

THE "IMAGE" OF THE KNOX COUNTY
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

UNIT 9

OTTIS MURPHY AND PAUL STREET

August, 1968

C O M M U N I T Y A C T I O N I N A P P A L A C H I A

An Appraisal of the "War on Poverty"
in a Rural Setting of Southeastern Kentucky

(Report of a study by an interdisciplinary team of the University of Kentucky, performed under Contract # 693 between the University of Kentucky Research Foundation and the Office of Economic Opportunity, 1965-1968)

UNIT 9

THE "IMAGE" OF THE KNOX COUNTY
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

by

Ottis Murphy and Paul Street

Contents of Entire Report:

COMMUNITY ACTION IN APPALACHIA

This is one unit of a report which includes the following units, each separately bound as is this one:

Unit 1--Paul Street, Introduction and Synthesis

Quality of Life in Rural Poverty Areas

Unit 2--Lowndes F. Stephens, Economic Progress in an Appalachian County: The Relationship Between Economic and Social Change

Unit 3--Stephen R. Cain, A Selective Description of a Knox County Mountain Neighborhood

Unit 4--James W. Gladden, Family Life Styles, Social Participation and Socio-Cultural Change

Change and Impacts of Community Action

Unit 5--Herbert Hirsch, Poverty, Participation, and Political Socialization: A Study of the Relationship Between Participation in the Community Action Program and the Political Socialization of the Appalachian Child.

Unit 6--Morris K. Caudill, The Youth Development Program

Unit 7--Lewis Donohew and B. Krishna Singh, Modernization of Life Styles

Unit 8--Willis A. Sutton, Jr., Leadership and Community Relations

Unit 9--Ottis Murphy and Paul Street, The "Image" of the Knox County Community Action Program

Specific Community Action Programs

Unit 10--Ottis Murphy, The Knox County Economic Opportunity Anti-Poverty Arts and Crafts Store Project

Unit 11--Paul Street and Linda Tomes, The Early Childhood Program

Unit 12--Paul Street, The Health Education Program

Unit 13--Thomas P. Field, Wilford Bladen, and Burtis Webb, Recent Home Construction in Two Appalachian Counties

October 178 * Spec. Coll. gift David Walls

ABSTRACT

THE "IMAGE" OF KNOX COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

The purpose of this study was to determine what "image" the heads of households residing in the community center areas being served by CAP in Knox County held of the program.

Eight community center areas were selected for this study. Four of these areas were the same as those from which much of the data were obtained for other units of this study: New Bethel, Kay Jay, Messer, and Middle Fork areas. The other four areas were deemed most like the first four in demographic and social characteristics. They were: Fount, Grove, Ketchen, and Wilton areas. The remaining six center areas, viewed as more urban in characteristics, were not included in this study. The six not included represent, with one exception, a more urban or village-type of housing pattern. Three of them were once small "coal towns." The one rural-mountain center area was excluded because a special study was underway there.

A random sampling of 398 heads of households was selected from eight community center areas out of a total of 1,136. Three hundred eighty-four of this group were interviewed. Two hundred fifty-seven of those interviewed claimed to be acquainted with the CAP, and 127 claimed not to be, while fourteen refused to be interviewed.

Findings indicate that the "image" held by heads of households regarding the purposes of CAP were not very clear. Some one fourth

of those interviewed and identified as being acquainted with CAP had no opinion regarding purposes (16.34% to 35.02%).

Similarly, the "image" held of the progress being made by the program was also revealed as rather hazy, no response coming from about four out of ten of the interviewees. It is logical to assume that those who did not understand the purposes may have been using the wrong "yardstick" in evaluating any progress that is being made.

The findings also reveal that feelings were rather mixed regarding the stratagems which have been employed in the Knox County CAP. It appears there is resentment toward some things which have been done; i.e., the sponsoring of some kinds of entertainment programs at the community centers particularly. Also, there appeared some resentment toward "outsiders." Both of these might be reasonably regarded as symptoms of a failure on the part of Knox County CAP to respect the culture of the group it is seeking to change.

Though those acquainted with the program and those not acquainted were found not to differ significantly in their over-all general impression of the program, they were found to differ at a significant level in age, education, occupation, income, and the distance they live from a community center. This difference was in the direction of those who were acquainted with the program being younger, better educated, of a higher employment level, and of higher income.

It follows that to an extent, therefore, the Knox County CAP has not as yet been able to reach its most central target: the most isolated, poorest, and least educated--these tending, also, to be the more aged--who would appear to represent those most deeply sunk in the miseries of rural poverty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Analysis of the Data	5
III. Summary	25
IV. Readings	27
V. Appendix A	28
VI. Appendix B	34
VII. Appendix C	35
VIII. Appendix D	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Purpose of Knox County CAP: New Business and Industry	8
2. Composite of Responses Regarding Purposes of Knox County CAP	9
3. Composite of Responses Regarding Progress of Knox County CAP	12
4. Patterns of Data Regarding Stratagems Employed by CAP	14
5. Effect of Knox County CAP: Dependency or Independency	20
6. "Image" of Knox County CAP: General Impression . . .	22
7. A Comparison of Acquainted and Unacquainted Groups .	23

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council Community Action Program is to help the poor ("targets") win the "war on poverty" in Knox County. The general "battle" plan for winning this "war" was to develop and employ whatever forces were necessary to bring about community action. Before there can be meaningful community action, there must be involvement of the people. It is more likely that the fullest realization of involvement will materialize if heads of households, especially of the "target" groups, in a community understand and approve a program being advocated for community action. In other words, it was assumed for this study that a favorable "image" of the program is much more likely to lead to involvement in community action than is an unfavorable one.

If it were found to be true that a large number of the "targets," especially the "hard core" group, were not acquainted with the program after it had been in operation for approximately three years, were not participating in community action, and possibly hold an unfavorable "image" of the program--it would appear that the time and effort required to obtain and analyze the data for this report would not have been wasted. Such findings would also indicate that more time, a different approach, or kind of effort, should be devoted to

acquainting the "hard core" poor with community action and perhaps to improving the "image" they hold of community action in general.

Unit 1 of this study reports that a significant percentage of the "targets" residing in the community center areas of Knox County are not participating in the OEO community action program. In an attempt to obtain information regarding the "image" heads of households residing in the community center areas hold of the program, this study was conducted in the eight most rural of the fourteen community center areas. Four of these areas were the same as those from which much of the data were obtained for other sections of this report: New Bethel, Kay Jay, Messer, and Middle Fork areas. The other four areas selected were deemed most like the first four in demographic and social characteristics. They were: The Fount, Grove, Ketchen, and Wilton areas. The remaining six center areas, not included in this part of the study, were viewed as more urban in characteristics than the other eight. The six not included represent, with one exception, a more urban or village-type of housing pattern. Three of them were once small "coal towns." The one rural-mountain center area was excluded because a special study was underway there.

In the eight community center areas included, there are approximately 1,136 households and from this number a random sampling of 398 heads of households (thirty-five percent) were selected--using a table of random numbers--for interviewing.

On the basis of their responses to the interview questions, the 398 heads of households were separated into three basic groups as follows:

- 1) Heads of households who claimed to be acquainted with the program (257 in this category).
- 2) Heads of households who claimed not to be acquainted with the program (127 in this category).
- 3) Heads of households who for some reason refused to be interviewed (14 in this category).

In other words, this part of the study was intended to reveal the "image" members of the acquainted group held of the Knox County OEO-CAP after its operation for approximately three years, and what differences, if any, exist among sub-groups when they are compared on the basis of the data obtained and their participation record in community center activities. Also, it was to determine what differences, if any, existed between the acquainted and the unacquainted groups when they were compared on the basis of the limited data available on the unacquainted group.

The data for this part of the study were obtained by interviewing a random sampling of heads of households as just described, and from participation records provided by the directors of the respective eight community centers. The sampling was intended to be representative of the population of the entire study. The procedure began with the compilation of a complete census list for each of the center areas included in the study and a plan whereby the respective community center directors provided information periodically regarding the degree of participation in community center activities by each individual included in the census. For purposes of this study, only participation by heads of households was considered.

An "image" interview schedule was developed (Appendix A) and the random sampling drawn to be interviewed. The members of the interview team were actually able to interview 384 of these individuals and, as already stated, 257 of this number indicated that they were acquainted with the program and 127 that they were not. Each of the 257 who claimed to be acquainted with the program was asked to respond to all the questions while the 127 individuals who claimed not to be acquainted with the program were only asked the questions they could be expected to answer. Therefore, the 257 individuals (acquainted group) provided most of the data for this report.

The data obtained on the acquainted group were computer processed, using the NUCROS or multi-variate analysis. Differences revealed were tested for significance by chi-square. The means of the data obtained on the unacquainted group were calculated and compared to the means of parallel data obtained on the acquainted group, using t-test for significance of differences between means.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The 257 heads of households who claimed to be acquainted with the program were separated into three groups on the basis of their participation record in community center activities. The three groups were:

- 1) Group I--Those with no participation.
- 2) Group II--Those with low participation.
- 3) Group III--Those with high participation.¹

Each of these three groups was then separated into three subgroups on the basis of employment level. These groups were:

¹Eight reports of participation were gathered at intervals between June, 1966 and February, 1968. In each, the community center director was asked to rate each person living in the area served by his program, on the following scale:

- 1) No participation in center activities.
- 2) Participation in some, but no more than 25% of activities.
- 3) Participation in more than 25% but less than 75% of activities.
- 4) Participation in more than 75% of all center activities.

For the eight periods, a person might therefore score as high as 32 (meaning that he was involved in more than 75% of activities at every report period), or as low as 8 (meaning that he was involved in no participation whatever). The three groups are:

- 1) No participation level = a score of 8.
- 2) Low participation level = 9 through 12.
- 3) High participation level = 13 or above.

- 1) Group A--Those with low employment level.
- 2) Group B--Those with medium employment level.
- 3) Group C--Those with high employment level.²

Each of these sub-groups was next separated into two groups on the basis of income level. These were:

- 1) Group 1--Those with an annual income below \$3,000.
- 2) Group 2--Those with an annual income above \$3,000.

It can be seen that this sort of an arrangement provided six different classifications within each of the three participation groups or levels.

Purposes of CAP

The patterns of responses to each of the eight questions regarding suggested purposes of the CAP as viewed by heads of households in the acquainted group were tabulated. Only the frequency of actual responses are shown; responses such as, "I don't know" or "I would rather not say" were discarded. The eight possible purposes suggested by the first eight questions actually included some purposes and some non-purposes of CAP. Some differences were found within the groups and among the various sub-groups when considered on the basis of participation. The question was: Were those differences between observed frequencies and expected frequencies significant at an acceptable level (.05)?

²Employment levels:

- 1) Low level = unemployed (on "welfare," "relief," or "retirement").
- 2) Medium level = irregularly employed or employed in Work, Experience, and Training program.
- 3) High level = employed full time at unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, or professional work.

In order to learn whether frequencies observed within any group were significantly different from the expected frequencies, the "acquainted" heads of households were separated into six sub-classifications within each of the three participation groups (none, low, and high participation) and a chi-square test applied. The six sub-classifications were:

- 1) Those with a low level of employment and an annual income below \$3,000.
- 2) Those with a low level of employment and an annual income above \$3,000.
- 3) Those with a medium level of employment and an annual income below \$3,000.
- 4) Those with a medium level of employment and an annual income above \$3,000.
- 5) Those with a high level of employment and an annual income below \$3,000.
- 6) Those with a high level of employment and an annual income above \$3,000.

The participation variable (none, low, and high) did not affect responses at a measurably significant level of acceptance (.05) for any of the eight choices with regard to purposes of OEO-CAP, except when the respondents were sub-classified in accordance with the pattern just described. In fact, only one category, the high employment-high income group, appeared to be affected significantly (.025) by the amount of participation they had had in the program, and then only with regard to the suggested goal, "new business and industry."

That is: Table 1 shows that the participation variable did appear to affect responses to the question regarding goals of CAP for those who had a high level of employment and an income above \$3,000. That influence was in the direction of the high participants regarding "new business and industry" less as a main goal than did those who participated less, suggesting that they recognize, more than others, that such a goal is not top priority in the program.

TABLE 1
PURPOSE OF KNOX COUNTY CAP: NEW BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Participation Level	Employment Level	Income Level	Not A Main Purpose	A Main Purpose
NONE	LOW	Below \$3,000	12	19
		Above \$3,000	2	2
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	3	4
		Above \$3,000	0	1
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	6	15
		Above \$3,000 ^a	4	7
LOW	LOW	Below \$3,000	11	20
		Above \$3,000	1	1
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	2	3
		Above \$3,000	2	2
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	8	9
		Above \$3,000 ^a	3	13
HIGH	LOW	Below \$3,000	10	13
		Above \$3,000	1	1
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	2	6
		Above \$3,000	1	2
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	4	12
		Above \$3,000 ^a	9	4

$$^a \chi^2 = 7.699$$

$$df = 2$$

$$p = < .05$$

Table 2 is a composite of responses to the first eight questions. It shows the number and percentage of heads of households who viewed each of the eight suggested purposes of CAP either as: (1) Not a main purpose; (2) A main purpose; or (3) Did not respond.

TABLE 2

COMPOSITE OF RESPONSES REGARDING PURPOSES
OF KNOX COUNTY CAP

Suggested Purposes of CAP	Not a Main Purpose		A Main Purpose		No Response		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Providing quick jobs directly for poor people	104	40.47	91	35.41	62	24.12	257	100
Providing quick jobs directly for people generally	121	47.08	54	21.01	82	31.91	257	100
Getting new business and industries for Knox County	81	31.52	134	52.14	42	16.34	257	100
Helping poor people to organize and demand rights	96	37.36	86	33.46	75	29.18	257	100
Helping poor people become better ac- quainted with wel- fare	92	35.80	95	36.96	70	27.24	257	100
Helping poor people find their own way out of poverty	70	27.24	142	55.25	45	17.51	257	100
Providing another way to distribute government funds	108	42.02	59	22.96	90	35.02	257	100
Providing temporary emergency aid to poor people	110	42.80	87	33.85	60	23.35	257	100

It appears from the data in this table that more than one half (55.25%) of the "target" population do include in their "image" of CAP the view that this program is designed to help poor people find their own way out of poverty. At the same time, however, more people who responded view CAP, than do not, as an agency to help people

become better acquainted with welfare. It may be important that more than one half (52.14%) of the respondents expressed the view that a main purpose of CAP is to help obtain new businesses and industries for Knox County. This would lead one to predict that a movement in the direction of doing so would be viewed favorably by people in this area.

One can see that the people living in the CAP community center areas of Knox County were not in very high agreement regarding the purposes of the program, which means that the picture of CAP was not very clear in the minds of the "targets"--the very people it was intended to help--even after the program had been in operation in Knox County for approximately three years. This does not necessarily mean that the "image" in the minds of the people in the "target" areas regarding the purposes of CAP is a derogatory one but rather that the image is not clear regarding purposes. It would appear that people who did not understand the program probably were hesitant to approve it and those who misunderstood the program were less likely to approve it. In either case, lack of approval could be expected to have resulted in no or low participation in the program; and without participation, the "targets" were unlikely to become affected by the program.

Progress of CAP

The patterns of responses to the next eight questions regarding the progress of suggested purposes of the CAP as viewed by the members of the acquainted group were also tabulated. Only the

frequency of actual responses was considered--responses indicating the interviewee did not hold an opinion being discarded.

The results of this classification revealed some differences among the employment-income level groups when they were compared on the basis of participation, but the chi-square test revealed no significant differences.

Table 3 is a composite of responses to questions regarding progress. It shows the number and percentage of household heads who viewed progress as being made, or not as the case may be, regarding each of the suggested purposes of CAP: (1) Slipping back; (2) Standing still; (3) A little progress; (4) Good progress; or (5) Did not respond.

One can see that the people living in the CAP community center areas, as was found to be the case regarding purposes of CAP, were not in a very high degree of agreement concerning progress toward the suggested goals of the program--a parallel to the findings regarding purposes. The picture of progress is not very clear in the minds of the "targets." It is reasonable to assume that those individuals who either did not understand the goals of the program or who misunderstood them were not likely to have a clear image of the progress toward those goals.

It is interesting to note that practically no one who was interviewed expressed an opinion that CAP was actually losing ground (slipping back) in the "war on poverty," though several did feel that it was not making any progress (standing still). It appears that, generally speaking, about one third of the interviewees had the feeling that a little progress was being made, but the percentage who felt

TABLE 3
COMPOSITE OF RESPONSES REGARDING PROGRESS
OF KNOX COUNTY CAP

Suggested Progress of CAP	Slipping Back		Standing Still		A Little Progress		Good Progress		No Response		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Providing quick jobs directly for poor people	0	0.0	18	7.00	95	36.97	41	15.95	103	40.08	257	100
Providing quick jobs directly for people generally	0	0.0	17	6.61	80	31.13	24	9.34	136	52.92	257	100
Getting new businesses and industries for Knox County	1	.39	28	10.89	104	40.47	38	14.79	86	33.46	257	100
Helping poor people to organize and demand rights	2	.78	15	5.84	74	28.79	43	16.73	123	47.86	257	100
Helping people be- come better ac- quainted with welfare	0	0.0	16	6.23	79	30.74	50	19.46	112	43.58	257	100
Helping poor people find their own way out of poverty	1	.30	28	10.89	101	39.30	42	16.34	86	33.46	257	100
Providing another way to distribute government funds	0	0.0	11	4.28	76	29.57	29	11.29	141	54.86	257	100
Providing temporary emergency aid to poor people	0	0.0	13	5.06	95	36.97	46	17.90	103	40.08	257	100

that satisfactory (good) progress was being made is considerably smaller. Again, it is evident that the picture regarding progress is hazy. One can see from the table that from one third to more than one half of the people did not appear to know what position to take. These findings appear to point up the importance of the "targets" having a clear, factual understanding of the purposes of the program; otherwise, they may use the wrong criteria in evaluating progress.

Stratagems of CAP

The next fifteen questions were intended to obtain the "image" pertaining to impact of different stratagems employed by CAP in Knox County. The NUCROS classification was again used to classify the frequencies of responses. Responses classified as no opinion were discarded when the chi-square test for differences was applied.

The fifteen stratagems were introduced in order to find out how the "targets" feel about them. Differences in opinions were found to exist, but no significant differences were revealed among any of the six groups regarding their views of any of the fifteen stratagems.

Table 4 is a composite of responses to questions 19-33 and shows the number and percentage of interviewees who rated each of the stratagems either as: (1) It had a bad effect; (2) It was never really done; (3) It was of little or no use; (4) It worked fairly well; (5) It worked well; or (6) Did not respond.

One can see in Table 4 that there was some disagreement regarding the stratagem of employing local poor people to work in the CAP, but there was a higher percentage (56.42%) who can be viewed as

TABLE 4

PATTERNS OF DATA REGARDING STRATAGEMS EMPLOYED BY CAP

Stratagems of CAP	Had Bad Effect		Never Really Done		Little or No Use		Worked Fairly Well		Worked Well		No Response		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employed local poor	1	.39	13	5.06	15	5.84	145	56.42	49	19.07	34	13.23	257	100
Employed "outsiders"	2	.78	2	.78	51	19.84	77	29.96	20	7.78	105	40.86	257	100
Used VISTA's	12	4.67	1	.39	49	19.07	64	24.90	18	7.00	113	43.97	257	100
Used Encampment for Citizenship personnel	5	1.95	2	.38	30	11.68	29	11.28	6	2.33	185	71.98	257	100
Provided transpor- tation for poor	2	.78	2	.78	15	5.84	91	35.41	106	41.25	41	15.95	257	100
Entertainment pro- grams at centers	19	7.39	3	1.17	63	24.52	65	25.29	11	4.28	96	27.25	257	100
Organized sports	0	0.0	2	.78	16	6.32	109	42.41	29	11.28	101	39.30	257	100
Promoted quilting for poor	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	5.84	115	44.75	52	20.23	75	29.18	257	100
Held open forums for poor	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	4.67	98	38.13	52	20.23	95	36.97	257	100
Piece work contracts	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	3.11	83	32.30	31	12.06	135	52.53	257	100
Arts and crafts store	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	2.72	59	22.96	37	14.40	154	59.92	257	100
Combined employment and job training	0	0.0	2	0.78	10	3.89	98	38.13	32	12.45	115	44.75	257	100
Poor taught new skills	0	0.0	4	1.56	5	1.95	73	28.40	33	12.84	142	55.25	257	100
Provided for repre- sentation of poor on Board	0	0.0	11	4.28	4	1.56	66	25.68	32	12.45	144	56.03	257	100
Set up a Charge Card store for poor	1	.39	2	.78	15	5.84	66	25.68	27	10.51	146	56.81	257	100

approving this stratagem because they indicated a belief that it had worked fairly well. On the matter of CAP employing "outsiders" (which was necessary in order to obtain professional staff to administer the program), it is interesting to note that a high percentage (40.86%) of the respondents did not respond. Could it be that Weller's³ observation that the people of Appalachia are person-oriented is true and that they are inclined to view disagreement very much as unfriendliness--and consequently the high percentage of no response regarding stratagems involving people? In view of the high percentage who apparently approved the first-mentioned stratagem--at least indicating that it had worked fairly well--one might have expected a high percentage to have disapproved employing "outsiders." The data do not, however, actually support this expectation.

It is interesting to note the very close similarity with which the "targets" view employing "outsiders" and using VISTA workers. Although the data do not establish that "outsiders" are viewed with reservations by the "targets," one is led to suspect this may be true. Of course VISTA workers are "outsiders," but they do not receive salaries comparable to professional staff members employed by CAP. See Appendix B for some actual statements made by interviewees regarding the use of VISTA workers as a stratagem used by Knox County OEO-CAP.

The Encampment for Citizenship (all the campers were "outsiders" from urban areas) was held on Union College campus the summer of 1966.

³Weller, Jack E., Yesterday's People, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, Kentucky, 1966, p. 83.

in cooperation with the CAP. It had been planned for the young people in this program to work in the community center areas, but the plan was dropped when the people in the center areas rejected them. In view of this outcome, it is interesting to note that almost three fourths (71.87%) of the respondents did not express an opinion about the usefulness of this stratagem.

It appears that the stratagem of providing transportation for poor people to attend CAP meetings is viewed favorably (35.41 percent indicating this had worked fairly well and 41.25 percent saying it had worked well).

The stratagem of promoting various types of entertainment at the community centers appears to produce more actual disagreement among the respondents than any other. It appears that entertainment programs at the community centers were labeled as drinking and dancing parties in the minds of a sizable number of heads of households and that no good could come from such "carrying ons"--at least nothing which would help win the "war on poverty." About as many heads of households (24.52%) rated this stratagem as being of little or no use as the combined number who rated it as having worked fairly well (25.29%) or as having worked well (4.28%). It may also be noted that a high percentage (37.35%) did not respond--again suggesting that respondents were reluctant to respond critically. See Appendix C for some actual statements made by interviewees regarding the entertainment programs sponsored by community centers.

The stratagem of promoting an organized sports program within each community center area and among the center areas is viewed as

having worked more favorably than the entertainment stratagem. A high percentage (42.41%) indicated that the organized sports program had worked fairly well and 11.28 percent indicated it had worked well. Very few of the respondents rated this tactic as having little or no use.

The stratagem of providing facilities (floor space and quilting frames) at the community centers for the women to make quilts also appears to be viewed with approval by the "targets"--44.75 percent saying it had worked fairly well and 20.23 percent saying it had worked well, as compared to only 5.84 percent who rated this stratagem as having little or no use.

Community meetings (meetings promoted by the community centers for the poor people to meet, identify, and discuss their problems) or open forums appear to have the approval of more than 50 percent of the respondents, for 38.13 percent rated this stratagem as having worked fairly well and 20.23 percent said it had worked well.

The stratagem of obtaining piece-work contracts (mostly the making of toy or furniture parts or making novelties on sewing machines at the community centers) did not get the rating given the last three stratagems. In fact, as the table shows, 52.53 percent of the respondents did not offer an opinion on the point. (Such activities have so far been on a very limited scale.)

The stratagem of establishing an arts and crafts store and shop in Knox County (a case study report of this project is Unit 10 of this study) appears to have very little opposition, but at the same time 59.92 percent of the respondents chose not to rate the effect of this

project. It was still in promotion stage as the interviews for this part of the study were taken.

The stratagem of using Work, Experience, and Training (WE&T) personnel on CAP projects which provided training in special skills (i.e., carpentry for the participants), also appears to have approval of those respondents who chose to comment on this subject; however, a high percentage (44.75%) chose not to do so.

More than 50 percent of the respondents did not comment on the CAP plan to teach some new skills needed to manufacture articles for sale in the arts and crafts store. No one thought the idea was bad and only five respondents felt it would be of little or no use. Apparently the plan was not widely known. It was comparatively new.

Regarding the provision for representation of poor people on the CAP board of directors, over half (56.03%) did not take a position; but of those who did, most felt it had worked fairly well or had worked well.

Knox County CAP does not actually operate a "Charge Card" store, but such a store does exist in Knox County--operated by an incorporated agency called Emergency Fund Service, Inc.,--and it has the blessing of CAP. This store is operated on a plan whereby donated articles (mostly clothing) are sold to poor customers on credit and the recipient works for CAP to pay for the merchandise, the customer thereby renewing his credit at the store. Again, very few people rated this stratagem as having little or no use; only about 36 percent rated it as having worked fairly well or well, but 56.81 percent did not respond.

All in all, the stratagems which were rated as having a bad effect by more than 5 percent of the respondents were the use of VISTA's in CAP work and the entertainment programs at the centers. Almost 20 percent of the respondents rated the use of VISTA's and the employment of "outsiders" as having little or no use in the program. Using Encampment for Citizenship personnel (also "outsiders") was rated by 11.68 percent of the respondents as having little or no use. The cruelest blow of all was given the entertainment programs sponsored by the community centers; 24.52 percent of the respondents took the position that such programs had little or no use.

Effect of CAP

Table 5 presents results of the NUCROS classification of responses to the question of whether the CAP had made people more dependent or more independent.

A chi-square analysis of these data reveals a significant difference within the medium employment and low-income-level group, depending upon the level of participation. The trend was toward those with a high participation record indicating that CAP has made people more independent. No significant differences were found within any of the other five groups. A fairly high percentage (42.02%) stated that CAP has made people more independent as compared to 26.07 percent who stated that this program has made the people more dependent (see bottom of Table 5). Certainly, in light of the prime goal of the CAP being movement of people from dependency toward self-sufficiency,

TABLE 5

EFFECT OF KNOX COUNTY CAP: DEPENDENCY OR INDEPENDENCY

Participation Level	Employment Level	Income Level	Made "Targets" More Dependent	Made No Difference	Made "Targets" More Independent	Did Not Respond
NONE	LOW	Below \$3,000	13	4	12	
		Above \$3,000	1	0	2	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	3	0	3	
		Above \$3,000	1	0	0	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	7	4	11	
		Above \$3,000	4	1	5	
LOW	LOW	Below \$3,000	10	3	16	
		Above \$3,000	1	0	1	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	2	2	1	
		Above \$3,000	0	0	2	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	5	1	9	
		Above \$3,000	5	0	9	
HIGH	LOW	Below \$3,000	9	1	10	
		Above \$3,000	0	1	2	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	0	0	7	
		Above \$3,000	0	0	3	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	3	4	9	
		Above \$3,000	3	2	6	
Totals and percents:			67 = 26.07%	23 = 8.95%	108 = 42.02%	59 = 22.96%

the fact that more than one out of four believed the program had done just the opposite appears crucial to any interpretation of the "image" in relation to program effectiveness.

General Impressions

Table 6 presents the ratings of the acquainted group regarding their general impression of the CAP.

It is interesting to note that about the same percentage who said CAP has made people more independent (42.02%) also gave the CAP a favorable rating (47.47%). On the other hand, a higher percentage (26.07%) said the program was making people more dependent than gave the CAP an unfavorable rating (10.12%). See Appendix D for actual statements made by interviewees in response to general impression question: (1) In general, how do you feel about the program? (2) What is your general impression of it? (3) Are there any observations you would like to make about it? This fact suggests that some who feel CAP is creating dependency approve its doing so.

Acquainted versus Unacquainted Group

Table 7 presents means of parallel data available on both the acquainted and unacquainted groups. To determine whether or not any differences in the means were significant, a t test was run to determine the t probabilities. This test revealed significant differences between the two groups in age, education, occupation, income, and the distance of residences from centers. In view of the fact that the two groups were found to differ significantly on the basis of these five variables, it is a bit surprising that they were found not

TABLE 6

"IMAGE" OF KNOX COUNTY CAP: GENERAL IMPRESSION

Participation Level	Employment Level	Income Level	Unfavorable	Indifferent	Mixed or Uncertain	Favorable	Did Not Respond
NONE	LOW	Below \$3,000	3	6	9	13	
		Above \$3,000	1	0	1	2	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	2	1	1	3	
		Above \$3,000	0	0	1	0	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	1	5	5	12	
		Above \$3,000	1	2	1	7	
LOW	LOW	Below \$3,000	4	5	5	19	
		Above \$3,000	2	0	0	1	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	0	1	1	4	
		Above \$3,000	0	2	0	2	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	2	2	2	12	
		Above \$3,000	5	0	2	8	
HIGH	LOW	Below \$3,000	3	3	4	13	
		Above \$3,000	0	1	0	2	
	MEDIUM	Below \$3,000	1	0	0	8	
		Above \$3,000	0	0	2	1	
	HIGH	Below \$3,000	1	4	4	0	
		Above \$3,000	0	3	2	6	
Totals and percents			26 = 10.12%	35 = 13.62%	39 = 15.18%	122 = 47.47	35 = 13.62%

TABLE 7

A COMPARISON OF ACQUAINTED AND UNACQUAINTED GROUPS*

Groups	Means					
	General Impression	Age	Education	Occupation	Income	Distance of Residence from Community Center
Acquainted	3.15	52.41	6.46	2.82	5.15	4.33
Unacquainted	3.03	56.32	5.54	2.31	4.44	4.70
t probability	.160	.012	.004	.005	.018	.047

*General impressions were rated according to the following scale:

- 1 = an unfavorable impression
- 2 = an indifferent impression
- 3 = a mixed impression (part bad and part good)
- 4 = a favorable impression

Age was calculated according to actual years.

Education was calculated on the basis of last grade level attended.

Employment level was rated according to the following scale:

- 1 = low level (unemployed--on "welfare," "relief," or "retirement)."
- 2 = medium level (irregularly employed or employed by Work, Experience, and Training Program).
- 3 = high level (employed full-time--unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, or professional work).

Income level was rated according to the following scale:

- 1 = Below \$500
- 2 = 500 - 999
- 3 = 1,000 - 1,499
- 4 = 1,500 - 1,999
- 5 = 2,000 - 2,499
- 6 = 2,500 - 2,999
- 7 = 3,000 - 3,499
- 8 = 3,500 - 3,999
- 9 = 4,000 - 4,499
- 10 = 4,500 - 4,999
- 11 = 5,000 - 5,499
- 12 = 5,500 - 5,999
- 13 = 6,000 - Over

Distance from center was rated according to the following scale:

- 1 = less than $\frac{1}{2}$ mile
- 2 = between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1 mile
- 3 = 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles
- 4 = $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 miles
- 5 = 2 to 3 miles
- 6 = 3 to 4 miles
- 7 = 4 to 5 miles
- 8 = 5 to 6 miles
- 9 = More than 6 miles

to differ significantly on the basis of their general impressions of the program.

It can be seen at a glance that the members of the acquainted group were, generally speaking, younger, better educated, worked at a higher occupational level, received a higher annual income, and lived closer to a community center than did the members of the unacquainted group. Also the differences in the means of these five variables were significant. The unacquainted group, being conversely older, with less education, with a lower level of employment, and of lower income, are obviously the ones the CAP should be directed toward making more acquainted.

SUMMARY

A random sampling of 398 heads of households was selected from eight community center areas out of a total of 1,136. Three hundred eighty-four of this group were interviewed. Two hundred fifty-seven of those interviewed claimed to be acquainted with the CAP, and 127 claimed not to be, while fourteen refused to be interviewed.

Findings indicate that the "image" held by heads of households regarding the purposes of CAP were not very clear. Some one fourth of those interviewed and identified as being acquainted with CAP had no opinion regarding purposes (16.34% to 35.02%).

Similarly, the "image" held of the progress being made by the program was also revealed as rather hazy, no response coming from about four out of ten of the interviewees. It is logical to assume that those who did not understand the purposes may have been using the wrong "yardstick" in evaluating any progress that is being made.

The findings also reveal that feelings are rather mixed regarding the stratagems which have been employed in the Knox County CAP. It appears there is resentment toward some things which have been done; i.e., the sponsoring of some kinds of entertainment programs at the community centers particularly. Also, there appeared some resentment toward "outsiders." Both of these might be reasonably regarded as symptoms of a failure on the part of Knox County CAP to observe what Herzog calls the first axiom for the change agent: "Know

the culture."⁴ While those acquainted with the program and those not acquainted were found not to differ significantly in their over-all general impression of the program, they were found to differ at a significant level in age, education, occupation, income, and the distance they live from a community center. That difference was in the direction of those who were acquainted with the program being younger, better educated, of higher employment level, of higher income, and living closer to the center.

It follows that to an extent, therefore, the Knox County CAP has not as yet been able to reach its most central target: the most isolated, poorest, and least educated--these tending, also, to be the more aged--who would appear to represent those most deeply sunk in the miseries of rural poverty.

⁴Elizabeth Herzog, "Unmarried Mothers: Some Questions to be Answered and Some Answers to be Questioned," Child Welfare, XLI (Oct. 1966), pp. 339-350.

READINGS

- Esser, George H., "The Role of a State-Wide Foundation in the War on Poverty," Law and Contemporary Problems, Vol. 31, No. 1, School of Law, Duke University, Winter 1966.
- Freedman, Alex S., (ed.) Symposium: "Views on American Poverty," Journal of Human Relations, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1967.
- Herzog, Elizabeth, "Unmarried Mothers: Some Questions to be Answered and Some Answers to be Questioned," Child Welfare, Vol. XLI, 1966.
- Kafoglis, Madelyn L., "The Economics of the Community Action Program," Tennessee Survey of Business, Vol. 3, No. 4, December 1967.
- Morris, Peter and Rein, Martin, Dilemmas of Social Reform, New York: Atherton Press, 1967.
- Murphy, Ottis, Attitudes and Social Characteristics of Vocational Rehabilitation Referrals, Bureau of School Service, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, June 1967.
- Weller, Jack E., Yesterday's People, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, Kentucky, 1966.

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule for "IMAGE"
Study of Knox County OEO-CAP
(areas of Fount, Grove, Kay Jay, Ketchen,
Messer, Middlefork, New Bethel, Wilton)
Spring 1968

Name of interviewee: _____

Address: _____

Place of interview: (Fount = 13. Grove = 30. Kay Jay = 03. Ketchen = 21. Messer = 04.
Middle Fork = 01. New Bethel = 02. Wilton = 18.) Area _____

Household (map) number _____.

Sex of interviewee: _____

Date of interview: _____ Time begun: _____

Time completed: _____

Total time of interview: _____

Name of interviewer: _____

I represent the University of Kentucky in an assignment we have to evaluate the poverty program in Knox County.

I would like to ask you some questions about the Knox County OEO Community Action Program which provides the OEO Community Centers. The program I'm talking about is the one involving the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council which has offices and staff in Barbourville and works through the Community Centers.

We are trying to find out how people of Knox County feel about this program.

1) Do you feel you know the program I'm talking about?

____ No ____ Yes

2) Let's be a bit more specific. Have you heard of (check those heard of):

____ a) The Early Childhood Education Program of OEO?

____ b) The Mobile Health Unit?

____ c) The Arts and Crafts Store Project?

____ d) The _____ Community Center (local)?

____ e) Mr. James Kendrick?

____ f) Mr. H. B. Harris?

____ g) Mr. Hollis West?

____ h) Miss Irma Gall?

____ i) The director of the _____ Community Center (local)?

What is the name of the director? _____

If response to question 1 was YES, go to question 4.

If NO, and none of those above were identified, check next question:

"No, and made no identifications," then go to question 9.

If NO, but some identifications were made, ask:

- 3) Now that you have identified some of the things I've mentioned which are part of the OEO program, do you now feel you know what program it is?

No, and made no identifications. No, although making some identifications. Yes.

If answer is still NO, skip to question 9.

- 4) Following is a list of things which some people have said are purposes of such programs as that of Knox County OEO. Which of these are purposes of the Knox County OEO program, as you understand it? (Use card, Table 1.)

Take the purpose of _____. Was it a purpose of the Knox County OEO program as you understand it?

If so, would you say it was a main one, or less important than others? (Check in table below.)

Table 1--

Purpose	Main	Minor	Not a Pur- pose	Don't Know	Good Prog.	A Little Progress	Standing Still	Slipping Back	Don't Know
a) Providing quick jobs directly for poor people.									
b) Providing quick jobs directly for people generally.									
c) Getting new businesses and industries for Knox County.									
d) Helping the poor people get organized so they can demand and get their "rights."									
e) Helping poor people find out about welfare programs so they can get the government money that's coming to them.									
f) Helping poor people find their own way out of their poverty so they will no longer need help.									
g) Providing another way of distributing government funds to the poor to supplement those of other government welfare agencies.									
h) Providing temporary, emergency aid to poor people.									
i) Is there any other purpose you would suggest?									

Other Purpose: _____

5) Which of these you said were main purposes would you rate as most important? Which second, etc.? (Write numbers in table above.)

6) How well is the Knox County OEO Program doing in accomplishing each of these purposes? Is it making good progress, progressing just a little, standing still, or perhaps even slipping backwards--for instance, in the purpose of _____ ? (Check in the table above.)

- 7) In order to accomplish its purposes, whatever they may be, the Knox County OEO has to some extent done the following things. We want to know what you think of each of these things and how you think they have done them. Look at this list and please tell me whether you think each of these parts of the program has worked well, been of little use, has even had a bad effect, or perhaps has never really been done. (Use card, Table 2)

Table 2--

	Worked well or very well	Worked only fairly well	Been of little or no use	Was never really done	Actually had a bad effect	Don't Know	If response is extreme (either "Worked Well or Very Well" or "Actually Had Bad Effect")--Why?
a) Employed local poor people in the program.							
b) Employed trained staff from outside the county.							
c) Used VISTA volunteers.							
d) Used volunteers from the Encampment for Citizenship group.							
e) Provided automobiles to transport OEO staff in doing their work and to get poor people to the meetings.							
f) Arranged for music and held dances at community centers.							
g) Provided an organized sports program for youth.							
h) Provided for quilting and similar activities at the centers.							
i) Held meetings at the community centers and countywide to encourage the poor to think together and with others about their problems.							
j) Obtained piece-work contracts that provide jobs and training for some poor people (chair frames, sewing work, etc.)							
k) Planned an arts and crafts store for which site has been obtained and some funds for building collected, with a shop room for employing workers and training the unskilled.							

(continued)

Table 2--(continued)

	Worked well or very well	Worked only fairly well	Been of little or no use	Was never really done	Actually had a bad effect	Don't Know	If response is extreme (either "Worked Well or Ve Well" or "Actually Had Bad Effect")-- Why?
l) Combined employment with job training in various parts of the program, including cooperative arrangements with WE&T (center rehabilitation, maintenance, etc.)							
m) Leased a building to be used for a training center to teach people new skills.							
n) Required that at least one-third of the Board of Directors of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council must be representatives of the poor.							
o) Run a program to exchange work for clothing or emergency help (fuel, food, money) through the "charge-card" arrangement.							
p) Do you know of other things the Knox County OEO has done that you would like to tell me about?							

Things done: _____

- 8) Do you feel that the OEO Community Action program has made poor people better able to take care of themselves--or has it made them more dependent upon government? Or has it made any difference on this point?

_____ Better able to take care of themselves. _____ Made no difference.

_____ Made them more dependent on government. _____ Don't know.

- 9) In general, how do you feel about the program? What is your general impression of it? Are there any observations you would like to make about it?

Now we need a bit of personal information so we can classify your responses with those of others of your age, sex, income level, etc.

Would you mind telling me?

10) Age: _____ years. 11) Race: _____. 12) Last grade completed in school: _____

13) Occupation (describe). _____

14) In which of these categories did your total family income fall, approximately, last year? (Show card and record letter.) Tell me the letter _____.

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| a) Below \$500 | g) 3,000 - 3,499 |
| b) 500 - 999 | h) 3,500 - 3,999 |
| c) 1,000 - 1,499 | i) 4,000 - 4,499 |
| d) 1,500 - 1,999 | j) 4,500 - 4,999 |
| e) 2,000 - 2,499 | k) 5,000 - 5,499 |
| f) 2,500 - 2,999 | l) 5,500 - 5,999 |
| | m) 6,000 - and over |

APPENDIX B

Typical responses regarding the use of VISTA workers in the

CAP:

Approving

- 1) "I think they are wonderful people."
- 2) "I've been around. They do their best."
- 3) "They work hard."
- 4) "Those VISTA's were interested in what they were doing."
- 5) "They work."

Critical

- 1) "They have a bad influence on our youth."
- 2) "They gave us a bad name."
- 3) "They engaged in bad conduct."
- 4) "VISTA's have had a bad influence."
- 5) "They pretend they are helping people."

APPENDIX C

Typical responses regarding entertainment programs at the community centers:

Approving

- 1) "The social events at the community centers are very helpful to the young people of our communities."
- 2) "The community centers are very good in the sense that they serve as a meeting place for people to come and see all their friends and talk over their problems."
- 3) "These programs gave the young people something to look forward to."
- 4) "They have had some good music at some of the centers."
- 5) "These programs worked fine at our center."

Critical

- 1) "They should take this foolishness out of the program. We need employment here."
- 2) "I think this has destroyed a lot of young boys and girls."
- 3) "They need to go to church instead of dancing."
- 4) "I feel they are a public nuisance. They are the worst thing that has ever happened around here."
- 5) "Those community centers are no profit. They are nothing but a dance hall. They just ruin young people."

APPENDIX D

Three types of responses to questions regarding general impression of the Knox County CAP:

Approving

- 1) "I think it is good, people are doing better now than they ever have."
- 2) "I think it is all right."
- 3) "It is a good activity. People like me need something to do and some place to go for recreation."
- 4) "I didn't much approve of the dances at first, but now I think they are all right. They are doing good work now."
- 5) "I think it is a good thing."

Mixed

- 1) "Somethings I hear about the center is all right, but most of it is no good--the way I see it."
- 2) "It has some good points and some bad ones."
- 3) "I would say it would be a very good thing, if it was carried out the way it was set up to be."
- 4) "Some of it is a downfall to the people."
- 5) "OEO has helped some of the people who needed help, but there are a lot who need help who are not being helped."

Critical

- 1) "I don't think it is worth a thing to this county."
- 2) "I don't think it is worth a thing. It is a sorry outfit."
- 3) "OEO hasn't helped the people who needed help most."
- 4) "I don't think OEO is helping the poorest people."
- 5) "OEO hasn't helped the people in this community. It has helped the people who don't need help."