full-time Director a person who had been Assistant Director at the North Shore. Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services continues the tradition started by the Kiwassa women of providing services primarily to the community's children. It has remained outside of NSA and is a member agency of United Way.

The Kiwassa neighbourhood received Neighbourhood Improvement Program money, a substantial portion of which the NIP committee decided to spend on demolition of the beloved though now inadequate firehall and construction of a more suitable building for Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services on the same site. The new building was finished and occupied by late 1979.

Little Mountain Neighbourhood House

Although the newest of Vancouver's neighbourhood houses, Little Mountain has a lengthy history[36] beginning with the United Way Area Development Project (ADP) referred to above. ADP operated in the Riley Park community from 1964 until 1968, and had as its goals improving community and family life, fostering a more healthy community, helping social service clients to function more effectively, and reducing community social problems. It worked toward these goals by bringing residents together around common interests and concerns, helping them determine community characteristics, needs and problems, and encouraging them to plan and develop appropriate community programs and services. ADP workers also collaborated with existing community organizations, facilitated the establishment of a neighbourhood council, and brought together professionals already working in the community so as to better coordinate local services.

. The assumptions behind the ADP were twofold: the integration of services to families through one worker would be more effective than providing services through different agencies; and viewing a community as the focus of efforts to change social service delivery would change community conditions which adversely affect family functioning.

When the ADP ended it left as a legacy the Red Door, primarily a low cost housing registry. But both agency workers in the community and residents wanted more. There were some problems centered around the Riley Park Community Centre, operated by the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation. It was located near the Little Mountain Housing Project and was the turf of the "Riley Park Gang." Many agreed that as a government agency it could not nor should fulfill the same function as the ADP. However, efforts of local residents to obtain some sort of neighbourhood house were in vain until the advent of the Riley Park Neighbourhood Improvement Program. The NIP Committee allocated $350,000 for

a Neighbourhood House/Youth Centre and an additional $100,000 for a storefront library, all to be housed in the same building. This was approved by City Council in 1978, subject to assurance of sufficient operating funds.

Meanwhile, in 1978 NSA's Board put a moratorium on the acceptance of additional member neighbourhood houses unless they were fully funded. The doubling of the number of member units in just two years had created financial strains partly because the increase in NSA's United Way allocation was not quite commensurate with the increase in member units. Before accepting new units NSA wanted to ensure, as a minimum, that existing units would not suffer cutbacks in funding.[37]

In 1978 NSA received a membership request from the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House Society backed by a firm offer of $28,000 from United Way for its first year of operation. Thus began discussion among the three agencies as to the advantages and disadvantages of all concerned should NSA admit Little Mountain. The result was that Little Mountain did not join NSA and is now a member agency of United Way from whom it received its first year of core funding in 1979.

The Little Mountain Neighbourhood House moved into its own building, purchased in 1980 by the City using the NIP money allocated, in late September 1981. Prior to that it operated out of a storefront office which was also the local City Planning Office during the NIP Program.

CHAPTER FOUR:

PROFILE OF THE FOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSES

Introduction

This chapter will present data gathered from interviews with staff and board members of the Cedar Cottage, South Vancouver, Kiwassa and Little Mountain neighbourhood houses, from the annual reports, minutes and program literature of these houses, and from visits to each. The interviews were semi-structured and open-ended so as to allow maximum opportunity to question further when people felt introspective, analytic or loquacious and the opportunity presented itself. Interviews were conducted in October, 1980; follow-up interviews of house directors were carried out in September 1981. The data is presented so as to provide profiles of each house in terms of the following variables: what staff and board members feel the purpose of their house to be; what programs and services each offers and into which, if any, social work category each fits; who funds each service and program and how much is allocated to it; what are the relative roles of the house directors and the boards with whom they work; and what staff and board members see as the strengths and weaknesses of their house.

A categorization and analysis of neighbourhood house programs, services and activities and a comparison of these both among the four neighbourhood houses being examined and with neighbourhood house programming in the past will enable three of the questions asked in Chapter One to be addressed in Chapter Five. These are: what types of social work services do neighbourhood houses provide?; to what extent are neighbourhood houses social work agencies?; and have neighbourhood houses departed from their historic roots as both community organization agencies and providers of casework and group work services? A summary of staff and board views on the purposes, strengths and weaknesses of their respective

houses will also help to answer the above questions. Examination of the relative roles of the directors and their boards will help answer another question addressed in Chapater Five, do volunteers play a significant role in neighbourhood houses? Finally, determination of program budgets and their sources will help answer to what extent neighbourhood houses have departed from historic practice of doing community organization work as well as providing direct service, and will aid in consideration of the final question addressed in Chapter Five: what are the policy implications of the ways in which neighbourhood houses now function?

However, before reviewing any of the above, it is important to briefly describe the atmosphere at each neighbourhood house in order to round out the profiles presented below and make them more meaningful.

Neighbourhood House Atmosphere

It is hard to find a quiet place at Cedar Cottage. Walking into what looks like a concrete barracks one finds a cluster of people, mostly teens, talking animatedly with the secretary and other staff even while she easily fields the many incoming phone calls and one-line, rapid fire questions that come her way. In another room a large group of seniors are eating a hot lunch and talking among themselves. Downstairs, young pre-schoolers are excitedly playing charades. In still another room, members of the Area Services Team are listening to the new Native Outreach Worker describe various program aims and discussing how their respective agencies can help or make use of the program. Suddenly the Sunny Hill van pulls up and the group of young people at the front desk disperse immediately and go outside to help wheel the children in. They spend the next three hours with these handicapped children. The President of the Board comes in to have a quick word with the Director, who has just finished meeting with the priest of a local church concerning the Portuguese Program. Finally, the children, the wheelchairs,

the people at the desk and the seniors have left and there is a lull, but only temporarily. In walk, in twos and threes, men, women and children carrying dishes of food for a pot luck supper. Finally at 10:00 p.m. the building empties, the lights go out and the door is locked, having been opened at 6:00 that morning.

At South Van the story is much the same. The seniors, who have all arrived at about 10:00 a.m., are in the middle of an exercise class, while in the reception area several people without umbrellas have ducked in for temporary shelter and coffee until the rain subsides. One takes the opportunity to ask about recreation programs for her son. Upstairs, the ethnic worker is wheeling toy cars around on a table top as she demonstrates to a group of Punjabi women how not to make a left hand turn. In another room the program supervisor is talking to a high school student interested in doing volunteer work at the house. On this night about twenty people come in around 7:00 to play bridge. The following evening the house is filled with the smell of salmon and freshly baked bannock as some ten native families settle in for a meal and a quilting session afterward.

When calling the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House one is never sure who will answer the phone, as the house makes it a policy to ensure that local residents with a lack of job experience or opportunities have the change to learn office skills. There is a constant stream of people in and out of the house enquiring about programs, and having a cup of coffee. The Director, who is rushing to a meeting at the housing project concerning its redevelopment, nevertheless stops to talk to a group of kids who have come in to find out when the new building will be open. A board member comes in with an item for the following evening's board meeting and the principal of Tupper school phones to enquire about the number of people who have registered for the evening classes to be held at his school. As with Kiwassa, many of Little Mountain's programs take place in other neighbourhood buildings. Little Mountain's will continue to do so until the house moves to its new, larger premises in October 1981.

In short, neighbourhood houses are busy, noisy, lively places. One is just as likely to hear Chinese or Portuguese or Punjabi as English, and one will probably see people aged 5 to 77 all in the building at the same time. There is a constant, however, and that is that virtually anyone who walks in the door of a neighbourhood house will be welcomed and talked to.

House Purposes

Each board and staff member interviewed was asked what they thought was the purpose and function of their neighbourhood house.

Cedar Cottage

Cedar Cottage Board and staff members said their neighbourhood house should be a place for neighbourhood residents to meet others, get help for a problem, receive a particular service, or simply get information. It was viewed as a place for those feeling lonely and isolated or wanting to take a more active role in the community. Both staff and Board members placed more importance on programs of a social work or preventive nature rather than on those that were primarily social, e.g. neighbourhood dinners. Although people mentioned the drop-in, information/referral, and social functions of the house, more important to many was the house mandate from the Board to do group-oriented social work. As a staff member noted Cedar Cottage is a social work agency staffed by social workers. A board member said that the difference between the neighbourhood house and the local community centre was that the house tries to understand why kids misbehave and then works with them in an informal, indirect way to reverse their behaviour, while the a community centre simply kicks them out as trouble-makers. Yet another person observed that the neighbourhood house functions to

find solutions to people's problems that do not fit into the jurisdiction of other agencies and was thus more flexible than most other social work agencies.

There was also agreement that the neighbourhood house should promote inter-agency communication and problem-solving. In other words, it should take the initiative to keep community agencies talking with each other and working to achieve commonly agreed upon goals, e.g. provision of more after school and summer programs for children.

South Vancouver

At South Vancouver both board and staff members noted that the house has broadly conceived social work and purely social functions. To paraphrase the responses of about two-thirds of those interviewed, the neighbourhood house is a place that: provides direct services to people needing them, e.g. seniors, those not able to get around on their own, people whose first language is not English, and others with specific needs and characteristics; becomes a focal point for collective community action to achieve agreed upon goals; fosters inter-agency communication and collective action; and provides a place for people to meet each other socially at various community events. As one person stated it, South Vancouver provides the opportunity for people in similar situations to meet each other and, if so inclined, work or play together to bring about mutual goals. Another said the neighbourhood house should function as a social place to which people come to meet others, listen to music and talk, as well as providing services for people with specific needs.

Some Board members and many staff are a little frustrated that the social function of the neighbourhood house has lagged behind the provision of social work services. A staff member said that staff should not have to spend all their time counselling. However, there was agreement that in order to establish credibility

and visibility within the community it was important to provide specific services to demonstrate to the community that the neighbourhood house was more than a place that simply talked about what it would like to be. In other words, offering specific programs has a demonstration effect that helps to establish the neighbourhood house as an effective community agency.

The South Vancouver program guide for fall 1981 has this to say about the neighbourhood house.

> What is South Vancouver Neighbourhood House? ... (it) provides a variety of programs and services for people of all ages and walks of life -- pre-schoolers, children, teens, adults, single parents, the handicapped, ethnic groups and seniors. We aim to work with residents to make this community an even better place to live. We are run by a non-profit society (so we are not government). Our Board of Directors are elected each year at our Annual Meeting in May.

Kiwassa

The board and staff members of Kiwassa most definitely view it as a private social work agency. Even Kiwassa's name, Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services, not Kiwassa Neighbourhood House, is a clue to its emphasis. To paraphrase many board and staff members, the purpose of Kiwassa is to assess the nature and extent of the community's needs, devise programs and services that will work to alleviate those needs, and to do so in a way that increases the ability of a person to realize their potential and to make decisions for himself or herself. There is the expressed desire to improve the welfare and quality of life of neighbourhood residents and to help people who have nowhere else to go. Many see these efforts as being appropriately centered on the children of the community.

Another frequently mentioned function of the neighbourhood house is to bring community organizations together so as to enhance their ability to work collectively to solve local problems, take stands on local issues, and provide

services and programs for community residents without duplicating existing services or impinging on each other's mandate.

On a recent application form for membership in the Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services Society, a non-profit society, the following objectives of Kiwassa were listed.

* to provide social, educational and recreational opportunities to those who reside, attend school or work in the area.
* to operate a nursery school.
* to provide opportunities for individuals of all ages, races and creeds to have experiences which will contribute to their social and emotional development.
* to improve neighbourhood health and welfare services through cooperation with other organizations, through influencing public opinion.
* to develop a sense of neighbourliness among families and groups in the community.

Little Mountain

The Little Mountain Neighbourhood House was unique among the four in that the most common response to the question of the neighbourhood house's purpose was that it should be a place to which people could come to meet others in a relaxed, unprogrammed atmosphere. Drop-in centre and information/referral centre were words frequently used to describe the ideal. Stated another way, many interviewed hope the neighbourhood house will become a focus of community initiative, e.g. a place to which people go to teach or learn something, that clubs use for their meetings and activities, theatre groups for rehearsals, and that musicians rehearse and play in. One board member wants the house to have a printing press and dark room which could be used to put out a community newspaper. Another envisages workshops in which retired tradesmen could teach their skills to young people, thereby giving them the confidence and skills to find jobs and stay out of trouble. A staff person summed it up by saying that the purpose of the neighbourhood house was to become a place neighbourhood residents

would use to organize activities for themselves in an informal way. All wanted the house to be a place in which people of all ages, incomes and racial backgrounds would be comfortable.

About one in six mentioned that the neighbourhood house should foster inter-agency cooperation and planning so as to act as an intermediary between the government and the community. Some wanted it to be the focus of activity aimed at improving the physical condition of the community, i.e. continuing the work to achieve improvements to parks, streets and local facilities started by the Riley Park Neighbourhood Improvement Program Committee in 1977. About one in four wanted the neighbourhood house to work to change social conditions that adversely affect community residents.

Of course, most want the neighbourhood house to provide some services that meet the needs of particular groups of people such as single parents, seniors and people on low incomes. However, no one wanted the neighbourhood house to become primarily a service agency that only served those with specific problems or conditions. Several were quite adamant that Little Mountain not become a social work agency, or a "cheap branch of MHR" as one person put it. What these same people envisage is a place that would be an intermediary between the poor and the socially isolated, and those that could help them to achieve the confidence and knowledge to help themselves and to initiate community activity, be it social, service oriented or political.

Little Mountain staff and Board members made it clear that they wanted to establish an alternative to the perceived structure and inflexibility of the Riley Park Community Centre. This is not to imply criticism of the Community Centre, but rather to emphasize that they want an alternative to the structured recreation provided by the Community Centre without going so far as to have structured social services such as are provided by the Ministry of Human Resources. The goal of most Little Mountain staff and board members is to have a place that will serve

as a focus for the community's social life and that will be the catalyst for

neighbourhood advocacy as practiced by the NIP Committee. Programming of

neighbourhood house activities by neighbourhood residents is part of that goal.

The fall 1981 Neighbourhood House News, put out by Little Mountain

answers, the question 'what is Little Mountain Neighbourhood House?' in this way.

> Little Mountain Neighbourhood House is a place where neighbours of all ages
> and backgrounds meet to get information, to express concerns, to plan
> programs and to get to know each other. Together we can make this
> community an even better place to live. The ... House began in August 1978
> when a group of residents formed a non-profit society (so we are not
> government). Our Board of Directors is elected for a one year term ... (and)
> meets ... each month. The meeting is open to everyone.

Programming

What follows is a discussion and classification of the program offerings of

each of the four neighbourhood houses. Their programs, services and events are

grouped both according to their primary emphasis, i.e. casework, group work,

community organization or something else, and to the age group served by them. It

should be noted that rigorous program evaluation was not part of the research for

this thesis. Classification of programs, although heavily reliant on interviews with

board and staff members and on perusal of neighbourhood house literature, remains

the subjective impression of the author.

Regular Recreation Programming

Both the South Vancouver and Little Mountain houses offer what could be

considered simply recreational programs for children. South Vancouver holds a

weekly Fun Night, for which there is a fee, aimed at children aged 8 to 14. It

includes games, outings and various other activities. Little Mountain has two after

school craft programs, one in each of two local schools, and weekly floor and ice

hockey sessions at the Riley Park Community Centre, offered at the request of local kids. There has been a Gym Night held at a local school as well as Sunday field trips for neighbourhood kids. In cooperation with West Side Youth Services, Little Mountain is starting an outdoor club for those interested in hiking and canoeing.

In addition to their regular programming, all four neighbourhood houses have summer recreational programs for children which are financed through various federal government grants. These are often run by older students who are supervised by neighbourhood house staff. Neighbourhood Services Association owns and operates a summer camp near Port Moody to which neighbourhood house children aged 6 to 12 may go for a 2 week session for an $80 fee. There are some camperships available for those unable to afford the fee. Kiwassa has a summer camp program for deaf children in its Hear! Hear! Program which is more fully described below.

There are two special programs with a connection to Camp Wallace. The first is an eleven day counsellor-in-training program for those with some camp experience who are interested in becoming camp counsellors. The second is Cedar Cottage's Leadership Program, offered to senior high school students who are interested in summer employment as camp counsellors and playground supervisors. The program teaches students to program and instruct outdoor recreation activities, e.g. canoeing, rock climbing and camping, and is particularly appealing to students interested in careers in social work or recreation. Camp Wallace hires counsellors from among Leadership Program participants. In addition, the students do volunteer work at the neighbourhood house. This Program is very popular with neighbourhood high school students. Whereas Cedar Cottage staff used to emphasize the more enjoyable aspects of the Program, such as weekend camping trips, to get recruits, they now stress the volunteering which is equally a part of the Program. However, even when told they must occasionally get up at 5:30 on a

winter morning to help out with the Breakfast Program the neighbourhood's students still flock to sign up. Because of its popularity, a more advanced program has been established for grade 12 students.

Child Care Services

All four neighbourhood houses provide child care services of some description, although South Van's are limited to the provision of babysitting for some of its programs. The other houses also provide this service for some of their programs.

Cedar Cottage holds morning and afternoon Nursery School sessions four days a week involving more than one hundred and ten children, some of whom are physically handicapped or have learning disabilities. Close to two hundred and twenty children from ten different schools participated in five out-of-school day care groups, one at the neighbourhood house and one at each of four nearby schools. Cedar Cottage also has a Breakfast Program for those children whose parents, because of work or some other reason, find it difficult to get their children to school. About thirty children get picked up at their homes, fed breakfast at the neighbourhood house and dropped off at one of five schools. They are transported in the neighbourhood house van driven by either a staff member or a student volunteer. There are fees for both the Nursury School and the out-of-school day care. However, there are Ministry of Human Resources (MHR) subsidies available to those parents able to demonstrate through a means test that they are unable to afford part or all of their children's day care costs.

The Little Mountain Neighbourhood House has a Day Care Centre. The Centre is the achievement of a few Board members who, with staff help, worked very hard to bring it about. Although affiliated with Little Mountain, the Day Care Centre is operated independently of it. It is the only daycare, as of October 1980,

to be both 'globally funded' by the Ministry of Human Resources and 'integrated'.

Global funding means that MHR pays all the daycare's operating costs not covered

by parental fees, including staff salaries, supplies and subsidies to low income

parents. Integrated means that the daycare accepts both special needs children,

i.e. those who are late developers, mildly physically handicapped, or who have

behavioural problems, speech or hearing impairment, or language problems, as well

as children with none of the above handicaps. Kiwassa has a Pre-School for three

and four year olds, about half of whom come from families whose first language is

not English.

It should be emphasized that the Pre-Schools, day cares and Nursury Schools

of the neighbourhood house provide child care of a high quality. The workers all

have some training and some have degrees in Education, Child Development or

Social Work. They do developmental work with the children, many of whom come

from families whose first language is not English and some of whom have specific

developmental or behavioural problems. Furthermore, because of the subsidies

involved, child care is being made available, to families who have no other satis-

factory options. Consequently, the child care services could be considered social

work programs of the group work type, i.e. using group experience to enhance

personal development.

Casework

All four houses provide services which are casework in nature in that they

involve one-to-one work with an adult or child to overcome blocks to that person's

development. Sometimes whole families are counselled.

A program which epitomizes casework is the Special Services to Children

Program which all but Cedar Cottage contract separately with the Ministry of

Human Resources to provide. Children deemed 'at risk', i.e. having problems at

home or in school, are referred to the Special Services program by MHR social workers. In addition, a small number of 'special needs' children are accepted, including some who are autistic, retarded, physically handicapped or emotionally disturbed. Staff are hired by each neighbourhood house and paid by the hour to work a specified number of hours a week on a one-to-one basis with a child. To quote from a September 1979 Report to the Board on the Special Services program at South Vancouver

> In keeping with the goal of the neighbourhood house, the Special Services team emphasizes warmth, compassion and friendship in working with children. An important aspect of this is 'unconditional positive regard,' i.e. a non-judgemental attitude. Counselling and therapeutic processes are integrated in the context of everyday activities with children. Fun, exercise and enriching experiences are viewed as part of the Special Services process.

The Special Services worker, the referring social worker, the neighbourhood house Special Services Coordinator, the parent(s) and, in many cases, the child, all determine appropriate goals for the child. Although there are slight variations in style, Little Mountain and Kiwassa have the attitude noted above. More will be said about this program in the contract services section below.

All four houses offer individual and family counselling to those who want it. This can and has been on anything from how to adjust to living in a strange culture, to how to find a job, to how to get along better with family members. Many of the people counselled are new Canadians. South Van has a Family Outreach Worker, funded by MHR, who works with those families and inviduals who feel the need to be counselled either in a sporadic or ongoing fashion. All but Little Mountain staff have done marital counselling.

Cedar Cottage and South Van each have a Native Outreach Worker whose job it is to provide assistance to native families and to represent native culture in the house. By way of background Cedar Cottage staff initiated a Native Indian Family Night in October 1980. It came about because local Ministry of Human Resources

staff asked the neighbourhood house to do some programming for the community's many native families in order to develop more native foster families. Cedar Cottage's interest in the program is to provide the vehicle for a social network and support system for native families. Cedar Cottage then applied for and received a Canada Community Development Project Grant[1] for a one year project, beginning January 1981, called Native Indian Neighbourhood and Employment Services. Two native staff were hired who work with the Native Family Night, among other things.

In early 1981 MHR approached Cedar Cottage regarding the funding of a Native Outreach Worker but Cedar Cottage was reluctant to take on this additional function given its existing native programming. The Ministry then approached South Vancouver with the result that both Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver now have one Native Outreach Worker each. The Cedar Cottage Worker has office space at both the Kensington and Cedar Cottage MHR offices.

Group Work - Children

All four neighbourhood houses offer programs of the group work type. These are programs which use group activities to help individuals function more effectively in group settings, enhance their personal development and develop citizenship responsibility.

Cedar Cottage has the Club Group Program through which problems of social adjustment are addressed. It is for children who have difficulty getting along with others and are frequently in trouble. Some are referred by teachers or police officers and many of the referrals are native children. The program depends, in part, on cooperation between Cedar Cottage staff and local school, probation and police staff. About two hundred children participate in the Club Groups which are run out of the house, at three local schools and at Camp Wallace. While the

activities engaged in are voluntary and often of a recreational nature the basic objective of the Program, according to the Cedar Cottage 1980-81 Annual Report "is to bring about possible changes in the relationships and behaviour of group members." Staff often counsel participating children and their families.

South Vancouver has Southtown which is funded by MHR and aimed at teenaged youth who are not in school nor working. It is located just down the street from the neighbourhood house in a storefront Annex. Although the neighbourhood house welcomes them it is not properly equipped and is occupied by seniors much of the day. Southtown came about because MHR, being impressed by the work of the Special Services staff, told South Vancouver and other local organizations that it would fund a program to work with those teenagers not being reached by existing agencies and programs. In turn, some of the South Van Special Services workers wanted a place to bring the children they worked with together for some group activities. South Vancouver submitted a proposal for Southtown and received MHR funding. To quote neighbourhood house literature

> Southtown provides academic tutoring, job search skills, opportunities for employment, recreation, counselling, carpentry and mechanics. The focus is on eventual return to school and acquiring the ability to function successfully in the community.

Kiwassa has about twelve Social Development or after school groups, each having about ten children aged 6 to 13. These groups are run by high school students who are, in turn, supervised by Kiwassa staff members. There are also six Social Adjustment groups, each of about eight to ten children who have trouble getting along with their peers, families and teachers. The children are usually referred by school staff and public health nurses. Participants in both the Social Development and Social Adjustment groups do crafts, play games, cook and go on outings. However, Adjustment group leaders emphasize helping the child to better understand himself and get along with others. Toward this end each child in an Adjustment group draws up goals to work toward.

Both South Van and Little Mountain offer a program, in cooperation with Family Services of Greater Vancouver, called Kids from Divided Homes. It is for children whose parents have separated.

Cedar Cottage hosts a weekly program of crafts, music and social events for wheelchair patients from Sunny Hill Hospital. According to the house's Annual Report each participant receives individual attention from the moment they arrive until they are escorted back to their van. Such attention is only made possible through the commitment of many volunteers, both adult and teen.

Kiwassa's Hear! Hear! Program is both a social adjustment and recreational program for hearing impaired children and is the first of its kind in Canada. It was started through the initiative and hard work of a community resident and board member who has three deaf children. The Program received initial funding as a demonstration project from United Way's Demonstration and Development Fund and is now, after considerable effort, fully funded by the Ministry of Human Resources. Highly regarded, the program receives referrals from the Western Institute for the Deaf, the Jericho School for the Deaf and the Children's Diagnostic Centre and has children from all over Vancouver and even outside The City. In addition to group and recreational work with deaf children the Hear! Hear! Program runs a summer camp for deaf children as mentioned, holds a sign language class for their siblings, and provides a support function for their parents.

South Van has several programs for children in groups including an after school group at the neighbourhood house for which there is a fee, and after school groups and teen groups at each of the three housing projects in the south Vancover area: Champlain Place, Culloden Court and Orchard Park. Not enough is known about these group activities to say whether they are primarily recreational or more developmentally oriented. Finally, both Little Mountain and Cedar Cottage sponsor summer youth employment projects whose aim is to prepare young people for full time employment and to help them find part time work in the community.

Group Work - Adults

In cooperation with Family Services Little Mountain, South Vancouver and Cedar Cottage all offer a course called "Positive Parenting." Apparently, the course is intended as both instruction and mutual support.

Little Mountain sponsors the Mainstream Single Parents group which meets weekly at the nearby Community Centre to hear talks on and discuss topics of particular interest to single parents. In that the group provides a support function to participating single parents it is a program of the group work type. In addition, the YWCA is sponsoring three groups for single parents in the Little Mountain area. These are meant to be support groups for those finding themselves in a similar position.

The Parents and Tots sessions at South Vancouver enable parents to bring their young children to the neighbourhood house, listen to speakers and discuss issues of mutual concern with trained facilitators. There is a fee for this program. Because Kiwassa is located in a heavily Chinese community its weekly Moms and Tots group is oriented toward the socialization of new Canadian, primarily Chinese, mothers.

Some would consider the Native Indian Family Nights at South Vancouver and Cedar Cottage to be group work social programs. Others would consider them primarily social functions. The same is true of the weekly Family Night at Cedar Cottage at which very inexpensive dinners are served. There is often music or other entertainment, a talk, or a demonstration.

Programs for Seniors

All but Kiwassa offer programs for seniors, although Kiwassa does host an informal daily senior's drop-in. Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver both have

extensive programs and activities for older people. In fact, Cedar Cottage had the first Adult Day Care Program in Vancouver. Every day pensioners come to the neighbourhood house for a hot lunch, recreation and entertainment. Over one hundred people participate. Transportation to and from the house for those unable to travel on their own is provided.

Seniors have several activities to choose from at South Vancouver. Three days a week the house hosts Senior Activity Days at which people can take an exercise class, eat a nutritious lunch, hear talks, do crafts, play cards and other games, etc. Bus trips around the Lower Mainland are the choice the other two days of the week. Again, transportation is provided to those needing it. Doctors, social workers, clergy, friends and relatives all refer people to the Activity Days. Five days a week the house also provides a Medical Transportation Service which transports people to doctor's appointments.

Both Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver have contracted with the Ministry of Health under the Long Term Care Program to provide a Homemaker and Handyman service to pensioners and others who cannot completely care for themselves but who do not want to leave their homes. Workers are paid an hourly wage to provide personal care, e.g. bathing; homemaker services, e.g. housecleaning and cooking; and handyman help, e.g. painting and light repairs, to those seniors not fully able to help themselves. City Health units make referrals of seniors requiring this service to the neighbourhood houses. About 30 staff provide some 3,900 service hours a month to south Vancouver area seniors while about 50 Homemakers at Cedar Cottage provide 4,700 service hours per month. More will be said about the Homemakers Program in the contract services section below. The Long Term Care Program also funds the Adult Day Care and the Seniors Activity Days mentioned above.

Little Mountain has gone a different route. It does not contract with the Ministry of Health. Instead, it, together with the local Health Unit and Family

Services, has nurtured a seniors club called the Little Mountain Live Wires which has a loose affiliation with the neighbourhood house. Together with the Career and Community Education Services of the Vancouver School Board the neighbourhood house and the Live Wires have organized a series of courses for which there is a $3.00 fee covering anywhere from four to eight sessions. Examples of courses offered include fitness, gardening, a history of Vancouver and memory training (for everyone!). During the summer the neighbourhood house also has a Handyman service for those on fixed incomes who are unable to do home repairs for themselves. This service is funded by a Provincial Youth Employment Program grant.

Multicultural Programming

All four neighbourhood houses have programs or services aimed primarily at those whose first language is not English. On Fridays the Cedar Cottage house is filled with Portuguese people. The extremely successful Portuguese Program is one of the few programs in Vancouver to receive funding from the City over and above its usual annual grant to neighbourhood houses. In addition, the Program can now bill the Ministry of Health under the Long Term Care Program for the transportation provided for participants unable to arrive on their own.

The Little Mountain house will have the benefit of a worker from Immigrant Services working half-time out of the new neighbourhood house building. The house sponsors a Chinese Cultural Orientation Group which meets weekly for English instruction and an orientation to Canadian culture.

In fact, all four houses hold either citizenship classes or language classes or both. Cedar Cottage, South Vancouver and Little Mountain all offer English classes for which babysitting is provided. At Cedar Cottage some of the Nursery School children take these classes as two out of three of them come from

immigrant families. Some of these classes go beyond simple language instruction.

For example, Little Mountain's English classes include information about where to

shop, how to find a doctor and where to find recreational facilities. The class

includes visits to community facilities. South Van also offers, for a fee, a Driver

Instruction class for Punjabi speaking people wishing to obtain their Learner's

Permit. Kiwassa and South Vancouver both hold citizenship classes. Kiwassa's are

taught by an older Chinese man who is highly respected in the Chinese community.

South Van holds one citizenship class each for Chinese and Punjabis for which

participants pay a small fee. All of the above could be considered group work

programs in that they help people adjust to and learn about a strange culture and

its language.

South Vancouver holds monthly East Indian lunches with modestly priced East

Indian food prepared by staff and neighbourhood women. In addition to being a

social event, the lunches afford socialization to Canadian culture for East Indian

women who find it difficult to get out on their own. South Vancouver also hosts a

yearly East Indian Night of food and entertainment, a Greek Night and an

Oktoberfest. These events, although having an undercurrent of improving cross-

cultural relations in racially mixed Southeast Vancouver, are primarily social.

As a result of efforts by South Van to establish a business venture that would

raise money for house programming as well as provide training and employment

opportunities for those who find it difficult to get work elsewhere, "Sami's

Samosas"[2] came about. Initial funding came from a Canada Community

Development Project grant and subsequently through LEAP. Begun in December

1980, the Samosa project, in addition to selling samosas in bulk to food suppliers,

caterers and individuals, provides employment for East Indian women who are other-

wise not eligible for employment through cultural barriers, insufficient English or

lack of skills.

Classes

All but Kiwassa offer classes of some sort. People can sign up for cross-country skiing and first aid at Cedar Cottage; East Indian cooking, Stop Smoking, law classes or pre-retirement planning at South Vancouver; and assertiveness training, class 4 driver's licence instruction, or fund raising for non-profit organizations at Little Mountain. In addition, the School Board and a local high school have worked with Little Mountain to make night classes available locally in a wide variety of topics including small business operation, do-it-yourself repairs, wood-working, public speaking and Japanese cooking.

Social Events

Of course, each house has its social events, some of which double as fund raisers. Cedar Cottage has a weekly program called "Mother's Break", for which babysitting is provided. It gives neighbourhood women a chance to go on outings, have discussions or listen to a talk. Other social functions include the International Pot Luck Dinner and holiday Family Dinners. Some double as fund raisers such as the weekend Pancake Breakfasts, Las Vegas Nights, the Fall Bazaar, the "Order of Good Cheer" banquet and dance and the Pub Nights.

South Vancouver holds a monthly pot luck dinner, a Christmas party, several folk dancing nights and sporadic music evenings at which local musicians are invited to play. The wildly successful Good Neighbour Day is an annual summer event which literally thousands of people attend. Recently, the house has started social evenings for those aged 45 to 60.

Little Mountain has a weekly pot luck dinner, called Chat and Chow, which attracts increasing numbers of people as well as a core of regulars. This program virtually runs itself and requires little staff time. Of course there are also special

event dinners such as the Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners. The house sponsors

a whist club. Recently, there was a contest to draw the neighbourhood house for

children in three age categories. The third annual Craft Market and Fair was held

in August 1981 and served as a showcase for local crafts, people, as well as having

music, dancing from different countries, food and games.

Even Kiwassa has some purely social events such as the Hanging of the

Greens at Christmas, an event which has come to mean a lot to neighbourhood

residents, particularly the children, and the Wing Ding, a new event which is being

repeated.

Community Organization

As the literature states, one of the chief concerns of community organization

is the helping of different groups in a community to work together to achieve

mutual goals. All four neighbourhood houses foster cooperative work among the

agencies of their respective communities. All but South Van play leading roles in

their local Area Services Team. For example, Cedar Cottage has been

instrumental in establishing and maintaining the Cedar Cottage-Kensington Area

Services Team and the Kingsway Management Committee. Both are associations

of social service and recreation professionals from different agencies working in

the community. The Area Services Team involves primarily information sharing

and staff development activities. Its aim is to foster better working relations

among Team members.

The Kingsway Management Committee is more action oriented. It is made up

of representatives from Probation, the Police, the Community Accountability

Panel, high schools, Community Centre staff, and Cedar Cottage staff. It works to

identify problems, determine solutions, and apply for and sponsor grant programs.

For example, the Outdoor Recreation Worker who works out of the neighbourhood

house is the direct result of the Management Committee's efforts. The Committee seeks to encourage and foster an integrated approach to youth programming. For example, some programs take place at the Community Centre but are administered by Cedar Cottage.

The Kiwassa Director chairs the Strathcona Area Services Team. The Team is a group of staff professionals representing twenty agencies active in the Strathcona and Grandview communities. Its function is to pool resources and work cooperatively in order to respond effectively to community needs. The Team reviews all the community's grant submissions and reaches a consensus on them before any are forwarded to the appropriate foundation or government department. Grants officers of the Ministry of Human Resources meet with the Team to collectively attach priorities to grant requests. In this way duplication of efforts and competitive animosity are avoided as much as possible. The Area Services Team also works to change government policies it feels adversely affect residents. The Native Indian Youth Advisory Committee is part of the Team. It was asked to help work toward the establishment of a native school. Partly through the Committee's efforts, the school has been approved in principle and its feasibility is now being tested. It will likely open in September 1982.

Kiwassa Board members also particpate in SeTaCoNa which is a "Board of boards". On it sit two representatives of each of nine Strathcona agency boards. It was developed to be a strong community voice. Because it is an umbrella organization that speaks for many agencies it gives the community the opportunity to come together on community concerns. For example, Kiwassa supervised four UBC Social Work students, one of whom researched the impacts B.C. Place is likely to have on Strathcona and the Downtown Eastside. This information, together with other findings and views, was presented at a Sunday meeting of SeTaCoNa in January 1981 and to Vancouver City Council before B.C. Place officials made their own presentation to the City. SeTaCoNa also successfully opposed a mini-stadium

which the City Board of Parks and Recreation wanted to locate in Strathcona. At one time the Kiwassa Board's Social Action Committee was active, particularly over successful efforts to stop trains running at night and waking up neighbourhood residents. However, it now refers such issues to SeTaCoNa. ('SeTaCoNa' is the enunciation of 'Strathcona' in Chinese.)

Likewise, Little Mountain makes a large effort to bring community agencies and groups together. Although Riley Park has no Area Services Team as yet, the neighbourhood house is in frequent contact with other community organizations and is working to establish a "Network of Agencies" made up of staff and volunteers from local agencies. The first meeting took place in September 1981. Future Network projects include volunteer training and recruitment, joint publicity, a community newsletter and expanding the role of the community vans.

With a few exceptions, Cedar Cottage does no real community organization work apart from its involvement with the Area Services Team and Kingsway Management Committee. The exceptions include the following. In 1977, Cedar Cottage Board members worked with Selkirk School to mobilize local support and successfully lobbied City Hall to obtain a pedestrian activated traffic light at 22nd and Victoria. Occasionally, local schools ask Cedar Cottage for help in setting up a program. One school wanted to have an out of school day care; another wanted to establish its own Breakfast Program. Both were given information by the neighbourhood house but both ended up having their needs met through an expansion or adjustment of existing Cedar Cottage programs.

South Vancouver tends to act in concert with other agencies providing comparable services when it sees a need to change the structure of a service to better serve community residents. For example, the neighbourhood was instrumental in forming the Association of Community Transportation Services (ACTS) in response to what staff saw as the bungled provincial government takeover of transportation services through the Lions Club. Twelve groups already

providing such services throughout the Lower Mainland joined ACTS and refused to give the government needed information until it met with their representatives. ACTS finally reached an agreement with the Lions as to the areas to be served by each. South Vancouver has good relations with other community agencies, groups and professionals. Several people mentioned that when the neighbourhood house solicits letters of support to accompany grant requests the responses are invariably complimentary.

There are two groups which have an affiliation with the Little Mountain house but which operate at arms length from it so as to enable lobbying activity. Neither wants to jeopardize the activities of the house. For example, the Live Wires have an affiliation with the Council of Senior Community Organizations (COSCO) which works on behalf of seniors groups to attempt to meet seniors needs.

Little Mountain is also organizing a workshop which is meant to be both a celebration of the Riley Park Neighbourhood Improvement Program and a chance to re-generate interest in neighbourhood issues. An example of house leadership in this area is its participation on the committee which is working with the City and the province on a complete re-design of the Riley Park Housing Project. The majority of people on the Committee are house staff or Board members, tenants and people in the Live Wires.

Little Mountain also hosts a monthly Community Forum on topics of concern to Riley Park residents such as the effort to get a 25th Avenue bus line or a discussion of the Guaranteed Annual Income for Need (GAIN) rates. To the extent these Forums bring together people of similar circumstances and views, they can act to facilitate community change efforts.

Of the four neighbourhood houses examined, Kiwassa has gone the furthest in a commitment to community organization work. At its June 1981 meeting the Board considered three options. One was to expand so as to take on additional services. This option was rejected because the Board did not want to see Kiwassa

become an inflexible empire out of touch with the community it serves. Another option was to establish a Child Guidance Centre or Clinic at the neighbourhood house. The Board has made a long-term commitment to this goal. But most importantly, the Board strongly endorsed the third option - to use the provision of services as a mechanism for community development. This means that house board members and staff will work toward the development of services but will also work with those residents desiring them toward the establishment, nurturance and strengthening of a lay structure to take over their management once in place. As an example, Kiwassa was recently approached to help put together a provincial organization of parents of deaf children. Kiwassa helped the parents involved get a grant for a founding conference from the Ministry of Education as part of the programs and grants set up for the International Year of Disabled People. Another long term community development project with which Kiwassa is helping is the establishment of programs for children at the Chimo and Grandview housing projects. The impetus for this work came from Special Services to Children workers' discussions with the parents in these projects.

Budget and Staffing

Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Services employed about ninety-three people in 1980. Four of these staff positions were funded by the United Way grant to NSA and are what NSA calls core staff. They are those of the Director, two Programmers and a Secretary. An additional twenty-three people were employed as full-time staff at Cedar Cottage on various projects. There were about fifteen part-time summer program workers and fifty people working on an hourly basis under contract with the Homemaker program in 1979.

The total budget from all sources for 1980 was about $839,000. The table below summarizes the house budget by program. It also indicates from what source the program's money came and how many people were employed.

Table I
Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Services
1980 Operating Budget

	Program	Budget	Source	Staff	
1.	Nursery School	$13,490[1]	parent fees	3	(1 PT)
		8,993[1]	MHR subsidy		
2.	Homemakers	461,707	LTC,[2] Min. of Health	50	(hourly)
3.	Adult Day Care	77,008	LTC,[2] Min. of Health	6	
4.	After School Day Care	39,342	parent fees	12	
		77,252	MHR subsidy		
5.	Portuguese Worker	9,822	City of Vancouver	1	
6.	Outdoor Recreation Worker	10,250	Vancouver Foundation	1	
7.	Summer Programs	7,695	federal grants	15	PT
8.	All Other Programs and Services	1,359	user fees	4	core
		31,605	City of Vancouver		
		1,997	misc. grants and subsidies		
		21,321	rentals and misc. revenue		
		17,269	recovery from projects		
		59,933	United Way via NSA		
		$839,043			

1. estimates
2. Long Term Care Program

As will be summarized in Table 4 below, 81% of the Cedar Cottage budget comes from government sources. Most of this amount comes from the provincial ministries of Health and Human Resources for on-going services. Private donations from the United Way and the Vancouver Foundation comprise 8% of the house budget. User fees, primarily paid by parents of children in the Day Care and Nursery School, account for 6%. Rentals of house space and project recovery account for 3% and 2%, respectively.

South Vancouver Neighbourhood House employs about 80 people and has a budget slightly over one million dollars for the 1981 calendar year. There are three

core staff, i.e. the Director, Program Supervisor and Secretary. Of the remaining seventy-seven staff, twenty-five are also full-time, two are part-time, and fifty work on a contract basis through either the Ministry of Health Long Term Care Homemaker/Handyman program or the Ministry of Human Resources Special Services to Children program. To give some idea of how fast South Vancouver has grown, its budget for the previous 1978-1979, fiscal year was $389,551. During that year, its staff complement was fifty-eight.

Of its one million plus budget 96% comes from government sources, primarily the Ministry of Health and MHR. About 10% of this amount comes from the Urban Transit Authority. The remaining 4% of the total budget comes from private sources, chiefly the United Way. Table 2 below summarizes the funding amount and source for South Van programs.

Table II
South Vancouver Neighbourhood House
1981 Operating Budget

	Program	Budget	Source
1.	Southtown	$ 156,648	MHR
2.	Special Services to Children	168,000	MHR
3.	Homemakers	457,000	LTC[1], Min. of Health
4.	Adult Day Care	85,897	LTC[1], Min. of Health
5.	Native Indian Services	25,000	MHR
6.	Transportation Services	105,000	Urban Transit Authority
7.	Samosa Project	18,000	federal grant
8.	All Other Programs and	37,565	United Way via NSA
	Services	34,795	City of Vancouver
		600	rentals
	Total	$1,088,505[2]	

1.   Long Term Care Program
2.   There was a $17,562 shortfall above this amount which was recovered through a variety of means including use of a 1980 surplus and fund raising of $3,500.

Kiwassa's operating budget for calendar year 1980 was about $390,194 of which close to 82% was provided by the public sector. Nearly all of this

government money came from the provincial Ministry of Human Resources and paid for the MacDonald School Social Development, the Special Services to Children program, and much of the Hear! Hear! program. Money received from the City of Vancouver also went toward the Hear! Hear! program. The United Way grant and the Kiwassa Club donation account for 13% of Kiwassa's total budget and paid for the Social Adjustment and Social Development groups, the individual and family counselling done by Kiwassa staff, and participation of the neighbourhood house in other community organizations. The remaining 5% is accounted for by user fees, private donations and miscellaneous income. Refer to Table 3 below for a more detailed breakdown.

About forty people worked at Kiwassa in 1980. Six of them had full-time permanent positions including the Director, the Secretary/Bookkeeper, the Hear! Hear!, after school programs and Special Services Coordinators, and an Assistant Special Services Coordinator. Ten people had temporary summer jobs funded by various government grants and twenty-four worked on a contract basis with the Special Services Program.

Table III
Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services
1980 Operating Budget

	Program	Budget	Source
1.	Pre-School	$ 4,400[1]	parent fees
		2,400	MHR subsidies
2.	Hear! Hear! Program	29,680	MHR
		14,451	City of Vancouver
		1,818	user fees
		2,025	CKNW Orphans Fund and private donation
3.	MacDonald School Program	7,925	MHR
		94	user fees
4.	Special Services to Children	248,701	MHR
5.	All Other Programs and Services	16,000	City of Vancouver
		5,000	Kiwassa Club
		44,000	United Way
		13,700	rentals, consulting fees, miscellaneous
	Total	$390,194	

1. includes some user fees paid for the Citizenship classes.

Little Mountain's 1980 operating budget was $271,635 of which about $241,755, or 89%, came from the municipal, provincial and federal governments. Nearly three-fourths of this amount is provided by the Ministry of Human Resources for the Special Services to Children program and the Day Care Centre. The year round youth programming is largely funded by the Vancouver civic grant. The summer youth programs are paid for by a joint City/provincial grant as is another summer project which provides a home repair service to those on low incomes. United Way provided $28,000 or 10.3% of Little Mountain's 1980 budget

Little Mountain employed thirty-five people as of October 1980. Nine of these people held full-time jobs including the Director; Secretary; Youth, Adult and Family Programs and Special Services Coordinators; the Day Care Coordinator; and three other Day Care staff. Ten worked on summer grant projects, one worked part-time and fifteen were employed on a contract basis for the Special Services to

Children Program. The United Way grant pays the salaries of the Director and Secretary.

Table 4 below summarizes the budgets and their sources for each of the four neighbourhood houses.

Table IV
Summary: Neighbourhood House Budgets
By Source
(% in parentheses)

Source	Cedar Cottage (1980)	South Vancouver (1981)	Kiwassa (1980)	Little Mountain (1980)	All Houses Combined
Private Funding[1]	$ 70,183 (8%)	$ 37,565 (3%)	$ 51,025 (13%)	$ 28,000 (10%)	$ 186,773 (7%)
Government Funding TOTAL	676,079 (81%)	1,050,340 (96%)	319,157 (82%)	241,755 (89%)	2,287,331 (88%)
Provincial and Federal;	634,652 (76%)	1,015,545 (93%)	288,706 (74%)	221,775 (81%)	2,160,658 (83%)
Municipal	41,427 (5%)	34,795 (3%)	30,451 (8%)	20,000 (7%)	126,673 (5%)
User Fees	54,191 (6%)	see 3 below	6,312 (2%)	-------	60,503 understated; see 3) (2%)
TOTAL BUDGET	$839,043[2]	$1,088,505	$390,194[4]	$271,635	$2,589,377

1. includes United Way, Vancouver Foundations and donations.
2. includes rental income, project recovery and miscellaneous revenue.
3. South Van charges fees for some of its programs. Unfortunately these have been buried in aggregated figures.
4. includes rental income, consulting fees and miscellaneous.

Contract Services

As was mentioned above, the funding of the Special Services to Children and the Homemakers Programs warrant more detailed discussion because they account for large portions of neighbourhood house budgets and because government ministries contract with the houses to provide the services. Beginning with the former, the Ministry of Human Resources allocates an annual sum to the sponsoring agency, in this case a neighbourhood house, based on so many hours of services per month at a negotiated hourly rate of pay. This rate includes the salary and benefits paid to the Special Services worker plus an administrative fee which pays for the salary of the Special Services Coordinator and for other costs of administering the program. The four neighbourhood houses which provide the service in Vancouver all banded together before the current budget year to try to achieve a unit rate of $12.00 per hour. Of this figure, $9.70 was to be paid to the worker. As of this writing, two of the houses being studied have settled with the Ministry, Kiwassa for an effective rate of $12.00/hour and Little Mountain for $11.75. South Van has thus far been unable to negotiate a new budget and it is highly likely that its Special Services Program will be phased out in October 1981.

All people interviewed on this topic said the reason for the variation in the unit rate negotiated was that there are five MHR regions in Vancouver, each of whose regional managers are autonomous. Furthermore, as one person said, the boards of the four houses involved did not pass motions to collectively negotiate a set price and did not agree that should one MHR manager settle below the set price than no house would carry the Special Services Program. Had they done so, in this person's opinion, the outcome might have been different, i.e., South Van may have continued to provide the program despite the apparent recalcitrance of its MHR regional manager. Interestingly enough, the board of the one house that was able to negotiate the $12.00 hourly rate, Kiwassa, made a firm commitment to not

settle for a dime less despite the trepidation of half of its Special Services workers who risked a possible loss of their jobs.

The Homemaker Program is negotiated in a similar manner in that the revenue to its sponsoring agency, i.e. the neighbourhood house, is based on the number of hours of service. The number of hours is based on the number of referrals to the neighbourhood house from the City Health Units which is, in turn, based on the number of assessments done by the Health Units. Long Term Care has told the Units to reduce their referrals. The unit rate negotiated by South Van with Long Term Care is $9.67/hour. Wages paid to the workers vary from $5.00 to $6.50 per hour, exclusive of benefits, depending on the budget submitted and the administrative costs incurred which drop as the number of hours increases. The number of hours negotiated is the issue because it determines the budget level. For example, South Van would ideally like about 4,100 hours a month, which they asked for. They received budget clearance for 3,900 hours.

Board Functions

The literature highlights the importance of volunteer participation in the directing and programming of neighbourhood houses. There are significant variations in the definition and roles of and the importance placed on volunteers. Some houses define a volunteer as someone who does something for nothing; others consider that a person who receives an honorarium or a small fee is a volunteer. Some houses make heavy use of volunteers; others scarcely use them. For example, Cedar Cottage's Handicapped Program could quite literally not continue without the large number of volunteers needed for one-to-one work with each participant. At the opposite extreme, Kiwassa scarcely makes use of volunteers due to an almost unstated view that the high quality of its programs would suffer. Some of the houses have UBC student interns who often become involved in

programming on a staff level yet they are not paid. Are they volunteers or are they simply fulfilling course obligations or both?

There is one type of volunteer which all neighbourhood houses share, however, and that is the person who serves on the Board of Directors. To determine whether or not volunteers play important roles in the four neighbourhood houses studied it was decided to focus on the board members - who they are, how they came to be involved with their neighbourhood house, what they perceive they do, what they actually do, and how they get along with their Director. Board and staff members were asked questions concerning the composition of their respective boards, the type of decisons boards made, what each thought was the role of the board, and how each characterized the interrelationship between and the relative roles of the house Director and its Board. Below are the responses presented by neighbourhood house.

Cedar Cottage

As of September 1981 there were fifteen people on the Cedar Cottage Board of Management. Cedar Cottage is unique in that all of its Board members have been or are involved in at least one of the house's programs and events and all live in the Cedar Cottage community. Nearly all have put in extensive hours volunteering at the neighbourhood house beyond their contribution as board members. For example, one person cooks for social and fund-raising events, one organized weekend furniture making sessions at the house, and another, who was the first police officer assigned to the Community Police Team office located in the house, used to take neighbourhood children on weekend hiking trips. Some drive both seniors and children.

As to their role members of the board tended to view themselves as giving advice and direction to staff in their capacity as community residents familiar with

local needs. They see themselves as supporting staff in efforts to respond to those needs. Members of other neighbourhood house boards placed more emphasis on their policy and decision-making roles while Cedar Cottage board members stressed their responsiblity to represent the community and be a liaison between it and the neighbourhood house. Several Cedar Cottage board members said they had the responsibility of trying to involve new people in neighbourhood house programs and activities. Members of other boards seemed much more conversant with their house's budget and its policy issues but board members at Cedar Cottage knew more about the actual programs offered.

Although all Cedar Cottage board members were very complimentary about neighbourhood house staff and programming three said they felt the Board, itself, was weak. One was of the opinion that board members neither kept themselves informed nor were informed sufficiently to make good decisions. Interestingly enough, although several staff members mentioned an annual board/staff workshop to discuss neighbourhood house goals and projects none of the board members mentioned this workshop. Some people felt the Cedar Cottage Board was a strong one that made its own decision and was in no way a "rubber stamp" body. Others felt it was not that strong, should be more dynamic, and should seek more influence on and involvement in decisions concerning neighbourhood house policy and programming.

South Vancouver

As of October 1980, there were nineteen people on the Board of Directors at South Vancouver Neighbourhood House. Many live in the area; of those who do not most did at one time. At least four of them were involved with the Fraserview Area Society before it became the Neighbourhood House in 1977. Most do not participate in house activities with a few significant exceptions. One was

instrumental in establishing the Parents and Tots group which meets twice a week at the house. Another always volunteers to work on preparation for special events. Yet another is a faithful volunteer at the Senior Activity Days and is President of the Friendship Club which raises funds for seniors activities. One of the youngest members continues to do odd jobs around the house as he has done for the past few years.

As to the role performed this by this Board, members saw themselves as setting broad goals and policy for the daily operation of the neighbourhood house, making budget, funding and programming decisions giving direction and supervision to the staff, acting as a liaison between the community and the staff in order that house programs and activities reflect community needs and interests, and generally overseeing house affairs. Both staff and board members make a concerted effort to recruit people to serve on the board who are knowlegeable about the area and who possess professional skills that enable them to understand and make a contribution to its operation. Among the occupations represented on the board are two lawyers, a teacher, a business manager, a life insurance company president, a contractor, a bus driver, a chemical engineer, a banker and an accountant. In addition, a serious and successful effort is being made to recruit people of varying ages, ethnic backgrounds and income levels. There are currently people representing two of the community's three housing projects.

Several board members mentioned that the board was conversant with house finances. Indeed, this seems to be the case as most knew the size of the budget. As one board member said with a staff approaching eighty and a budget well over half a million dollars, (now over one million), the Board should be active, concerned and skilled so that the neighbourhood house is run like a business. In fact, many said that keeping track of house finances was the main board function. Particularly well informed on nearly every aspect of the functioning of the neighbourhood house is the President who goes into the house several times a week. To

paraphrase him, no program is undertaken or major decision made without having been thoroughly discussed and voted on by the board.

Kiwassa

The Board of Directors of Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services had nineteen members as of October 1980. Of these nineteen only four live in the neighbourhood while one other person lives in nearby Grandview-Woodland and almost none participate in house programs or events. The lack of community residents on the board makes Kiwassa an anomaly among Vancouver neighbourhood houses. However, there are historic reasons for this development. As mentioned in Chapter Three, Kiwassa started as a volunteer project of the Kiwassa Club, the women's branch of the Kiwanis. Ties with Kiwassa have remained strong and there are two Club members on the house's board. The Club continues to donate an annual $5,000 to Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services which is a small amount compared with Kiwassa's overall budget, but represents a considerable effort for the women of the Club and is a warmly appreciated donation.

Another reason for the lack of local residents on the board is the preponderance of Kiwassa's programming devoted to after school programs. A tradition of cooperation with these programs on the part of the community's school principals has evolved so that today, to be principal of Seymour, MacDonald, Strathcona, or Britannia schools is to be on the Kiwassa Board. It "comes with the job" as several princi-als said. Those transferred to other schools outside the area before their board terms expire have, for the most part, become so involved at Kiwassa that they stay on as in the case of the current President, Past President and Vice-President. The board's Treasurer was the manager of the Royal Bank's first Community Branch on Hastings Street and Kiwassa was one of about fifteen local agencies who snatched him up because of his facility with budgets and

computerized accounting systems. He continues to serve as Treasurer even though he has since had a job transfer to a branch on the North Shore. As an independent neighbourhood house which cannot rely on NSA to do its accounting and payroll Kiwassa finds this person invaluable.

Kiwassa's four local Board members are all active in other local organizations including the Strathcona Community Centre, SeTaCoNa, the NIP Planning Committee, and others. One of them is largely responsible for the Hear! Hear! program.

Despite the skills and interest of current members and the long-time association with the house of many, nearly all want to have more community residents and parents of program participants on the board. A couple of people in particular felt strongly that there were too many outsiders making policy decisions affecting community residents. A very real effort is being made toward this end with the result that two board members just beginning their terms are parents of children in the Hear! Hear! and Pre-School Programs, respectively. It has long been difficult to attract local residents to serve on the Kiwassa Board. There are a large number of agencies in the community and a small population of residents on which to draw. Many of these residents have low incomes and therefore have little time or energy left to do volunteer work when working just to feed their families takes up so much. Recruitment of more local residents to the board remains a stated priority at Kiwassa.

The consensus of Kiwassa board members was that their main responsibilities were to manage the house finances and to make all major and many minor policy decisions. Regarding its role to represent the community, all admitted that the board was weakened in this regard by the lack of resident board members. Some felt that there was a real danger that the board could become patronizing and non-accountable to the neighbourhood, if this situation continued, and a couple felt this was already the case.

An indication of both the seriousness with which the board takes its financial responsibilities and the regard it has for Kiwassa staff is its policy and commitment to bring staff salaries up to comparable levels paid for similar work elsewhere. There has been a 40% increase in staff salaries in the past two years with no attendant cutback in services provided.

Little Mountain

Fifteen people served on the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House Board of Directors as of October·1980. Of these fifteen, all but two live in the neighbourhood. Most were members of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program Committee, a committee of local residents who worked with Vancouver City Planning staff to determine how nearly two million dollars should be spent in the community. Four joined the NIP Committee specifically to make the neighbourhood house a reality. Three of them had been on the Little Mountain Community Resources Advisory Board when it existed. Two others had belonged to the Riley Park Area Council, started up by NSA's Community Development Department which was active in the early 1970's. Another member had been on the Board of the Riley Park Community Centre, and yet another was instrumental in getting the Thunderbird Neighbourhood Centre for native families underway. Most of the other board members have a history of community and volunteer involvement. Obtaining a neighbourhood house for their community was a goal for many and most current members have worked to bring it about.

Some of the board members were recruited or are valuable because of their professional talents. The Chairman is a social worker. Another member is a local business man and another has a business downtown. Both of these people have considerable organizational experience and are skilled parliamentarians. Another has had considerable experience as a volunteer manager and bookkeeper for⁻

government grant projects. Yet another, who has since had to resign due to work pressures, is a lawyer and was deliberately sought as such. Generally speaking, the Little Mountain board and staff have deliberately not chosen to seek professionals living outside the community to serve on the board although this practice may change in the future. Recently, two new board members were elected, one of whom is involved in the Mainstream group. The other lives in the housing project.

Regarding the functions of the Little Mountain Board, members mentioned that making fiscal, budget, policy and programming decisions were their most important functions. Two mentioned attending on behalf of the neighbourhood house a workshop on Accounting Practices for Non-Profit Organizations held at Simon Fraser.[3] Because Little Mountain is such a recently established neighbourhood house board members have also been involved in drafting a Constitution, writing a statement of goals for the house, and establishing personnel practices for its staff. However, as many noted, the board is initiating less and reacting more as the neighbourhood house grows and more of its functioning becomes routine. Some members are taking a bit of well-deserved rest from the tremendous amount of work necessary to keep the house functioning in its early days. Consequently, more program suggestions are now initiated by staff. For example, it was initial policy to offer only those programs which had expressly been asked for by community residents. However, discussion on whether or not Little Mountain should become involved in the Ministry of Human Resources Special Services to Children program was initiated by staff. The final decision was, of course, made by the board.

Board/Director Relations

Board members were unanimously complimentary of the administrative abilities, the initiative and the dedication of their respective directors. Many mentioned the breadth of knowledge of the neighbourhood each director has. Some

mentioned the skill of the directors in obtaining money for house programs and the value of their political connections.

However, although nearly every board member felt the directors worked closely with their boards, the style of this working relationship varies considerably among houses. For example, one director will not, even when pressed, indicate an opinion or recommendation concerning an issue. The house for which this person is the director made a very important policy decision in mid-1980, and again this year. More than half the board members were not sure, even months after the first decision, what was the director's recommendation on the matter. This director's attitude is that his recommendation is immaterial. If a strong divergance of opinion exits between board and director, than the latter should resign. He clearly views the board as his boss and stressed that it would be inappropriate for the board to bend to the wishes of the director on important policy matters and, indeed, on any matters.

In another house the director is trusted to make decisions, some of which are not referred to the board, which are in the best interests of the neighbourhood house. One board member at this house observed that it was easy for the director to present information in such a way as to get the decision he wants. This person did not mean this as a criticism. The director, himself, felt that at one time he was leading discussion too much but that this was now less of a problem because present board members discuss and question more.

Perceptions of House Strengths and Weaknesses

It is not enough to examine the nature of programs and services offered by each neighbourhood house. It is also necessary to review board and staff member conceptions of the strenths and weaknesses of each house as this will provide further clues to the nature of the work done by each house.

Board board and staff members were asked what, in their opinion, their neighbourhood house did particularly well, what they took special pride in from their association with the house. Conversely, they were asked what was not working as effectively as it could, what needed to be improved and what was not being done that should be. Below are the responses organized by neighbourhood house.

Cedar Cottage

When asked what Cedar Cottage did well, all board and staff members mentioned the excellence of the programs, the dedication of the staff, the cooperation between the board and staff, and the homey, friendly and casual atmosphere of the neighbourhood house as its greatest strengths. Many mentioned specific programs. A few noted that Cedar Cottage is very successful in attracting people from different ethnic backgrounds to participate in house programs. As one board member put it, "there are no minority groups here." Several mentioned the value of the preventive work Cedar Cottage does. As one member said, the neighbourhood house sees people before they become statistics. For example, the presence of the Community Team Police in the neighbourhood house buildings helps deter juvenile crime as does the Leadership Program. Staff were particularly proud of the key role played by Cedar Cottage in fostering inter-agency communication through its chairing of the Area Service Team and its involvement in the Kingsway Management Committee.

Isolated but strongly felt concerns included the following: the need to have more people on staff who could speak languages other than English; the opinion that the neighbourhood house should involve itself more in working to improve the neighbourhood's physical facilities now that the City Planning Department sponsored capital improvement programs are winding down; and the desire to have more communication between neighbourhood houses such as occurred at the recent

NSA organized and sponsored workshop on October 5, 1980 which involved NSA neighbourhood house staff and Board of Management members in disucssion groups with members of the NSA Board of Governors.

It was clear that Cedar Cottage board and staff members are generally pleased with house direction and priorities as a social work agency. Criticisms were confined to the wish that existing programs could be expanded to reach more people, not altered in their approach or basic assumptions. Furthermore, there is consensus among staff and board members as to appropriate future directions. There surfaced some frustration with being at the mercy of government funding policies. As reviewed above, the provincial government provides the vast majority of neighbourhood house funding. This frustration focused on the extent of programming allowed under existing levels of funding, not on its type.

South Vancouver

At South Van, the accomplishment which everyone is particuarly proud of is the rapid growth of and the great variety of programming and activity at the neighborhood house. Specific house virtues mentioned included its agressiveness, initiative and independence. When asked what neighbourhood house accomplishments were particularly noteworthy board members tended to list various programs and services. One credits the multicultural programming with helping to alleviate further outbreaks of violence toward and harassment of East Indian community residents as occurred in the mid 1970's. Southtown was spoken of as being an excellent way to reduce delinquency among teens and to help them to find their way. The Seniors Program was felt to be the most active and the longest running in the City. These three programs all help respond to what one board member termed, the neighbourhood's most pressing problems - the treatment of and

attitude toward the elderly, racism, and juvenile delinquency. Staff members also mentioned the cooperation of neighbourhood agencies with each other.

Both board and staff members mentioned that South Vancouver is very firm in its negotiations with government agencies over contract services. As one board member put it, the neighbourhood house refuses to be cowed by the demands of funding agencies if they are thought to be unreasonable, even if this means losing the funding which, incidentally, may happen as of October 1981 with the Special Services Program as outlined above. The large and increasing number of volunteers is a source of pride for all.

Areas of concern mentioned by both staff and board members at South Vancouver include the rapid growth of the neighbourhood house, the need for more volunteers, the house's dependence on government funding, the desirability of having more simply social programs and events, the wish for more resident initiated programs, and the need for more space.

The rapid growth of the neighbourhood house's programs, staff and budget is both a source of pride and a source of concern. To paraphrase a staff member, the growth has occurred without the benefit of much foresight. It was generally agreed that it was time to stop "flying by the seat of the pants" and to start developing overall goals so as not to lose sight of what both staff and Board members want the neighbourhood house to be, i.e. a focus for community social life and community improvement efforts, not only a provider of services to target groups, as important as that is.

More than half the people interviewed mentioned a need to increase the already large number of volunteers at the neighbourhood house. Board members were more concerned about their numbers and what they could do whereas staff, fittingly, were more concerned with how to bring about an increase. Staff generally agreed that a stronger, more systematic volunteer program right through from recruitment to training to placement to evaluation was indicated. Staff were

particuarly concerned that volunteers become more involved in the actual programming, e.g. initiating and running programs, as opposed to helping out with existing programs or special events.

Another area of concern to many is the house's dependence on government funding. Much of its rapid growth is accounted for by the number of government funded contractual services, e.g. the Special Services to Children program. This concern ranges from a philosophical objection to the neighbourhood house having to scrounge funds for social services which it is felt the government should automatically pay for, to the fact that the government only funds programs or services for people with specific problems, not those for "normal" people. It is also felt that the government will not fund programs of a preventive nature. Perhaps the most frustrating example of this for South Vancouver was their inability for a time to find a permanent source of funding for their worker in charge of ethnic programming, especially that involving East Indian families, despite the fact that the south Vancouver community is close to three-fourths non-white. The neighbourhood house would like to have an independent source of funding and is working hard to develop projects that will generate revenue which it can spend as the board sees fit, as well as provide employment and training opportunities for local residents. The Samosa Project is an example of efforts in this direction.

Several people mentioned that they would like the neighbourhood house to become more of a social drop-in sort of place, with emphasis on programs such as bridge nights, a coffee shop, a singles club, and the like. Of course, the lack of staff to do the necessary organizing and preparation is the constraint. That is why many want to have more volunteer initiated and run programs. Staff realize that although there are plenty of them around, they are all too busy carrying out specific programs for which funding is already earmarked, to undertake the efforts needed to make the above mentioned programs a reality.

Kiwassa

It is evident that both staff and board members at Kiwassa take considerable pride in the high quality of their programs. Time after time board members mentioned that Kiwassa has the respect of people in the community who make use of its services, of professionals in related fields, and of funding agencies. This pride seems justified as evidenced by the fact that Kiwassa is continually approached to expand its existing services and to take on new ones. Many board members attribute the quality of the services provided at Kiwassa to the competence and extreme dedication of the staff and to the ongoing training and supervision they receive. Most staff members cited the support they give to each other and the autonomy each has as reasons for the quality of their work. Staff members were also very complimentary of the involvement and competence of the board. Another aspect of the functioning of Kiwassa which was frequently mentioned by those interviewed is the leadership role the neighbourhood house plays in both the Area Services Team, which the Director chairs, and SeTaCoNa.

On the critical side nearly everyone mentioned as a weakness the lack of local residents on the board and its preponderance of professionals who either work in the community or used to. Several board members regretted that there was little left for volunteers to do at Kiwassa other than serve on the board. A few said they would like to see more social events held at the neighbourhood house such as the roast for a departing bank manager who is still on the Kiwassa Board.

A couple of board members had more serious criticism of the neighbourhood house. They feel that Kiwassa syphons money away from other community agencies and facilities, specifically Ray Cam, Strathcona Community Centre, McLean Park and the Carnegie Centre. These same people were also concerned by the house's dependence on government grants which, in their view, causes it to back away from taking stands on controversial issues. They felt that the

government was using Kiwassa and other agencies like it to pay less for services which government should provide.

Little Mountain

Foremost among the strengths of Little Mountain mentioned by both board and staff members, is the degree of progress that has been made in such a short time. For example, one person was particularly proud of the fact that United Way had accepted the neighbourhood house as a member agency after only one year of operation. Little Mountain has also won the respect and support of the Ministry of Human Resources and the City Planning and Social Planning departments.

Both staff and board members noted the ability of the neighbourhood house to respond to the small requests and problems people have, the responses to which have an importance to people completely out of proportion to the small amount of time spent on them. Staff are particuarly pleased with the way in which they have been able to respond quickly to people suggestions and requests for specific programs and events, even while operating under an extremely limited budget. The desired function of Little Mountain as an informal gathering place and information clearing-house is already become well established, even in its temporary, cramped quarters. People are continually walking in off the street to make enquiries. Some continue to drop by, many become program participants, and a few have become highly valued volunteers.

As with the other neighbourhood houses, Little Mountain people mentioned specific programs and achievements which they were particularly proud of includ-ing the Day Care Centre, Special Services to Children and the Chat and Chow programs. One person observed that although the Day Care Centre and, to a lesser extent, the Special Services to Children program represent substantial achieve-ments they do not affect people as tangibly in relation to the money spent as do

the very successful neighbourhood clean-up days, the weekly Chat and Chow and the Thanksgiving Dinners. This person felt these events were the heart of the neighbourhood house and corresponded most closely with the Board and staff ideal.

As with all new organizations, Little Mountain has had some growing pains and both board and staff freely acknowledge that there is much room for improvement. The area needing the most work, as mentioned by the greatest number of people interviewed, is the achievement of an appropriate organization structure and style of management. Meetings of the board have tended to be long and unfocused, although this had improved as of October 1980. A great deal of time has been spent on goal and policy formulation at the expense of developing a way of working, lines of reporting, and the formalized aspects of board/staff relations.

Several suggested that the board's Committee structure needed to be modified. Examples of the ways in which it was not working as effectively as it could were the tendency of some Committees to make decisons which are acted upon before discussion and ratification by the board as a whole, the lack of an active programming committee with which staff can work and which might take over some of the programming responsibilities, and the lack of a table officer structure.

Many mentioned the need for additional volunteers and the desirability of more widespread involvement of community residents in programming decisions and policy making for the neighbourhood house. As with South Vancouver, Little Mountain board members see the need for more volunteers as a means of taking some of the load off themselves and the greatly overworked staff and of moving closer to the ideal of community-based and determined programming. Staff, under-standably, had more specific suggestions on how to increase volunteer involvement and participation. These included more systematic recruitment, orientation, training, evaluation, and rewarding of volunteers. Several mentioned that Little

Mountain should improve its public relations activity so as to better inform both Society members and community residents of neighbourhood house programs, events and needs, and to attract more participants and volunteers. The staging of a large event was one suggestion as to how to bring this about. The annual Craft Fair and Market is accomplishing this objective.

Some board members were concerned about duplication of programs offered by the Riley Park Community Centre. Staff were not worried by this trend because they share an attitude held by other neighbourhood house staff that what looks like a recreation program, such as a hockey night, may, in fact, be a vehicle for other work with children such as teaching them how to get along with each other and to work together toward some common ends.

Both staff and board members expressed concern that the ethnic outreach function of the neighbourhood house was taking more time to become established than had been anticipated, partly due to funding difficulties. Consequently, many of the multicultural program splanned simply are not taking place. However, now that Immigrant Services is providing a half-time worker to be based in the new building it is anticipated that multicultural programming efforts will receive a big boost.

There were a few disagreements among the staff as to the future direction for Little Mountain. Some would like to see present social work activities curtailed and more social events, courses and discussion groups held, whereas other would like to move in the direction of the social adjustment groups held at Kiwassa. Still others would like to see the neighbourhood house become the focus of non-partisan political activity aimed at bringing about social change, e.g. changes in government welfare policy or in neighbourhood amenities, services and representation. This seeming lack of agreement could create problems later if not discussed and resolved.

Having presented the interview findings, it is now time to analyze them in light of insights gained from the literature and from individual house histories. Chapter Five will attempt such an analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE

SYNTHESIS

In Chapter One five questions were asked. These are:

- What type of social work and other programs and activities do neighbourhood houses provide?
- What do staff and board members perceive the function of the neighbourhood house to be?
- Do volunteers play a significant role in neighbourhood house operations?
- Have neighbourhood houses departed from their historic roots as both community organization agencies and providers of social work services of the casework and group work type?
- What are the policy implications of the current functioning of neighbourhood houses?

This chapter will attempt to answer these questions by analyzing the interview responses and comparing them with themes running through the literature. Where appropriate the analysis will incorporate insights gained from the historical evolution of neighbourhood houses and of their sponsoring agencies in Vancouver.

House Programming

The first question asks what type of services and programs neighbourhood houses provide and implies that a statement about what type of agency they are will be made. To answer this question a comparison of what those involved in neighbourhood houses think they should be with what they actually do must be made.

The stated purposes of three of the four houses, particularly Kiwassa and Cedar Cottage, emphasize their commitment to the provision of quality social work programs to target groups, e.g. single parents, the handicapped and children at risk. Only one, Little Mountain, places greater importance on the house's role as a sort of organic neighbourhood focal point which residents make use of to organize activites for themselves as opposed to receiving specific social work services that

have been organized and are administered by someone else. In addition, all houses professed a commitment to fostering inter-agency communication and collective action toward commonly agreed upon goals. But only Kiwassa and Little Mountain interviwees went beyond this statement to express the view that an additional focus of house activity should be on enabling community residents to act on their own behalf to initiate, take responsibility for and eventually manage programs and services on their own, be they social, recreational or social work in nature. This is not to say that the other two houses do not have such a focus, simply that it was not explicity stated by most of those interviewed.

Turning now to specific house program and activities, it is clear that the majority of programs at all houses, but most particularly at Cedar Cottage and Kiwassa, are social work in nature. Using the definition of social work supplied by Murray Ross, this means that the bulk of neighbourhood house programs seek to remove impediments to individual growth, to release individual potentialities and to enable people to manage their lives more effectively. This definition is most applicable to the casework and group work streams of social work, the former emphasizing individual personality development, the latter focusing more on social functioning or relating to others. Clearly, most neighbourhood house programs are of the group work type. Furthermore, the programs seem to mirror the evolution of group work highlighted in literature. Whereas group work programs in past years emphasized the place of the person in and his responsibilities to society, they now tend to concentrate on the personal development of an individual in relation to a group.

Community organization, social work's third area, seeks to do one or both of two things. It can seek to improve the quality of social services and to ensure that they are available to those in need of them. It can also seek to enhance the ability of individuals and community groups to work effectively to bring about desired ends. The former places more importance on the achievement of results while the

latter focuses more on process and the development of group efficacy. Community organization which uses both approaches results in the identification of service gaps, the provision of needed services, and the fostering of self-help, volunteerism and the development of group efficacy.

Cedar Cottage and South Vancouver tend to place more importance on identifying service gaps and developing quality programs to fill in these gaps, i.e. achieving results, while Kiwassa and Little Mountain seem to be more interested in helping groups to help themselves. This is not to say that the former houses assume only they can provide quality services and the latter place no importance on results -quite the contrary. To further illustrate the point, when a local school approached Cedar Cottage to establish its own out-of-school day care the house gave it information but ended up ex anding its existing program to meet the school's needs. When Kiwassa was approached to help set up an organization for the parents of deaf children it helped the initial group obtain a grant and gave them advice on how to organize a founding conference; it did not do the organizing for them.

To summarize the above and answer the question neighbourhood houses are predominantly social work agencies which emphasize the provision of high quality programs of the casework and group work type. However, two of them, Kiwassa and Little Mountain, equally emphasize the fostering of community efficacy to develop programs and achieve desired ends. All four do community organization social work but the latter concentrate more on process than on results.

Volunteers

The second question asks whether or not volunteers play an important part in neighbourhood house operations. As stated earlier, it was decided to focus on boards of directors, this being the volunteer group which all houses had in common.

One measure of the importance of the boards was the degree to which they make important decisions, i.e. policy, staffing and budget decisions. Another measure is their knowledge of day to day house operations. Still another indicator is their knowledge of program funding and content. On all counts the Kiwassa Board appears to be the most actively involved and influential in determining house direction. The Cedar Cottage Board seemed the least involved, with South Van and Little Mountain being in the middle of this continuum.

A recent example which illustrates the above point is the contrasting conduct of the boards of Kiwassa and South Van, both of which were faced with the resignation of long-time Directors and the hiring of new ones. South Van staff vetted all the candidates and drew up the short list from which the board made its choice. The only involvement Kiwassa board members allowed their staff was to ask them in very general terms what qualities the Director should have. Otherwise, the board did everything from writing the job ad, to drawing up a list of interview questions, to conducting the interviews, to making the final decision.

Having said all of the above, Cedar Cottage, more than any other house, has the most non-board volunteer involvement in programs whereas Kiwassa has the least. As the literature says, people like to be part of an identifiable, purposive group activity, to be able to create something and follow it through to its conclusion. Why one house fosters tremendous board involvement but next to no other kinds of volunteering, while another house is virtually the polar opposite, and the remaining two with both active boards and relatively large numbers of volunteers is not completely understood.

One reason for this phenomenon might be the lack of staff turnover. The longer the Director and core staff are there the more board members come to trust them and to delegate decision making to them. Furthermore, board members drawn from among the ranks of program participants tend to be self-selecting and "satisfied with the status quo." As one Cedar Cottage board member said, the

Director is Cedar Cottage. Therein lies a problem. Should the Cedar Cottage Director change it is not clear that the present board could run the house on its own. The current Director has been there about twenty years and knows more about the agency than anyone else. This makes for very high quality programs but not, it is submitted, for strong boards. On the other hand, the Kiwassa Director recently resigned, in part, because of the conviction that a person who remains an agency director for more than about five years begins to take things for granted and quite easily slips into the conviction that he ultimately knows what is best for the agency. This is not to imply criticism or support for either approach. It is simply to say that the latter situation will likely lead to a weaker board that tends to agree and identify with the Director. Such a situation tends to result in warm, friendly staff/board relations but does not foster the development of indigenous leaders.

To summarize, volunteer board members are important to the functioning of neighbourhood houses. But their importance is governed, in part, by the length of tenure of the Director and other core staff, by the nature of their past involvement in house activities, and by their perception of the purposes of their board.

House Variance from Historic Functions

Another question to be addressed is whether or not neighbourhood houses in Vancouver have departed from the functions they performed in the past. To answer this question, it is first of all necessary to briefly review just what those functions were. It is also necessary to assess the effects of increasing levels of government funding of neighbourhood houses, but, more importantly, their increasing tendency to provide services through contractual arrangements. Finally, examination of neighbourhood house expenditures not earmarked for a specific

program, i.e. the use they make of their discretionary funds, will help to answer the question.

First of all, the early settlement houses worked to bring about social and legislative reforms in addition to providing direct services. It was felt that while it was important to intervene at the level of the individual to alleviate in whatever small way possible personal distress, loneliness and ineffectiveness, it was also important to attempt to change those conditions which caused this distress and alienation. Moreover, it was important to do so in such a way as to enable the education and nurturing of individuals, working collectively, to bring about such changes with minimal professional intervention.

But as social problems become more complex; as communities become larger, more fragmented and more anonymous; and as publicly funded social work programs increase there is great pressure for agencies, such as neighbourhood houses, to accept and actively seek such funding. It enables them to provide services to people who might not otherwise receive them. Daycare is a good example. Without the provision of government subsidies, some working parents simply could not afford daycare for their children. Ironically, Cedar Cottage covers the shortfall in MHR subsidies with both its own operating money and income from trust accounts. It does so because there is no other agency or government department that will take up the slack.

But what are the effects of increasingly publicly funded social work programs? First of all, programs obtain a relatively secure source of funding provided the agency complies with government regulations. Secondly, services become decentralized and, many would argue, better, because they are more easily adapted to local conditions and because those who deliver them likely have more contact with and accountability to clients. A third result is that the agencies which receive government funding become, themselves, mini but growing bureaucracies. Several Directors mentioned being frustrated by the amount of

time needed to negotiate and administer increasingly large budgets at the expense
of agency planning and community organization work. The Kiwassa Board has
decided two years in a row not to expand because they do not want to create an
empire which loses touch with the community and its ambitions.

Looking at the use neighbourhood houses make of their discretionary money,
i.e. money not designated for a specific program, it becomes apparent that all the
social and community organization work are funded from this source. Tying all of
the above together leads to the following conclusions. Neighbourhood houses do
not need government money to survive. However, some of the services they
provide do. Acceptance of public money to fund social work services can change
the nature of what neighbourhood houses do, not because of any overt control
exercised but because administering these services takes time and energy away
from those activities which have been intrinsic to neighbourhood houses in the past,
namely a balance between provision of services to target groups and community
organization work which enables community residents to act on their own behalf.

To finally answer the question, it is apparent that neighbourhood houses have
departed from their historic roots to the extent that they accept increasing
amounts of money for direct service provision.

Policy Implications

The final question to be addressed are the policy implications inherent in the
current functioning of neighbourhood houses. Should they continue to be funded
either privately or publicly or both? Is a community better off for having a neigh-
bourhood house? On what should their future efforts be focused?

Clearly, neighbourhood houses do much to create a sense of community in
otherwise fragmented urban communities. Some work to develop local leadership.
Although comparative program evaluation and costing were not a part of this thesis

investigation, data obtained from the interviews; the dedication, caliber and low turnover of the staff; and the quality of the programs indicated by their ever increasing participation rates all suggest that neighbourhood house programs are superior to and cheaper than those of a comparable nature provided by the public sector.

However, there are concerns. Increasingly large, publicly provided budgets make for either top-heavy administration (which decentralization tries to avoid) or over-burdened administrators. One solution is to follow the example of Kiwassa which has consciously chosen to curtail the level of its service provision to that deemed manageable and accessible by local residents.

Another is to adopt the stance of Little Mountain and South Van which is basically to bargain collectively with government ministries when negotiating contractual services. Several agencies standing firm for a given unit rate and refusing to provide the service should that rate not be paid is certainly more effective than houses bargaining and settling individually with the government. As one Director noted, the ministries want to provide the services and neighbourhood houses are a logical vehicle through which to do so. In some neighbourhoods, they are the only vehicle. These circumstances, combined with the constituency many houses have created by virtue of the quality and accessibility of their activities, could well combine to give them leverage when negotiating with government.

Neighbourhood houses could possibly make savings on administrative charges for government sponsored services and use these savings for other purposes.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will summarize the conclusions of the thesis, suggest some policy implications, and indicate areas for further research.

The evidence in this thesis shows that neighbourhood houses are social work agencies with casework and group work social work activities dominating their programs. However, two of the houses, in particular, also involve themselves in extensive community organization work.

Volunteer board members play significant roles in the running of all four neighbourhood houses. However, the nature of this role seems to vary according to the length of tenure of the house Director and other core staff, the past or current involvement of individual board members in house programs and activities, and their perceptions of the purpose of a volunteer board. Generally speaking, the longer the house has had the same Director and the more board members are, themselves, program participants, the less significant is the role of the board in making important policy, programming, staffing and budget decisions.

At least two of the four neighbourhood houses studied have departed from the functions of neighbourhood houses of the past, given that past houses, in addition to providing direct services to target groups, also worked to bring about social and legislative reforms that would change those conditions that necessitated the services in the first place. One reason for the increased emphasis on the provision of casework and group work services and programs and the de-emphasis of community organization is the reliance on provincial government funds to provide direct services. Although neighbourhood houses do not need these funds to survive, clearly some of their program do. The acceptance of public money changes the emphasis of neighbourhood house programs, not through the exercise of overt control on the part of the funding ministry, but because administration of these

publicly funded services takes time and energy away from those activities which have been intrinsic to neighbourhood houses of the past, namely community organization work which enables community residents to act on their own behalf.

Turning now to the policy implications of the thesis it seems clear that neighbourhood houses do undertake activities of great value in urban communities. Although comparative progrm evaluation and costing were beyond the scope of the thesis, the data collected from program literature, staff interviews and observations all suggest that programs provided by neighbourhood houses may be both less costly and of a higher quality than comparable ones provided by the public sector.

If neighbourhood houses are to continue to provide services to target groups, then it appears that they should negotiate collectively with the relevant government ministry in order to help ensure that their services are not undervalued. In some communities, neighbourhood houses are the only logical vehicle for service delivery. The desire of the government to make certain services available combined with the constituency the neighbourhood houses have established by virtue of the quality, accessibility and visibility of their programming all combine to give them considerable potential leverage if negotiating collectively with the government on the rates for services provided.

Having said the above, the percentage of neighbourhood house funding which comes from public sources is nonetheless a source of concern as it appears to be deflecting some of the houses from doing long range planning, and community organization work, and engaging in social functions, which are also an important part of their role. Perhaps reliance on grants, as tenuous as they are, miaht be preferable to service contracts with government ministries which result in government regulations and onerous administrative duties.

Areas of further research suggested by this thesis include the following. A rigorous program evaluation comparing a neighbourhood house program with a comparable one provided by either the government or another agency would be

worthwhile. The former comparison would help determine whether or not services which are contracted for by the government to private, decentralized agencies are of better quality than comparable government services. The latter would help establish criteria for program delivery.

One criterion of program effectiveness which could be singled out as an area of separate investigation is the level of community awareness of neighbourhood house activities. An assumption was made above that there is considerable local awareness of neighbourhood houses and their activities. It would be useful to determine whether or not this is the case. It would be more important to determine if neighbourhood house programs and activities are known about by people who either need or want to make use of them. A negative answer to either of these questions has its own policy implications.

Another avenue of enquiry to pursue would be whether or not neighbourhood houses contribute to the development of a political efficacy at the local level. Do they serve as a training ground for potential leaders who then become active in their communities in other capacities? This enquiry examined sketchily the involvement of board members in other organizations. However, a much more exhaustive piece of research might be a useful endeavour to determine whether or not neighbourhood houses help to foster civic responsibility and involvement.

Another question posed at the beginning of this work but not pursued in the research is whether neighbourhood houses are forces of change in a community. Do they foster change or do they contribute to community stability and a maintenance of the status quo? Who goes to the neighbourhood house? Why do they go? Are they changed in some way through their participation in house activities? Is this personal change, if it occurs, a cause of community changes? A user survey structured so as to answer these questions and to determine the level of involvement of program participants in house decision making as it varied from house to house would be an important piece of research.

CHAPTER TWO FOOTNOTES

1. Robert Perlman and Arnold Gurin. Community Organization and Social Planning. New York: John Wiley and Sons and the Council for Social Work Education, 1972. p. 27.

2. Elizabeth A. Ferguson. Social Work: An Introduction. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1963, p. 5.

3. Ibid.; Mary Richmond in; p. 3.

4. Ibid.; Helen Harris Perlman in; p. 7.

5. Ibid.; Swithun Bowers in; p. 7.

6. Andrew Armitage. Social Welfare in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975, p. 1.

7. Ibid., p. 45.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p. 1.

10. Ibid., p. 44.

11. Ibid.

12. Murray Ross. Community Organization: Theory in Principles and Practice. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967, pp. 4-5.

13. Armitage, op.cit.

14. Perlman and Gurin, op.cit.

15. Charles D. Garvin and Fred M. Cox. "A History of Community Organizing Since the Civil War with Special Reference to Oppressed Communities." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979.

16. Ibid., p. 65.

17. Ibid., p. 59.

18. Ross, op. cit., p. 62.

19. Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven. "Notes Towards a Radical Social Work." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975; Brian Wharf. Community Work in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979, p. 264.

20. Armitage, op. cit., p. 1.

20. Peter Leonard. "Towards a Paradigm for Radical Practice." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975, p. 50.

21. Cloward and Piven, op. cit.

22. Armitage, op.cit., p. 13.

23. Ibid.

24. Wharf, op.cit., p. 264.

25. Nina Toren. Social Work: The Case of a Semi-Profession. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1972, pp. 18-19.

26. Ibid.

27. Ferguson, op.cit., p. 9.

28. Ibid.

29. Kenneth D. Benne. "The Current State of Planned Changing in Persons, Groups, Communities and Societies." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

30. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 532.

31. Toren, op. cit.

32. Garvin and Cox, op. cit.
    Toren, op. cit.

33. Benne, op. cit; Samuel A. Culbert. "Consciousness-Raising: A Five Stage Model for Social and Organizational Change". In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

34. Garvin and Cox, op. cit.

35. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit.

36. Jack Rothman. "Part One: Introduction." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979, p. 3.

37. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 18.

38. Cox, op. cit., p. 198.

39. Ross, op. cit., p. 49.

40. Ibid.

41. Garvin and Cox, op. cit.

42. Ferguson, op. cit. p. 562.

43. Robert E. Blake and Jane Srygley Mouton. "Strategies of Consultation." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976, p. 66.

James E. Crowfoot and Mark A. Chesler. "Contemporary Perspectives on Planned Social Change: A Comparison." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
Perlman and Gurin, op. cit.
Ross, op. cit., p. 23.

44. Jack Rothman. "Part One: Overview: Introduction." In Strategies of Community Organization. Edited by Fred M. Cox et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979, p. 4.

45. Wharf, op. cit., pp. 243-248.

46. Rothman prefers the word locality development because it highlights that there is a geographic base to this kind of community organization. But he acknowledges the term community development whch will be used throughout the remainder of this paper as it is far more familiar to practitioners and writers alike.

47. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 60.

48. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 561.

49. Ibid., p. 565.

50. Rothman, (a), op. cit.

51. A community can be either a geographic entity or people united around a common interest or condition.

52. William W. Biddel and Loureide Biddle. "Intention and Outcome." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. p. 354; Robert R. Chin and Kenneth D. Benne. "Some General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 22-45; Ross, op. cit; Wharf, op. cit., p. 270.

53. Rothman, (a), op. cit.; Jack Rothman (b) "Three Models of Community Organization Practice. Their Mixing and Phasing." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et.al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979, pp. 25-45.

54. Cloward and Piven, op. cit.

55. Marjorie Mayo. "Community Development: A Radical Alternative." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975. pp. .

56. Rothman, op. cit., (b).

57. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

58. Armand Lauffer. "Social Planning in the United States: An Overview and Some Predictions." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. p. 295.

59. Rothman, op. cit. (b)

60. Armitage. op. cit.

61. Chin and Benne, op. cit.

62. Crowfoot and Chesler, op. cit.

63. Cloward and Piven, op. cit.; Lauffer, op. cit., p. 298.

64. Lauffer, op. cit., p. 298.

65. Rothman, op. cit. (a) and (b)

66. Chin and Benne, op. cit.

67. Crowfoot and Chesler, op. cit.

68. Kenneth Benne, Warren G. Bennis and Robert Chin. "Planned Change in America". In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Ed. by Warren G. Bennis et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976; Howard Buchbinder. "Community Control: General Remarks." in Participatory Democracy for Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books, Our Generation Press, 1971. pp. 59-77; Gerry Hunnius, "Strategies for Change: Problems and Possibilities". In Participatory Democracy for Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books, Our Generation Press, 1971, pp. 73-76. Joan Kuyek. "Community Control." In Patricipatory Democracy for Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books, Our Generation Press, 1971. pp. 59-77.

69. Neil Gilbert and Joseph W. Eaton. "Who Speaks for the Poor?" In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et. al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976, pp. 245-251.

70. Lisa Peattie. "Drama and Advocacy Planning." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis. et.al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976, pp. 251-259.

71. Donald Keating. The Power to Make It Happen. Toronto: Green Tree Publishing Company, 1975.

72. Warren C. Haggstrom, "The Tactics of Organization Building." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979, pp. 446-461.

73 Wharf, op. cit. pp. 260-261; 270.

74. Ibid., pp. 257-259.

75. Ibid., p. 259.

76. Ibid., p. 257.

77. Irving A Spergel. "Organizing the Local Community: The Social Stability Approach." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 391-400.

78. Haggstrom, op. cit.

79. Yeheskel Hasenfeld. "Program Development." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1976. pp. 138-159; p. 138.

80. Armitage, op. cit.

81. Rothman, op. cit. (a) p. 15.

82. Wharf, op. cit., p. 267.

83. Armitage, op. cit., p. 49.

84. Ibid.

85. Fred M. Cox. "Introduction to Part Two: Arenas." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. p. 197.

86. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 2.

87. Armitage, op. cit.

88. Ferguson, op. cit.

89. Wharf, op. cit.

90. Armitage, op. cit.

91. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 2.

92. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., pp. 161-162.

93. Ibid.

94. Ferguson, op. cit.

95. Armitage, op. cit.

96. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit.

97. Armitage, op. cit., p. 48.

98. Harleigh B. Trecker, Citizen Boards at Work: New Challenges to Effective Action. New York: Association Press, 1970, p. 48.

99. Ibid., p. 213.

100. Armitage, op. cit., p. 161; Mayo op. cit.; Wharf, op. cit.

101. Lauffer, op. cit., pp.298-299.

102. Ibid.

103. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 76.

104. Douglas Barr. "The Regent Park Community Services Unit: Partnership Can Work." In Community Work in Canada. Edited by Brian Wharf. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979. p. 40.

105. Keating, op. cit., pp. 223-224.

106. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 167.

107. David Morris and Karl Hess. Neighbourhood Power: The New Localism. Institute for Policy Study Series. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1975.

108. William J. Sahlein. A Neighbourhood Solution to the Social Services Dilemma. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, 1973.

109. Trecker, op. cit., p. 272.

110. Wharf, op. cit., p. 261.

111. Armitage, op. cit.

112. Vancouver Sun, August 22, 1981.

113. Ruby Sills Miller. "The Future of Voluntary Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974.

114. Abraham Maslow. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

115. David Hortan Smith. "Research and Communication Needs in Voluntary Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974, p. 180.

116. Miller, op. cit., pp. 188-190.

117. Ibid., pp. 191-192.

118. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., P. 76.

119. Hilda Hubbell. "The Meaning of Planning in Community Organization." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974. p. 89; Trecker, op. cit., p. 181.

120. Perlman and Gurin, op. cit.

121. Ibid., pp. 90-92.

122. Ibid, p. 92.

123. Smith, op. cit., p. 180.

124. Ferguson, op. cit.

125. Armitage, op. cit.; Miller, op. cit.

126. John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. "Opportunities for Voluntary Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974; Armand Lauffer and Sarah Gorodezky. Volunteers. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1977.

127. Cull and Hardy, op. cit., p. 15.

128. Armitage, op. cit., p. 55.

129. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 568; Trecker, op. cit.

130. Ibid.

131. Miller, op. cit.

132. Trecker, op. cit., p. 17.

133. Ibid., p. 181.

134. Ibid., p. 21; pp. 36-37.

135. Ibid., p. 171.

136. Ibid.

137. Ibid.

138. Smith, op. cit., p. 180.

139. Trecker, op. cit., p. 180.

140. Ibid, p. 251.

CHAPTER THREE FOOTNOTES

1. Judith Ann Trolander. Settlement Houses and the Great Depression. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975, p. 18.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 20.

4. Ibid., p. 25.

5. Ibid., pp. 26-28.

6. Ibid., p. 29.

7. Harold R. Johnson and John E. Tropman. "The Settings of Community Organization Practice". In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et.al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979.

8. Charles D. Garvin and Fred M. Cox. "A History of Community Organizing Since the Civil War with Special Reference to Oppressed Communities". In Strategies of Community Orginazation. 5rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et al. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979, p. 50.

9. Ibid., pp. 49-50.

10. Ibid., p. 50.

11. Ibid., p. 64.

12. Ibid., pp. 53-54.

13. Robert Perlman and Arnold Gurin. Community Organization and Social Planning. New York: John Wiley and Sons and The Council for Social Work Education, 1972, p. 27.

14. Ibid.

15. Garvin and Cox, op. cit., Perlman and Gurin, op. cit.

16. Garvin and Cox, op. cit., p. 54; Perlman and Gurin, op. cit., p. 27; Paul Rutherford. Saving the Canadian City: The First Phase 1880-1920. Series on the Social History of Canada, Michael Bliss, ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

17. Garvin and Cox, op. cit., p. 54.

18. Johnson and Tropman, op. cit., p. 220.

19. Trolander, op. cit., p. 26.

20. Ibid., pp. 26-27.

21. Ibid., p. 29.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 30.

24. United Way. Annual Report 1979-1980.

25. The information on the Alexandra Community Activities Society, the Alexandra Neighbourhood Services Association, the Neighbourhood Services Association, the United Way social planners and the NSA Community Development Department was obtained from from a May, 1980 interview with Elmer Helm, Executive Director of NSA except where noted otherwise.

26. Brian Wharf, ed. Community Work in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979, p. 53.

27. Ibid., pp. 53-54.

28. Neighbourhood Services Association. Annual Report 1979-1980.

29. National Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centers. Standards for Neighbourhood Centers. new York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centres, 1973.
1979-1980 Annual Report of the Neighbourhood Services Association.

30. Garvin and Cox, op. cit., p. 61.

31. The information on the history of United Way was obtained from their 1979-1980 Annual Report unless otherwise noted. This "50th Anniversary" report contains a fairly extensive history of United Way and of social services in Vancouver.

32. The history of Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Services was assembled through interviews with the Director and other staff and board members, and from reading a 1962 paper by a Sociology and Anthropology student and material prepared by the neighbourhood house.

33. Pat Buckley. "The Expanding Role of Cedar Cottage Social Agency as it Attempts to Meet Some Social Needs of this Urban Area." Unpublished paper. March 1962, p. 20.

34. The information on the history of the South Vancouver Neighbourhood House comes from interviews with house staff and board members.

35. The history of Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services was gathered in discussions with its Executive Director, another staff person, three Board members and an explanation on the back of stationery showing the old firehall building in which it used to operate.

36. The history of the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House was gathered from discussions with a Board member and local planners, a 1979 Report to the Council, a United Community Services of Greater Vancouver report on the Area Development Project, and the author's personal experience in the Riley Park community as coordinator of a social needs survey and observer of the NIP planning.

37. Minutes of a May, 1979 special meeting of the NSA Board of Governors at which representatives of Little Mountain Neighbourhood House and United Way were present.

CHAPTER FOUR FOOTNOTES

1. The Canada Community Development project grants are funded by the Federal Employment and Immigration Department as part of the International Year of Disabled Persons. To quote from a September 22, 1981 ad in the Vancouver Sun

   > The Canada Community Development Projects program is designed to support local organizations in the development and management of activities that will create employment opportunities in specific, identified types of activity generally supportive of broader national priorities such as:
   >
   > - energy conservation
   > - fisheries
   > - tourism development
   > - community restoration and development
   > - environmental conservation and reclamation
   > - development of local resources
   > - non-profit housing and rehabilitation
   > - native employment.

2. A samosa is a blend of vegetables and spices which is wrapped in a thin pastry and lightly fried until crisp.

3. This workshop was attended primarily by non-profit agency staff who said their Boards were neither interested in nor competent enough to handle the intricacies of agency finances. These Boards tended to simply "rubber stamp" financial recommendations of the staff, a situation with which staff present were not comfortable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armitage, Andrew. Social Welfare in Canada: Ideals and Realities. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.

Barr, Douglas. "The Regent Park Community Services Unit: Partnership Can Work." In Community Work in Canada. Edited by Brian Wharf. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979. pp. 27-49.

Benne, Kenneth D. "The Current State of Planned Changing in Persons, Groups, Communities and Societies." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis et.al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 68-83

Benne, Kenneth, Bennis, Warren G. and Chin, Robert. "Planned Change in America." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 13-22.

Biddle, William W. and Biddle Loureide J. "Intention and Outcome." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 365-375.

Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, Jane Srygley. "Strategies of Consultation." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 48-68.

Buchbinder, Howard. "Community Control: General Remarks." In Participatory Democracy for Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books: Our Generation Press, 1971. pp. 50-53.

Buckley, Pat. "The Expanded Role of Cedar Cottage Social Agency at it Attempts to Meet Some Social Needs of this Urban Area." Unpublished paper. March 1962.

Chin, Robert R. and Benne, Kenneth D. "General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 22-45.

Cloward, Richard A. and Piven, Frances Fox. "Notes Towards a Radical Social Work." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975. pp. vii-xviii.

Cox, Fred M. "Introduction to Part Two: Arenas." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman, Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 195-211.

Crowfoot, James E. and Chesler, Mark A. "Contemporary Perspectives on Planned Social Change: A Comparison." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 108-204.

Culbert, Samuel R. "Consciousness Raising: A Five Stage Model for Social and Organizational Change." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 231-244.

Cull, John G. and Hardy, Richard E. "Opportunities for Voluntary Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974. pp. 5-15.

Ferguson, Elizabeth A. Social Work: An Introduction. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1963.

Garvin, Charles D. and Cox, Fred M. "A History of Community Organizing Since the Civil War with Special Reference to Oppressed Communities." IN Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 45-75.

Gilbert, Neil and Eaton, Joseph W. "Who Speaks for the Poor?" In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 245-251.

Haggstrom, Warren C. "The Tactics of Organization Building." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 446-461.

Hansenfeld, Yeheskel. "Program Development." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 138-159.

Hubbell, Hilda. "The Meaning of Planning in Community Organization." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Porfession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974. pp. 76-90.

Hunnius, Gerry. "Strategies for Change: Problems and Possibilities." In Participatory Democracy in Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books: Our Generation Press, 1971. pp.- 83-87.

Johnson, Harold R. and Tropman, John E. "The Settings of Community Organization Practice." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 213-223.

Keating, Donald. The Power to Make it Happen. Toronto: Green Tree Publishing Company, 1975.

Kuyek, Joan. "Community Control. In Participatory Democracy in Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books: Our Generation Press, 1971. pp. 78-82.

Lauffer, Armand. "Social Planning in the United States: An Overview and Some Predictions." In Stategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 292-305.

Lauffer, Armand and Gorodezky, Sarah. Volunteers. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1977.

Leonard, Peter. "Towards a Paradigm for Radical Practice." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975. pp. 46-61.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Mayo, Marjorie. "Community Development: A Radical Alternative." In Radical Social Work. Edited by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975. pp. 129-143.

Miller, Ruby Sills. "The Future of Volunteeer Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974. pp 187-192.

Morris, David and Hess, Karl. Neighbourhood Power: The New Localism. Institute for Policy Study Series. Boston, Massachussets: Beacon Press, 1975.

National Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centers. Standards for Neighbourhood Centers. New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centers, 1973.

Peattie, Lisa R. "Drama and Advocacy Planning." In The Planning of Change. 3rd ed. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin and Kenneth E. Corey. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976. pp. 251-259.

Perlman, Robert and Gurin, Arnold. Community Organization and Social Planning. New York: John Wiley and Sons and the Council for Social Work Education, 1972.

Repo, Marjalena. "The Fallacy of Community Control." In Participatory Democracy for Canada. Edited by Gerry Hunnius. Montreal: Black Rose Books: Our Generation Press, 1971. pp.59-77.

Ross, Murray G. Community Oraanization: Theory, Principles and Practice. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.

Rothman, Jack. "Part One: Overview: Introduction." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 3-22.

Rothman, Jack. "Three Models of Community Organization Practice, Their Mixing and Phasing." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman and John E. Tropman, Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 25-45

Rutherford, Paul, ed. Saving the Canadian City: The First Phase 1880 - 1920. Series on the Social History of Canada, Michael Bliss, ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Sahlein, William J. A Neighbourhood Solution to the Social Services Dilemma. Lexington, Massachussets: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, 1973.

Selander, Audrey; Mitchell, Maraaret; and Purdy, Douglas. "The Red Door: A Report on Neighbourhood Services". Area Development Project. United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area. June 1968.

Smith, David Horton. "Research and Communication Needs in Voluntary Action." In Volunteerism: An Emerging Profession. Edited by John G. Cull and Richard E. Hardy. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1974. pp. 111-188.

Spergel, Irving A. "Organizing the Local Community: The Social-Stability Approach." In Strategies of Community Organization. 3rd ed. Edited by Fred M. Co, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979. pp. 391-400.

Toren, Nina. Social Work: The Case of a Semi-Profession. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1972.

Trecker, Harleigh B. Citizen Boards at Work: New Challenges to Effective Action. New York: Association Press, 1970.

Trolander, Judith Ann. Settlement Houses and the Great Depression. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975.

Wharf, Brian, ed. Community Work in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.

OTHER SOURCES

Annual Reports of the Neighbourhood Services Association
   1979-1980
   1978-1979
   1977-1978

Annual Report of the United Way of the Lower Mainland, 1979.

Pamphlet on the Alexandra Foundation, no date. Put out by the Neighbourhood
   Services Association.

Minutes of the meetings of the NSA Board of Governors from January 1979 to
   October 1980.

Minutes of the meetings of the Little Mountain Board of Directors from January
   1979 to October 1980.

Minutes of the meetings of the Kiwassa Board of Directors from January 1977 to
   October 1980.

Minutes of the Cedar Cottage Board of Management from January 1978 to October
   1980.

Interviews with:
   Executive Director of Neighbourhood Services Association
   Assistant to the Executive Director of NSA
   Deputy Director for Agency Operations, United Way of the Lower Mainland
   Director of the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House
   5 coordinating staff at Little Mountain
   14 members of the Little Mountain Board of Directors
   Director of the South Vancouver Neighbourhood House
   7 coordinating staff at South Vancouver
   12 members of the South Vancouver Board of Directors
   Director of Kiwassa Neighbourhood Services
   7 coordinating staff at Kiwassa
   18 members of the Kiwassa Board of Directors
   Director of Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Services
   5 coordinating staff at Cedar Cottage
   10 members of the Board of Management of Cedar Cottage
   President of the Canadian Association of Neighbourhood Services

Program and miscellaneous literature from each of the four neighbourhood houses.

Report to Council of September 1978 on The Little Mountain Neighbourhood House

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
FOR
NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE DIRECTORS

Introduction:

My name is Sarah Mellor and I am currently finishing a Masters thesis at the UBC Planning School. I am looking at whether or not there are differences in the organizational structure and volunteer recruitment between those neighbourhood houses which are members of the Neighbourhood Services Association and those which belong directly to the United Way. I would greatly appreciate your answering the following questions and I thank you in advance for your time.

I will also be talking to the Directors, other staff, Board members and some other volunteers at this and at three other neighbourhood houses in Vancouver.

Incidentally, if anything I ask you is written down somewhere please refer me to it and I will save you time.

I'd like to start by asking you some questions about the Board of Directors here and about some of the other volunteers.

1) How are Board members recruited?

2) What is the composition of the Board? Who do Board members tend to be? long-time residents of the area? program participants? professionals in the social services field? business people?

3) How often does the Board meet?

4) What sorts of items frequently appear on their agendas? Who sets the agendas?

5) Is the Board broken down into Sub-Committees? If so, what are they, what is their function and how often do they meet?

6) Are Sub-Committees expected to give policy direction or clarification or do they more often implement Board decisions or work on special projects?

7) Is the Board called upon to make policy decisions and indicate future directions for the neighbourhood house or does it tend to hear progress reports of the day-to-day functioning of the neighbourhood house?

8) How closely do you work with the Board? What items would you tend to discuss with Board members and what items do you usually discuss with staff?

9) Do Board members and staff ever seriously disagree on something? If so, would you say this happened frequently, occasionally, or hardly ever? Would you give me some recent examples and tell me how the disagreement was resolved?

10) How do you define a volunteer?

11) About how many volunteers are there at the neighbourhood house, not including Board members? About how many hours do they put in a month? I understand that all neighbourhood houses put in three year reports to the United Way which cover, among other things, the number of volunteers and their hours of service. Maybe I should just look at this.

12) What sort of things do volunteers do? Do any lead programs or supervise others?

13) Are volunteers an important part of the activities of the neighbourhood house or could it function effectively with the existing staff?

14) What is the approximate ratio of volunteers to staff? How has this changed over the years?

15) How does the neighbourhood house recruit volunteers?

16) Are there job descriptions for volunteers?

17) Are potential volunteers screened?

18) Is there any kind of training program or orientation for volunteers?

19) Is the work of volunteers evaluated in any way? If so, how is this done?

20) Are there CIP, VIP, YIP volunteers here?

21) What kind of turnover is there among volunteers? Do you have any idea what the average length of stay for a volunteer is?

22) Are volunteers rewarded in any formal or symbolic way?

23) Where do ideas for programs come from? Who is responsible for implementing these ideas? Can you give me a recent example?

Now if you don't mind I'd like to ask you some questions about yourself and the role of the Director at this neighbourhood house.

24) How long have you been in this job?

25) What attracted you to it. What sort of work had you done before?

26) How were your recruited or how did you find out about the job?

27) Who interviewed you? Do you know who had the final say in selecting you?

28) What do you spend your work time doing? How is your work week divided up?

29) Are there regular staff meetings? Which staff are involved?

30) Do you hold regular meetings with individual staff members? If so, are these opportunities for evaluation of staff work?

31) When there are disagreements on policy or program items how are these dealt with? Can you give me a recent example?

32) Do staff members report their work to you on a regular basis?

33) When you have a problem related to the functioning of the neighbourhood house whom do you most frequently go to other than a friend for advice?

34) Whose evaluation of your work is most important to you?

35) Do you feel connected to other neighbourhood houses? If so, which ones and in what way? Do you meet with the Directors and staff of other neighbourhood houses in either a formal or an informal way?

36) What do you see as the purpose of this neighbourhood house? What are you trying to accomplish with your work here?

37) Assuming that you provide leadership to the Board in what directions are you trying to lead them?

38) What do you think the neighbourhood house does well? What do you, personally, feel a great deal of satisfaction about?

39) In what areas do you feel there could be improvement?

Now I have some questions about how the neighbourhood house views itself in relation to the community.

40) Do you or the rest of your staff or the Board see yourselves as acting as advocates for community concerns? If so, would you please elaborate?

41) Does this neighbourhood house engage in what you would call community organizing or advocacy? Is there much lobbying to change government policy which receives direction or encouragement from the neighbourhood house? If so, can you give me an example?

42) Has the neighbourhood house ever gotten into trouble with its funding sources, specifically the city, NSA, or United Way, because of any of its activities? If so, what was the issue and what was the outcome?

We're almost finished now. I just have a few final questions about your relationship with NSA/United Way.

43) How does NSA/United Way participate in the running of this house?

44) How would you characterize the relationship with NSA/United Way?

45) In your opinion, what are the most important benefits derived from membership in NSA/United Way?

46) Are there any significant problems with belonging to NSA/United Way? Do you feel the neighbourhood house is constrained in any important ways by either? If so, please explain.

THAT'S IT. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD OR EMPHASIZE?

THANKS!

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
FOR
NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE STAFF
(Other Than Directors)

Introduction:

My name is Sarah Mellor and I am currently finishing a Masters thesis at the UBC Planning School. I am looking at whether or not there are differences in the organizational structure and volunteer recruitment between those neighbourhood houses which are members of the Neighbourhood Services Association and those which belong directly to the United Way. I would greatly appreciate your answering the following questions and I thank you in advance for your time.

I will also be talking to the Directors, other staff, Board members and some other volunteers at this and at three other neighbourhood houses in Vancouver.

Incidentally, if anything I ask you is written down somewhere please refer me to it and I will save you time.

Before we start I'm not sure I know exactly what you do here. Would you describe your job to me and what you spend you work time doing.

I'd like to start by asking you some questions about the Board of Directors here and the other volunteers at the neighbourhood house.

1)   Do you have any contact with the Board of Directors? If so, in what way? Do you attend Board meetings? Do you submit written reports to them? Do you talk to individual Board members on an informal, casual basis? Or are most of your dealings with the Board through the Director?

2)   Do you work with any Sub-Committees of the Board?

3)   What do you see as the function of the neighbourhood house Board?

4)   What do you see as the function of the staff?

5)   How would you define a volunteer?

6)   About how many volunteers are there at the neighbourhood house?

7)   What sorts of things do they do?

8)   What is the ratio of staff to volunteers and how has that changed over the years?

9)   How does the neighbourhood house recruit volunteers?

10) Is there a training program or an orientation for new volunteers?

11) Is the work of volunteers evaluated in any way? If so, how?

12) Are volunteers rewarded in any formal or symbolic way?

13)   What kind of turnover is there among volunteers?

14)   Are volunteers an important part of the work of the neighbourhood house or could it function quite effectively with the existing staff?

15)   Where do the ideas for new programs come from? Using the example of a specific program can you describe how it came into being. Who was involved? Who made the final decision to go ahead with it?

Now I have some questions about how you view the neighbourhod house in relation to the community.

16)   Do you, as a staff person here, see yourself as an advocate for community concerns?

17)   Does this neighbourhood house engage in what you would call community organizing or community advocacy?   Is there much lobbying or work to change government policy which receives direction or encouragement from the neighbourhood house? If so, would you give me an example?

18)   Has any kind of community organizing or community advocacy ever gotten this neighbourhood house into trouble with any of the principal funding agencies, particularly the City, NSA or United Way? Do you know of other neighbourhood houses which have gotten into trouble because of this kind of activity? If yes to either, would you give me an example and tell me what the outcome was.

Now if you don't mind I'd like to ask you some questions about yourself and your role here.

19)   How long have you been working here?

20)   What attracted you to this job? What sort of work had you done before?

21)   How were your recruited or how did you find out about the job?   Who interviewed you? Do you know who had the final say in selecting you?

22)   Do you supervise anyone? If so, how many people?

23)   Who do you work most frequently with?

24)   Who do you report to?

25)   When you have a question or problem related to your job who do you most frequently go to for advice?

26)   Are there regular staff meetings here?

27)   How involved do you feel in the decisions which are made at this neighbourhood house?

28)   Have there been disagreements on policy or program issues among the staff or between the staff and the Director? If so, would you give me a recent example and tell me how the disagreement was resolved.

29)   Whose opinion and evaluation of your work means the most to you?

30) What do you see as the purpose of this neighbourhood house? What are you trying to accomplish with your work here?

31) What do you think the neighbourhood house does well? What do you, personally, feel satisfaction about?

32) In what areas do you feel there could be improvement?

We're almost finished now. I just have a few final questions about how this neighbourhood house gets along with NSA/United Way.

33) How would you say the neighbourhood house got along with NSA/United Way?

34) In your opinion, what are the most important benefits derived from membership in NSA/United Way?

35) Are there any significant problems with belonging to NSA/United Way? Does NSA/United Way constrain the neighbourhood house in any important ways? If so, please explain.

That's it! Is there anything you would like to add or emphasize?

THANKS VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ANSWERS AND YOUR TIME.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
FOR
NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE BOARD MEMBERS

Introduction:

My name is Sarah Mellor and I am currently finishing a Masters thesis at the UBC Planning School. I am looking at whether or not there are differences in the organizational structure and volunteer recruitment between those neighbourhood houses which are members of the Neighbourhood Services Association and those which belong directly to the United Way. I would greatly appreciate your answering the following questions and I thank you in advance for your time.

I will also be talking to other board members, other volunteers, and to the staff at this and at three other neighbourhood houses in Vancouver.

Incidentally, if anything I ask you is written down somewhere please refer me to it and I will save you time.

1) How long have you been a board member at this neighbourhood house?

2) Did you have any prior connection with the neighbourhood house? as a program participant? involved in setting it up?

3) What made you decide to run for election? Did someone approach you or nominate you? If so, who?

4) Are you on the Board because of any agency or organization?

5) How often does the Board meet?

6) What sorts of items are often on your agenda?

7) Is the Board called upon to make policy decisions or indicate future directions for the neighbourhood house? Does it more often hear reports from the staff?

8) How closely does the neighbourhood house Director work with the Board? Do you feel he looks to the Board for advice and policy direction?

9) Are there ever any major disagreements between the Board and the Director? If so, what? How were they resolved?

10) Does the Director attend all Board meetings?

11) Is the Board broken down into Sub-Committees? If so, what are they, what do they do and how often do they meet? Are they active or inactive? Do they carry out important work or does this occur in other forms such as Board meetings, Socity meetings or staff meetings? Do Sub-Committees tend to give policy direction to the Board or do they tend to implement decisions which have already been made? Do they tend to work on specific projects? If the answer is yes to any of these questions can you give me some examples.

12) Do you feel the Director should report his activities to the Board? Does he?

13) Do NSA or United Way staff ever attend any of your Board meetings? If so, how often and in what capacity?

14) When you first became a Board member did NSA or United Way or the neighbourhood house hold an orientation program for you or give you any literature?

15) Do other neighbourhood house staff ever attend Board meetings or does the Director usually report on the work of the staff?

16) Who do you feel the Board is ultimately responsible to?

17) What do you see as the function of the neighbourhood house staff?

Now I have some questions about the work of other volunteers at the neighbourhood house.

18) How would you define a volunteer?

19) Approximately how many volunteers are there at the neighbourhood house? About how many hours a month do these volunteers put in?

20) What sorts of things do the volunteers do?

21) How are the volunteers recruited?

22) Are there training programs for volunteers? Do they have an orientation to the work of the neighbourhood house and of the Board?

23) Are volunteers evaluated in any way?

24) What kind of turnover is there among volunteers?

25) Are volunteers rewarded in any formal or symbolic way?

26) Are volunteers an important part of the work of the neighbourhood house or could it function quite effectively with the existing staff?

27) I want to interview a few of the other volunteers here. Who do you think I should talk to?

28) How is the decision made to run or go after a new program? Can you please described the steps involved in a recent decision to hold a new program? Who was involved in the decision? Who made the final decision?

I have a few more questions on you and your role at the neighbourhood house.

29) Do you feel connected in any way to other neighbourhood houses? Do you meet either formally or informally with Board members or staff at other neighbourhood houses?

30) When you have a problem related to the functioning of the neighbourhood house who do you most frequently go to for advice other than a friend?

31) What do you see as the primary purpose of this neighbourhood house? What are you, personally, trying to accomplish here?

32) What do you feel the neighbourhood house does well? What do you feel a great satisfaction about?

33) In what areas do you feel there could be improvement?

Now I have some questions as to how the neighbourhood house views itself in relation to the community.

34) Does this neighbourhood house engage in what you would call community organizing? If so, would you give me an example. Is there much lobbying or work to change government policy which receives direction or encouragement from the neighbourhood house?

35) Do you see yourself or the Board as an advocate for community concerns?.

36) Has any kind of community organizing or community advocacy ever gotten this neighbourhood house in trouble with any of its funding sources, particularly the City of Vancouver, NSA or United Way? If so, would you please elaborate? What was the outcome?

We're almost finished now. I just have a few more questions about the neighbourhood house's relationship with the NSA/United Way.

37) How would you say the neighbourhood house got along with NSA/United Way?

38) In your opinion, what are the most important benefits derived from membership in NSA/United Way?

39) Are there any significant problems with belonging to NSA/United Way? Does NSA/United Way membership constrain the neighbourhood house in any important ways? If so, please explain.

That's it! Would you like to add to emphasize anything?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOU ANSWERS AND YOUR TIME.