COMMUNITY ACTION IN APPALACHIA

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 4

FAMILY LIFE STYLES, SOCIAL PARTICIPATION, AND SOCIO-CULTURAL CHANGE

(Profiles of Selected Knox County Families--Patterns of Family Behavior, Belief and Value Systems and Their Relation to Participation in Community Action Programs).

by

James W. Gladden

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

ABSTRACT

FAMILY LIFE STYLES, SOCIAL PARTICIPATION, AND SOCIO-CULTURAL CHANGE

(PROFILES OF SELECTED KNOX COUNTY FAMILIES--PATTERNS OF FAMILY BEHAVIOR, BELIEF AND VALUE SYSTEMS AND THEIR RELATION TO PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS)

by

James W. Gladden

What are families like that actively participate in an OEO Community Action Program in a predominantly rural county in Appalachian Kentucky? Why do some families refuse or fail to take part in a government-sponsored local community effort for rehabilitation? Are those that support the enterprise and use new social services significantly different from the non-participating families?

These were some of the questions that this portion of the evaluation of Knox County's Community Action Program (KCCAP), by the University of Kentucky research team, tried to answer. A purposive sample of 131 intact families was studied to discover features of the family life styles of three catagorical types. Nearly three-fourths (95) of the selected families reported a sub-standard income of less than $3,500 for the year 1966-67. The remaining 36 had self-earned incomes for the same period of more than $3,000 but less than $6,000. Those with sub-standard incomes were divided into two sets: Participating Poor (PP) families numbering 39 and Non-participating Poor (NP) units totaling 56.

The research design was to contrast the two Poor groups and compare them, together and separately, with the 36 relatively autonomous families to see which of the Poor types, PP or NP, were more similar

to the Above Poor (AP). The hypothesis was that PP would be more like the control group (AP) and would show promise of real improvement in the early future because of their disposition to co-operate. The hypothesis was generally supported in that, more frequently than not, PP proved to be more similar to AP in family ideology, upward mobility, and future goals.

Two sets of questionnaires each were administered, a year apart, to the mothers in their homes and to sixth-grade sons in their schools. Data analysis showed both PP and NP were quite fatalistic because of their espousal of fundamentalistic and sectarian religious views. Majorities in both types were affiliated with, and regular attenders of, small churches. Both were also highly familistic in their loyalties and associational activity. The two types were headed by parents (only whole families were studied) with very low educational levels and, on the average, in the 40-44 age group.

PP families had longer histories of financial difficulty. The participating families differed substantially from NP in their voluntary association, having much higher records of social interaction with kinfolks and neighbors and in religious activities. Neither group belonged to formal organizations to any measurable extent. PP families were older, larger, and had more unemployed or underemployed members. Their major objective in supporting KCCAP was economic. Considerably less geographically mobile than NP, they desired, for both fathers and sons, job opportunities in Knox County or nearby. They felt that the OEO assistance had been providential and were generally enthusiastic about

changes that had been made in the county in the wake of CAP.

NP were critical of the endeavor and chose to abstain because of cultural scruples and a narrow version of the American doctrine of self-help. They were opposed to government intervention, accepting welfare and only for reasons of physical survival. NP mothers had higher aspirations and expectations for their sons than did PP; their boys also aspired highly and seem to be headed toward more frustration than the PP lads. NP, more stable, believe in status quo; PP, more vertically mobile, support change.

The study concludes that the Poor in Knox County need jobs, vocational training (for the boys perhaps as early as the elementary grades) and a much improved plan for community organization. KCCAP has helped a minority of families who are very grateful. The great majority are still resisting chronic dependency. The region needs most a creative, imaginative provision for economic development which the national OEO decided, in 1965 and again in 1968, not to implement.

PREFACE

In a sense, this study is a continuation of an observation of family life in Eastern Kentucky started nearly two decades ago. Shortly after coming to the University of Kentucky in 1949, I conducted research on families in two small industrial communities in Harlan and Floyd counties to determine the effects on the family culture of the shift in occupation of the household head. Very little cultural change was discovered despite the fact that some of the men were second and third generation miners. The durability of the mountain farm culture was impressive.

I had intended to follow up that study with another ten years later. To my dismay, the great majority of the families observed in 1950 had migrated out of the state by 1960 and were too dispersed to contact. But my interest had been whetted in the family patterns of this relatively isolated mountain region. Consequently, when the opportunity for an adequately supported investigation of contemporary families in nearby Knox County was made possible, I was quite ready to accept.

An equal interest in the religious behavior of the area's population alerted me to the likelihood of its importance in understanding the possibility of cultural and social change in Appalachia. I urged an inclusion of some kind of examination of religious beliefs in Knox County. As it turned out, we probably should have stressed this aspect more than we did. Fortunately, this crucial pattern was not completely ignored.

This portion of the inter-disciplinary investigation of the effectiveness of the Knox County Community Action Program concentrated on the county's intact families. Initiated in the spring of 1966, shortly after the program was founded, the research design was developed to provide a Time I field study that fall. This step sought to ascertain the characteristics of rural families which were the target groups of the innovative Federal project. The following summer, a second set of questionnaires was perfected to probe the social participation of the families selected for the study. The field work was completed in the fall and winter of 1967 with another round of visits to the county. Data analysis and preparation of the report of our findings were completed by July 15, 1968. It should be noted that the actual study of family behavior and associational activity covered only a period of approximately eighteen months of the three-year program. It would have been more appropriate to have made the second investigation, i.e., the study of center participation, late in the current year in order to secure a completely valid account of the involvement of the families in the co-operative enterprise. However, this was impossible in the time allotted for the research.

I am indebted to a number of people for the completion of the study. Two graduate students in Sociology at the University contributed largely. Lynn Lackey participated in the development of the first questionnaires and in the administration of the schedules to the grade school boys. Mrs. Vibba Saiyed has done so much in the two years in which she has worked with this part of the evaluation that the discussion which ensues is expressed in the plural first person to

denote her involvement in both the data gathering and the data analysis. I especially thank Dr. Paul Street for granting me the privilege to deal with the research problems as I saw fit and for his support throughout.

Gratitude is due to several of my colleagues who have strengthened my knowledge of the area. In both their writings and in conversation, Drs. James Brown and Harry Schwarzweller have immeasurably aided me. I am deeply appreciative of the faith my department chairman, Dr. Thomas Ford, has had in the worthwhileness of the project and the released time, over the period, from teaching duties. No one who writes can ever fully express his thanks to the secretaries who labor long to help bring research to publication. In this case, my thanks go to Linda Donaldson and Mrs. Julia Fleming.

I am especially grateful to the various persons in Knox County who greatly facilitated my work. The OEO personnel, the school administrators, and the classroom teachers were models of hospitality. To Dr. Ottis Murphy, our liaison representative at Barbourville, and his secretarial staff, I owe much for their innumerable assists. Finally, I wish to thank in this way, my wife who admirably co-operated from the inception of the research design to its final fruition.

--J. W. Gladden

August 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

LIST OF TABLES viii

LIST OF FIGURES xii

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. RESEARCH DESIGN 6
Family Types: Description of the Sample
Research Objectives
Sampling Procedures and Sources of Data
Treatment of Data

II. DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS 19
Ethnic and Racial Origin
Age and Sex Composition
Selected Social Features
Economic Characteristics

III. SOCIAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS 40
The Progress of Change
Programs Fostering Family Development
Readiness for Change

IV. FAMILY SUB-CULTURES AND PLANNING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE 58
Family Sub-Cultures of the Poor
Planning for Social Change

V. RELIGIOUS FACTOR AND SOCIAL CHANGE 82
Church Membership in Knox County
Church Membership in the Sample
Trends in Reactionary Religious Forms
Church Membership and Community Improvement

VI. FAMILY STRUCTURE AND MOBILITY 99
Structure of the Sample Families
Family Mobility and Participation
Differences in the Sample

Chapter Page

VII. ASSOCIATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY 116
Personal Mobility of Knox Countians
Associational Patterns of the Selected Families
Spare Time Activities
Ideational Mobility--Exposure to Mass Media
Typical Trends and Differences

VIII. CONJUGAL ROLES, CONCEPTS OF PARENTHOOD AND CHILD-REARING PRACTICES. 130
Conjugal Role Acceptance and Performance
Planned Parenthood
Child-Rearing Concepts and Practices

IX. SOCIALIZATION PROCESS--ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS 160
Boys' Aspirations for Mobility
Mothers' Aspirations for their Boys
Typical Trends and Differences
Sharers in the Socialization Process

X. PROSPECTS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE 188
Reasons Why Poor Families Do Not Participate
Reasons Why PP Families Do Participate
Towards A Profile of Participating Families
KCCAP and Participating Families
KCCAP and Grade School Children
The School as a Vehicle for Mobility
Suggestions for Planned Social Change
Prospects for Adoption of Social Change

NOTES 216

LIST OF WORKS CITED 220

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Number of Families not Included and Reasons for Exclusion 14

2. Number of Families in Three Sample Types 15

3. Closest Center by Family Types 17

4. Percentage Distribution of the Population, by Marital Status and by Sex, in Knox County, its Rural Portion, and in the U. S., 1960. 22

5. Selected Labor Force Characteristics of the Sample as Compared with Those of the County in 1960 31

6. Selected Economic Characteristics by Family Types and by Total Sample 33

7. Housing and Residential Mobility by Family Types 38

8. Contacts with and Participation in the Various Programs of KCCAP by Family Types and by Total Sample 49

9. Opinions About Centers and About Improvements that Have Been Brought About in Knox County by Family Types and by Total Sample 50

10. Reasons for Never Participating by Family Types and by Total Non Participating 53

11. Participation in Selected Formal Organizations (other than those now promoted by KCCAP) by Family Types and by Total Sample 54

12. Differences Between Poor and AP Respondents in Fatalistic Orientation as Revealed by Responses (in percentages) to the Various Statements Indicating Fatalism 64

13. Orientation to the Present as Revealed by Poor Respondents, AP Respondents and Total Respondents . . . 66

Table Page

14. Joint Decision Making and Sharing of Parental Roles by Family Types and by Total Sample 70

15. Evidence of Parental Authoritarianism by Family Types and by Total Sample 71

16. Extent of Practicality (Concreteness) by Family Types and by Total Sample 76

17. Kinship Network and Familism by Family Types and by Total Sample 77

18. Shift in Church Affiliations in the Last Two Decades . . . 84

19. Attendance at Religious Services by Family Types and by Total Sample 85

20. Differences Between AP and Poor Respondents in their Agreement with Certain Beliefs of Fundamentalistic Nature 88

21. Intensity of Religious Resolutions by Family Types and by Total Sample 89

22. Religion in Home Activities by Family Types and by Total Sample 90

23. Ideas Regarding the Future of Protestant Church by Family Types and by Total Sample 91

24. Conception Regarding Social Programs in Churches by Family Types and by Total Samples 92

25. Extent of Baptist Domination by Family Types and by Total Sample 93

26. Willingness to let a Family Member Become a Missionary to a Foreign Country by Family Types and by Total Sample 96

27. Extent of Religiosity in Family and of the Wife by Family Types and by Total Sample 97

28. Age Composition of Wives and Husbands by Family Types and by Total Sample 103

29. Family Size by Family Types and by Total Sample 104

30. Size of Wife's Mother's Family by Present Family Size . . 106

Table Page

31. Differences Between NP and PP in Inter-generational Education Mobility 109

32. Occupational Stability and Mobility by Family Types and by Total Sample 112

33. Mutual Help with Relatives and Neighbors by Family Types and by Total Sample 121

34. Informal Meeting Places by Family Types and by Total Sample 122

35. Participation in Civic Organizations by Family Types and by Total Sample 123

36. Sparetime Activities by Family Types and by Total Sample 124

37. Contact with Mass Media by Family Types and by Total Sample 125

38. Informal Associational Interaction by Family Types and by Total Sample 128

39. Intensity of Participation in Formal Association by Family Types and by Total Sample 128

40. Overall Conjugal Role Index by Family Types and by Total Sample 137

41. Wife's Deference in Certain Selected Matters by Family Types and by Total Sample 139

42. Help Received by Wife in Fulfilling her Feminine Obligation by Family Types and by Total Sample . . . 139

43. Wife's Sense of Satisfaction with Mother-Wife Role by Family Types and by Total Sample 140

44. Control of Family Size by Family Type and by Total Sample 143

45. Reasons for Desiring Children by Family Types and by Total Sample 144

46. Parental Permissiveness by Family Types and by Total Sample 149

47. Consistency Between Spouses in Handling Children by Family Types and by Total Sample 150

Table		Page
48.	Boy's Identification with Father by Family Types and by Total Samples	151
49.	Dependency in Children by Family Types and by Total Sample	154
50.	Status Awareness and Aspirations of Boys by Family Types and by Total Sample	166
51.	Potential Occupational Mobility by Family Types and by Total Sample	167
52.	Educational Aspirations of Boys by Family Types and by Total Sample	169
53.	Potential Spatial Mobility by Family Types and by Total Sample	170
54.	Consensus on Son's Career by Types of Poor Families	174
55.	Desiderata in Choice of Son's Job by Family Types and by Total Sample	175
56.	Behavior Qualities in Child Desired by Mothers and Sons by Types of Poor Families	176
57.	Schooling Desired by Family Types and by Total Sample	179
58.	Importance of Education for Boy's Later Life by Family Types and by Total Sample	181
59.	Distance Between Home and Closest Community Center by Family Types and by Total Sample	191
60.	Perception of OEO Goals by Boy by Family Types and Total Sample	202
61.	Boys' Opinions on Government Policy for Treatment of Poor by Family Types and by Total Sample	203
62.	Specific Help Received by Boys who have been to Centers by Family Types and by Total Sample	209
63.	Siblings Educational Attainment as Compared to Possible Level of Schooling for their Age by Family Types and by Total Sample	211

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Mixed Tendencies in Progression or Regression in NP, PP, and AP Families in the Degree of Husband's Contribution	139
2.	Mixed Tendencies in Progression or Regression in NP, PP, and AP Boys in the Degree of Aspiration	168
3.	Progressive Tendencies From NP to AP Boys on Items Indicative of Potential Upward Mobility	169

INTRODUCTION

The Knox County Community Action Program (KCCAP) has been in operation much too short a period to expect significant and measurable changes in family organization and behavior. The institution of the family is too tradition-laden to undergo rapid alteration in a free society. Change emerges more slowly "in the more basic, more emotionally charged, more sacred aspects of a culture." (Berelson and Steiner, 1964)

Still, the family situation is felt to be both a leading cause and a serious effect of poverty conditions. Some conclusions are desired concerning the impact of the KCCAP on families and through these social units on individual members. It is an accepted fact that existing families, and those yet to be created, must be more self-sustaining if the war on poverty is to be won. However, there is little consensus yet among social analysts on what constitutes family improvement or what the indicators are that justify the assertion that families have left the ranks of the poverty-stricken. Some say, as did David Moynihan, "The essential fact about family stability is that as individuals become more prosperous, in the sense of having greater incomes, their marriages become more stable." (Myrdal, 1968) Hence, since poverty is basically defined in monetary terms by the Office of Economic Opportunity, it would seem that a major goal is being achieved if more families are found to be receiving annual incomes over the arbitrarily set poverty line.

Others counter, as did the President's Commission on the problem, that poverty is only partially due to low income. Their report (The People Left Behind, 1965) cites the paramount needs in Appalachia of a general lifting of the educational level and "crash" training in market-

able skills for youth and unemployed adults. Persons can then be expected to earn enough to make themselves and their families self-supporting, i.e., no longer so dependent on government subsidy for their economic welfare. Can we claim improvement in family and individual well-being has occurred if more children are in school, and they stay there longer than their parents? Or if more young males and females are getting job training?

Some social scientists claim that the large number of dependents is the root of the plight of most poor families. (Ornati, 1965) These critics would seek confirmation of the salutary effects of KCCAP in the increasing numbers of women who secure contraceptive guidance to limit their offspring. High rates of family dissolution are also known to be concommitants of poverty. Therefore, fewer couples voluntarily breaking their marital ties or lower morbidity and mortality rates could serve as proof of the worth of the new programs. Out-migration is so highly recommended, by many who see the area as over-populated for its economic potential, that a general exodus from the county might demonstrate KCCAP's effectiveness.

Quite apart from such presumed indications of renewed family stability-and some of the above have occurred in Knox County in the past three years - the question remains whether <u>cultural</u> change will be sufficient to maintain the social changes promoted by the ameliorative agencies and personnel. Can communities which are invigorated by governmental intervention become viable enough to continue on their own? Are present families being prepared to wage their own battles against the specter of poverty? Have there been enough changes in Knox County to justify the expenditures of time, energy, and money?

If families continue to cherish beliefs that are not conducive to social health, to say nothing of progress, if they retain attitudes that resist or prevent mutual cooperation and, if they cling to values different from those said to be in the mainstream of their society, the poverty cycle may persist or resume if and when the help from the larger society is curtailed or withdrawn. These aspects of the local and regional sub-culture, as adaptive as they may have been for previous physical subsistence and psychic survival, have served to make the people who live by them appear to a native analyst as the Permanent Poor. (Caudill, 1964) The possible persistence of these cultural elements into the future prevents an easy reliance on the evidence furnished by social indices such as a rise in family income (perhaps by greater transfers of wealth), an increase in the county school system's retention power, a drop in proportions of families disrupted or even a decrease in family size (as important as all of these seem in the social context of the county). The removal or withdrawal of people from the county, in the years ahead, may continue to act so selectively of age and productivity as to make the problem of those remaining far more insoluble. One might add that many migrants from southeastern Kentucky have joined thousands of others to produce and aggravate urban poverty elsewhere because of their inability or refusal to acculturate or become assimilated in the cities to which they moved.

This is not to state that we cannot ever know if the Knox County CAP has "worked" to improve families. It says rather that we shall need more socio-psychological depth analyses and more extensive longitudinal study to document the impact KCCAP may have had on families in such straightened circumstances as those known to exist in this target area.

"Planning of necessity implies the future and the elements of prognosis inherent in a program can never be exposed to the ultimate empirical check before they become history." (Myrdal, 1968) But the difficulties involved in evaluating, as well as those encountered in planning, are no excuse for a disclaimer that programs cannot be rationally formulated and then carefully checked.

In light of the foregoing, it seemed more feasible and more appropriate to examine a sample of Knox County families and their relative participation in various community activities. The aim would be to make some assessment of the poor people's acceptance of the innovative community enterprise rather than try to measure the early effects of the programs on families and individual members. It should be a real contribution to planners on all levels of the national society to have information about those families, in this predominantly rural county, which were more likely than others to accept 1) proffered governmental assistance of a non-dole nature, 2) a larger opportunity to help one another to enhance their life-chances, and 3) guidance and grants for neighborhood and local community development toward more effective democratic action. In addition, some understanding of the features of resisting families, of those seemingly devoted to exclusiveness or handicapped by isolation, should inform future strategies for aiding other disadvantaged sections of the country.

The purpose of this portion of the Evaluation project is to offer profiles of several types of families, derived from data obtained in a study of the relation of participation, in the various KCOEO-sponsored programs, and selected personal and family characteristics. Where clues were discovered and inferences might be drawn about the achievement of

KCCAP goals they will be suggested. But, until future studies can be made to test emerging perceptions, our statements concerning the impact of KCCAP, in stimulating basic changes in the area's sub-culture or in enabling families to escape now or avoid later the entrapment of poverty, must largely remain speculative and hypothetical.

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

An hypothesis is advanced in the general research design for evaluating the effectiveness of Knox County CAP that

> "Those who participate in the community centers, while generally of the low income groups perhaps, are nevertheless distinguishable from the 'hard core' poverty group--are more 'middle class' in attitudes, aspirations and living standard than those of low income who do not participate."

This portion of the research project was largely designed to operationalize and test this hypothesis. The study is focused on the life styles of a purposive sample of Knox County families to ascertain if there are discernible and significantly discriminating differences that distinguish low income families who are willing to participate in the various activities sponsored by the KCEOC (Knox County Economic Opportunity Council) from the poor families who refuse or fail to become involved.

It is presumed that a major reason why poverty has persisted in some sections of the country, and may be perpetuated in rural areas, is the lack of engagement in extra-familial association and community organization by those who are suffering from limited and insufficient income. This non-involvement is thought to result from a kind of adaptation by people of lower incomes who tend to rely heavily on their kinship system and narrow neighborhood ties for the satisfaction of most of their needs. They may eventually be compelled by their marginal

economic position to venture out of their seclusion to secure governmental assistance to survive. The one formal organization in which they participate, outside of the family, is likely to be a religious association. But this social group, rather than acting to improve the community situation, has frequently adopted sectarian tactics of an anti-societal nature and has usually promoted individual reform instead. It generally operates only indirectly to resolve social problems and may serve to create or exacerbate local divisiveness. Of course, their children attend schools and, for a while at least, have contact with the larger society in a systematic way.

To attack this alienation said to prevail among the lowest economic strata in rural areas, attempts are now being made in numerous places in Knox County to conduct variegated activities which will elicit the participation of heads of families, homemakers, and their children. Such group endeavors, some restricted to particular age-levels, aim to help persons to work out more effective solutions to particular problems which accompany or result from inadequate income and limited socialization.

Family Types: Description of the Sample

For one reason or another, sometimes freely expressed but often carefully guarded, many families do not support the new programs. Reports on general participation (elsewhere in this Evaluation) indicate a majority of the county's target population have attended very infrequently or not at all. To determine some of the factors that shape this rejecting disposition, as well as those accounting for the positive attitude of the minority that has become involved, we undertook to examine the life styles of the two groupings. Assuming that decisions concerning

participation are family-made and related to the belief systems of the homes, we selected representative families, divided them on the basis of participation, and studied their behavior, their perceptions, and their goals and aspirations.

Also found in our research sample (chosen with this purpose in mind) is a third kind of family. The first two types represent those groups announced to be the target of the national war on poverty--those whose total annual incomes were less than $3,000* or, if more, received a portion of their income, in 1966, in some form of governmental welfare subsidy. Our third group of families are headed by a father who is presently employed in an occupation usually taken to indicate substantial membership in the blue collar or working class. Their earned annual income in the first year of the study was above the arbitrary figure set by Federal authorities. A very few of the third group might be more appropriately termed middle class since they proved to be salaried and/or professional. However, none had made over $6,000 in the period 1965-66. All families in the third category were considered to be a control group because they were expected to reflect many of the values and patterns of the class mentioned in the original major hypothesis. These upwardly mobile families should be somewhat different, or so the assumption goes, from the other two types, in that they are relatively

---

*This figure may be too high for rural dwellers. However, considering the modal size of these families, the number and small acreage of the "part-time" farmers, and the fact that two-thirds of the county's population are not farm residents, the figure may be realistic as any.

independent, quite self-sustaining, and likely to be involved in the on-going community life. However, it was not held essential that these families and their members must be participating in KCEOC projects. They might not feel it necessary to co-operate with government-sponsored programs. About half of them did, in fact, engage in certain KCCAP activities.

Our research sample thus has three categories of families: 1) Those with incomes of $3,500 or below, a portion of which tends to be furnished by some kind of transfer payment, who have not chosen to take part in community center programs and whom we have called Non-Participating Poor (hereafter designated NP); 2) Those with similarly subsidized sub-standard incomes who, given the opportunity, are attending the centers and engaging in one or more of the community programs--hereafter designated the Participating Poor (PP); and 3) The control group of families with non-welfare, self-earned incomes between $3,000 and $6,000, which we label the Above Poor (AP). The last may include some of the leaders and workers in the community centers, although some have refrained from KCEOC involvement for economic, political, or social reasons.

Research Objectives

The main research objective was to compare the life ways of NP and PP families to see if participation proved to be a differential variable; then to compare the Poor families (NP and PP) with those called Above Poor (AP) to discover any measureable differences between Poor and non-poor (not-so-poor is perhaps more accurate). Finally, an attempt was to be made to determine whether the participating dependent families (PP) were more like the independent ones (AP) than were those not participating (NP).

This then is a survey of a sample of Knox County lower class families (none of whom has an annual income equal to the American average of around $6,000) and their interaction and associational patterns, with special notice given to their reaction to the multi-faceted KCEOC programs. Because of the brevity of the time span of the innovative enterprise, participation is construed more as a dependent variable (involvement as an effect rather than as a cause of change.) Family life style is most often used here as an independent variable. Since the relation of life styles of the social strata and active involvement in a community enterprise is still a broad and inconclusive issue, we did not limit ourselves to testing the hypothesis of expected correlation between participation and other family characteristics. We have maintained a broader, exploratory objective of learning as much as we can about the systemic properties of the families which have been declared disadvantaged. We were interested in the possibilities and prospects of change, but we were fairly certain we would not discover that participation had effected much change in family ways, or that we would yet be able to predict its effects.

The survey was conceived as a two-stage operation to secure a record of the intensity of the sample's participation. We planned to determine the membership of NP and PP in the following fashion: NP would include not only those who never participated but also those who reported taking part in 1966, but not in 1967. PP would include only those who were continuing to participate at the time of our second study. Since the centers were established at different times we also considered relying on the records kept by the directors, and filed

with our project, for measures of the degree of active involvement. The intent was to construct eventually, sub-categories of NP and PP by ranking groups within each major type by the number of family members attending and the regularity of attendance. However, as we prepared the Time I research instrument we became aware of the futility of this complex objective. Families in our sample had not become sufficiently acquainted with the KCOEO projects to furnish measurable data; e.g., the Family Development Program was relatively unpublicized. We decided to secure a substantial amount of information on the families' internal systems in our first round of interviews; we postponed the checking of the interaction of the external system of the families with other institutions and agencies until the second stage. The objective of measuring the amount of change in formal participation in the year that elapsed between the Time I and Time II field work was only slightly accomplished. The Evaluation schedule did not permit the needed follow-up after three years of center operation throughout the county.

Sampling Procedures and Sources of Data

A relatively high percentage of families in Knox County are not intact, i.e., with father and mother alive and present. Nevertheless, we felt that whole families with at least one offspring of school age would be more representative of those which might be most helped by a community endeavor to make social and cultural changes. Families with school-age children and maximum chance for contact with the various KCCAP projects seemed the best target for sociological analysis.

There were more than 4,000 families in Knox County with incomes under $3,500 when KCCAP was started.[1] Most of the poor families have

a rural residence. Because the major focus of the general research design is on the rural portion of the county's population, our sample was as selective as possible of rural families. However, for purposes of comparison of these and a more urban-oriented, upwardly mobile group, we included families living in or near the county-seat town of Barbourville. To get families with school children, we visited appropriate elementary schools and secured the permission from school authorities to interview the boys in each fifth grade classroom. There were 234 enrolled in the groups we selected. On the days we were able to go to each school, eleven (11) boys were absent. We were primarily interested in families, and, although 223 questionnaires were collected in October, 1966, only 213 could be used. Male siblings and two pairs of twins accounted for eight schedules not used in our present data analysis.

Our adjusted universe of families thus became 213 families which had at least one son attending the fifth grade on a given day in 15 elementary schools nearest the community centers. We chose families with sons because we wanted a two-generational study and because boys seem to reflect more readily than girls the desire of the family to lift its prestige in the future. Since the adult male's occupation plays such a critical role in determining family status, focusing on the "father of the man" may give a better idea of the aspirations of the family for the next generation. The boy should be young enough to reflect the maximum effect of the home and minimal influence of outside factors. To secure adequate responses, on the other hand, he must be old enough to communicate in writing. Mothers became the other family respondents because much of the research on family has relied on the mother as being more

informed about the internal family system. (Mussen, 1960; Christensen, 1965). Moreover, in Knox County, despite the high rate of male unemployment, the mother is more accessible to the interviewer than the father. As assumed also, the wives consistently have had more years of schooling than the husbands.

When the boys proved to be members of intact nuclear families, the homemaker was interviewed. In this way a sample of 140 families was established for the first round of data collecting. As we lost nine families during the year between the first and second interviews,* our total sample was 131 families. Mothers and sons of this sample responded to two questionnaires each, the first completed in the fall of 1966, the second, again in schools and homes, in the winter of 1967-68. Native women interviewers conducted the homemaker interviews. Table I reveals the specific reasons for the loss of 82 of the original 213 families discovered in our first contact with the schools.

---

*Analysis of the characteristics of the missing cases showed that the families lost would have been distributed in such a way that their influence on the total trends was practically unnoticeable.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF FAMILIES NOT INCLUDED
AND REASONS FOR EXCLUSION

Number	Reasons
46	Incomplete families
13	Parents divorced or separated
13	Parent(s) deceased
5	Step-parents
5	Father out-of-town
10	Child living with other than parents
15	Families not available
10	Moved away during data collection period
5	Refusals
11	Low income families with no community center
10	Middle class families (income over $6,000 in year 1965-66)
82	Total excluded

Nearly three-fourths of the families reported sub-standard incomes, many of them relying on governmental supplements. Of these 95 disadvantaged families, a majority (56) indicated they were not now participating in KCCAP and became the NP group in this study. The other 39 Poor families reported one or more of their members presently involved in CAP-sponsored activities and were categorized the PP type.

The control group (AP) included 36 families whose incomes for the previous year were $3,000 and above, earned in wages or salary from regular employment, with the exception of five retired fathers on pension. Nineteen of these families have engaged in the county's CAP. Table 2 depicts the story of the participation of the 131 selected school-age families.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF FAMILIES IN THREE SAMPLE TYPES

Number	Type
56	Non-participating Poor Families (NP)
39	Participating Poor Families (PP)
36	Lower class Families Above Poverty (AP)
131	Total Adopted Sample

As another portion of this Evaluation shows, the Community Center directors reported regularly to our research team an assessment of the participation record of their constituency. These records were consulted to check the reliability of the responses by mothers and sons to several questions given in the second interview on center participation. Where a discrepancy was noted, a further examination of the family's claims was made.[2] If any uncertainty persisted, however, the final decision gave credence to the mother's statement that at least one of her family was actively participating during the winter of 1968.

A further word about the make-up of the sample is necessary to account for certain differences in the findings of this portion of the Evaluation and those derived from the larger rural sample of homemakers and heads of households utilized by other members of the investigating team. Three of the schools included in the purview of this study were located in or near Barbourville. One school was a part of the independent city school district and furnished us nearly a fourth of our AP families. The other two were county elementary schools where we picked

up twelve, or another third of our control group. It is important to realize that nearly one-half of the sample families that claimed continuing participation in their centers (Barbourville, Rosenwald-Boone, and Cannon) are probably less rural in outlook than the families in other parts of the general Evaluation. In like manner, about one third of the NP reside in these same areas and may have had more urban contacts than the rest of the non-participating poor families. A trichotomous composition of the families by residence reveals 46 living in the environs of Barbourville, 37 in homes located in settlements or villages, and 44 in relative isolation. A completely rural sample, which was infeasible with our research design, might have yielded sharper differences between the categorical types. However, many of the 46 families, who would be considered non-rural by census criteria, were probably not much urbanized in their life ways because of their very limited income. Thirty-two of these units were rated as Poor families. Table 3 designates the location of the three categories of families in terms of their proximity to the 14 centers in Knox County.

TABLE 3

CLOSEST CENTER BY FAMILY TYPES

Center	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Barbourville	12	3	15	7	22
Bethel	0	5	5	3	8
Cannon	4	2	6	6	12
Flat Lick	5	1	6	1	7
Fount	2	0	2	0	2
Grays	8	2	10	4	14
Grove	3	2	5	1	6
Jackson	4	0	4	0	4
Kay Jay	0	1	1	3	4
Ketchen	4	0	4	0	4
Messer	2	7	9	0	9
Middle Fork	2	2	4	0	4
Rosenwald-Boone	3	14	17	7	24
Wilton	3	0	3	4	7
Unknown	4	0	4	0	4
Total	56	39	95	36	131

NOTE: Barbourville and Rosenwald-Boone centers are located in urban areas; Bethel, Fount, Grove, Jackson, Ketchen, Messer, Middle Fork and Wilton are relatively isolated areas; Cannon, Flat Lick, Grays and Kay Jay are settlements and villages.

Standardized questionnaires were designed to elicit information relating to numerous variables which have been found to differentiate families both as social groups and cultural systems in terms of class-linked traits. As much as possible we accepted or developed questions which would yield responses that could be scaled ordinally. Several open-ended queries were included to secure actual statements of opinions. Interviewers noted nuances of attitudes and made a summary observation of each adult respondent and the home situation.

Five trained native married women of middle adult age range conducted the homemaker interviews which were all done in the respondent's residence. The contacts usually lasted from one to two hours. Two female graduate students from the University of Kentucky administered the group interviews to the boys at their separate schools in rooms isolated from the girls and frequently with the elementary teacher not present.

Treatment of Data

Non-parametric statistical tests were included in the programming for analysis because data were normally ordinal scaled. Composite measures were constructed and used as indices. Descriptions of these various collective scores such as Indices of Familism, Religiosity, Neighborliness, and Mobility and the like, are given in the appendix. Such indices are considered as variables which are used to explain the differences between participating and non-participating family types. Tests were run for differences between the analytical family groups utilizing these derived scores to change nominal sets of responses into ordinal scales.

Chi-square tests were relied upon for determining the presence of dependence between the variables. In instances where data were ordinally scaled, Gamma was used as a test of association. P (Probability) was considered significant at the .05 level unless otherwise stated.

CHAPTER II

DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Knox County, the locale of this study, is one of the western-most counties of Appalachian Kentucky. Its population is largely white, of Anglo-Saxon extraction and Protestant in religion. Many of the present inhabitants have ancestral ties to this mountainous area going back a century and a half or more.

The county, one of the oldest in the state, has had an illustrious but checkered history. Recently, because of the decline of its only major industry, mining, it has become one of the economically blighted areas and, hence, a target for the concentrated effort of the national OEO.

To understand the problems confronting the local organization, KCCAP, it is necessary to describe some of the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the people. Such a picture of the structural patterns focuses quite logically on families. As the Evaluation stresses, many of the current conditions that the Poor families face are associated with population features that have commonly been called "poverty-linked" characteristics.

This chapter discusses age composition and sex distribution; social features such as marital status, family stability, family structure, and educational achievement; and such economic characteristics as employment, family income, settlement patterns and housing. We shall proceed after a general county description to a delineation of these characteristics in the purposive sample to provide a back-

ground for persons concerned with the effectiveness of the KCCAP in assisting Knox County families to cope with poverty.

Ethnic and Racial Origin

Knox County's population is so homogeneous that this study may ignore ethnic and racial origins. Although around five percent of the people in the county are not native born, all members of the 131 families and their forbearers for at least three generations were born in the U. S. Less than two percent in the county are non-white. Only one Negro family is included in the sample.

Age and Sex Composition

Migration as a Factor

Nearly fifty percent of Knox County's inhabitants, five years and over, changed their residence in the 1950's. From 1960 to 1966, some 3,000 left the county. The net loss by out-migration from the county was (-)32.1 percent from 1950 to 1960. It was (-) 14.7 percent from 1960 to 1966. (Kelly, 1968) Like the rest of Eastern Kentucky, this county had net losses during the fifties in all age groups except those 70 years and above. About two thirds of its young adults (20-29), half of those 30-34, and around one third of the 35-39 age group were not replaced by in-migration or chronological maturing. By 1960, Knox County had only one-half as many persons in each of the age groups just mentioned as in the group 15-19. Some of this was due to higher birth rates since 1940, but much was due to age-selective migration.

Since most of the movement of people out of the region has been from rural areas, it is not surprising that Knox County reported a decrease in 1960 of one fifth of its rural dwellers. The move northward

and urbanward may have been selective of more characteristics than age. The attraction of this alternative, rather than living on in the depressed areas, must have affected the family organization of those unable or not wanting to leave. Not only have the more adventuresome males departed; the current sex ratio (96.6) indicates that females have left in even greater numbers. The fertility rate is relatively stable since some women who stayed in the county have exercised their fecundity far into their forties. The median age of the population was 23.3 at the beginning of the present decade. It probably approximates that, eight years later, even though a large number of residents are over 65. Latest figures on the dependency ratio of the county reveal the number of children under 15 and persons over 65 to be 1,176 per thousand persons in the age group 25-64. (Kelly, 1968).

Age Composition of the Sample

The above census data account for the age composition of our sample which contained relatively older parents, on the average, than one might have anticipated for families with young boys. Median ages for fathers of the grade school boys in the poor families were over 45. The mothers, on the same average, were around 40 and many had borne a child in the previous five years.

Selected Social Features

Marital Status and Family Stability

The table below compares the marital status of the county's white population 14 years and over (with the urban portion separated out) and that of Americans at large in 1960.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION, BY MARITAL STATUS AND BY SEX, IN KNOX COUNTY, ITS RURAL PORTION, AND IN THE U. S., 1960

Marital Status	Male			Female		
	U. S.	Knox Total	Rural	U. S.	Knox Total	Rural
Single	25.1	31.6	32.2	19.1	23.1	23.1
Married	69.1	63.7	64.0	54.9	61.8	63.0
Widowed	3.6	3.4	3.5	12.2	13.2	12.3
Divorced	2.1	1.3	1.3	2.8	1.8	1.6

SOURCE: U. S. Census of Population: 1960 Final Report PC (1)--1B Table 61, P. 174; and 19B. Tables 28, p. 101 and 29, p. 116.

The chances of marriage are less in Knox County than in the national society as a whole for both males and females. But the local area's disruption rates are more comparable with those of the larger society. Knox County's percentages of widowed and divorced may reflect the high value of marriage, or its utter necessity, as well as marital stability. Certainly, the quoted rates are lower than the indices of economic security would imply. A study of divorce in the county for the past twenty years also suggests that marriages are much less likely broken by legal means in this poverty area than in the more affluent regions elsewhere in the U. S. Seventeen divorces were granted in Knox County in 1966. The rate was .68 as compared to the U. S. crude divorce rate of 2.6 for that year. These figures also raise a serious question about the reliability of the rumor that marriages are frequently dissolved to enable mothers to qualify for AFDC funds. We have no measures of desertion for the county; reported figures in 1960, for separated couples, were not abnormally high.

Yet, the county's families do suffer disorganization even though they are not as vulnerable to divorce as those in urban America. In 1960 (and we suspect it is not much different now despite OEO counselling assistance), almost a fourth (22.9 percent) of the county's 10,000 children under 18 were not living with both of their own parents. This is a much larger percentage than that of the nation's children that year who were separated from at least one parent (13.6). The pattern of father-absence exists somewhat in the county, since heads of families are known to be away from home seeking or filling jobs. Whatever be the causes of Knox County's rate, the effects of child care and development of such family disruption have usually been considered to be severely detrimental. (Lynn and Sawrey, 1959; Stolz et al., 1954; Sears, 1951; Bach, 1946) Some studies have raised doubts about the imperative need of a child to be reared by his biological family, especially if that family be unstable or economically insecure. (Skeels and Harms, 1948; Dager, 1964). The variety of arrangements discovered in a cursory check of Knox County's broken homes suggested that a study of the effects of living with other than one's biological parents might serve some purpose. But we felt it was outside the scope of this evaluation to deal with atypical family units.

Since the decision was made to study only intact family systems, thirty-one of our original 213 families were excluded from our survey because they were presently incomplete or had been recently reorganized by step-parents. The percentage (14.5) of sixth grade boys in Knox County in 1968, not now living with their own parents, thus proved much lower than that for children in general in the county in 1960.

Our data revealed some additional marital disruption in the past experience of the homemakers who were studied. Seventeen of our 131 now

intact families had a history of divorce or widowhood in the mother's life. Hence, one-fourth of all school boys in the first interview had mothers who had suffered such traumatic experiences. Ten NP homemakers (17.8 percent) had this background; five PP (12.8 percent) and two AP (5.6 percent) wives had lost their first husbands by death or divorce. None had been married more than twice.

Size of Family and Household Composition

We have referred to the relatively high birth rate as a mitigating factor offsetting the migration losses in the county. Actually, births per 1,000 population have decreased, here as in the state and nation, during the past seven years. (Kelly, 1968) However, given the median age of women with reproductive power, who reside in Knox County, and the regular out-migration of females with incomplete fertility, the maintenance of a birth rate of such magnitude strongly implies large families as a result of fertility expression throughout the reproductive years of the homemaker. Given also the general absence of voluntary sterility, and the historic positive relation (until very recently) of an increase in births per family with increases in income, it is not surprising to find an increase in family size since 1960. Finally, the younger and smaller families seem to have migrated, leaving the older and larger families behind to raise the index.

Instead of 4.39 persons per household as reported in the decennial census, there are now 4.64, if a five percent sampling can be relied on to be representative of the whole county.[3] Since the average family size in 1940 was 5.18 members, a rural tradition may be on the way to re-

establishment unless contravening forces are introduced. The prospect of undiminished family size must be considered a negative finding if it is not being effectively dealt with by planned parenthood personnel.

Knox County has had a lower death rate than the more urban areas. "Mortality, as measured by the crude death rate (which does not take age composition into account), has been traditionally low in Eastern Kentucky." (Kelly 1968) This rate has been rising as youthful people have moved out of the region. A noteworthy aspect of the rising rate is that of infant mortality. Another indication of the older age of the mothers presently is the radical increase in this latter rate from 18.2 in 1962 to 29.0 in 1965. Such a condition should be contraindicated by the attempted improvement lately of health services in the county.

The average size of the families in the sample might be expected to be large since some were far advanced in the family life cycle. The median number of offspring in NP units was 6.5; PP families were even larger with a comparable average of seven children still living. The AP group had a median of 5.3. Of course, these figures include offspring over 18 years of age.

An assumption that the gross number of persons per household might be influenced by the pattern of extended family, living in one residence, was not supported by the respondents. Only one tenth of the homes in all three types contained any other than nuclear family members. One of the women interviewed remarked that:

> "many young families have been living with their parents and have not been able to live alone since they had no jobs until jobs were offered by the OEO program. Now that they have jobs (most of them) they are able to live out."

This suggests that a three-generation family residence is not highly

valued in this sub-culture. Observers of family life in Appalachia have described the practice of young men bringing their new wives home temporarily until they were able to find a place of their own. A lengthy delay in securing such a neo-local residence would be a reflection on the young husband. Not that they needed to go a great distance. Another long-lived pattern was to live close enough to their families to be able to visit them regularly. As a consequence, over 75 percent of both husbands and wives in the sample have one or more relatives living nearby. But a sign of change is shown in the numbers of families whose adult sons and daughters have ventured northward up the migration stream.

The actual size of the sample families (considering only those children under 18) is slightly over the American average for such families, "with heads 45 to 64 years old and some children under 18," announced by the Bureau of Census as being 4.78. (U. S. Statistical Abstract, 1967) Similarly categorized families in our sample averaged 4.86.

Infant mortality has been a limiting factor in one-third of the NP families, one-half of the PP, but less than a fifth of the AP group. We do not have ordinal information on the deceased children. Sixty one children, in all, died in their childhood, an overall mortality of about seven percent.

The age of the mothers in our study would also indicate some future fertility expression in light of the aversion of many to a program of planned parenthood.

Educational Levels and Percentages of Children in School

Over one fourth (27.1 percent) of the adults in the county, 25 years and above, were functionally illiterate in 1960, having completed four years of schooling or less. The 1960 census showed another fourth in this age grouping had finished only elementary school. However, an additional 22 percent had dropped out between the fourth and eighth grades. Nine percent were high school graduates; seven percent had some college training, less than half of whom had secured a degree. The median educational level for persons of these ages was 8.0, a rise of 1.3 since 1940. The females had a slightly higher average than the males.

Fathers in our sample of Poor families had lower educational levels than those just mentioned. Sixty percent had six grades of schooling or less; only five percent had ever attended high school. One third of those above the poverty line (AP) had gone beyond the eighth grade.

Mothers, as expected, had higher levels. One fifth of NP and PP homemakers had gone to school beyond the eighth grade; a little over two fifths of AP women were similarly privileged. The median for mothers in the first two categories was seven years. It was six for fathers in the two groups. The state's comparable levels were 8.8 and 8.5 for the two sexes in 1960; those of the U. S. were 10.7 and 10.3 at that time.

Although adults in Knox County have been deprived of education themselves, their children seem to have greater opportunities. A spectacular increase in percentages in school since 1950 bespeaks some promise for the younger generation.[4] The county school system like the independent city system has profited from a statewide foundation program. Federal and state funds have been used to consolidate schools,

eliminating many of the one or two-room school houses. Due to out-migration, the total number of school-age children in the county has declined; yet the percentages of children attending daily and of those completing the year enrolled have increased. These latter two figures in 1965-66 were 92.8 and 93.3, respectively. The high school principal reported a steady though gradual recent increase in the ratio of percentages of graduates to the percentages of students entering.

Percentages of school enrollment for each age group, 7-13, 14-15, and 16-17 have increased during the past five years. The curriculum expansion has been impressive, especially in vocational training. The Elementary and Secondary School Act (Title I) provides a half million dollars a year to the county school system. The impact is great and this aspect alone deserves extensive exploration. We can mention here that the over-all school program has been extended to include teacher aides, office and administrative personnel, guidance counsellors, and special programs (e.g., remedial reading).

As the quality of the education is enhanced, there is little doubt that the average student will be better educated than his parents. However, a study of the records of the enrollees indicates that the present quality of performance is low by any standard. Retardation and drop-outs are still serious problems. The former now seems to begin as early as the first grade. Children attending the larger consolidated schools are better achievers and consequently are less retarded. Numerous tests show generally sub-normal I.Q.'s. Evidence indicates that those attending high school are in quite low national percentiles in reading, English, math, and science. The

Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Form AM) were administered to all high school students. In only one instance for the entire student body was the percentile rank above the .50 level - in one classroom the average spelling percentile was .54. Few if any students with such abilities would have much success in college. Thirty (30) percent of the 34 freshmen attending the local college (a church-sponsored institution in Barbourville) were in the 10th percentile in English on the American College Test. (The average for all freshmen at the college was the 39.5 percentile.) A few young people are attending schools elsewhere and may be better prepared.

A profile of the typical drop-out, drawn by the county school office, looks something like this: white, male (three out of five chances), 16 years old, dropping out during the ninth grade in January, and having attended one elementary school and no other secondary school. He will probably not have had any conferences with the pupil personnel worker until his withdrawal. There is a greater chance that his parents were not contacted. He most likely will be enrolled in a vocational or technical program. His record will show he was irregular in attendance, has an IQ below 90 and was achieving below ability level. He was retained in the first grade, was failing three or more subjects, and reads on the third to sixth grade level. He had never been a behavior problem, had never been suspended from school, was accepted by his peers socially, but did not participate in extracurricular activities or athletics. He does not have even a part-time job to which he goes; he withdrew because of lack of interest. He is most likely to be the oldest of four siblings, living with both parents. The family income is dependent on

the father, an unskilled laborer who earns $1,720 per year. The family is not receiving welfare assistance. Neither of his parents has more than a fifth grade education. He was one of 146 males withdrawing from school in 1964. The other 104 drop-outs that year were girls with somewhat similar personal and family backgrounds. Over 6,000 persons were enrolled during that year.

Turning to the 131 sixth-grade boys, we find indications of potential educational casualties not too dissimilar to the above. Thirty were over-aged for their grade (11 years is normal age), 28 of them in NP and PP families. Four boys were over 13. Half of the youngsters from the 95 Poor families said they already disliked school and only two fifths expect to get more than a high school education if that.

Since the school might be an important socializing force impinging on these pre-adolescents, "an ever increasing proportion of responsibility for teaching boys the attitudes, values, beliefs, skills, and standards of judgment necessary for effective participation in the community is being assumed by this agency." (Voss, 1964) It is doubtful that it can fulfill this role, however, in depressed rural areas unless families become interested and supportive. The extent of this latter condition is given further attention in this report.

Economic Characteristics

Employment and Family Income

The latest Federal census (1960) revealed over ten percent of Knox County's employable persons were unable to find work. Since then, this rate is said to have decreased for the county's potential labor

force. However, 14.5 percent of the fathers in our sample were non-employed or underemployed in the winter of 1968. An additional 15.3 percent had retired from an active work life because of age, disability or chronic illness. These percentages mean that nearly a third of the fathers of our pre-adolescent boys are currently unable to furnish their sons an example of work productivity in addition to their inability to provide a livelihood for the family. Table 5 below shows a picture of how the working men in the sample compared with those reported in the labor force of the county in 1960. (The composition has undoubtedly shifted for Knox Countians during the decade; fewer men are farming or mining today.) The percentage of wives working (13 percent) is much lower than that in urban counties.

TABLE 5

SELECTED LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE AS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF THE COUNTY IN 1960

Labor Force Characteristics	Knox County 1960[a]	Present Sample[b]
Percent unemployed	9.4	16.0
Percent employed.		
Professional, technical, etc.	10.7	3.4
Manager, official, etc.	6.3	5.7
Clerical & kindred & sales worker	14.7	1.4
Farmer, farm management, farm laborer, etc.	8.8	8.0
Craftmen & foremen, etc.	12.3	21.8
Operative & kindred	24.0	29.9
Household & service worker	10.3	5.7
Laborers except farm & mine	8.2	24.1
Occupations not reported	4.7	

SOURCE: [a]Claire C. Kelly, "Eastern Kentucky: A Descriptive Analysis of The Population" (unpublished Master's Research Paper, Department [b]of Sociology, University of Kentucky 1968.
[b]Is computed on the basis of the head of the household's occupation.

Per capita income in 1965 had almost doubled the amount reported fifteen years earlier. It rose from $392 in 1950 to $761 in the mid-sixties.[5] The more rapid increase since 1960 (when it was $501) implies similar rises in family income. But seventy percent of all heads of families were receiving less than $3,000 when family income was nationally surveyed nearly ten years ago. Only ten percent reported more than $6,000 at that time. Estimates by the KCCAP personnel, in 1965 and since then, have indicated some decrease in percentages of those receiving from $1,000 to $3,000, largely due to federal and state help. In 1965, the average household income was thought to be close to the latter figure. The median was pegged at $2,000.

The median income for the two categories of Poor families in this study is still below the cut-off level. However, the latest modal family income for each of the categorical types implies some improvement. Careful attempts to ascertain the number of men who have become self-supporting during the period of the operation of KCCAP were not very successful.

Only 48.2 percent of the NP families relied on self-earned incomes in 1967 while even fewer (38.5 percent) of the PP families mentioned this as their sole source of support. None of these, it must be remembered, received over $3,500. Many wives indicated that they had seen better days earlier in their marriages. A further bit of evidence of the continuation of family distress is revealed in the fact that Poor families tend to have one or more older sons and daughters who are unemployed and staying at home. Some of the relevant information on the current economic plight of Knox County families appears in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Economic Characteristics (by percentage)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Heads not in work force					
Unemployed	17.9	23.1	20.0	5.6	16.0
Retired	21.4	20.5	21.1	8.3	17.6
Family income less than $2,000 per annum	32.1	30.8	31.6	0.0	23.1
Self earned family income	48.2	38.5	44.2	100.0	58.8
Working Wives	14.5	2.6	9.6	22.2	13.0
Unemployed sons	25.0	41.1	31.6	11.4	26.2
Unemployed daughters	19.4	33.3	25.2	5.6	19.8

Settlement Patterns and Housing Conditions

The economic history of the area is one of transition from subsistence and tenant farming to involvement in the extractive industries of oil, coal, and timber. Knox County proved to be short in all of the usable natural resources on which these enterprises are based. It has subsequently suffered from many features of the "boom and bust" process. (Howard, 1937; Jarvie, 1948; Oxendine, 1954) Among these was the culture-disturbing influx of railroad workers in the late nineteenth century, oil drillers and coal miners from 1900 to 1920, strike breakers in the early twenties, and commercial and professional personnel, throughout, to service the incipient industrial complex. The newcomers came from other parts of the United States. Many left at the end of the successive booms. Some stayed on as they became acculturated with the generations

of farmers who had settled on the adjacent hillsides decades before. How assimilated the "strangers" have been is difficult to determine.

We do know that farm tenancy grew from 1890 to 1940 at the same pace as the population; there were 468 tenant farmers in Knox County in 1890 and 1,226 after the nationwide depression. In both years they constituted about a third of the population. An additional twenty percent still owned and operated small farms just prior to World War II. There are tantalizing questions which we were unable to answer satisfactorily: Was the increase in farm tenancy in the earlier years due to those who adapted after each flurry of industrial activity rather than move on to other sites? Are many of the long-time owners of small, subsistence farms, who are now engaging in part-time farming and have become somewhat dependent, the remnant of the earliest culture-bearers of the region?

After 1940, a drastic decline occurred in numbers of both types of farmers. By 1945 the percentage of farm tenants was halved. The 1950 census revealed that the rural-farm segment was then less than half of the total county population. In the ensuing decade this percentage dropped to 14.9 as many left the county or simply stopped farming. The 1970 census will probably show a further drop to about a twentieth of the inhabitants relying solely on agriculture for their livelihood.

The mining portion of the population has remained around ten percent since 1930. Clustered mostly in and about small, now non-growing settlements, these residents include descendants of both the in-migrants of decades ago and farm families too large to survive on the production possible on the steep hills.

The logging enterprise has been a deforestation process, costing the county a valuable economic resource. Those involved in the denuding of the timber have been largely of native stock, many of whom are still trying to wrest out of the wooded country-side sufficient income to escape the welfare rolls.

The foregoing details on the economic background are necessary to account for the distribution of the people throughout the county and certain characteristics of housing accommodations for the families under study. We have omitted much of the story, especially of the development of the little urban community of Barbourville, since we are primarily interested in the rural dwellers.

In the non-urban sections two settlement patterns have developed. One pattern is the village with homes and commercial and community service establishments typical of many small American towns. Three of these are the sites in or near which some of our sample families live. One, Kay Jay, is a dying mining camp. Another, Artemus, is much livelier looking but its leaders have not seen fit to participate in the KCCAP or develop a community center.

The other rural type is distinctly open-country with houses sometimes scattered but often clustered according to the consanguineous ties of the occupants. Some extended family groupings live in close proximity; an example is the section whose children are enrolled in a one-room school in which all 28 students are related. There are only three different family names. Some isolated valleys (hollows) are inhabited by several kinship groups who have varying success in maintaining neighborhood relations. One or more country churches is located nearby.

The dwellings themselves are predominantly two-story frame buildings, reflecting both a former level of prosperity and a large-sized family. A majority of the houses are occupant-owned. Nearly half of them were built before 1930. As a consequence of the latter fact, over 50 percent are in a state of deterioration. The latest generation has been unable to keep the buildings in a state of repair. Most of the houses have access to electric power, an improvement since 1940 which has not been fully utilized by the introduction of modern conveniences. Again, poverty has handicapped the families by preventing the purchase and up-keep of facilitating aids to comfortable family living. Modern plumbing is almost universally missing from the houses, but radios and television are rather frequently found in the homes.

The native interviewers rated the condition of the houses and surroundings of each family they visited. By these highly relative rankings, the accommodations of one third of the NP families and one fourth of the PP units were still considered poor. Only two of the AP homes were considered locally sub-standard. Nearly three fifths of the houses of the lower-income groups were owned by the families living in them. Almost half of these had been built by a member of a preceding generation. The typical amount paid monthly by those who rented was either below $20 or between $30 and $50, according to size and land value. The modal number of rooms per house was four.

Because of the already lengthy interview schedules, information about household conveniences was not collected. We have little reason to expect much difference from the description of these home aids given above. We did check on the exposure to mass media of the two respondents

in each family. Two thirds of the homes have access to a radio. Apparently more own TV sets, since 80 percent of the boys in the NP families and only slightly less (68.8 percent) of the PP youngsters said they watched TV sometime every day.

The sample, it should be remembered, contains some families living in or near the one city and in several villages. This may help to account for one third to one half of the family units reporting no available land for farming or gardening. Less than ten percent raise enough produce to sell. NP families reflect a greater orientation to the farming tradition of the region in that more than fifty percent have sizeable gardens and some own livestock.

Like the rest of the population in Knox County, nine out of ten of the adults in the families studied were born in the area. Similar percentages of their parents had spent their lives in or near Knox County. One fourth of the NP husbands had worked and lived outside Kentucky. Less than a fifth of the NP wives had been so far away from the county. Fewer PP husbands and wives were as bound to one family home as the apparently more residentially stable NP. Table 7 summarizes some of the findings we have discussed in the last few pages.

TABLE 7

HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY
BY FAMILY TYPES

Housing and Possessions	Poor				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total
"Poor" housing condition	33.3	26.3	30.4	5.8	23.8
House ownership	58.0	59.0	59.0	69.5	61.8
Have radios	85.5	87.2	86.2	83.3	85.5
Have television	80.0	82.1	80.9	94.6	80.0
Land available for farming	60.7	43.6	53.7	50.0	52.7
Present house as lifelong dwelling	23.2	40.5	30.0	55.6	37.2
Husband born in Knox County	67.9	61.5	65.3	77.7	68.7
Wives born in Knox County	69.6	71.8	70.5	72.2	71.0
Husbands lived in the same community	75.0	59.0	68.4	77.8	71.0
Wives lived in the same community	82.1	64.1	74.7	69.4	73.3
Husbands worked in Ky. only	74.5	89.2	80.7	51.6	80.0

Summary of Sample's Characteristics

The sample of 131 selected families seems fairly representative of the lower classes in Knox County in age composition and family size. As intact families, they have experienced higher stability than may generally be true of the total population. Little evidence exists of a common residence for extended family groups. Each new family prefers to live separately. Most of the mothers are at or nearing the end of their reproductive period. The 131 women have borne over 900 children, sixty-one of which died in early childhood.

Both parents of the Poor families have been severely disadvantaged

educationally, a fact that will be pertinent in the rest of the study. They are not too dissimilar from the rest of the lower class citizens of the county in this respect. The slightly higher level of schooling noted for county adults has been affected by the educational achievement of the middle and upper classes (who constitute a distinct minority). Some hope may exist for the younger children since the schools have recently been considerably improved.

These families with grade school sons suffer from higher rates of underemployment (including those unemployed, unemployable and retired) than observed ratios for the county as a whole. Poor families tend to receive governmental subsidies, much less than a half relying on their self-earned annual incomes.

Sixty percent of the families own their own homes, less than a third of which were reported as sub-standard according to relative rankings of the native interviewers. Rental rates do not seem exhorbitant for the rest of the family units. NP families tend to engage in marginal or part-time farming and gardening more than the PP, although only ten percent of the total sample raise enough produce to sell.

The families are made up of persons largely native to Knox County, like their fellow-countians. Many of the families are home-bound to Knox County. The rest had moved a number of times, NP families greater distances than PP units, a condition which will be considered in the later discussion of differential participation by family types.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

The forces of social change have been acting on Knox County for a long time. Rural families and their individual members have been reacting and resolving the stresses produced in their living patterns in various ways and, of course, with varying degrees of success. It would now appear that a large segment of the county's people have been relatively unsuccessful in their adaptive struggle. Disadvantaged by under-employment, under-education, and over-sized structure, the Poor families are in a constant crisis-bind brought on by the clash of two cultures. The one is a regional sub-culture traditional in nature which has served many for at least a century in their fight to eke out survival and subsistence in a mountainous and hilly land. The other, a dominant more complex and contemporary culture, has penetrated the region and is confronting the traditionalists with new ways of resolving old problems. The conflict is heightened by the dissatisfactions arising out of the generally unsatisfactory outcome of living by the ancient adaptation. The least dissatisfied retreat from the attack on their traditional cultural modes. The others are caught in the "bind." For them strains are occurring. They are forced to make decisions between acceptance or rejection of one after another of the modern methods and innovations of the invading cultural system.

Stephenson (1966) studied "a rural, relatively undifferentiated series of localized dwelling areas" in western North Carolina. He discusses the patterns of adaptation in a changing mountain community

similar to the ones this report is investigating. Using a family typology somewhat corresponding to the categories utilized here, he examined the elements of the conflict as the families shifted along a continuum of acceptance of the "contemporary" cultural forms. Focusing on the "stressors" and the potential for resolution or retreat, Stephenson predicted that the types characterized by indecision would "show higher rates of pathology" than the one that completely capitulated or the families who withdrew into further isolation.

This study differs from the one on the North Carolina community (also in Appalachia) in that it deals with an area in which the reference bind is accentuated by a concerted organized effort to interculturate the native residents with outside representatives of contemporary culture. Through a developmental program fostering family acceptance of new attitudes, and novel means for making their attempts at adaptation more successful and more satisfying, the planners sought to involve the families themselves in projects of social action. Community planning was to be supported by services rendered both from without and within each local neighborhood for rehabilitating individuals and for improving families.

The present chapter, after a brief description of the progress of social change and the degree of readiness in the area for adopting a program of social action, discusses the findings concerning the extent of acceptance in the first two years of the enterprise.

The Progress of Change

A major highway (U.S. 25) which is now being modernized runs through the middle of the county on a southeasterly course. It symbolizes the flow into the area of broad social changes that were established before the emergence of the concentrated effort. These changes had diffused into the far reaches of the county in almost direct relation to the condition of the transportation arteries linking settlements and homes with the federal route. First, the black-topped state roads give way to infrequently improved dirt county roadways. These, in turn, disappear shortly into the many creek-beds which are rendered impassable by intermittent mountain streams. In like manner, the penetration of social renovation seems slowly to diminish, and then, often abruptly, ceases. Here, some of "yesterday's people" can still be found. (Weller, 1965)

However, the majority of the population are not that isolated from social change. We have mentioned the irregular impact of industrialization. The relative proximity of many rural homes to the one growing community also implies the operation of at least some characteristic urbanizing influences--increased use of mass media and telephone communication, to name but two. Modern improvements in the school system--consolidated new school buildings, for example--have been taking place for some time.

Government programs installed years ago have introduced social innovations as they brought economic relief. Barbourville, through its college and civic organizations, has generally and sporadically stimulated the rest of the county to adopt new practices intended to accelerate the transition to a modern way of life. The little city has a history of

considerable contact with the mainstream of the American society. (Oxendine, 1948) Due to the enlightened concern of the city's leaders, Knox County was one of the earliest applicants for an OEO funded program. (Rees, 1965) Similarly alert persons in other sections of the county were socially conscious in 1965 and somewhat supportive of the goals of county-wide rehabilitation when KCCAP began its campaign to speed up the social change and further diffuse it.

Programs Fostering Family Development

One obvious objective for inclusion in the comprehensive proposal of the newly constituted KCCAP was the improvement of the housing conditions and home life of the target population. The family was recognized, as the key institution that it is, in the outline of the plans the leaders promised to put into operation immediately following a Federal grant under Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act. A Family Development Program was a major portion of the Community Center Component of KCCAP.

After a description of Knox County and its people that sought to justify their qualifications as a potential host population for a special concentrated rural community effort, the council proposed several imaginative projects. Among these was a plan for family renewal and renovation which would include "a central family service and community family development program in the eleven community centers and the three community school centers."* Soon after the grant was received the promised project got underway.

---

*All quoted excerpts in this section are from documents in KCCAP office files unless otherwise stated.

Original Program Objectives

It was to work on "low parental education, adult hopelessness, lack of skill in child care, poor nutrition and home budgeting, extremely bad housing conditions, poor sanitation, lack of knowledge about good health rules . . . what government services are available . . . and how and where to apply for employment." Its announced purposes were an "attack on adult apathy," literacy training, a program "to increase homemaking skills," home improvement activities to deal with housing and sanitation, and the provision of a Family Service Center for handling family-related problems. Neighborhood programs to implement these aims were to be organized at 14 locations. A specific additional goal was the building of several model homes and "help for prospective builders in getting loans and plans." Work crews were to be organized to repair substandard housing as a team effort by co-operating families.

Program Structure

The planners had offered a description of personnel needs in setting up the task force to operate the program. Beside the eight full and part-time professionals, local residents were to be hired as aides, volunteers would teach basic reading and writing (on a person-person basis), and the Neighborhood Action Councils would act as advisory groups for the administration of the program. A total of around $110,000 was sought to cover the costs of the different features for helping families to help themselves.

This was the proposed plan of action in 1965. As in many planned projections, the Family Development Program underwent structural changes as it, itself, was developed. Scarcely publicized as such, the program

for Family Development was not as easily recognized by its target clientele as were Head Start, Early Childhood Programs, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and others.

Under the date of July 6, 1966, the KCCAP gave a progress report that indicated the program had been launched in home improvement, legal education, the teaching of homemaking skills, and a long range project for "raising the incomes of marginal farmers." Proposals were being prepared for a federal grant for "a Speech and Reading Clinic to serve a multi-county area." Meanwhile, a conference had been held on adult education. The Counselling Center was reported as "doing a quiet but effective job." This was the FDP when our interviewers made their first visit to the homes of the 131 families. No specific questions were asked about the FDP because our pre-testing showed it was too recently established and too diverse for the respondents to be aware of it.

By the summer of 1967, KCCAP was under the direction of its present executive. Its projects had been reorganized as well as its organizational chart and job descriptions. The component on Family Development thereafter concentrated on "home improvement, adult education, and home economics," according to a communication from the Community Center Projects Director.[6] "These programs are continued. . . .(in a manner relatively the same as the original proposal) . . . . "under the 'Technical Assistance Program.' Aides were changed from a specific field to community aides performing combined duties."

The major change in emphasis was in home economics, in which a shift took place from home-centered skills to those producing items that could be marketed. Home Improvement aides were reduced in number

with those retained having their salary raised to that of full time employees. The aides not retained were transferred as employees to Cannon Industries, a small home-operated manufacturer of wood products guided into existence by KCCAP.

The program office assisted in administering loans for home renovation, obtaining legal aid for interested families from local sources (no money was allocated for legal aid as such in the current program year), and helping families to contact other agencies for specific services.[7]

The model homes project now called Knox Quality Homes, Inc., had succeeded in building several low-cost houses.[8] Still functioning, it was looking forward to greater activity in the new program year, 1968-69, when nine men were to be assigned to it under a new federal work program.

The Counselling Center in Barbourville was available for individual service and offered its resources to other groups and programs. It no longer is considered a part of the Family Development Program, however.[9]

Program Acceptance

A number of questions were included in the second interviews which were administered to the homemakers of the sample in the late fall of 1967. About eighteen months had elapsed since FDP was set into operation. We asked the women if they had heard of the titled project, if they had been helped by any of its services (which were specified), and what they thought of the various aspects.

Perhaps the account of how the Family Development Program did not closely follow the original plan explains why 59 percent of those attending the Centers (PP) and almost nine out of ten of the NP adult respond-

ents (87.5 percent) claimed they had never heard of FDP. Just four PP mothers and only one NP woman indicated they had participated in any activities recognized as sponsored under that title. Nearly half of the Participating Poor acknowledged that they had received help at the Counselling Center. Evidently, none of the NP visited this new agency. As we shall see later, these expressions of awareness and acceptance of the particular program, focused directly on the improvement of home and family, are not true indicants of the effectiveness of KCCAP in this aspect of community improvement.

Active participation by PP families in other titled programs is counter evidence. The reported aid received by NP units in other activities, together with their limited but favorable approval of the Centers in general, suggests either 1) a failure in publicity of FDP; 2) too subtle a tactic in promoting its goals; or 3) a premature, perhaps naive, perception of the readiness of disadvantaged people to work on such basic individual and family problems. It is possible that all of these may be held responsible for the low rating an evaluator must give FDP if he uses the criteria which the originators of this plan of work set for its evaluation.

Said the planners in 1965, there should shortly (in three years) be "a change in attitudes toward family planning and child care, awareness of simple rules for nutrition, home improvements, the number of successful and unsuccessful literacy students, and use of Family Service Center facilities." Responses by the interviewees and reports by KCCAP personnel do not permit a very sanguine judgment of the outcome so far. Elsewhere in the general report is a statement of the

extent of housing repairs and new homes built in the county. There was a slight amount of repair reported for the houses of the sample. Three homes have had minor repairs according to those mothers who responded to this question. The adult literacy training, also described in another portion of the Evaluation, seems scarcely to have touched our respondents. No homemaker mentioned this as an accomplishment induced by her center.

The number of women visiting the KCCAP Health offices for help in "family planning" is said to have increased during the period.[10] Although a majority of the PP mothers indicated that they had received some assistance from the new Health Program, none specified this particular aid. The prevailing negative attitude toward contraception may have made any who were helped in this way reluctant to admit it.

We have mentioned the low total percentage of homemakers who reported access to the Family Service centers. Whether child care practices have undergone shifts during the brief period of KCCAP's existence may be deduced as we compare the parenting behavior in the family types. Here it is necessary to mention that less than a fourth of all wives have continued as active participants in center activities during the entire existence of their center. Table 8 shows the extent of the contact of the families by type with various programs KCCAP has sponsored to serve families.

TABLE 8

CONTACTS WITH AND PARTICIPATION IN THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS OF KCCAP BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Contacts and Participation (in percentage)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Heard of community centers	94.9	100.0	96.8	100.0	97.7
Someone in family has participated	17.9[a]	100.0[a]	51.6	52.8	51.9
Wives actively continuing to participate	0.0	59.5	26.3	19.4	24.4
Participated in:*					
Family develop. prog.	1.9	13.2	6.5	8.3	7.0
Counselling center	0.0	43.4	17.4	3.8	13.9
Health programs	25.5[a]	75.7[a]	45.2	33.3	42.3
Youth activities	4.3[a]	61.0[a]	28.9	34.6	30.3
Early childhood program	6.8[a]	55.5[a]	25.3	27.2	26.0
Have reported one or more programs that have helped the family	39.3[a]	84.6[a]	57.9	58.3	58.0

*Excludes very little participation.
[a]= x^2 for the differences between NP and PP were found to be significant at $<.05$.

Readiness For Change

The question remains whether the poor themselves have been willing to support the various projects aimed at accelerating change. The general acceptance of the community centers is reflected in the expressed opinions of our respondents, concerning the center programs, and their verdict about positive changes that have come since the KCCAP was introduced. Around two-thirds of all adults surveyed gave a favorable rating of "good" or "excellent" to the centers. The opinions by family types on the centers themselves and the responses by homemakers on how much

improvement they thought had occurred in the area since the inception of KCCAP are revealed in Table 9.

TABLE 9

OPINIONS ABOUT CENTERS AND ABOUT IMPROVEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT ABOUT IN KNOX COUNTY BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Opinions (in percentages)	Poor Families			AP	Total Sample
	NP	PP	Total Poor		
Wives opinion about center "good" to "excellent"	47.4[a]	84.2[a]	65.8	72.7	67.9
Wives report husband opinion about center as "good" to "excellent"	47.2[a]	78.4[a]	63.0	66.7	64.2
Jobs and ways of finding them have changed for better	51.8	46.2	49.5	69.4	55.0
Income and level of living have changed for better	55.4	56.4	55.8	77.8	61.8
Way things are run and decisions are made in neighborhood have changed for better	12.7[a]	30.8[a]	20.2	22.2	20.8
Way things are run and decisions are made in county have changed for better	16.1[a]	33.3[a]	23.2	28.6	24.6
Way schools are run in Knox County has changed for better	62.5	66.7	64.2	62.9	63.8
Way welfare works in Knox County County has changed for better	21.4[a]	39.5[a]	28.7	13.9	24.9
Way recreation is organized and available has changed for better	19.6[a]	53.8[a]	33.7	44.4	36.6

a = x^2 for the differences between NP and PP were found to be significant at $<.05$.

The differences in rates of approval of the centers are obviously related to the degrees of participation. The extent of involvement also partially explains the impressions of the constructive influence of KCCAP. But note the similarity in the perceptions of "changes for the better" in job opportunities, income levels and school administration.

However, the fact that cultural patterns are not likely to change as rapidly as the social environment changes is shown by comments by our mother and child respondents. Answers to open-ended questions reflected considerable opposition to the centers which was based on traditional resistance to social change. The literature on social change, generalized by Berelson and Steiner (1964), indicates that "the more a social change threatens or appears to threaten the traditional values . . ., the greater the resistance to that change." Kaplan and Delberg argue that hindrance to implementing change "is affected by such factors as leadership, whether the changes are 'material' or 'non-material', how close they are to the 'cultural focus', and how rapidly the changes are occurring." (1968) Criticisms of center activities were given by members of all family types, even by some participating in, and generally sanctioning, the programs. The responses took the form of derogatory remarks about "outside leaders," about supposed dancing, drinking and ribald behavior at the centers, and about the perceived threat to certain tenaciously held moral and religious values.

Many of the residents, especially in outlying rural neighborhoods, seem to have viewed the whole KCCAP enterprise at first as a big new agency for the "material" improvement of Knox County's needy. They were attracted to the centers by the presumed job opportunities they

hoped to find there, by the pleasant recreation announced as occurring there, and by the rumors that houses would be repaired and homemaking skills would be taught. Those who were hired or who enjoyed the recreation or learned new techniques of cooking, sewing and the like, became enthusiastically involved. Naturally not all could be given jobs. Some who came felt their beliefs and values would not permit their continuing.

Program Resistance

Over a third of the NP families stated that they had visited the centers at least once. Half of these claimed that they had taken part for a while in the programmed activities. But for reasons implying cultural resistance none of the members of these particular families persisted in attendance. As we shall discuss later in some detail, over half of the AP type also demonstrated initial interest which was sustained for several months. Since one or more of their family members were regularly employed in another job, it would seem that this was not the motive for their early center acceptance. Subsequently, nine of the nineteen AP families, who began to attend, stopped participating and explained their disaffection in cultural terms.

TABLE 10

REASONS FOR NEVER PARTICIPATING BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL NON PARTICIPATING
(Percents by Column)

Reasons	NP (N=42)	AP (N=19)	Total (N=61)
Disinterest: never heard of, not interested, doesn't like	52.4	26.3	44.3
Personal reasons: don't participate in such things, have no time	28.6	47.4	34.4
Extraneous reasons: distance, lack of transportation, husband's and neighbors' discouragements, other	19.0	26.3	21.3

The relative resistance is depicted in Table 10. The non-participating families showed mixed reactions. Many had never "been near" the center to become informed. A few had never heard of this social innovation, while the greatest percentage think so little of the concept of community co-operation in the broadest sense that they never discussed the endeavor within the family circle. Several women felt that the program was "all right for the ones that needed it or liked that sort of thing." They rated the center nearest their home as "good" or "excellent," but not for them. As one might expect, the coolest reception of the attempt to get "maximum feasible participation" was expressed in caustic statements about the character and life styles of those who were "wasting" their time and energy when "they should have been working."

The majority of the Participating families acknowledged the worth of their family involvement in one or more organized projects of KCCAP.

Yet an examination of their level of participation in other action-oriented associations in the county (see Table 11) raises doubts about the potential cultural change that has occurred or can occur when the most enthusiastic supporters have such meager organizational experience.

TABLE 11

PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS
(OTHER THAN THOSE NOW PROMOTED BY KCCAP)
BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLES

Formal Organization (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Service Clubs					
Membership	0.0	2.4	1.1	8.3	3.1
Regular Attendance	0.0	2.4	1.1	0.0	0.8
School Service Group (P.T.A.)					
Membership	14.3	15.4	14.7	54.4	32.9
Regular Attendance	7.1	10.3	8.4	22.2	12.2
Labor Union					
Membership	5.7	2.4	4.2	16.7	7.6
Regular Attendance	3.8	2.4	3.1	8.3	4.6
Farm Organizations					
Membership	0.0	2.4	1.1	14.3	4.6
Regular Attendance	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	1.5

Extent of Prior Social Participation

Consistent with our anticipation and with findings of other studies (Cohen and Hodges, 1963), the sample population reported little participation in any formal organization except a religious association. Knox County, and especially Barbourville, has a fairly sizeable list of voluntary associations. Evidently, the membership and interest are restricted to the small middle and upper class segments and the urban community almost exclusively. Few members of the families with substandard income have been affiliated with special interest groups

such as farm organizations, labor unions, civic clubs, service groups or school groups (other than those now promoted by KCCAP). Fewer are attending regularly who belong to these associations. The largest amount of steady interest indicated in the data on associational activity is in P.T.A.'s. But these are in the urban areas; few of the rural schools can establish such parent-school co-operation.

However, while it is true that the rural poor seldom join the more secular voluntary associations, they do unite in a regular fashion in religious groups. Even greater segments of time are spent in informal interaction within the close-knit network of kinfolk and neighbors. It was precisely this fact which led to the decision to use these networks as a basis for community centers for social action. Undoubtedly, the measure of success which some centers have had can be attributed to the "familiarity" engendered by the neighboring experiences within the small, intimate sets of kith and kin.

We intend to deal at length with their religious participation in other parts of our report. Here we point out that what opportunity the adults have had in playing formal roles of leadership has been at the church. The occasional flurries of political activity and the infrequent gathering of men at favorite hang-outs are so equalitarian and relatively unorganized that little readiness is achieved for more formal meetings where agenda are followed and business is conducted.

Perhaps, the very nature of an action-oriented, future-planning, formalized structure connected to higher levels of authority and leadership in increasingly remote and centralized places is foreign to the life style of the Knox County poor. The churches which they attend and

support are the opposite in organizational design. Neither the Baptist nor the Holiness association has such a polity or bureaucratic complex as that fostered in the staff organization of the KCCAP.

Those who will continue to participate in activities other than simply the recreational or "social" (as popularly conceived) may in time become more sophisticated in the democratic process. But after several months of community action promotion, the number is very small.

Summary

Stephenson (1966) found in his Mountain Community that "certain parts of the community participate in the traditional subculture more than do others." Conversely, engagement with aspects of the contemporary cultural patterns also varied. A generalization like that of Weller (1965) that families are all "yesterday's people" overstates the common attachment to the old ways and beliefs.

We have discovered the diversity in Knox County communities and neighborhoods as people and families depart from the "tried and true" in a deviating manner. They accept or reject the invading and intervening social forces according to the satisfactions they perceive in the innovations and, perhaps, to the degree that the traditional adaptation is no longer satisfying. The Poor we call NP are more wedded to the "old-fashioned," i.e., they are content to remain aloof from the alluring attractions of the new methods and means of community action. Some of these they speak of as being lurid. But they do see the improvement in the aspects of the social scene, they partake of those social changes that do not violate their cultural espousal. They shun the counselling and overt services they perceive as implying a social

dependency they struggle to avoid. The PP are less satisfied to pass up opportunities for personal and family rehabilitation. More involved in the activities of the social action effort, they claim the enterprise has progressed farther than their disaffected and disapproving neighbors. What accounts for the differences in the dispositions to participate? In our next discussion we attempt to probe the ideological and behavioral bases for deviations in the acceptance of the community action program.

CHAPTER IV

FAMILY SUB-CULTURES AND PLANNING FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

In her analysis of family life patterns associated with poverty, Chilman calls for more information about the various sub-cultures of poverty. (1966) She draws a distinction between the chronically poor, the shorter-term poor, the economically dependent poor, and poor families that do not receive public assistance. Each in its own way may be differentiated from the working class and lower middle class groups.

Knox County, like so many parts of Kentucky (and the U. S.), has all of these groups. Despite their ethnic homogeneity, we expected to find several distinctive rural family sub-cultures. It was the major purpose of this study to discover and describe the differences between these cultural versions. We tested their relation to participation in an action program developed "to help poor people leave the conditions of deprivation, defeat and despair which currently tend to keep them at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder." (Chilman, 1966)

It now seems clear that there are differences between the various kinds of poor families--taken as types they show significant differences in their life styles. As a result of being poor they also share similarities. Before discussing the distinctions, it will be helpful to describe their common characteristics.

Oscar Lewis has concluded that certain regional sub-cultures are so uniquely poor that they may be called a "culture of poverty." He

found them likely to exist in a social setting with "a cash economy, wage labor and a production for profit, and with a persistently high rate of unemployment and underemployment, at low wages for unskilled labor." (1966) He further points out that in the larger society

> "the dominant class asserts a set of values that prizes thrift . . . stresses the possibility of upward mobility and explains low economic status as the result of individual personal inadequacy and inferiority."

In such a society, Lewis suggests the way of life among some of the poor is this "culture of poverty." He questions the likelihood of such currently existing in America for various reasons but sees the possibility of their emergence in the future with an allusion that it might be true of certain populations in rural Appalachia.

We wanted to ascertain if such a sub-culture was latent among the poor of Knox County. After analyzing the data on the selected families, we have concluded that the several discernible sub-cultures of the poor are all versions of the dominant culture. The impression we have secured of the folk-ways of the families in our sample is that most are not yet so alienated from the larger society and its cultural mainstream as to be content with their dependency--at least not yet.

Our conclusion is not based on the absence of several characteristic cultural configurations which people in poverty tend to have in common. As we shall now discuss, not only do the Poor families in the sample continue to cling to the traditional orientations that have fastened them into a cycle of poverty but also many of the families that have not yet developed a social dependency problem. Rather, we have uncovered in a large number of cases a strong drive to move into the mainstream of the dominant society. These adhere to their version of the classic American

doctrine of self-help. As Clapp (1961) insisted, "there is a possibility that their behavior stems from their poverty rather than their poverty from their behavior." Given the traditional situation, their cultural ideal of helping themselves worked for a long time. Now that their social situation is changing a refinement is in order.

This chapter describes the cluster of cultural features that are presently crippling their power even to cope adequately with current problems. Their behavior, goals and aspirations will be examined in succeeding sections of the report.

Family Sub-Cultures of the Poor

All three family types essentially seek and value the same things that other Americans strive for. Each has a version of "the dominant dream and design, a constricted but recognizable variant of America's society-wide goals and standards." (Irelan and Besner, 1966) For the poorest, because their struggle for economic security has proven frustrating if not fruitless, the degree of generalized despair approximates a kind of hopeless resignation and acceptance of the futility of their own striving. Still, even they manage, most of them, to aspire for better outcomes for their children. When an occasional child succeeds, like other American parents, they are proud; experience has taught them, however, not to expect it.

Irelan and Besner in a summary of the literature on the "Low-Income Outlook on Life" (1966) see the lower classes as reinterpreting the values of the larger society in order to retain them. "Paths to achievement and to security are refracted." Their review of research on "life themes" prevailing among America's poor stresses forms of

fatalism, orientation to the present, authoritarianism, and concreteness as distinctive attitudinal configurations which handicap people in the lower strata of the society. These are said to be the effects of the feelings of "powerlessness, meaninglessness, anomia, and isolation" which are generated by the deprivations they suffer. The longer the deprivations last, that is to say, if they become chronic from generation to generation, the more likely a cycle of poverty-induced characteristics may become established. Hence, by the process of enculturation, children are taught the crippling attitudes and modes of this cultural version by parents who feel helpless because of their failure to promote their own security. The persisting powerlessness is held to be the source of fatalistic beliefs. We would propose that the self-defeating fatalism of the older generation is, in turn, the source of the sense of helplessness in the next generation, and can be perpetuated as part of the culture thereafter.

For an unknown number in the rural areas of Eastern Kentucky the above cycle has been in operation for a long time. These are "the chronically poor," the hard-core poor. For others, the experience of inadequate income, crowded quarters, reduced access to education and social participation, and similar limiting life conditions has occurred rather recently as technology and associated social changes render the adults unemployable. These are "the economically dependent poor" who are new victims of the socio-economic transition. Their forced cultural adaptation and subsequent social adjustment may have taken place only in the past decade or two.

"The shorter-term poor" are those who suffer from recurring crises they cannot resolve because of underemployment and low hourly wages. Poor families that do not receive public assistance tend in Knox County to be unskilled workers or marginal farmers, unable or unwilling to secure government aid.

The intensity with which all the poor of this target area cling to the cultural modes associated with poverty conditions may thus be seen as a function of the length of time the deprivations have been experienced. This differential in duration might be more crucial for social rehabilitation than the extent in numbers of those who have dropped below the poverty line. The longer the poverty and its associated depressed behavior patterns have lasted the more rigid the cultural version tends to be. Beaglehole (1955) contends that "changes will be accepted or rejected on the basis of the cultural and personal rigidity and adaptability of the people."

Common Attitudinal Modes

Fatalism

There is ample evidence in our sample of the existence in varying degrees of typical modes and feelings delineated by current analysts of poverty-stricken Americans. We do not know how long portions of the study population have maintained these perceptions and reactions. Some, no doubt, hold a religious philosophy and world view of historic vintage which goes back centuries to a British origin. It seems to be a prevailing system of thought and behavior which has provided an adaptation for those who have lived in the area the longest. Others

in their desperation have, to a large extent, adopted some of the precepts and practices of this regionally dominant religious sub-culture. We discovered differences in percentages between the Poor and the relatively self-sustaining AP families in the degree of adherence to fatalistic notions and anomic attitudes which have been a part of the fundamentalistic belief system prevalent among Appalachian poor.

Statistically significant differences were found, for example, between the Poor and the "Above Poor" in homemakers' expressions of agreement with statements about the possibility of managing one's future destiny. The contrast is shown in Table 12. Despite the modest success of the AP families in achieving their economic self-sufficiency, mothers in these families tend to subscribe to the ideas that "the future is totally unpredictable" and "God has a plan for each individual." The overwhelming conviction that one's life is "subject to a set of forces over which he has virtually no control" is an indication of the anomic climate of the area. Simpson and Miller would attribute the adherence of the more successful to the fact that "attitudes formed in primary group contexts and reinforced by peers may linger even after one's own status has changed for the better." (1963)

TABLE 12

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POOR AND AP RESPONDENTS IN FATALISTIC ORIENTATION AS REVEALED BY RESPONSES (IN PERCENTAGES) TO THE VARIOUS STATEMENTS INDICATING FATALISM

Statements (in percentages)	Percents of Poor agreeing with statements	Percents of AP agreeing with statements	Statistical differences between Poor and AP		
			X^2	df	P
Poverty just happens and nothing can be done to prevent it	35.8	5.6	11.97	1	< .001
One may work hard but success and failure lie in the hands of God	84.2	61.1	8.08	1	< .01
Things happen because God wishes them to be so	65.6	47.2	3.66	1	*
Future is unpredictable	86.2	83.3	.168	1	*
Having faith is better for solving problems than thinking them through	87.4	72.2	4.27	1	< .05
When in doubt stop and pray	97.9	94.9	1.05	1	*
Most difficulties in life can be overcome by prayers	94.7	80.6	6.31	1	< .01
God who brings children on earth knows best how to provide for them	71.6	47.2	6.79	1	< .01
God has a plan for the life of every individual	97.9	94.4	1.05	1	*
Composite score on high fatalism	21.1	2.8	18.20	3	< .001

*Not significant at .05.

Time Perspective

The unplanned nature of so much lower class life results in (if it is not caused by) an orientation to the present. "If it appears that the place in society of one's family, friends, and self will remain much the same as it is at present, one becomes apathetic to those areas of life that are considered the serious business of life for other social strata." (McKinley, 1964) The demands of each situation, day-by-day, become the focus of attention. The most basic human value--security and survival--is interpreted as "getting by" today and this month. "Getting ahead"--advancement--implies deferment of gratification, but from experience this is impossible; the poor are busy avoiding the worsening of an already unstable situation. Putting aside meager resources for a rainy day makes no sense if it "rains every day."

Mothers of our Poor families, much more than those of the not-so-poor, rated their present financial condition in Knox County as not good and their future prospects were equally poor. (Table 13) Only a few mothers in the poorer groups thought they could "face unexpected expenses." They desired higher education for their children. They would be willing to undergo hardship to help them attain it but could not make plans or set aside any funds for that support. Only eleven wives thought they could plan ahead. And, of course, there was little planning of births or numbers of children.

TABLE 13

ORIENTATION TO THE PRESENT AS REVEALED BY POOR RESPONDENTS, AP RESPONDENTS AND TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Indicators of Present Orientation (in percentages)	Poor	AP	Total	Difference between Poor & AP		
				X^2	df	P
Futility of Economic Planning						
Financial condition rated as not good	93.7	83.4	90.8	3.61	1	<1.0
Future financial prospects rated as not good	95.8	80.6	91.6	7.87	1	<.01
Possible financial breaks considered not good	93.7	83.3	90.8	3.36	1	1.0
Willing to send sons to college even if it meant serious financial hardship for the family	73.6	88.9	78.5	2.91	1	<1.0
Have made some definite provision for childrens' education	0.0	2.9	0.8	--	1	--
Feels that her savings can't meet unexpected heavy expenses	8.4	36.1	16.0	14.87	1	<.001
Feels that she is not able to plan ahead	88.4	75.0	84.7	3.63	1	<1.0
Contentment in Present:						
Does not know and is not looking forward for kind of life she will have after the next few years	77.9	66.7	74.8	1.75	1	*
Does not feel she has fallen short of marriage and home-life	76.6	83.3	78.5	.699	1	*
Feels she has adjusted to mother-housewife role very well	69.5	54.5	65.4	2.61	1	*

* Not significant at <1.0

This ad hoc orientation puts a premium on the "taking of pleasures now." The Poor come to value the routine, the familiar, and the predictable and learn to be content. Only in retrospect (a mood forced on them by the interview) do many express regrets about falling short of their goals for themselves. Only in their economic and educational inadequacies were the majority willing to admit disappointment. Realistically, given their time perspective, they had grown content with motherhood, their home, their marriage and their surroundings.

We need to introduce three notes of caution here. One is a finding in a survey of the mental health of Americans that "respondents with less education tend to be less introspective about themselves, whether about strong points or shortcomings." (Gurin, Veroff and Feld, 1960) Had we conducted an anthropological observation of day-to-day interaction we might have discovered more anxiety. Second, statements given by the interviewees to open-ended attitudinal questions reflect considerable general dissatisfaction within a sizable number of families, especially among the fathers, none of whom were directly studied. Finally, as in most surveys, we determined characteristics of the families from majority responses. Minority opinions and variations of reactions are usually ignored when one reports tendencies and trends. That diversity is as noticeable among families of the poor as in the upper strata is one of the major presuppositions of this report.

Authoritarianism

The less advantaged position of the lower class family produces anxieties which set the stage for the development of authoritarian responses which appear to be more common in lower socio-economic groups.

This concept of a rigid personality structure has recently been used to describe the attitudes of family members toward each other and toward the outside world. Studies have indicated, for example, that "the lower-class father, because of his marginal economic position and his greater vulnerability to negative sanctions vis-a-vis the power structure, is an anxious and hostile parent demanding obedience and conformity from his children." (McKinley, 1964) Another aspect of authoritarianism is the tendency toward dichotomization of male and female sex roles. "Masculinity and femininity are conceived of as opposites, with no overlapping traits." (McKinley)

As a consequence, several specific adjustments are said to take place in family relationships which were anticipated in the selected Knox County families, particularly among the economically dependent. McKinley describes the sequence as originating in the general familial responses to extra-familial or societal evaluation of the dependent family and unemployed (unemployable) fathers. Typically, "the wife withdraws some respect and begins to exercise more authority over the family and more autonomy in her own behavior in response to the father's low status." Our impression is that most wives in this particular area have assumed more authority but they have evidently not exercised as much autonomy in their relations with their husbands.

We have similar mixed evidence in the father-son interaction. The father's authority over his young son is strong in many families because he has not completely withdrawn from an active position in the family to participate in other groups. It is when this default as a parent takes place that "the lower-status son (in comparison with the upper-status son) turns more to the mother than to the father for emotional support

and identification." (McKinley) It may be that pre-adolescent boys are too young to exercise a judgment derogatory of their fathers. We are told, however, that children sense their family position and father's demeaned status at earlier ages than those of our sample. (Kahl, 1953)

Detailed responses on decisionmaking and the sharing of parental roles by the three family types show variation somewhat related to the degree of family autonomy, but they indicate fairly consistent co-operation between husband and wife. (Table 14) The majority of the sample spouses customarily discuss and reach consensus on the critical matters of the disposal of money, changing of residence, and schooling for children. The fair amount of husband participation in domestic activities may come as a surprise to those who perceive lower class men as usually abdicating. Especially noteworthy is the sample husband's assumption of some share in the care of infants and children. Least institutionalized and, therefore, occurring only rarely is the man's performance of traditionally feminine tasks. The reactions of the women to our questions about the division of labor in the home revealed few problems or sensitive issues in the allocation of work, even in the homes of the underemployed fathers. Nor were admissions of their husband's failure to help accompanied by emotional outburst.

A battery of questions was given to the boys to tap their perceptions of their fathers' participation in the activities of the home and the strength of the relations between the two generations of males. Sons confirmed the reports of their mothers on the contributions of the head of the house. Table 14 also reveals helpful findings in detecting the presence or absence of the authoritarian spirit expected to be operative in these homes where the men are occupationally limited.

TABLE 14

JOINT DECISION MAKING AND SHARING OF PARENTAL ROLES BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Syncratic Interaction (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Wives reporting discussion and joint decision making in:					
"Money matter"	48.2	59.0	52.6	66.7	56.5
"Free time activities"	41.0	41.0	41.1	34.4	39.2
"Moving to another house"	57.4	72.2	83.3	51.4	60.0
"Schooling for 16-year-olds"	72.7	59.0	67.0	72.0	68.5
"Community matters"	53.6	52.6	53.2	38.9	49.2
"Buying new things"	69.6	71.8	70.5	85.7	74.6
"High" degree of husband's participation in childcare	32.1	28.2	30.5	22.9	28.5
Husband's participation in domestic activities:					
Painting of house	51.8	46.2	49.5	52.8	50.4
Getting up at night	30.4	26.3	28.7	36.1	30.8
Holiday plans	98.2	92.3	95.7	97.1	96.1
Buying food	45.3	51.4	47.7	38.7	45.4
Getting children "up"	27.3	22.6	25.6	15.2	22.7

The grade school youngsters tended to show appreciation for their fathers. Those who exclusively turned to their mothers for emotional sustenance were in the minority. A majority, or near it, do not discriminate, at this age at least, between their parents in soliciting or reciprocating support. If we are to believe the boys in the aspect of discipline and punishment, the image of the father as the stricter disciplinarian and court of last resort fits less than three out of ten of our cases. Komarovsky in a study of stable working class families found slightly more instances of rigid male parental authority. (1964) More than forty percent of the young respondents in the Knox County families

recognized their parents as about equal in meting out penalties for misbehavior. (Table 15) Less than a fourth thought the mother punished more. As we shall see when we examine differences in concepts of parenthood between the family types, discipline is "old-fashioned" in most of the homes. However, our data do not uphold the idea that the mother is generally the more indulgent parent or that the father is likely to be hostile and rejecting.

TABLE 15

EVIDENCE OF PARENTAL AUTHORITARIANISM
BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Perceived Parental Authority* (in percentages)	Poor Families				Total Sample
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	
Punished mostly by:					
Father	44.2	15.2	32.9	45.7	36.7
Both the same	38.5	60.6	47.1	31.4	42.5
Mother	17.3	24.2	20.0	22.9	20.8
Control exercised mostly by:					
Father	35.8	36.4	36.0	37.2	36.4
Both the same	47.2	36.4	43.0	45.7	43.8
Mother	17.0	27.3	20.9	17.1	19.8

*As reported by 5th grade boys.

We would have to conclude from our limited testing of extreme authoritarianism in these lower class families, and the consequential adjustment in conjugal and parent-child relations, that few of our families especially suffer from the anxiety-laden aggression characteristic of the authoritarian personality type. It was our intention to include questions of the Adorno or Srole scales to ascertain more directly the extent of authoritarian features that might be a factor

in the interpersonal relationships of our sample. We decided on the other approach because of the sex of the adult respondents, the age of the boys, and the limited schooling of both. (Recent studies have seriously questioned the predictive value of the F-scale for working-class groups and those with little formal education ([Riessman and Miller, 1958]).

We must add here that other research, especially on urban lower-class subjects, has found authoritarianism pervasive in family relations. (Janowitz and Marvick, 1953) We do not doubt, because of our informants' generalized statements about interpersonal relations, that some stereotyped thinking so characteristic of this psychological trait is in individuals in our study.

Concreteness

Irelan and Besner claim that "concreteness, stress on material rather than intellectual things, is a little-discussed theme of lower class life." (1966) It is a pragmatic orientation for people preoccupied with problems of survival. There is a tendency to deal dichotomously with all of reality in this non-abstract, anti-intellectual thought frame. What conceptions the possessors of this life-view have of the natural and social order are pre-scientific. They have a keen sense of the practical and what works. They trim their expectations to fit their experience and they "regard their ordinary lives as being of much intrinsic interest." (Haggstrom, 1963)

Gans describes many poor who are urban villagers (1962) as being either "routine-seekers" or "action-seekers." Like other students of the target area being examined, we find these apt descriptions of families in predominantly rural Knox County. There seem to be more

of the "routine-seekers" in our sample than those who are in the pursuit of episodic action. The former prize a stable way of life "in which economic and emotional security of the individual and his family are most important." (Gans) Novelty and variety are not desired; instead a recurring schedule of behavior is relied on. If this reliance is disturbed or frustrated by personal or familial disabilities there is an anxious striving to re-establish the life-style in another routine. Says Gans, "routine-seekers are more likely to be regular church-goers, to live by ethical norms of religion, and to favor moderation in all pursuits." In our next chapter we shall see how appropriately this characterizes a majority of the sample families in Knox County.

They tend to be good workmen along the lines laid down by what has been called the Protestant ethic. They are thrifty (even if on occasion they spend injudiciously on impulse goods) and would be even if they had "enough" money to "make ends meet." The family comes first before any individual and their respect for consanguinal ties borders on a pathological loyalty to their kin some of whom may deserve opprobrium for their destructive misconduct in seeking action.

Furthermore, members of these families are not only reluctant but fearful of venturing beyond the confines of their neighborhood except for specific short-term purposes. They may regularly exchange visits with non-family acquaintances but they prefer to linger for informal association with those proven to be of their own kind.

Because they reflect the family cultural version that is being taught (caught) in their homes, the responses of the boys were utilized to ascertain the "concreteness" that is said to be so ingrained in the lifeways of persons of the lower socio-economic classes. We shall also

be discussing an additional major feature of the poor families' value orientation (namely, familism), which at least one analyst considers "obviously dysfunctional for mobility into the higher reaches of the economic, status and power system," (Hodges, 1964)

Brown and Schwarzweller have studied in depth the familistic orientation characterizing social relationships within the region of Eastern Kentucky. (Brown, 1952; Brown and Schwarzweller, 1962) The latter argues that "isolation from the mainstream of American society has helped to preserve the cultural vestiges of a family-centered social organization which were necessary, indeed crucial, for survival during the earlier frontier situation." (Schwarzweller, 1964) We are indebted to these colleagues for insights and portions of our testing instrument in this investigation of individual commitment to the extended family and certain attitudes generally associated with familism. Schwarzweller found that "larger proportions of nonmigrants, compared with migrants (from Eastern Kentucky to the urban north), responded in familistic terms" to selected questions. (1964)

Answers to the same questions, and others which we had gleaned from the literature (empirical and theoretical), were secured from the boys in the second schedule, offered when they were in the sixth grade. (Table 16) It is interesting that, in most of the questions focused on the "concrete" and "familistic" nature of the value system to which the sons were exposed, little significant difference emerged between the groups which we had categorized as types. While AP boys seem more willing to give up many things in order to "get ahead," they tended to be like the "poorer" boys in answering "no" to the question, "If getting ahead in-

volves not seeing your parents and folks very often would you be willing to go away to work?" The size of the minority saying "yes" to this question may be indicative of some change taking place. There is diversity in the responses to the other questions related to the sacrifices these schoolboys were willing to make to succeed in life and the worth they already attributed to the "things they wanted to get" on reaching adulthood. Such concrete desiderata as "enough" (but "not a lot of") money and material things, home ownership, friends, and a good steady job elicited favorable reactions. The more abstract (and perhaps unrealistic) desire for high status they ignored by a similar margin. We do not know how middle class Kentucky children would respond to these goals. The opinions of the boys in our sample are consistent with the proposed hypothesis that members of poor families think practically and trim their expectations to fit their life situation and life chances.

TABLE 16

EXTENT OF PRACTICALITY (CONCRETENESS)
BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Evidences of Practicality (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Willingness to make sacrifices in order to get ahead in life:					
Sacrifice vacation	50.0	53.8	51.6	65.7	55.4
Leave friends	48.2	61.5	53.7	65.7	56.9
Give up leisure time	67.9	45.9	59.1	64.1	60.0
Move to strange part	35.1	51.3	42.1	55.9	45.7
Do less enjoyable work	50.9	61.5	55.3	67.6	58.6
Not see parents and folks often	41.1	43.6	42.1	41.2	41.9
Checked as one of the three future desiderata:					
Owning a home	83.6	79.5	81.9	88.9	83.8
Having a lot of money	47.3	61.5	53.2	27.8	46.2
Having a lot of friends	65.5	64.1	64.9	83.3	70.0
Having people to look up to you	9.1	10.3	9.6	13.9	10.8
Having a good steady job	85.5	74.4	80.9	80.6	80.8

Pervasiveness of Familism

Almost all of the younger generation in Knox County live in homes apart from their grandparents and extended family. Rarely do families include a third generation member in the household. The separation is not as complete or autonomous as that of normal families in the society's mainstream. Table 17 reveals a strong though modified kinship network maintained in viable ties with relatives who live nearby. Very few units have no kin within visiting distance. The vast majority have two or more related families, especially in the homemakers' kinship group, with whom they kept a fairly frequent schedule of reciprocal visiting. Extremely little strife was reported between members of the extended families.

These rural groups have a visiting pattern different from that of urban families of lower status in that it is more normal for both sexes to go to the homes of both kin groups. In only a small number of cases do the husband and wife exchange visits separately and exclusively with their own consanguinal group.

TABLE 17

KINSHIP NETWORK AND FAMILISM BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Kinship Contacts and Familistic Attitudes (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Members of extended family living in the household	5.4	5.1	5.3	11.1	6.9
No wife's relatives living within driving distance	7.1	10.3	8.4	11.1	9.2
No husband's relative living within driving distance	26.8	18.4	23.4	13.9	20.9
Visit to wife's relatives at least monthly	53.8	65.7	58.6	65.6	60.5
Visit to husband's relatives at least monthly	69.0	77.4	72.6	83.9	75.9
Reported incidences of troubles with relatives	1.8	0.0	1.9	5.6	2.3
Wives often visiting relatives alone	30.4	30.8	30.5	31.4	30.8
Husbands often visiting relatives alone	23.2	28.2	25.3	23.5	24.8
Children living elsewhere	57.1	56.4	56.8	36.1	51.1
Willing to let children go out of state	51.8	56.4	53.7	61.1	55.7

The boys would like to continue this practice and its associated features when they are grown. It is clear that familistic indoctrination continues to be a potent influence in the lives of the newest members of these groups. One of the strongest of all the aspects of the value system of rural poor people, this traditional familism must be recognized as a powerful factor in the success or failure of an improved opportunity system for Knox County's population. For ever so long, the familistic system prevented rural folks from exploiting any of the modern industrial opportunities except those that invade their countryside (e.g., mining). Recently, "the extended family has legitimized the geographic mobility of its members where external circumstances are unfavorable for the maintenance of the family." (Schwarzweller, 1964) Parents of the sample families have moved in this direction since they have sanctioned the moves to distant places for economic reasons by the older brothers and sisters of the youngsters we were studying. Mothers stood similarly ready to permit the younger siblings of the recent out-migrants to leave home.

We have briefly outlined certain cultural characteristics that the families of our sample hold in common, albeit in varying degrees, both among themselves and in comparison with those of the poor in other parts of the U. S. We infer from our survey and from other research that the five attitudinal complexes (fatalism, orientation to the present, authoritarianism, concreteness and familism) constitute hindrances for some of the poor in the acceptance of cultural change within the county. They lower the motivation of others to migrate successfully in search of personal and family fulfillment and stability. We have just alluded to

the latter and will develop its implications later. We close this section with some further inferences concerning the determinable influence of the hindering cultural modes on the propensity for change.

Planning for Social Change

Haggstrom makes a contribution to our understanding of the potential for change in the target area under study. He suggests that "an economy with limited opportunities for success plus the belief in equal opportunity for success made inevitable an assault on the self-esteem of the permanently unsuccessful." (1963) Natives of Knox County who are numbered among the Poor, because of the radical social transition and accompanying higher standards and inflated money values, include a large minority (44.2 percent) who are not yet suffering from a sense of dependency. They are still struggling for autonomy with a keen determination based on the doctrine of self-help. Independent people (43 percent) are found in all three family types categorized on a base line of below $3,500 annual income.

Some of the families are managing to earn over $3,000 and are judged Above Poor. Others receive less for their independent efforts and may be psychologically or culturally (they are not mutually exclusive realities) unable and unwilling to become "persons on Welfare." Their resistance to public assistance may include a refusal to participate in government-sponsored programs identified, at least by them, as "for the poor." Still others may conceive of working with and for the government as legitimate (many middle and working class people do) and of participation in new community co-operative efforts as more effective means for helping

themselves. We simply do not know how many or who in our interviewed families have not resigned from the struggle for independence. Nor do we know, for certain, that the "behavior and belief patterns," of those deemed poor by the warriors against poverty "represent durable characteristics of the people over a wide variety of social situations." (Haggstrom) The patterns could be situation-induced.

Haggstrom argues that the poor (but proud) may protect themselves by various strategies from fully accepting the implications of their situation. "Their behavior may therefore be remarkably transformed when, as has happened through social action, they begin to acquire a sense of power, of ability to realize their own aspirations." (1963) It is precisely this objective--"to help the poor as a group to secure opportunities for themselves"--which has inspired the community action program to seek to implement the latent and silent motivation of the people in the neighborhoods where poverty is widespread to enter or re-enter the majority society.

We saw our problem as investigators to assess the duration and durability of behavior and belief patterns of selected families in the variety of situations within the home and beyond it. We sought to discover if the sub-cultures of the families were so different from that of the dominant culture as to make many inevitably and chronically poor permanently disposed to be unsuccessful. From the outset we were aware of the presence of a long-lived religious tradition in the region--"fundamentalism"--which we suspected was influential in the adaptation that Americans made earlier to the rigors of a frontier experience. They may have brought the tradition with them from

Great Britain as a previous explanatory world-view in their adaptation and adjustment to demeaned status in "the old country." Generations of persons, since the settlement in the hills of Kentucky, have been successful in the limited setting and in isolation from the outside world which, meanwhile, has undergone vast social changes. From time to time, as we have shown, others have entered the area and social change has gradually invaded the region. Now, the centuries-old belief system is no longer functional in social adaptation except for those who renounce personal ambition. The "chronically poor" are regularly suffering under "the assault on their self-esteem" as they deal with their persistent if not permanent failure. These are the ones who have been subject to their worsened social situation "instead of being able to affect it through self-generated action through behavior which flows from decisions and plans." (Haggstrom, 1963)

The extent and dominance of this religious orientation are impressive to any thoughtful observer of life in Eastern Kentucky. This investigator felt compelled to study it as one of the factors responsible for the "backwardness" of the people who are poor in Knox County and for their resistance to social changes which KCCAP was established to accelerate. We said in our preliminary report, and we are more convinced after two years of study, that real change appears unlikely if the influence of religion is ignored. We turn, therefore, to an analysis of our findings on the religious behavior of the selected families.

CHAPTER V

THE RELIGIOUS FACTOR AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The Southern Appalachian Studies revealed that "religious values so permeate the culture of the region that it is virtually impossible to treat meaningfully any aspect of regional life without taking them into account." (Ford, 1961) Other researchers, notably Lenski (1961), have discovered the religious factor to be as powerful a discriminating influence on the attitudes and behaviors of American people as is social class.

In regard to cultural change, "basic intellectual and religious assumptions and interpretations as to existence, power, providence, mortality, welfare and attendant emotional tensions" are aspects of culture and categories of behavior that tend to persist. (Barnett, 1953; Keesing, 1958) Since religion is usually the core system of a culture, its function is to discourage rapid change and, by the reevaluative process, to permit only those innovations which can be rationalized within the context of the traditional orientation.

It would seem that change agents must be acquainted with the religious tenets and practices of the host population if acceptance of the proposed change is to be established. "Strong external pressure may produce the appearance of change, but without alteration to character structure, such change will be superficial." (Beaglehole, 1957) If the findings in our data can be generalized for the county, the poor people there are especially religious-minded. The religion they espouse is fundamentalist in

doctrine and sectarian in structure. Neither of these features allows for much pro-social activity which is necessary for community co-operation. The fundamentalist is exclusive in that he imposes rigid requirements of belief and practice on himself and others. The sectarian is likely to be class-conscious and tends to be antagonistic in his outlook toward other churches and, especially, toward the larger society.

Church Membership in Knox County

For years, the county has had one of the highest percentages of the population affiliated with a church in Appalachian Kentucky. In 1950, fifty-eight (58.3 percent) of persons 14 and over were reported members, according to a Federal census. (Kelly, 1968) Of these, 89 percent were Baptist. Undoubtedly, the census underenumerated for some members of the various Pentecostal sects were not counted. Since "church membership in this area is not taken lightly but denotes a religious experience of a definite nature," we can assume that these figures connote intensive rigorous religious beliefs and standards of behavior for a large majority of the county's residents. Furthermore, persons of the two groups mentioned above (Baptist and Holiness sects) tend to believe that "one should go back to what he regards as the purer standards of bygone days." (Hoult, 1958)

Today's religious composition of Knox County shows some change. (See Table 18) Percentages of Baptists and Pentecostals (Holiness sects), as estimated by local clergy, have shifted. (Cubine, 1966) The latter proportion has radically increased in the past two decades. Estimated frequency of attendance indicates as strong a commitment (about 75 per-

cent), even for rural areas, as that found in less isolated parts of the country. The limited social participation of rural members of the two largest religious groups (less than 10 percent), as reported by the ministers of the churches, is another indicator of the exclusive spirit of the sectarian and fundamentalist affiliates. Rural members of these groups by any index of class status (income, occupation or educational level) are in the lower stratum of the county's population. Methodists, Disciples of Christ, and Roman Catholics, in that order by size of membership, together with urban Baptists (those attending in Barbourville) constitute the upper classes in the county.

TABLE 18

SHIFT IN CHURCH AFFILIATIONS IN THE LAST TWO DECADES (PERCENTS BY COLUMNS)

Church Membership and Percent Distribution by Major Denominations	Eastern Kentucky 1950[a]	Knox County 1950[a]	Knox County 1966[b]	Present Sample 1967[c]
Percent of population 14 and over who were members	35.9	58.3	NA	NA
Percent distribution by denomination				
Baptist	67.1	89.0	78.3	64.8
Church of God	3.2	0.4		
Disciples of Christ	10.4	2.9	1.0	3.8
Methodists	11.0	4.7	6.4	2.8
Presbyterian	3.5			
Roman Catholic	1.5	0.7	0.7	
Others*	3.3	2.3	13.6	28.6

*Includes Pentacostal

SOURCE: [a]National Council of Churches, Churches and Church Membership in the United States, Series C, No. 40; U.S. Census of Population, 1950, Kentucky General Characteristics, 17B, Table 41, Here taken from Claire C. Kelly, 1968.

[b]Based upon personal interviews with leaders of various religious bodies in Knox County, By William P. Cubine, graduate student in the Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky.

[c]Based upon wives' church affiliation.

TABLE 19

ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Attending Religious Services (in percentages)	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Wives attending church more than once a month	53.6	61.6	56.8	50.0	55.0
Husbands attending church more than once a month	42.8	51.4	46.3	42.8	45.2
Boys attending church more than once a month	62.0	52.5	73.5	73.6	62.1

Church Membership In The Sample

Less than 20 percent of the wives in the sample are not connected to some church. Over a half of these respondents are members of Baptist churches. A fifth of the women belong to a Holiness association. Majorities of each family type said they attended regular religious services rather habitually. Despite the fact that few boys belong (having not yet been "converted"), they reported almost as regular attendance as their mothers and a much higher record in the second year than in 1966. Wives stated their husbands were somewhat slacker in their involvement but in the case of those actively supporting the centers (PP), over half of the fathers belonged and went regularly. (See Table 19)

Glock and Stark (1964) studied religiosity in four metropolitan counties of northern California. They consistently discovered that Baptists (mostly of the Southern branch) and members of numerous sects were more likely than those of other religious persuasion to have

qualified for membership by a "confirming" experience of personal acceptance of the Deity and a continuing "awareness of the divine presence." These "converts" (they are called that even though they may have been born in Baptist and Pentecostal homes) were nearly unanimous in their certainty of the existence of a supernatural Being, the divinity of Jesus and his return to earth,and a number of associated fundamentalist precepts. We did not raise these particular questions with our respondents because of the length of our schedule and the importance of other facets of family life. We presume the similarity observed in the far West will pertain as well (if not more) to the selected Knox County families. Certainly, nearly identical responses, to questions we did ask, (See Tables 20,21) cast no doubt on the hypothesis that Baptists and Pentecostals in rural Eastern Kentucky are as fundamentalistic and sectarian as their west coast contemporaries.

Trends In Reactionary Religious Forms

The sectarian origin is held to lie in some form of deprivation. Such a group is born of a shared negative attitude to the established socio-economic and political system. It "rejects the social environment in which it exists." (W. Stark, 1967) The classical theory of religious organizational types, i.e., the church-sect-denomination theory in the American instance, suggests that as the sense of deprivation diminishes the tension between the sect members and the rest of the society also diminishes. "In the end there is often very little difference left between the values and volitions of the once revolutionary body and those of the wider social world." (W. Stark) The causal connection

between the protest movement, its religious myths, and material poverty is well-documented by Werner Stark. This linkage would suggest that improvement, economically and socially, may dull the protest and mollify the movement. Adherence to fundamentalist beliefs seems to have a similar retrogression. Indeed, the Southern Appalachian Studies (Ford and others, 1963) have shown that strict fundamentalism has given way to a modified fundamentalism in subsequent generations as they have received more education, have achieved success in the occupational world, have become assimilated in urban areas or, significantly enough, have been relieved of the threat of general deprivation while still living in the relatively isolated rural areas. Social changes can evidently have a softening influence on the more rigid features of this belief system.

Differences In The Sample

Some evidence of the diminution of the strength of fundamentalism and sectarianism can be detected in our selected families. In the last chapter we pointed out the almost total reliance on the Deity, to provide for and control their lives, on the part of the more dependent Poor. But there are signs of less explicit trust in a supernatural providence in the answers of those who are managing to be independent. Significant differences exist between the AP and the Poor in proportions agreeing with certain statements of a fundamentalistic nature. A majority of AP wives expressed disagreement with such declarations as "God knows best," "Man cannot plan for his future," and "Nothing can be done to prevent poverty." (See Table 20).

TABLE 20

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AP AND POOR RESPONDENTS IN THEIR AGREEMENT WITH CERTAIN BELIEFS OF FUNDAMENTALISTIC NATURE

Statements	Percent of Poor in agreement	Percent of AP in agreement	Differences X^2	df	P-
God knows best	71.6	47.2	6.80	1	< .01
God has plan for all individuals	97.9	94.4	1.05	1	*
Faith is better than reasoning	87.4	72.2	4.29	1	< .05
Cannot plan for future	65.6	47.2	3.66	1	*
Difficulties can be overcome by prayers	94.7	80.6	6.31	1	< .02
Nothing can be done to prevent poverty	35.8	5.6	11.97	1	< .001

*Not significant at < .05

The intensity of religious resolution of the sense of deprivation was measured using checked responses to the question "How sure are you that you have found the answer to the meaning and purpose of life?" Glock and Stark (1964) forcing a choice of four alternative responses to this query, report about nine out of ten Baptists and sect-members in California were "quite certain." Far less assurance exists in the minds of our sample of mothers. (See Table 21) Actually, the majority are either "uncertain" or skeptical about ever knowing.

It can happen that persons in "the depressed stratum are so abject and wretched that they have not even the strength to protest and rebel." (W. Stark, 1967) This condition, if it is to be ameliorated, calls for outside leadership.

TABLE 21

INTENSITY OF RELIGIOUS RESOLUTIONS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE (PERCENTS BY COLUMNS)

Responses	Poor Families			AP	Total
	NP (N=55)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=94)	(N=36)	(N=130)
Pretty certain and grew up knowing these things	12.7	25.6	18.1	27.8	20.8
Quite certain though uncertain once	27.3	17.9	23.4	13.9	20.8
Uncertain	40.0	41.0	40.4	25.0	36.2
Do not really believe there are answers to these questions	20.0	15.4	18.1	33.3	22.3

Lacking that human external inspiration, the deprived may turn individually to religious resolution and be daily assuaged by access to truly external power or assertions about its working. "Intensive religious experience is one way of adding depth to lives otherwise shallow, insecure, and difficult." (Wilson, 1961) In Table 22 we see intimations of deep social deprivation in the responses of the sample women to questions about the extent of religious activity in their lives and their homes.

Where organizational responses to social deprivation survive, "they are likely to do so without radical alteration of their original form; . . . the ability of churches to survive in basically unchanged form is, in substantial part, a consequence of the persistence of social deprivation." (Glock and Stark, 1964) Since participation in such an association does furnish status gratification, "compensating for the deprivations but not eliminating them," the church lasts as long as the sense of deprivation endures.

TABLE 22

RELIGION IN HOME ACTIVITIES BY
FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Religious Activities (in percentages)	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent reporting high place* of religion in their home activities	30.9	48.7	38.3	41.7	39.2
Wives praying privately	83.6	89.7	86.2	94.4	87.8
Wives praying for material things	9.1	20.5	13.8	2.8	10.7
Wives praying to keep misfortune out	71.4	71.8	71.6	61.1	68.7
Wives praying for restoration of their health	85.7	84.6	85.3	77.8	83.2
Wives praying for restoration of someone else's health	85.7	84.6	85.3	86.1	85.5
Wives listening or watching religious program on radio or TV frequently	92.9	92.3	92.6	83.4	90.0

*Includes responses of those who reported that religious activities are performed in their homes at least once a week or daily.

We asked the homemakers what they thought about the future of the Protestant church. We wish we could have probed here. The answers might have indicated an acknowledgement of non-sectarian identification with the pluralistic nature of American denominationalism. Thus, the women might have evinced a loss of hostility to the church-at-large and hence its society. The respondents may, on the other hand, have ignored the word Protestant and, being non-Catholics, simply thought their little religious organization would persist. At any rate, as noted in Table 23, they are confident that the church as they know it is not losing ground or influence.

TABLE 23

IDEAS REGARDING THE FUTURE OF PROTESTANT CHURCH BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE
(Percents by Columns)

Future of Protestant Church	Poor Families				
	NP (N=55)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=94)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=130)
Will grow weak, will lose influence	7.1	10.5	8.5	14.7	10.2
Will continue same, will gain more	92.9	89.5	91.5	85.3	89.8

Church Members and Community Improvement

The larger survey of the extensive mountainous region in eastern U. S. looked at the relation of the churches and the community. (Ford and others, 1963.) In the opinion of only a third of the residents, in a sample from throughout the area, were the church and kindred religious associations considered most important in dealing with a vast array of community problems. "Three in five persons did not know what the churches could do about these community problems or felt that the church could do nothing." (Weatherford and Brewer, 1962.) Ford, however, argues that "the surprisingly small proportion of respondents who were positively opposed to this type of church program indicates that social action is no longer considered outside the legitimate sphere of religious activity." (1963)

We have no comparable data but also have little reason to believe our Knox County families are very different in their conceptions of the church's function in the community. Our sample did prove to be more supportive, than those in the Appalachian study, of churches offering

recreational and social programs for members of all ages as seen in Table 24.

TABLE 24

CONCEPTION REGARDING SOCIAL PROGRAMS IN CHURCHES BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLES

Social Programs in Churches	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent desiring full program of recreation for youth by church	73.1	77.4	74.7	58.3	64.3
Percent desiring program of social activities for all age groups by church	64.2	74.2	67.9	61.1	61.2

With the coming of a community action program, it is to be expected that the kind of exclusiveness which marks the sects and the fundamentalism which negates secular future planning would combine to discourage church people from participating. Studies have also shown that those not belonging to the church do not tend to participate in community organization. (Hodges, 1964) This is particularly noticed in the lower classes. If all of these tendencies held true--sectarians disdaining co-operation, fundamentalists recoiling from future planning, and non-church members refraining from involvement--community action would be doomed.

But there has been participation in Knox County community centers. The data indicate a higher proportion of Pentecostal church members in the Poor families attending center programs than are found in NP families.

It is true that a majority of Pentecostal people in the total sample have not become center-involved. How can we explain those who participate? On the other hand, Baptists who are less sectarian, although equally fundamentalist, are over-represented in the category of the non-participating families. Forty-seven percent of all Baptists in the total sample are NP. Why are so many of the Baptists unwilling to become involved in community organization as evidenced in Table 25? A significant difference exists between the NP and PP when we compare Baptists with all the others who are members of some or no church.

TABLE 25

EXTENT OF BAPTIST DOMINATION BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE
(Percents by Columns)

Church Affiliation	NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
Baptist	60.7[a]	43.6[a]	53.7	47.2	51.9
Non-Baptist	39.3	56.4	46.3	52.8	48.1

a = X^2 for the difference between NP and PP was found to be significant at $<$ .05.

Furthermore, proportionately fewer NP families than either of the other types are not a part of some church. Only nine, or less than one-sixth of the NP homemakers, claimed to be non-affiliated. We surmised at the outset, on the basis of the literature on voluntary participation, that the NP families would have little if any associational involvement. We thought some might belong to a sectarian group. We expected PP families to belong to less sectarian churches as well as participating

in the KCCAP. An intriguing analytical problem confronts us.

A persuasive but still speculative interpretation is that some NP families who do not support government-sponsored activities are being re-enforced by their religious involvement to retain their independence. Twenty-seven of the 95 families with incomes under the arbitrary line ($3,000) determining poverty are not on some public assistance roll. Five of the seven who earn between $3,000 and $3,500 are Baptist heads of NP families. Of the 20 NP whose self-earned incomes are below $3,000, twelve (12) are Baptists. Over sixty percent of the "independent" NP families are Baptist. Again this religious group is over-represented.

We suggest that the self-discipline engendered in their church is conditioning these staunch rural Baptists to rely on the middle class doctrine of self-help. Victims of economic deprivation caused by forces perceived as beyond their control, these frugal, industrious (though not industrialized), proud but poor people are not espousers of the culture of poverty and dependency. Perhaps as Baptists, who comprise the dominant religious group in the county and state, they need not substitute, as most sectarians tend to do, high religious status for low social status. They do not have to "over-compensate for an inferiority complex." Some Baptists among the poor are admittedly sectarian in spirit; rejected, they reject in turn. But others support the affiliation of their local association with a two county association of Baptist churches.[11] Less status discrepant, they are not seeking ways of lessening the social deprivation they do not feel. Resisting public welfare, they are disinterested in government aid of any kind.

The Holiness type being sect-prone likely suffers from status hunger as well as the threat of physical hunger. They may be disposed to join in a community effort to help themselves and their relatives and neighbors because they see the enterprise as a means of guaranteeing their economic security. They may remain interested in the neighborhood social action group so long as they see this as a possibility of economic or occupational improvement. They do not have much enthusiasm for going beyond the boundaries of their neighborhood. Hostility to the larger world they may retain in the form of distrust of outside leadership and authority. Still, in their active involvement on the local level the PP Pentecostals can be prevented from turning their family version of the regional sub-culture into what Yinger has called a "contraculture." (1960) In this condition, the sub-culture becomes more than a variant of the dominant culture. Werner Stark calls it an "inversion of the dominant culture." He supports Yinger in seeing the values of the contraculture "as specific contradictions of the values of the dominant culture." (1967) Both authors think of the sect as a typical contraculture.

Among the values which may be transvaluated are education, for which the sect may substitute revelation, and rational planning, which the antagonist of the dominant value system may replace by utter subservience to what he calls God's will. In extreme instances, the spirit of sectarian contraculture opposes all forms of bureaucracy and eschews the value of daily labor.*

---

*The author plans to follow up on this point in an examination of the sources of American religious non-conformity. Any further discussion here is beyond the scope of this report.

Religiosity in the Selected Families

We have said that the families under study are religious-minded, families with sub-standard income especially. Both NP and PP families are Bible oriented; women pray regularly in private; and nearly fifty (48.7) percent of the PP homes hold daily religious rituals. The difference between the PP and NP families in this aspect approaches statistical significance. (See Table 22) A similar but not as strong difference exists in the greater desire of PP mothers that some member of their family may become a missionary to a foreign society.

TABLE 26

WILLINGNESS TO LET A FAMILY MEMBER BECOME A MISSIONARY TO A FOREIGN COUNTRY BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE
(Percents by Columns)

Like some member to be a missionary	Poor Families NP (N=55)	PP (N=37)	Total Poor (92)	AP (36)	Total Sample (128)
No	61.8	45.9	55.4	52.8	54.3
Yes	38.2	54.1	44.6	47.2	45.7

An index of the religiosity of the three family types was constructed to determine the variation of religious interest and activity of the mothers and their families. Assigning arbitrary weights to the kinds of religious endeavors and totaling them for composite scores, we developed a Wife's Religiosity Index and a Family Religious Participation Index. The results are tabulated in Table 27 which follows.

TABLE 27

EXTENT OF RELIGIOSITY IN FAMILY AND OF THE WIFE BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Indices of Religiosity	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Family Religious Participation Index Score*					
Low	33.9	41.0	36.8	44.4	38.9
Medium	42.9	20.5	33.7	16.7	29.0
High	23.2	38.5	29.5	38.9	32.1
Wife's Religiosity Index Score*					
Low-low	12.5	10.3	11.6	8.3	10.7
Low-high	26.8	23.1	25.3	27.8	26.0
Medium	26.8	23.1	25.3	33.3	27.5
High-low	23.2	20.5	22.1	13.9	19.8
High-high	10.7	23.1	15.8	16.7	16.0

*Percents for levels in each index for each column totals approximately 100% allowing for rounding.

Relevant to the interaction of religious activity and participation in KCCAP, it is noteworthy (Table 27) first, that a wide variation exists among all types. A normal distribution is observed for wife's religiosity from a low percentage of almost no religious expression to a similarly small proportion of rather high activity. A peak is reached of about a fourth of the women reporting a moderate amount of habitual religious effort, except for PP wives. A tendency is obvious for the women in families who participate in community centers (PP) to engage in much religious exercise as well.

With such religiously active mothers, the PP families have a significantly higher FRPI (Family Religious Participation Index) than NP family units. A positive association emerges between participation at the

centers and religious participation. The larger index score of those families with center attendance balances the noticeable difference in FRPI scores between the AP and NP when the former are compared to all the Poor.

The PP families have the highest FRPI scores; the NP groups are much lower even though they, too, seem rather active religiously. Our early surmise is supported that PP families would have more religious involvement than NP units. But we are still perplexed by our discovery that there are about as many Holiness members that go to the centers as stay away and that nearly twice as many Baptist families do not support the community effort as do join in. We can somewhat explain the latter as being further evidence of the historic Baptist notion of separation of church and government as well as preservation of individual independence. The possible personality character of the participating Pentecostals and their contraculture potential should be kept in mind as we discuss our findings on the family life-styles and life-ways in the rest of the report.

CHAPTER VI

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND MOBILITY

The general purpose of this portion of the Evaluation of the three year impact of KCCAP on its target population has been to examine selected intact families and their life styles to see if we could discover the potential for adopting social innovations which are deemed necessary for socio-economic improvement. We have disclaimed the possibility of much noticeable cultural change so far or the appropriateness of assessing the effectiveness of KCCAP by attempting measures of its achievement of such an objective.

We chose to make our investigation more meaningful by dividing our purposive sample of families with preadolescent sons into three categorical types on the basis of family income and participation in the various government-funded projects. We are testing the major hypothesis that those dependent poor families who became program involved (PP) would differ from those who did not participate (NP) and usually in the direction of being more like families considered upwardly mobile because they are able to live above the poverty line (AP).

The assumption is that over time (and we say it will take a longer time than several years) the group served by a community program will change to a greater extent than the group not served. We also presuppose the existence of properties in family and personality systems, latent and dormant as they may be, which predispose people to seek or refuse broader social participation and more efficacious upward mobility. It

is possible, of course, that some persons will believe in one and not the other as well as both or neither of these highly valued characteristics of the middle class American culture.

A secondary but important objective was to focus on the child in the family. We assume that the cycle of poverty can only be broken if the younger generation is socialized for self-autonomous and effective membership in the larger society by the time they reach the crucial moments of decision. Such decisions include choice of occupation, choice of residence, whether and whom to marry, what size of family one can afford, and which value system will undergird and implement one's life plans. Instrumental to these decisions are others such as how much education to secure, what social relationships to establish, and which models to identify with and emulate. Again, it is postulated that young persons, who engage in activities that are gauged to stimulate social participation and motivate personal and upward mobility, will be more likely to become constructively decisive than those who cannot or will not become involved. This may be a naive postulation. It deserves careful longitudinal study.

What are the families like that are receptive to the new effort in Knox County? How do they live in an environment restricted by their sub-normal income? What are the parents' own aspirations and expectations? What future do they want for their sons and what are they doing to prepare for it? What are the boys themselves doing, and thinking, about the time when they will be men? Are there differences in these families and their sons from those that do not join in the KCCAP enterprise? Do the discernible differences augur for improvement

in the homes and lives of those who participate? What of the non-involved people? What can we say for the KCCAP if NP groups and persons are more like the Above Poor? Finally, is the community action program serving the people who need what it is purported to offer? What services should be continued; which ones seem to be ineffective? Do these families need any planned services at all? These are the underlying questions that we sought to answer in our analysis of the data we accumulated in two stages of interviews, a year apart, of the 131 homemakers and their sons.

We propose to deal with them in the following manner. First, we shall describe the chosen aspects of family life which seem relevant to our purpose as they appear in the family types. We shall use not only program participation as the expected influential variable but also, when pertinent, age and educational level of the spouses, their occupation and mobility, the size of their family, and, wherever it seems significantly discriminating, the occupational history of their own parents. Then, in a brief summary, we shall point out what differences have been detected which distinguish the two sets of target families. Comments on revealed similarities and differences between these two categories and the AP families (representing an approximation of what the Poor families might become with enlarged opportunities) will conclude the analysis of each aspect.

The present chapter looks at the structure of the selected families and their position in the social structure. The latter we shall discuss in terms of mobility (residential, educational, and occupational). We do so on the assumption that the KCCAP's chief objective is to reverse the downward trend, encourage upward tendencies, and, in general, shock

the static conditions of the communities which are locked in the plight of poverty.

Structure of the Sample Families

Almost all of the Poor families are two-generation households. These nuclear groups have existed in a large majority of cases for more than twenty years. NP families have experienced more disruption but are generally as old as the other type. The data indicate that some of the more independent AP families are considerably newer units and may represent the Knox County adults who did not feel compelled to migrate out of the area to secure a livelihood.

The last federal census should have alerted us to the likely age of the sample families and parents. With such a depleted number of persons of the normal reproductive years of 20-39 in the county, one ought not be surprised that the fifth grade boys (in 1966) would, more likely than not, have older parents than those in regions with a more normal age distribution. As seen in Table 28, the ages of the AP spouses approximate those anticipated for parents of ten and eleven year olds. But the majority of other mothers are over 40, with husbands modally three to four years their senior.

Consequently, our boys in the Poor families are members of large households and even larger families of orientation. Despite some variation in family size, most boys have at least three siblings still living at home which suggests a typical current family of six or seven. This figure itself makes the reported annual income of the selected homes far below the amount such a family would require for subsistence. But the families are worse off than their present size would indicate. A

TABLE 28

AGE COMPOSITION OF WIVES AND HUSBANDS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Age Composition	Poor Families				
	NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
Wife's Age (percents by columns)					
Less than 29 years	9.4	4.8	7.4	13.9	9.2
30-34	11.3	11.9	11.6	19.4	13.7
35-39	20.8	16.7	18.9	36.1	23.7
40-44	28.3	42.9	34.7	16.7	29.8
45-49	24.5	11.9	18.9	8.3	16.0
50-54	3.8	4.8	4.2	2.8	3.8
55-59	0.0	7.1	3.1	2.8	3.1
60-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65 and above	1.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.8
Husband's Age (percents by columns)					
Less than 29 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.8
30-34	13.2	7.1	10.5	19.4	13.0
35-39	17.0	21.4	18.9	13.9	17.6
40-44	13.2	21.4	16.8	27.8	19.8
45-49	17.0	19.0	17.9	13.9	16.8
50-54	18.9	11.9	15.8	16.7	16.0
55-59	9.4	11.9	10.5	2.8	8.4
60-64	7.5	0.0	4.2	2.8	3.8
65 and above	3.8	7.1	5.3	0.0	3.8

majority of the mothers in the target groups have borne nine or more children, many of whom are grown and married; some have left the county. This means that these families have been consistently large for a long period and fathers have been struggling under the threat of sub-standard income for much of their married life. (Table 29)

TABLE 29

FAMILY SIZE BY FAMILY TYPES
AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Family Composition	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent having 4 or less living children	33.9	18.0	27.4	41.7	32.1
Percent having 7 or more living children	42.8	59.0	49.5	38.9	46.6
Percent having married children living elsewhere	57.2	46.2	52.7	30.6	46.6
Percent having adult members (other than parents) living in the household	7.1	7.7	7.4	11.1	9.4

It is likely that the parents of these families have longer histories of enduring such stringent circumstances. Many have lived in or around Knox County all their lives. Coming as the great majority have from equally large families headed by an unskilled laborer or farmer, it is quite conceivable from our findings that a majority of the parents have always had to cope with poverty conditions. Only a minority (25 percent of the men and 27 percent of their wives) grew up in mining homes which might have, briefly at least, enjoyed adequate incomes. The number is comparatively small of those whose siblings were few or whose fathers were skilled or white collared workers.

History is being repeated by these present families. The older sons and daughters at home are usually unable to find jobs. Unmarried and unemployed they add to the emotional burden as well as the economic plight. There are very few other adults, presently, in the homes, either

to compound the families' predicament or to assist in combating it. Several homes do contain employed adult sons; eight NP wives but just one PP woman have supplemented the earnings by part-time work. The fathers' occupational status and financial contribution to family welfare have already been described in a previous chapter.

We have previously discussed the housing and the available resources from the plots of land on which the families are living. Little more needs to be added here about the condition of the residences. No perceivable advantage is held by one or the other of the low income types.

Typical Trends and Differences

Several differences that approach statistical significance are thus far noteworthy between the Poor family types and also between the two taken together and the AP. The participating Poor families have suffered the least from marital dissolution. In comparison with NP families, PP tend to have a lower median income, larger present households and more unemployed offspring.[12] The Poor in contrast with AP have older parents, longer marital history, much more infant mortality, more children living away from home, and less wives working. AP are only slightly different from the Poor in the number of children (one or two less on the average) in the size of the parents' family of orientation, and in the occupational level of the husband's father (slightly higher generally than either PP or NP.)

Two important clues emerge from these comparisons of family structure and other background features to account for the economic distinctions among the groups. Poverty is perpetuated by the persistence of a pattern of family size too large for self-sufficiency in an industrialized society. (Myrdal, 1968)

The poorest families in our sample tend to be largest also; the larger the family size of the present target groups the larger the wife's maternal family seems to have been. (See Table 30). Larger units, too, reported less employment and fewer sound houses, which they are more likely renting than owning. Mothers with most children are least able to supplement the family income. It may be argued that the other families are relatively large for the average income. This helps to explain the relatively low income level of the sample but it does not obviate the apparent association between extreme poverty and gross number of children.

A long-lived pattern of uncontrolled fertility which is persisting in the area is seen in the size of the families of the present generation. Some of the younger families in the sample have six or seven children. We have mentioned that AP families are almost as large as the others despite their comparatively shorter existence.

TABLE 30

SIZE OF WIFE'S MOTHER'S FAMILY BY PRESENT FAMILY SIZE*

Wife's Mother's Family size	Present Family Size	
	Small (less than 7) (N=42)	Large (7 and more) (N=52)
Less than 5	26.2	11.5
5 - 11	61.9	65.4
12 and more	11.9	23.1

$X^2 = 4.40$; df = 2; not significant at .05
G = .394

*AP families are not included in this table.

A second pertinent finding is the lack of diversity in the occupational backgrounds of the paternal grandfathers. Men for two generations in all types have been relatively unskilled. Quite a large number have worked at only one occupation. Their labor has not been sufficiently remunerative though they may work long hours, because it is not in fields highly rewarded by their changing society. As we shall shortly see this pattern may continue into the third generation and prolong the problem of sub-standard income.

Summary

Certain characteristcs of the families that have become involved in the new programs have been described. Families that participate are more likely to be the larger ones in the area. Heads of these bigger households tend to work less hours than those of the other non-active homes and to be comparatively more unemployed. Participating wives are modally older and unlikely to be working outside the home. Their husbands are relatively younger than those of the NP families. The centers are attended by the families whose housing is relatively poorer. Finally, although there are differences between all Poor families and AP households, the participating families are less like the more prosperous groups in particular structural aspects than are those who do not participate.

Family Mobility and Participation

The Poor families are alike in one basic trait--the parents are equally deficient in schooling. Over ninety percent of the fathers never enrolled in high school and less than forty percent went beyond

the sixth grade. Five men have had no schooling. The mothers have fared a little better; around twenty percent attended school beyond the eighth grade and twice that many got as far as the seventh or eighth grade. We would have to say that most of the adults in the Poor families are not much above the level of functional illiteracy.

The relation between education and modern employment marks these relatively unschooled persons as virtually unemployable in today's society. The comparable success of the AP men and women, jobwise, only accents the requirement of systematic schooling and/or technical training to be eligible even for the lowliest of occupations.

The family pays for the parents' lack of education not only in depressed income but also in the loss of potential cultural enrichment that literacy brings into the home. Poorly schooled parents have serious difficulties supporting their children's need for academic achievement. This could limit the acceptance of alternative role models by their offspring of both sexes. We have reason to believe that the inadequate exposure to systematic extra-familial and non-parochial socialization largely accounts for the contracultural attitudes of severely undereducated adults. Furthermore, the tradition of poverty-associated life and thought ways can scarcely be blocked or even attenuated if parents and other unlettered associates have exclusive access to the lives of the children.

Educational Mobility

The small amount of schooling that the parents themselves have is still an improvement for NP mothers and fathers over that of their parents when Table 31 is examined. The NP mothers have a somewhat better record of educational mobility than the women of the PP families. This, we think could mean that the forbearers of the former wives had scarcely any schooling and the NP homemakers had to overcome the home handicap. From additional evidence in our data,[13] we project an interpretation that the PP women were from homes with slightly more education than those of their non-participating neighbors. About half of the husbands in each type have more education than any of their family, which in light of their limited achievement academically bespeaks a long and pervasive lack of exposure to what the schools had to offer.

TABLE 31

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NP AND PP
IN INTERGENERATIONAL EDUCATION MOBILITY

Educational Mobility (in percentages)	NP	PP	Differences X^2	df	P
Wives more educated than her parents and siblings	51.8	30.8	4.37	2	*
Husbands more educated than his parents and siblings	49.1	48.6	2.17	2	*

*Not significant at $<.05$

Spatial and Occupational Mobility

The low level of schooling which seems to have been normative is a base for explication of the occupational and residential histories of the Poor families. Men could farm or could work inside mines, they could cut down timber and log it to market, and they could work as unskilled or semi-skilled laborers. Their choice of residence was related to the job opportunities that were open to them and they were willing to seek. One supposes that many were so homebound that their willingness to seek work was substantially influenced if not largely determined by its availability near-by. A small minority, it seems, were enabled to hunt far afield for employment when it could not be secured in their native area.

Differences In the Sample

As we have said, the husbands and wives of the two target groups were native-born and tended to be Knox County natives of parents who were born there or in a place not too distant. Table 33 summarizes the findings on the residential experience of the parents in the sample families who had lived their entire lives inside the county boundaries. They constitute the majority. For the rest there is a different story.

We glean from the data these important findings: PP men have changed their residence significantly more than NP; they have spent more years away from their parents' neighborhood; they have moved more times, usually within the area of Knox County and surrounding counties, however. Their wives reported living in more towns than did the NP women and had spent less time, conversely, in the vicinity in which they now resided. These figures suggest a restless occupational instability.

A majority of the Poor family heads have worked in two or more occupations. NP men, in this respect, were more mobile earlier in their lives, and more have migrated away from the region seeking work.

Although the NP men have been employed out-of-state in larger numbers than have the PP husbands, the former now seem much more stable, spatially and workwise. It appears that the latter (PP) have generally moved toward better job opportunities that were close at hand. The data imply they were unable to make the extreme breach of home ties that work in northern industrial cities was perceived to entail. Their wives have apparently never entered the labor force. This, too, may have deterred the families from the longer trek into the larger society. In these features of family behavior NP spouses have clearly been more similar to the AP. The more prosperous AP, however, have been far more adventuresome, proportionately, than those whose incomes currently are sub-standard. Curiously, fewer AP husbands, percentagewise, despite their record of migration, have worked in more than one occupation. This is the kind of job stability that the somewhat better trained (if not educated) have evidently used to advantage.

Knowing this history, a significant difference is not unexpected, between AP and the Poor in the intergenerational upward mobility of the fathers of the sample families. The PP men in this aspect seem to have advanced beyond their fathers in occupational status (when they could find work) more than NP husbands. This is indicated by the similarity of the records achieved by PP and AP. Shall we suppose that the PP men are actually upwardly mobile in spirit? Perhaps they have momentarily faltered because of lack of opportunity. Thus when

a new program (KCCAP) comes to them, for re-entering the labor market, these family heads PARTICIPATE.

TABLE 32

OCCUPATIONAL STABILITY AND MOBILITY BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Occupational Status (in percentages)	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Husbands' Work Life					
Husbands (who have) worked on two or more other occupations	58.9	50.0	55.3	40.0	51.5
Husbands (who have) worked out of state	25.5	10.8	19.3[b]	48.4[b]	26.9
Husbands working for 40 hours a week or more	49.1	32.4	42.4[b]	68.6[b]	49.6
Husbands working for govt. agencies excluding OEO, CAP, VISTA	5.6	10.0	7.1	18.5	10.8
Husbands employed by OEO, CAP, VISTA	44.4	45.0	44.6[b]	7.4[b]	32.8
Unemployed husbands	17.9	23.1	20.0[b]	5.6[b]	16.0
Husbands with 8th grade or less education	94.4	95.2	94.7[b]	64.7[b]	86.9
Occupational Mobility					
Husbands occupationally better placed than their fathers	40.4	59.4	47.6[b]	65.7[b]	52.9
Husbands doing same or better in their occupational status	61.5	69.2	64.9[b]	85.7[b]	70.6
Families having same or more income than previously	62.5[a]	35.9[a]	51.5[b]	30.6[b]	45.8

a = X^2 for differences between NP and PP were found to be significant at < .05.

b = X^2 for differences between Poor and AP were found to be significant at < .05.

We have a picture then of two groups of Poor families some of whom, early in their existence, have moved to find work, a few NP much farther than the PP. They are both back at their home base. NP husbands have found employment of some kind much more readily than the heads of the PP homes. The "non-participating" men work long hours at wages that are inadequate. Some may even work for a government agency. That PP men have been less successful is shown in the high proportion who are unemployed, and who may now be unemployable in normally available occupations. KCCAP may seem to them providence-sent.

We asked the wives how their present situation compared with the past. Did their current income seem greater than it was earlier in their marriage? Had their husbands achieved higher occupational status than they had when they started out? Consistent with the foregoing picture, a significant difference is found between NP and PP families. A majority of the NP husbands are doing as well or better now than previously while nearly a half of the PP wives felt they were presently less prosperous. The variation in responses on the existence and direction of occupational mobility makes a conclusion difficult to render. PP husbands are slightly less downwardly mobile than their NP counterparts. The somewhat surprising evidence that our category of more self-sufficient AP families is less financially secure now than in the past reflects the low opportunity level in Knox County and the influence of price inflation on lower income brackets. The AP men are, however, significantly more upwardly mobile in occupational status than the Poor types taken together.

Using participation in the centers as a dependent variable reveals additional tendencies pertinent to our evaluation of the impact of KCCAP. The participating families tend to have heads who are less educated and who work less hours in the day and less days in the year. Participation and educational mobility were found to be inversely related for the wives. Since older wives boast of more educational mobility generally and we have already ascertained that the women who participate are also older, we must deduce that it is the less educationally mobile older woman who is active at the centers. Again, since the participating husbands are slightly younger than the non-attending men and have less educational mobility we have an apparently incongruous pairing of participating spouses. Further analysis reveals that the PP husbands and wives are more homogeneous in age than the others. This leads to the speculation that the women who participate may be less-husband dominated than the non-attending wives. The latter included at least four who said their husbands forbade their going to the centers.

Summary

PP husbands are similar to AP men in their attitude and achievement of upward occupational mobility. They have been frustrated by their extremely restricted schooling and their reluctance to outmigrate from the region. With this experience and limited drive, they are attracted to KCCAP as a means of improving their economic condition in a more familiar and less threatening environment. More home industries and job training would solve their unemployment and underemployment problem.

On the other hand, NP heads of households are presently more stable and adapted to the status quo prior to the arrival of KCCAP. Some have migrated greater distances than the PP. The group as a whole is satisfied to stay out of the enterprise that they see as ill-conceived and bearing just one more alluring but illusory scheme of the government and outsiders to exploit their somewhat-denied predicament. PP wives are exclusively homemakers and evidently homebodies and homeland-bound. Whatever will improve their economic security and social status without disturbing their desired residential stability has their support. NP women are also content to live in Knox County and with their husbands see little advantage to be gained from radically changing it. However, with a propensity for working outside the home, if it is necessary they would be willing to exercise personally the doctrine of self-help and accept a job to supplement the family income if private enterprise develops in their community.

CHAPTER VII

ASSOCIATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY

Sociologists, in recent research, have rediscovered the existence and importance of the extended family in our society. (Sussman, 1959; Litwak, 1960) Their studies have largely focused on the urban community where they find family ties to be still surprisingly strong among all classes. They speak of the networks of intra- and intergenerational relations which characterize the day-to-day living as evidence of the persistence of a kinship system. This family pattern, although of ancient origin, was uniquely reshaped in the rigorous frontier development of American culture.

Once more in the past century, as the social context shifted from the open country to urban concentration, a new adaptation was required. Modifications have been manifested in the transition but the basic family form has been maintained. The literature has stressed the social changes to which people have reacted as they made their way from relative rural isolation to live in villages, towns, small cities and, eventually, the huge metropolis. The increasing independence of the nuclear unit of parents and children was noted. The ties of loyalty and obligation to the larger family organization were recognized as handicaps to effective extensive horizontal and vertical mobility. Success seemed to necessitate the devaluation of the solidarity of the extended family.

Now that urban living has become the way of life for second and third generations, the traditional solidarity of the kinship system is being restored to a high position in the hierarchy of basic American values.

This is a long story of socio-cultural change. Stable families are still lingering in rural isolation on one end of a continuum which stretches to a polar type of integrated families in the large cities. The latter are a result of generations of people working out adjustments. So long as individuals could manage their subsistence in the agricultural context the old form of extended family seemed functional. But, if, as has occurred, the dominant economy shifts to an industrial type, and it becomes increasingly difficult for subsistence farmers to secure their livelihood, more and more persons must change their occupation. This entails either migration toward industrial centers or the establishing of industries in the vicinity.[14] The second alternative requires community co-operation to accomplish and is expedited by the presence of a pool of trained or trainable workers. The first is obviously more simple but is likely to be managed only if migrants have marketable skills, comparatively high levels of schooling to make them capable of social adjustment, and either freedom to leave legitimized by their family or healthy emotional independence from the network of kith and kin.

Personal Mobility of Knox Countians

Knox County has had some industrialization but the present poor prognosis for industries on location or to be located is part of the poverty predicament of the current population. Many persons and families have migrated or milled around in the area in continual frustration. The success of the permanent out-migrants is beyond the scope of this study. Those who tried to leave but have come back,

those who have moved about in the area with decreasing resources, and the ones who manifestly cannot or will not do either comprise the relatively reluctant host constituency of KCOEO, a sample of which we are investigating. We have described their lack of schooling and training and their limited degrees of mobility, outward and upward. Now we examine them in terms of two other kinds of mobility, personal and ideational. We are aware immediately of another key factor in the failure of families to find financial security. It is the predominance of the kinship group and like-minded neighbors in the associational activity of the adults and children. "This narrow field for communication and emotional interdependence fixes a kind of dependency on the young which they may never be able to resolve." (Chilman, 1966) Consequently, residential and vertical mobility are strongly influenced by the degree of felt need to be in familiar surroundings for emotional and, in turn, economic stability.

The life of the growing child in the county is circumscribed by the ring of relatives living around or near him. The nuclear family itself furnishes plenty of interaction; in extreme isolation, the parents and siblings may be the solitary human contacts, interrupted by the infrequent appearance of an "outsider," a distant neighbor or a member of the kindred. In homes not so remote from others intimate social relations develop between members of the related families and between them and their neighbors. Friendly association and friendships develop at school but, again, the distance that separates the houses restricts after-school and free-time play with non-family companions. Meanwhile,

the omnipresence of the extended family, children and cherished adults, builds a pattern of ties, mutual obligations and exclusive loyalties that become a sense of belonging which is visceral deep and permanent. If the individual who "belonged" to such a family, and a church and neighborhood dominated by it and others like it, he is likely to find the urban milieu into which he moves unfriendly and unrewarding. (Schwarzweller and Seggar, 1967) Since his appetite for affection and need for belonging were gratified by the intimate bonds of life-long kinship and narrow friendship ties he may feel compelled either to return home regularly or to stay.

The phenomenon of habitual going back and forth between old home and new is commonly observed on Kentucky highways that connect the hills with the northern cities. Our sample is somewhat made up of persons who have made such trips but have finally decided to remain in the county.

Part of their problem of staying out is the lack of experience in their background of membership in organizations, formal and voluntary. The dearth of opportunity to participate in extra-familial associations characterizes the backward rural areas. For psychological reasons beyond the purview of this study, people who grow up in such an environment "prefer to belong to an audience where they can be one of a collection of individuals rather than to join a co-operating group." (Mogey, 1956) The personal and social compulsions are cathected in the commonly accepted associations of the least formal nature.

The recreational activity of such persons may be encompassed by this getting together of the like-minded. Leisure time is more likely to be spent either in visiting or in relative inactivity. Reading, for the older family members, is too difficult an endeavor. The radio and television are instruments for varying the monotony of drab lives. Sports are for the young and sprightly but the equipment is scarce and teams imply organization and money that are lacking in their setting. The ancient skills for subsistence, hunting and fishing, herb, berry, wild plant and nut picking, are still practiced more as food gathering than as pastime. Doing such things primarily as leisure time activities is not a lower class perception.

Associational Patterns of the Selected Families

Similarities were previously shown to be more impressive than differences in the contacts that NP and PP families make with their relatives. There was not much of a meaningful contrast between the Poor and AP groups. Center participating units had more relatives of the parents living within visiting distance. Their advantage approximated significance. But, with that difference, dissimilarity between all sub-groupings becomes smaller in magnitude. Table 33 indicates virtual unanimity in the response that no trouble occurs in the relations with kinfolks and demonstrates the durability of kinship ties. Surmised expectations, however, of considerable reciprocal dependence on relatives for material help and mutual services by Poor units were only weakly supported by the data. Their sense of responsibility is high but the record of instances of aid is below the projected expectation. AP families, being more secure, have a significantly higher incidence of exchanging aid. A majority of the homemakers expressed

preference for some of their relatives as closest companions. But a clear picture of acceptance and interaction with friendly neighbors exists in the data.

TABLE 33

MUTUAL HELP WITH RELATIVES AND NEIGHBORS
BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Intra-Familial Associational Network	Poor Families				
	NP	P	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent reporting troubles with relatives	1.8	0.0	1.1	5.6	2.3
Percent feeling a responsibility for helping relatives	75.0	71.8	73.7	80.6	75.6
Percent who have rendered any kind of help to relatives	19.6	15.4	17.9	41.7	24.4
Percent expecting help from relatives	83.9	69.2	77.9	86.1	80.2
Percent who have received help from relatives	7.1	12.8	9.5	19.4	12.2
Percent expecting relatives to be more ready to help than neighbor	30.4	20.2	26.3	31.4	27.7
Percent expecting both relatives and neighbors to be equally ready to help	58.9	66.7	62.1	62.9	62.3

The responses of the boys on choice of companions may reflect the fact that they were interviewed during the school term. Around three fourths (74.8 percent) of the youngsters signified preferences of neighbor children and schoolmates as their daily associates. Perhaps the size of the minority who marked cousins as regular companions in play is the more impressive indicant of the actual width of the associational field of the boys.

Pertinent to the objective of the study, the several aspects of interdependence between Poor families and their kinfolks and neighbors, in which a near-significant contrast did occur, suggest higher reciprocity of NP with relatives. (See Table 33) In this respect, the tendency for NP and AP to be more alike may be due to PP's greater participation in the community center. However, the differences among the families in terms of reported preference are overshadowed by the size of the majority of each sub-group that treat neighbors and relatives about the same.

Women rarely meet informally in any kind of established place outside their homes. (Table 34) Unlike those in more congested populations, a small minority of men in this area gather in recognized places inside their neighborhood.

TABLE 34

INFORMAL MEETING PLACES BY
FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Informal Meeting Places	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent reporting meeting places for men in the neighborhood	12.8	28.3	19.8	13.9	17.6
Percent reporting meeting places for women in the neighborhood	28.6	28.2	27.4	23.5	25.6

Taking Part in Formal Groups

The description of formal participation of the three sets of families can be brief. Although no more than one out of 10 of the men and women is involved in any organization other than the church, the AP type has much more reported contact and experience of this nature than does either of the others. Table 35 tells the meager story of the seriously stinted encounter of the whole sample with civic and community organizations.

TABLE 35

PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Civic Organizations (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Wives participating in organizations other than church	1.9	2.6	2.2[b]	20.6[b]	7.1
Husbands participating in organizations other than church	3.8	2.6	3.3[b]	32.3[b]	10.6

b = Significant difference at .05 level.

Attention was called earlier in the report to the ignorance and inexperience of these rural people in the realm of the structured relations which the large formal group rapidly institutionalizes. Adults are child-like in their comprehension of, and competence in, effective conduct in secondary groups. Living so completely in relatively unorganized primary groups, the mere thought of engaging in a systematic fashion in policy-making procedures with their peers creates panic if not revulsion.

Part of their attitude of recoil from engagement is their ideological interpretation of the impossibility of planning for the future, let alone managing or pushing plans to fruition. It is certainly to be expected that resident participation in community organization will not be early or quickly achieved in areas where the social skills of the constituency are so woefully weak.

Spare Time Activities

Around two-thirds of the wives of the Poor actually have no spare-time activities and in light of their homemaking load this might be expected. Neither does it come as a surprise that what spare time they felt they had was devoted to family needs and interests. Of course, they indulge in home entertainment provided by the radio and TV sets which most households have purchased.

TABLE 36

SPARETIME ACTIVITIES BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Wife's Sparetime Activities	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percent reporting no specific sparetime activities	16.1	15.4	15.8	8.3	13.7
Percent reporting sparetime activities related to homemaking	51.8	64.1	56.8	47.2	54.2
Percent reporting leisure activities*	32.1	20.5	27.4	44.5	32.0

*Includes TV watching

Ideational Mobility--Exposure to Mass Media

The experience world of persons in these families can be broadened by their access to the outside world (outside their neighborhood at least) through the modern media of communication. As in so many other studies, our sample of families depends on the radio and TV for most of their information about the larger society. Table 37 reveals husbands, wives, and children in a majority of the homes are regular "listeners" and "viewers." Less than a fourth of the Poor households, however, take or read a newspaper. The AP families are not significantly more avid in their contact with the local and larger society through the medium of newsprint. Those who are ABOVE POOR do seem more discriminating in their use of television, although, because more own sets, AP mothers view more programs than the others. From these and other findings we infer a limited degree of psychic mobility.

TABLE 37

CONTACT WITH MASS MEDIA BY
FAMILY TYPE AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Contact with Mass Media (in percentages)	Poor Families				Total Sample
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	
Wives listening to radio daily	72.7	76.9	74.5	69.8	72.5
Husbands listening to radio daily	69.6	69.2	69.5	52.8	64.9
Wives watching TV daily	78.7	82.1	79.8	88.9	81.7
Husbands watching TV daily	70.9	73.7	72.0	69.4	70.2
Getting and reading newspaper	23.2	26.3	24.5	33.4	27.0

We examined the mothers' reading habits according to age and educational level. Age did not discriminate but a positive relation emerged between level of schooling attained and functional literacy. Three fourths of the least educated evidently never read either newspaper or magazine.

Typical Trends and Differences

An impression of extensive and intensive interaction between members of lower class families in Knox County led to the hypothesis that the ratio of contacts with relatives and neighbors would be inversely related to community participation. Our proposition was that the lower the rate of center participation, the more the intimate contacts and greater exchange of visits with kinfolks and the less the association with neighbors. We surmised that the NP, by tradition and choice, would have closest relations with relatives. The AP, toward the other extreme, would have greater interaction with neighbors and fellow-workers and fewer contacts with the extended family. For PP, we assumed a variety of intermediate positions on a continuum between these constructed types. Obviously, our data do not support this set of presuppositions. All sets of families maintain fairly equal intimacy and reciprocity with both kindred and neighbors. AP nuclear units exchange more help and more visits, proportionately, with their kin, than do the others. PP primary groups have more frequent contacts with their relatives than do the NP (although this may be a result of the greater number of PP kinfolk living in the vicinity). We found a much larger incidence of mutual exchange of

contacts than anticipated for PP and AP families and a considerably lower rate and amount of interfamily material assistance in the reports by NP homemakers.

A mixed conclusion is deduced about the general hypothesis which is basic to this part of the inter-disciplinary evaluation, namely, that PP families would have life-styles more like AP than NP and would be significantly different from the latter in ways associated with their taking part in the KCCAP. In regard to their degree of personal mobility, our findings suggest that the PP families are more active participants in all forms of association than the NP. Index scores* were derived combining sets of responses in the several aspects of informal association. All but one showed weak but positive relation between participation and the several aspects of intimate interaction under study. (Table 38) However, the fact that they exchange material aid with their neighbors indicates the possibility (perhaps probability) that the NP are not social isolates exclusively devoted to their kin.

The PP are similar to both other sets in particular aspects; they are like the NP, for example, in informal participation. But PP have a significantly higher total formal participation score than the NP. (Table 39) In previous discussion we have shown PP's greater involvement in the church. Whether this organization is actually a formal structure remains a moot issue. As a fellowship it might be considered more as an informal community association.

---

*The details of these and other composite scores appear in Appendix A.

TABLE 38

INFORMAL ASSOCIATIONAL INTERACTION BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Informal Associational Interaction Indices	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Percents scoring "high" on Contact with Relatives Index	28.5	48.7	36.9	52.8	41.2
Percent placing relative "higher" among visitors and friends	46.4	56.4	50.5	52.8	51.2
Percent scoring "high" on Kinship Tie Index	37.5	51.3	43.2	55.6	46.5
Percent scoring "high" on Contact with Neighbor Index	25.5	33.3	28.7	19.4	26.2
Percent scoring "high" on Index of Neighborliness	17.9	28.2	22.1	13.9	19.8

TABLE 39

INTENSITY OF PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL ASSOCIATION BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Formal Participation Index Score	Poor Families NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
No formal participation	57.1	0.0	33.1	11.1	27.5
Low	26.8	23.1	25.3	30.6	26.7
Medium	12.5	25.6	17.9	38.9	23.7
High	3.6	51.3	23.7	19.4	22.1

Difference between NP and PP: $X^2 = 47.23$, df = 3, $p < .001$, G = .896

Difference between Poor and AP: $X^2 = 10.14$, df = 3, $p < .01$, G = .250

NP use the mass media slightly less than their Poor counterparts. With less engagement outside the home, it might be expected that these families would have more listening and viewing time, although they do have more employment and longer hours at work than the PP. Their formal participation is so low that scarcely any adult belongs to a systematically organized group other than the church. The nature of the Baptist churches in rural Knox County leads us to much the same conclusion about the NP church involvement as we have suggested for PP religious affiliation.

Summary

The evidence grows that the PP are in certain specific phases of their family life style groping their way toward the patterns which the AP are able to practice. Their personal and ideational mobility is handicapped by their low educational background. Their mobility in these respects is similar to their occupational and geographic dynamics--their spirit is willing.

CHAPTER VIII

CONJUGAL ROLES, CONCEPTS OF PARENTHOOD AND CHILD-REARING PRACTICES

In this chapter we shall examine the internal system of family behavior. Clues to the kind of adaptation and social adjustment, which families and their members may make in the future if social change is successfully promoted, may emerge as we sort out the findings on the current allocation of marital tasks and parental responsibilities. The assumption is that roles perceived by the children as being performed in their homes will influence their later role enactment. Furthermore, the role acceptance by the spouses up to now is likely to affect their future marital adjustment in case the family situation is altered by economic improvement. In the limited scope of our study, we propose to analyze the data on the family social systems primarily to ascertain the growing conceptualization by the male child of personal and family roles, his role-assumptions, and his potential for adult role performance. "Since his own modes of participation are reciprocals of his family's role patterns, the latter undoubtedly play a large part in socializing and enculturating him for the requirements of adult life." (Maccoby, 1959)

The structured questionnaires for mothers in the sample contained numerous questions on their own role perceptions and their report of the role acceptance of their husbands and sons. Many of the questions are identical to those in other studies.[15]

The group interviews of boys also included standardized questions, most of which appeared in Herbst's UNESCO study of the relationships

between husband and wife within Australian families. Unfortunately, we cannot compare our findings in Appalachian U. S. with Herbst's conclusions. (1952) But, since we agreed with him that the child in the family may give less biased or stereotyped replies and also furnish a second view of what "goes on" in the home and who decides it, we subjected our young respondents to Herbst's battery of questions. We had only partial success in eliciting the desired information.[16] We used Herbst's constructed typology of conjugal patterns of activity-sharing and distribution of authority in our analysis of the family power structure of the family groups.

Earlier (Chapter IV), we described briefly how the parents in our study deviated from an expected pattern of father default, matriarchal authority, and son's dependence on mother for succorance and identification. The latter in adolescence supposedly shifts to his peer group. We now intend to show in a summary report of further findings how the behavior and beliefs of the selected Knox County families depart somewhat from the practices and ideological perceptions reported in lower-class families by other researchers. As we contrast our sets within the study and with those of similar strata elsewhere, our primary objective is still to detect differences in families by participation. We shall also attempt to derive indicants of the potential chances for the boys to become self-reliant adults and reliable heads of families in the future.

In searching for factors that might account for the differences in the behavioral fields of the sample families, and between them and the family situations discovered in urban lower classes, we considered the

possible influence of the mining experience of two generations of fathers on some of the family systems. A doctoral dissertation under way is investigating the effects of the coal mining occupation on the family roles of father in homes in a West Virginia poverty area similar to Knox County.[17] Tentative findings support the hypothesis that "occupational role develops in the role occupant (the miner) a set of values and attitudes and creates loyalties, responsibilities and obligations which in turn shape his family relationships." It seems reasonable that the two extracting forms of manual labor, farming and mining, would have some perceivable differential effects on the life patterns of the worker. However, in an earlier research piece on a similar subject in two mining communities of Eastern Kentucky the present author found very few significant differences in family systems of first, second, and third generations of miners. (Gladden and Christiansen, 1954) The tendencies toward change were there but the traditional farming background of native Kentuckian miners was still too determinant to permit large changes in their family relations.

A second influential factor serving to discriminate between the roles and relationships of husbands and fathers in the several types might be the cultural background of the men whose families entered Knox County to work on the railroads or in the mines. Again, if the findings of Bott in England are at all definitive, the years spent in northern industrial areas, by some of the "returnees" in our sample, may have altered the pattern of rigid segregation of conjugal roles associated with close-knit family networks. Bott discovered support for her hypothesis that

> if conditions are such that their networks become loose-knit after marriage, they (the spouses)

> must seek in each other some of the emotional satisfactions and help with familial tasks that couples in close-knit networks can get from outsiders. (1957)

In areas where the spouses are drawn into activities of their extended family, the traditional division of labor by sexes is more likely because the spouses can get help from their kin whenever needed.

Some analysts have theorized that an increase in joint-participation in the homes, by family members of both generations, may also be due to the extended unemployment of the adult male. His greater activity in the performance of homemaking tasks becomes possible because he is more frequently in the home. It is especially when wives work that husbands are disposed to supplement or substitute for them in household tasks.

To return, momentarily, to the thesis by Lewis, it may be that some fathers are unable or unwilling to serve actively in the home because of their regular contacts with fellow mine-workers in a male peer group with a high degree of informal solidarity. Some evidence has already been shown in our sample of a small number of gathering places where men meet informally in any regular fashion. The number is too small to account for the projected pattern.

Before our investigation was launched, we had gleaned from the literature a description of spousal role enactment, parental perceptions, and child care practices of lower-class American families.[18] From this and from previous research in Eastern Kentucky, we developed a set of hypotheses about expected behavior and ideologies of Knox County's homemakers and household heads. We hypothesized that:

I. The sample families are husband-dominated, despite the reported widespread male underemployment. Husband's authority is unquestioned if he cares to exert it. He may have a "compulsive need to affirm, and from time to time exert, his power in the household." Differences between NP and PP fathers should be insignificant. What distinctiveness exists should find PP adult males sanctioning more joint decisions and participating slightly more actively in the homemaking responsibilities than the NP men. Because we knew of the larger portion of wives of this family type working, we felt AP husbands would be more involved in the household tasks and child care than the other husbands.

II. NP wives will be more content than PP wives. One might have said more adaptable. They have trimmed the sails of their craft to take the difficulties they have encountered. PP wives are still struggling. More NP women are expected to be willing to work outside the home under the impetus of a strong conviction of self-help. But both types are thought to prefer the exclusive homemaker role.

III. The Poor families do not believe in planning their family size. They are willing to have as many children "as God gives them" and feel it sinful to control the natural process. We expect a majority response of agreement with the statement that "children should be wanted for the parents' sake" in contrast to a greater emphasis on the value of the child to society or the companionship which children give to each other.

IV. The Poor mothers are believers in permissive child care of a laissez-faire nature. They do not expect their children to become independent early. They require obedience but do not insist or follow up. They love their children "all alike," but they like them better as babies (they are less "bothered" by them in infancy). The families are relatively unorganized in their parental behavior. Differences between NP and PP mothers are expected at least to approach significance. The women who attend the center programs are more concerned that their children be better (and more realistically) prepared for the vicissitudes of life which the PP parents have tried to cope with in their hardship-ridden histories. (But we anticipated little use of middle class methods of discipline.)

Conjugal Role Acceptance and Performance

Doubts have been cast on the ability of men, in homes with sub-standard incomes, to fulfill the traditional expectations concerning the head of the household because of their chronic ineptitude or down-right failure to provide for the physical needs of the family. However, norms vary, from region to region, concerning what constitutes adequate provision. Hence, a generalization may oversimplify the association between a man's inability to play the classic role as the provider and his loss of the right to power and prestige in his home. True, there is a tendency for a wife in straitened circumstances to assume a central position. Her task of nurturance is made more difficult when her husband is continually prevented from performing his major function. The mother

is also hard put to take proper care of her children without the economic support of the father. If she is to serve or save the family in the multi-faceted plight of poverty she must enact her homemaking role to the fullest. This frequently means she must augment the income by adopting a second role, that of her husband. The more the wife assumes the latter role the more likely she will share the rights and privileges of the status of joint head. Of course, when the husband is a dismal failure his abject personal condition may become so pathological as to require the wife to play both roles. The first two hypotheses have to do with how husbands and wifes are expected to accommodate to each other in a family situation which is so handicapped by economic insecurity. Do husbands tend to adhere to the rigid division of labor when they are not successful providers; or do they compensate by rendering assistance in the home?

Hypothesis I: The sample families are husband-dominated.

Husband's Performance. That many Poor families in Knox County have not reached the point of pervasive wife dominance is an important discovery in this research. But most Poor husbands are also not generally dominant. A surprising finding, disclosed by the data in both the mothers' and sons' responses, is the index score of the Overall Conjugal Role pattern of all sets of spouses. Using a modified form of Herbst's typology, we ascertained that a majority of mates in the sample tend to be syncratic.[19] Table 40 reveals the pattern constructs held likely in the interaction of husband and wife. Notice the extremely low percentage of families in which the wife admits dominance. Much higher proportions of the families operate under the relatively active authority of the father. However, the cooperative pattern of joint decision-making is predominant

in nearly two thirds of the total sample in matters pertaining to household duties, child control and care, social activities, and economic activities. A trend exists for the spousal subsystem to be significantly more syncratic and less husband dominated as we move from NP to PP to AP.

TABLE 40

OVERALL CONJUGAL ROLE INDEX BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE
(Percent by Columns)

Overall Conjugal Role Types	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Husband dominance type	32.1	25.1	29.5	11.1	24.4
Wife dominance type	5.4	5.6	5.3	11.1	6.9
Mixed dominance	8.9	0.0	5.3	2.8	4.6
Syncratic type	53.6	66.7	58.9	75.0	63.4
Autonomic type	0.0	2.6	1.1	0.0	.8

When we turn to the particulars on the role enactment of the husbands, the differences between the two sets of Poor families lose their significance. There are no significant differences in the father's participation in either household tasks or child care. Both types apparently help considerably. The NP husbands have taken slightly more part in the child care activities; but the PP husbands are sharing in the household tasks a bit more than NP. In these spheres of homemaking, both types of men, perhaps because of more time free from outside labor, were reported by the wives to be more helpful than were the AP. Finally, because of considerable variation in percentages within each type and between the categories, only tendencies appeared in the boys' reports of the fathers'

contributions to the internal household tasks. Figure 1 summarizes other findings, including boy's responses, concerning the husband's acceptance of participation in non-traditional home responsibilities.

FIGURE 1

MIXED TENDENCIES IN PROGRESSION OR REGRESSION IN NP, PP AND AP FAMILIES IN THE DEGREE OF HUSBAND"S CONTRIBUTION

Getting up at night most likely to be done by husband	NP < PP > AP
"Much" contribution by husband in child care	NP < PP < AP
Father most of the time sees children out of bed	NP < PP < AP
Father most of the time buys food	NP > PP < AP
Father most of the time sees that children eat	NP > PP < AP
Father most of the time does the dishes	NP > PP < AP

Hypothesis II: NP women will be more content than PP wives.

Wife's Perceptions and Acceptance

The women, as the main respondents in the study, were asked about their perception of their roles and their level of satisfaction. They pictured their husbands as somewhat acceptant of a pattern of sharing in home responsibilities and in decision-making. Their picture is not complete without some details about the areas in which the wife defers to the husband. As impressive as the syncratic tendency of the discussion of important things seems, the wife granted the superiority of her husband in political decisions, in the location and kind of

work he would choose, and, in a large measure (especially for NP families), in "money matters." Table 41 delineates the details of the topics on which the wife defers to the husband.

TABLE 41

WIFE'S DEFERENCE IN CERTAIN SELECTED MATTERS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Wife's Deference (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
In political matters	60.7	44.7	54.2	64.7	57.0
In moving to another house	37.1	22.2	31.1	37.2	32.8
In changing husband's job	85.7	82.0	84.3	77.8	82.4
In money matters	51.8	33.3	44.2	30.6	41.3

TABLE 42

HELP RECEIVED BY WIFE IN FULFILLING HER FEMININE OBLIGATION BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Help Received (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Help received from husband in child care	69.6	61.5	66.3	62.9	65.4
Help received from husband and children doing dishes	47.2	44.4	46.1	42.4	44.1
Help received from husband and children in ironing	14.0	22.2	17.4	31.4	21.5

The wives are receiving quite a bit of help in fulfilling their traditional feminine obligations, either from husbands or children. (Table 42) The nuclear family, perhaps because of its separation from both extended families to which it belongs, apparently is rather self-sufficient because it has to be. When members really need a helping hand they know they can count on it, but it takes a crisis before a cry is sent out. One must remember the size of these families, the average age of the mothers (who are in a period of their lives which is crisis prone and frustration tolerance is at a low level), and the severe limitations caused by their lack of schooling. Some have chosen to enter the labor force to alleviate their family's predicament. Others have engaged in community programs to improve the family's conditions. The rest are playing the role of homemaker exclusively, with whatever assistance they can garner from their large families.

TABLE 43

WIFE'S SENSE OF SATISFACTION WITH MOTHER-WIFE ROLE BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Satisfaction with Mother-Wife Role (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Wife working outside home	14.5	2.6	9.5	22.2	13.0
"Staying home" conceived as wife's main job	46.4	56.4	50.5	42.8	48.4
Wife has been able to solve her role problem fairly well.	67.9	71.8	69.5	54.3	65.4

The proportion of NP women, claiming a sense of satisfaction with the mother role, did not prove high enough to make them different in this respect from PP wives. (Table 43) Only a weak association appears between non-involvement in the community enterprise (KCCAP) and wife's willingness to provide the family's needed additional income by entering the labor force. (The discrepancy in numbers of NP and PP women working /eight and one, respectively/ is not great enough to be accepted as significant at lower than the .10 level.) A slightly greater majority of PP wives reported that they felt they had solved their role problems with little anxiety. These shifts in indicators of wife contentment, between the two sets of wives, suggest that the NP were most different from the PP in their drive to implement their desired improvement on their own and with least outside help, especially that offered or engineered by the government. NP are not much different in assessing their present financial condition or the extent to which they think they have resolved their role problems. They are only slightly more confident and optimistic about the future. They retain their high hopes for their sons as we shall see in the ninth chapter. A few were attracted by the original announcement of the community center but because of their scruples rather early dropped their interest. The PP women, out of long frustration in the fight for financial security, are still hopeful, nearly two-thirds of them, that KCCAP will help.

Neither of our original hypotheses about conjugal role acceptance has been supported. Indeed, the observed tendencies have been in an unexpected direction. Husbands are not so dominant, but not because

they have abdicated. Instead, they have sustained their relation to a perceptible degree as their family fights for survival. A majority of the wives are relatively satisfied with their own role perception but the NP do not surpass the PP in contentment.

Hypothesis III: The Poor families do not believe in planning their family size.

Planned Parenthood

We were not surprised to discover the adverse climate of conviction toward the artificial control of family size.* Recognizing the prevalence of large families of procreation, and for a long time aware of the widespread religious belief in predestination, we were convinced that the Poor families would be virtually identical in their negative attitudes toward contraception. The data bear us out. (Table 44) The positive value of child-bearing is evident in the AP as well. However, a significant contrast is revealed, between the latter group of families and those Poor, in their ideological approval of birth control. Only in the actual use of modern methods for limiting births does the difference between these two groups become less meaningful. Here the PP are more dissimilar to the control group than are NP. In fact, the PP are the most traditional of the three types in this feature of the family belief and behavior system as the table demonstrates. Again, as in other issues directly related to religious doctrine, PP are less like the upwardly mobile than the NP are.

*We were warned by persons living in the area that we probably should not raise questions about this subject. We had to delete several questions from our schedules because our native interviewers felt they could not ask them.

TABLE 44

CONTROL OF FAMILY SIZE BY FAMILY TYPE
AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Control of Family Size (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Four or less children are considered ideal number for a family	23.3	28.2	25.2	27.8	26.0
Family size should not be left to nature	47.3	43.6	45.7[b]	72.2[b]	53.1
Family size can be limited	94.5	97.4	95.7	100.0	96.7
Have discussed limiting family with husband	38.2	43.6	40.4[b]	65.7[b]	40.4
Have tried limiting family size	39.3	28.2[c]	34.7	52.8[c]	39.7

[b] = X^2 for the difference between poor and AP was found to be significant at $<.05$

[c] = X^2 for the difference between PP and AP was found to be significant at $<.05$

We were interested in why they want so many children. Was it because they needed them for proof of their sexual vitality? Do the mothers find increasing fulfillment as they express their fecundity? Do they bow to the mysterious plan of God for their lives, meekly accepting continual fertility as evidence of the design? As it turned out, all three groups of wives were similar in their responses to the question concerning reasons for having children. However, when we collapsed the responses into two categories and compared family types on the basis of choosing to have children because they are interesting or because they provide adult fulfillment and security, a real difference emerged. Table 45 shows over a half of the NP mothers desired children for the latter

reasons; less than a third of the PP checked such responses. The NP and AP are much more similar in this respect. PP are less concerned about adult security problems.

TABLE 45

REASONS FOR DESIRING CHILDREN BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE (PERCENTS BY COLUMNS)

Reasons for Desiring Children	Poor Families				
	NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
Because they are interesting	46.4	69.2	55.8	52.8	55.0
Because of fulfillment and security of parents	53.6	30.8	44.2	47.2	45.0

Difference between NP and PP: $X^2 = 4.85$, df = 1, $p < .05$.

We tested for differences among our total sample using other independent (causal) variables. The deviations were highly significant. Older parents could be expected to cling to the tradition of having as many children as they could; and they were. Mother's educational level fitted norms and was inversely related to fertility aspirations. Higher family income and farming occupation also proved to be discriminating factors. The number of families with weak religious involvement was too small to use this influence as a measure. However, all of the forces revealed as associated with high fertility evaluation are themselves indications of the traditional isolated society of the past. The relatively high degree of pressure toward conformity, and the low social differentiation of such a society, may continue to exert such power over those with

least education, the oldest, and the most oriented to the ageless milieu of agriculture that they dare not deviate.

Child-Rearing Concepts and Practices

We come now to the testing of the final hypothesis related to the support and power structure of our families. For a number of reasons, the aspect of child care is crucial to this study. It should give us further clues to the viability of the families. Since parental behavior flows from the values and the beliefs of the adult actors, we should discover more about the goals of the mothers and fathers as they are reflected in child-rearing concepts and practices. Since almost everyone does what he can for the welfare of his children, he is revealing his own personality system in what he does for them.

A principal objective in seeking information on the patterns of child care was to secure some facts on which to base some predictions and suggestions concerning the future of the newest generation in Knox County families. It is almost universally assumed that early experiences of a child are a major influence on his personality development. If the social structure and cultural context in which a child is reared are that strategic, then the supposed social deprivation in the lower class orientation could severely handicap his life chances by permanently damaging his character structure. "Evidence from research with children suggests strongly that poor environments retard intellectual development." (McCandless, 1961) Other possible but less drastic outcomes are: the reproduction of persons who tend to be overdependent on their family of orientation or

> "the production of a personality in the lower-class child which is moderately secure--secure enough so that he functions without social or emotional breakdown--but which includes an incomplete identification with adults." (McCandless)

A general lack of social skills, a chronically low level of verbal communication, and the persistent pattern of family failure and frustration are other disadvantages which must be overcome if the child is to move out effectively into the mainstream of his society.

The socialization process is so complex, even for the children of rural areas, that here we shall describe only the most basic features of the treatment of children. We shall limit our discussion in this section to infant and pre-school child care. The sharing of the responsibility for preparing the young for adulthood will be examined in the next chapter.

In analyzing the mass of data derived from the reports of our two age groups of respondents, we were looking for several factors that underlie the wide variety of discrete parental behaviors. We sought clues on the conceptions of parenthood and childhood as well. How do these mothers think parents should act? What do they perceive as correct and normal conduct by children? What <u>do</u> they do as mothers; how <u>do</u> they treat and care for the infant and child when he "misbehaves"?

Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) performed a factor analysis of ratings and judgments based on interviews with mothers of five-year-old children.

We included some of their questions in our schedules and utilized several of their factor scales to group items which were related to types of behavior. We shall report in brief our findings on the factors ob-

served as we deal with the fourth hypothesis generated early in the project.

We are aware as Deutsch (1963) has claimed that "we really have no external criterion for evaluating the characteristics of a milieu in terms of how well it is designed to foster development." The child may be well enculturated to live in his own native neighborhood by adopting the qualities of the way of life which has endured so long. But if he is to be more than an observer--an outsider--of the larger society, he probably needs a preparation different from that given his forbearers. Some of them made the plunge into the mainstream only to withdraw, while others hardly got their feet wet. Many have remained comparative strangers to the dominant society.

The tide of the mainstream is lapping all around the doors of these Knox County homes. What was functional for the forefathers is no longer for the current fathers and may be more dysfunctional if not dysgenic in the future. It is our purpose as we launch into discussion of how children are viewed, nurtured, controlled and rewarded to ask if the prognosis of their potential for participation in tomorrow's society is favorable. The cycle of poverty has to be interrupted somehow, somewhere. The boys in question are almost beyond the stage of influence. We wish we could state how far they can go, both geographically and vertically. We shall have speculative suggestions later relative to their future and that of a community action program. Presently, we are concerned with the early child care patterns of the sample families.

Parental Permissiveness

Hypothesis IV: The study mothers are believers in permissive child care of a laissez-faire nature

Judging from the Sears, Maccoby, and Levin study (1957), the mothers in our sample would be "permissive" if they had low restrictions on play in the house and on making noise; acceptant responses to dependency; infrequent use of physical punishment and light punishment for aggression toward parents; high permissiveness for aggression toward all others; and high permissiveness for nudity, immodesty, and sex play.*

The conclusion we reach from the responses is that the Poor mothers are, indeed, relatively permissive in the sense of allowing their children to be noisy, to become dependent, to act somewhat aggressively toward others and to go relatively non-punished. They are restrictive in sex exhibition and modesty. Table 46 presents selected findings on the factor. This is laissez-faire permissiveness.

Our conclusion would have to be modified if we relied on the single response to the question of general supervision. The mothers in all three family types insisted they are quite strict. But the other responses, and observations made by interviewers, as well as casual comments frequently offered in the conversations between the two ladies (interviewer and interviewee), serve to confirm the hypothesis. Mothers in each group were fairly evenly divided on tolerance of noise, handling sibling quarrels,

---

*We have omitted an item or two in the derived factors because of our sample's anticipated sensitivity and the difficulty expressed by our native interviewers in broaching certain subjects.

expecting obedience, and "keeping after the boy until he behaves." They said they punished physically on occasion but the great majority "waited" for fear of bodily injury to their child or to give him a chance to explain. By the time the son is in the middle years of childhood, these parents are not as likely "to deprive" or "talk about it" as to apply physical penalties. Aggression, although not encouraged by mothers, is not discouraged; in fact, almost all expect their child "to fight back." We failed to tap directly the offspring's aggression, resistance and rebellion

TABLE 46

PARENTAL PERMISSIVENESS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Indicators of Parental Permissiveness (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Noise is tolerated by mother	51.8	56.4	53.7	40.0	50.0
Use of methods other than physical punishment in disciplining the child	28.3	13.2	22.0	21.9	22.8
Do not punish children right away	87.5	82.1	85.3	80.6	84.0
Children should fight back	96.4	82.1	90.5	94.4	91.6
Children encouraged to fight back	60.7	51.3	56.8	55.6	56.5
Children be allowed to be without clothes when indoors	1.9	2.4	2.1	2.8	2.3
Children be allowed to be without clothes when outdoors	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	0.8
Boys should not play with dolls	73.2	64.1	69.5	52.8	64.9
General supervision reported as permissive	0.0	10.3	4.2	0.0	3.1
Immediate obedience not expected	51.8	41.0	47.4	44.4	46.6

against the parent. Since most of our boys are not yet adolescents, the element of actively achieving independence did not seem crucial to our study. Impressions from inferences drawn from several related items are that there is really little resistance to parents, slightly less aggression against them than one might have found in an urban slum, and no apparent rebellion. The familistic climate usually precludes the last except for older "black sheep."

The parents seem to be in agreement about these matters. Table 47 indicates that these mothers reported consistency of a high level in parental demands made for obedience and the exertion of their discipline. Boys' responses on these aspects of parental behavior, as Table 48 shows, authenticate the pattern, discussed previously, of joint participation of parents in the intergenerational interaction. Father's punishment is either not resented or is understood as appropriate. The sons found themselves identifying with the male parent much more than with mothers. This is the case despite her less frequent punishment and the greater ease the boy admitted he had in talking with her.

TABLE 47

CONSISTENCY BETWEEN SPOUSES IN HANDLING CHILDREN BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Reported Consistency (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
In matters related to obedience	75.0	84.6	78.9	72.2	76.3
In matters related to discipline	90.0	87.2	89.4	83.4	87.7

TABLE 48

BOY'S IDENTIFICATION WITH FATHER BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLES

Items showing Identification (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Father equally easy or easier to talk with	70.4	63.7	67.8	60.0	65.6
Father equally or more ready to appreciate boy	76.4	76.5	76.4	66.7	73.6
Father equally or more inclined to like boy	83.4	75.8	80.5	75.8	79.1
Boy equally or more inclined to side with father	69.8	75.8	72.1	57.1	67.8
Father punishes boy equally or more	82.7	75.8	80.0	77.1	79.2

Typical Trends and Differences

Are there any differences of a significant nature between the three family types in the permissive-restrictive factor? Item by item checking shows consistent similarity between the Poor families. The contrast between the Poor and the AP is somewhat impressive in that the latter are more restrictive. Actually, there is a trend from NP to PP to AP for parents to be more restrictive. Bronfenbrenner (1958) in his summary of changes in this factor in child-rearing claims "a gradual shift over time, with the middle class being more restrictive in the 1930's and early 1940's but becoming more permissive during the last decade." With our upper-lower group being more restrictive and the NP being permissive, how shall we interpret the trend in relation to the goal of improvement in the families? Why are the families who are seeking to adapt to modern ways so slow to adopt the new techniques?

There are several possible explanations. There could be a definite attempt on the part of certain upwardly mobile families to impose restrictions as a way of insuring proper upbringing. This was part of our hypothesis: that PP mothers would be more careful in their practices to better prepare their children to evade, or cope with, adult problems. But we have also found by intercorrelating the factor of permissiveness with that of participation and certain demographic variables that older PP mothers are more permissive, as are also the better educated mothers. We can unravel this complexity with the discovery that these two groupings have higher incidences of exposure to the middle class literature on child care. According to Bronfenbrenner, these mothers who "have closest access to the agencies for change, e.g., public media" are likely to be following the recommended practices for effective child-rearing.

He also suggests that "rural families appear to lag behind the times somewhat in their practices of infant care." This would support another explanation of the trend toward more restrictiveness as families become more mobile. The tendency might be a belated attempt to catch up, on the part of rural families who are concerned with their responsibility to prepare their children for participation in the larger society. Their non-literacy has handicapped them.

Some have held, contrary to our expressed assumption, that child-rearing practices arise from the necessities that do not pertain to children, depending more on conditions in the natural and social environment. (Whiting, ed., 1963) In this case, practices precede beliefs and values which are designed to support them. This might help to

account for the least advantaged families in the sample being more permissive in that their members are faced with more survival problems. In their frustration, the laissez-faire tactic is the easiest to use.

The fact remains that the PP families on the whole seem slightly more restrictive than the NP, although a few of the former claim to be more lax in their general supervision. The general similarity with NP in specific child-care items is violated in the instances of lower proportions of PP women encouraging aggression toward peers and their greater attempt to become acquainted with the recommended methods of child care. Thus, our fourth hypothesis has had both positive and negative support thus far. We focus on several other facets of the child-care patterns before our final conclusion.

Observations on Other "Factors"

We were unable to make a complete study of the application of Sears, Maccoby, and Levin's factors because of our broad objective of the examination of the whole family life-style. We included a few items in our questionnaires which we felt were relevant to our objective of weighing the life-chances of the younger generation in the families under study. We report on several because of their implications for this purpose.

In setting out the fourth hypothesis, it may be recalled, mention was made of the generalized love for their children by mothers who encouraged dependency but offered little individual warmth and affection. The exigencies of the family situation require a stability and sturdiness in the mother which become in-

creasingly less likely as she produces more children and life crises do not relent. Another facet of the parent-child subsystem which we were curious about was what Sears, Maccoby and Levin call "aggressiveness-primitiveness," their fifth factor.

TABLE 49

DEPENDENCY IN CHILDREN BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Dependency in Children (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Not bothered by children	53.6	56.4	54.7	66.1	56.4
Feel should not let babies cry	60.7	56.4	58.9	52.8	57.3
Considered babies fun as infants	57.1	61.5	58.9	63.9	60.3
Follow demand schedule in feeding	75.0	64.1	70.5	72.2	71.0
Do not expect children to go to bed at a set time	64.3	57.9	61.7	72.2	64.6
Do not expect children under 10 to put away their clothes	32.7	34.2	33.3	28.6	32.0
Do not expect children under 10 to run errands	27.5	20.6	24.7	19.4	23.1
Immediate (unquestioned) obedience not expected	51.8	41.0	47.4	44.4	46.6
Did not follow to see that child obeys	60.7	56.4	58.9[b]	30.6[b]	51.1
Do not insist on obedience	16.1	15.4	15.8	22.2	17.6

b = X^2 for the difference between Poor and AP is significant at $< .05$

Our Poor family mothers do tend to like their children when they are babies, although two-fifths think them more "fun" when they are no longer infants. (Table 50) Mothers are permissive, (NP more than PP) in feeding their babies when they are hungry--a "demand schedule." Around a third or

less of them never expect them as children to put away their own clothes, run errands, or go to bed at a set time. The other two-thirds reported they did have these expectations. This might then be claimed as the greater tendency. But nearly half of the mothers were surprised when they were obeyed and over half did not follow up to make certain their commands were heeded. Yet eight out of ten said they "insisted on obedience." This combination of command and laxity results in about four-fifths of the mothers (see Table 46) of the two groups using physical punishment (PP mothers using this sanction themselves more than do the NP).

A pair of practices utilized by PP mothers--in both of which there is a meaningful contrast with the NP--is less encouragement of aggressiveness in their boys and more physical punishment applied. This combination is said by the co-authors mentioned above to be likely to produce a pattern in the child either of aggression anxiety or antisocial aggression, neither of which is a healthy condition. Bandura (1964) using a different learning-theory approach claims that "when a child has learned aggression as a dominant response to emotional arousal there will be a high probability of his displaying aggressive reactions to frustration."

There are two polar types of aggression--prosocial and antisocial. The first type seems functional for persons who would be successfully upward-mobile. The northern cities as well as the southern hills have felt the fury of the second. The aggressively anxious may become authoritarian or develop some other kind of character pathology. To offset these direful consequences, Sears, Rau, and Alpert (1965) have

postulated that "a low level of anti-social aggression is associated with indications of an affectionate and happy relation (of the boy) with his father." There is evidence in our study of a tendency for this latter condition to be typical of the PP boys. Identification with father and effective sex-typing seem particularly true of both sets of sons (NP as well as PP). But what can be said for the boys if they do imitate their fathers when these role-models are not presently effective exemplars in economic self-sufficiency? Bandura (1964) would insist that there is a wide range of imitative responses which may be elicited without first establishing a nurturant-dependent relationship. Perhaps the hope for the PP boys lies in the widening of their responses, which is potential through contact with more successful adult models in the KCCAP programs.

In Chapter IV, the question was raised about the presence of the syndrome of authoritarianism in lower class families and its probability if there were a rigid and extreme polarization of sex-typing. Evidence was introduced about our study families which led to the conclusion that the fathers were not showing the gross characteristics of an authoritarian adult. Boys were shown in the current chapter to be aware of their father's more fluid role acceptance. What of the boys' own developing sex-role perception? One of our items, particularly, and several related responses of the mothers and sons, yield clues on the climate in the homes of these pubescent youths as they seek their sex-identity. Table 46, especially, deals with this ideological context. The trend for a rigid sex-typing along the traditional lines (i.e., boys should not play with dolls) seems to decrease from NP to PP to AP. The

difference between NP and PP is significant and also approximates the appropriate critical level when the Poor are compared with the AP. It is interesting that families that appear to be more restrictive do not require rigid sexual conformity, at least early in the child's life.

Summary

The chapter has dealt with interrelationships and interaction between family members. Husbands have been shown to be more fluid in their role performance and less dominant in their conjugal co-operation with their wives. The men thus departed from our expectations and deviated from husbands in other research on lower class families. The wives, understandably, have given evidence of some dissatisfaction with their role resolution. They are discontented with their families' achievement more than they are with their personal situation.

The trend in the first of these profiles of role enactment was in the direction projected by the basic hypothesis of this report. But NP and PP wives were not sufficiently different in role acceptance to warrant a contrast of the separate family types with the AP. However, when we considered the three groups in the aspect of artificial birth control and planned parenthood the NP proved more similar to the AP than did the PP. In issues especially related to religious doctrine and traditional ideology, the PP are consistently dissimilar from the upwardly mobile group in our study.

Our Poor families tended to be noticeably deviant from the AP in many discrete items of parental behavior. In the "permissive factor" the major hypothetical trend pertained. The direction, however, was

unexpected in that there was an increase in restrictiveness from NP to AP. Several speculative explications were offered but none was felt adequate. The fourth hypothesis of expected permissiveness had both positive and negative support. We are made aware of the diversity of over one hundred lower class families when we study the internal system that has to bear the brunt and absorb the shocks resulting from ineffective interaction with the outside world. Hylan Lewis, (1961) in his District of Columbia studies of low-income families, which are quite comparable to ours except for the biracial characteristic, discovered wide variety in the child-rearing practices. Washington's lower class parents tended "to show greater conformity to, and convergence with, middle class standards in what they say they want (or would like to want) for their children than in their actual child-rearing behavior." A similar diversity in Knox County low income families complicated our conclusion about their spirit of parental control and nurturance. Their desire to comply with the social expectations of rearing their children correctly is evinced in their nearly unanimous response on general supervision. But their relative unorganization (rather than disorganization) prevents the implementation of their high standards, "old-fashioned" as these apparently are, in discipline and development. One must conclude, as Lewis does, that many low income families mean well for their children. But lack of funds, education, contact and communication with social agencies and organizations, and now, the loss of their youthful vitality, hamper their coping with the continuous cycle of problems that their children force upon them.

If, as we have shown, the trend in these families is toward restrictiveness, they may be producing persons who can become either authoritarian or capable of anti-social aggression. The essential irony in the matter is that the families which are able to be more autonomous may be more disposed toward these pathological life modes. Frenkel-Brunswik (1954) found in her studies of ethnocentrism that fathers who are strict, disciplining, punitive, and <u>good</u> providers tend to foster the attributes mentioned. The less restrictive and relaxed parent might not provide either sufficient economic security or a model for attaining it, but he can support his children emotionally and permit them to seek new life ways and other models to emulate. Our sample seems to contain both kinds.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIALIZATION PROCESS--ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

The family enacts its most formative role in preparing the child for his future career in the first few years of the child's life. His psychogenic conditioning is largely completed in his pre-school days. From then on, the individual develops his sociogenic characteristics within an expanding social milieu. This procedure "by which someone learns the ways of a given society or social group so that he can function within it" is called the socialization process. (Elkin, 1960)

This process, admittedly, is never-ending--it continues throughout the person's life span. It is naturally simpler in a simple society whose norms and expectations are traditional and well-nigh sacred. But Americans are no longer privileged to live in such a socio-cultural context, even those in the isolated areas of Knox County. The test of the efficacy of the process has become more exacting for the newest age-groups in this target area. Even if the individual never leaves his native neighborhood, to work and to live, the contemporary child has to have more training in "copability." In light of the recent high incidence of out-migration, many must be socialized for a residence, work experience, and community participation in a region rather foreign to their family. Socialization by these homes must be strongly supplemented (in some cases substituted for) by social agencies and institutions.

It is our purpose in this chapter primarily to examine the boys themselves, their goals and aspirations, their school adjustment and prospects for further education and training. We shall also survey their expectations of where they probably will be living, what job they will hold, and what relations they will maintain with their extended family.

To assist us in analyzing the potential educational, geographic, and occupational mobility of the sons, it will be necessary to look at the aspirations and expectations of the boys' parents, particularly those of the mothers. One gets close to the core of the value system of families when he investigates the goals and desires the adults have for their offspring. Since a vocation and necessary training for it are so influential in lifting their children above mere survival into some sort of esteemed status, families express their future hope most in the objectives they hold for their sons. The boys' chances may depend on how much discrepancy exists between the parents' aspirations and their actual expectations.

Our final focus will be the contribution of the community to the process of preparation. Can the schools carry the heavy responsibility thrust upon them? What has KCCAP done and what can it do to expedite the boys' move toward more appropriate self-identity and eventual self-actualization? This last question we will attempt to answer in our final chapter.

Boys' Aspirations for Mobility

It is an odd but fairly general finding that lower class boys have high aspirations.[20] There is scant support to the notion of occupational resignation on the part of such lads. Bred by American parents and fed the desire to achieve, they are led by American schools and the American mass media to be upwardly mobile in thought. Boys recognize early that some schooling and training of a systematic nature are associated with achievement in the American society, much more now than a few decades ago.

Of course, their level of aspiration is affected by a number of influences other than the ones mentioned. However the causal factors may have operated, they seem to be either reinforced or offset by the middle class values which dominate the school system of the United States. Consequently, a boy with five or six years of schooling can be expected, despite his socio-economic status, to have been suffused with stimulation toward a need for achievement.

Unfortunately, low expectations of success are endemic in the environment of the lower class boy. Less regular emphasis on the future (earthly), increased awareness of the differential opportunity system, the expense in effort against odds, as well as in money his family does not have, all may diminish his motivation for achievement. If the need for achievement remains high and the motivation is complicated, the accompanying frustration may reduce his will to strive. Or it may send him into some form of anti-social activity or mental aberration. The high achievement anxiety which is common in lower class homes is a most difficult emotional condition

to alleviate. This may be a bigger problem, for those seeking to improve communities, than a low aspiration level or a low need for achievement in the constituency.

A direct relation is known to exist between educational aspirations and occupational goals. High levels of both are, apparently, for Knox County boys, associated with a willingness to be geographically mobile. High occupational status drive should be supported by high educational goals of a technical and vocational nature if not academic. It should be accompanied by an understanding of the location of the opportunity system for fulfilling the work objective. Furthermore, it calls for emotional independence, to enable the individual to stay in that system once he has found it.

Ginzburg (1951) proposes that boys pass through three periods in the process of occupational choice. The first is a "fantasy" period which coincides with the latency stage from six to eleven years. The second is a "tentative" period during which the adolescent considers all possibilities and temporarily fastens on one or more as likely prospects for mutual fit. By young adulthood, the stable person has made his "realistic" choice and is likely to be on his way to some position within that occupational field. We observed boys in this study who are leaving the latency period with its fantasies. They are about at the time when a specific job will attract them which seems appropriate to their life needs and goals. Ginzberg claims that boys of eleven may want their parents to make the decision for them. For want of alternatives, sons of this age may pick the occupational field of their fathers. They are becoming aware, however, that their interests

are changing. Hence, their answer to the question "what job would you like to have when you are grown?" will tend to reflect more their current interests and likes and dislikes. (Ginzburg)

Does the choice behavior of the lower income groups during the "tentative" period parallel that of the upper group? Ginzburg found this to be so at this age. "Lower income boys expect little more than to graduate from high school in contrast to their upper class counterparts' anticipation of a college education." Poorer boys seem eager to improve upon the standards of their fathers (job, income, social status). Most of them are already being discouraged from following their father's occupation. Advice is almost always negative--the boy is more often told what jobs not to pursue. Lower class families fail to provide specific constructive advice for their sons. Let us see how the boys of our sample support the Ginzburg thesis.

The Boys in Our Sample

This portion of our research is largely exploratory since we are dealing with the futures of the children. Still under the dominating sway of their family, the boys are not mature enough to have ventured far into the world. They watch TV regularly and listen to the radio. They read comic books and study school books. Attendance at an occasional movie, infrequent family trips to the small city and to visit relatives, several longer jaunts to larger urban centers, and, for some, a number of years residence elsewhere constitute their personal mobility. Less than a tenth (11 boys) were born outside of Eastern Kentucky.

Their horizon has been widening for some time now in their involvement at their school to which they are transported by bus. Friendships have developed with children from other neighborhoods since for many the school is now consolidated and centrally located. But their preference for peer companionship is uncertain between schoolmates, neighbors and relatives (many of the latter two are identical). They are normal for American boys of this age in appearance, dress, demeanor, and enthusiasm as they sit for an hour and fill in their responses to the group-guided questionnaire. No untoward incidents occur in any of the school rooms in which the boys are assembled. Except for the deteriorated condition of several small school buildings one would not know he was in Appalachia. And, except for these surroundings, the interviewer is impressed with the boys' situation in most cases, and their co-operative spirit. Only a very few act like "isolates." Seventy percent are normal in age for the grade level.

What are their aspirations? With Ginzberg's types of occupational choice in mind, it may be surprising that over half of the boys from Poor families did not prefer the job their father has as an occupation in the future. (Table 50) More than half of the boys were aware of the status and of the job description of the parent's usual employment. Over two-thirds of the 95 boys would choose, as of now, a higher status occupation. The fantasy feature of their aspiration appears in their inability to describe the jobs in simplest terms. Nor did they realize the level of education the job of their dreams requires. The grade school youngsters were chumming with boys of similar social status to their own. Consequently, the boy respondents' occupational aspiration also proved to be higher than the actual job level of the fathers of these friends.

The trend was for boys, from NP to PP to AP, to follow in father's footsteps but the reverse direction obtained in the comparisons of boys' status aspiration with that of their fathers (AP > PP > NP). This latter is the only item in the aspect of boy's upward mobility drive that the study's major hypothesis--greater similarity between PP and AP--was not confirmed. Perhaps, it is appropriate here to indicate that the tendency for boys to be of normal age for the grade was consistent with the hypothesis.

TABLE 50

STATUS AWARENESS AND ASPIRATIONS OF BOYS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Status Awareness and Aspirations (in percentages)	Poor Families				Total Sample
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	
Like to have the kind of jobs fathers had	42.3	46.9	44.0	60.0	48.7
Know exact occupation of fathers	58.8	56.8	57.9	67.6	60.7
Aspire for jobs of higher status than those of fathers	71.4	65.4	69.3[b]	44.9[b]	61.5
Aware of the nature of jobs desired	13.2	9.4	11.8	27.3	16.1
Aware of the levels of education needed to get the desired jobs	21.6	40.7	28.2	37.1	31.0
Aspired occupational status higher* than those of 1st friends' father	84.6	92.0	87.5[b]	47.0[b]	54.2
Aspired occupational status higher* than those of 2nd friends' father	85.3	95.7	89.5[b]	55.5[b]	58.7
Age 11 years or over	30.3	29.7	30.1	5.6	23.3

b = X^2 for the difference between Poor and AP was found to be significant at $\leq .05$.

*The boys who didn't report or said "don't know" were excluded from this computation.

Two-thirds of the sons in homes with sub-standard income believe they would rather work for an employer than be self-employed. A similar proportion are willing to migrate away from their home state if they must. Table 51 demonstrates how mobile they are in this respect, and how depressed they have already become about their chances. The realism of these youngsters is impressive for their relative maturity. As Ginzburg might claim, these lower class fledglings are eager to try their wings but their ceiling visibility is low.

TABLE 51

POTENTIAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Boy's Desire for Occupational Mobility (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Would rather work for an employer	67.3	64.9	66.3	55.6	63.3
Willing to migrate away from home state	64.3	61.1	63.0	55.6	61.6
Reporting chances of getting ahead in life are <u>not</u> good	61.8	63.2	62.4[b]	42.9[b]	57.0

b = X^2 for the difference between Poor and AP was found to be significant at $<.05$

Our findings are similar to those of Hyman (1957) in his survey of several studies on the relation of stratification and class value systems when we analyze our data on "the most important single thing for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work." Hyman's age group was older, but our younger males are already concerned with the need for job security, i.e., steady employment as the supreme work value. The

trends in these aspects of mobility are strangely mixed. Figure 2 indicates the gross difficulty confronting a researcher who attempts to measure tendencies in the lives of boys whose simple environment has been invaded by the "winds of change."

FIGURE 2

MIXED TENDENCIES IN PROGRESSION OR REGRESSION IN NP, PP, AND AP BOYS IN THE DEGREE OF ASPIRATION

Would like to have the kind of job father had	NP > PP > AP
Aspires for occupational status higher than father	NP < PP < AP
Good to excellent chances of getting ahead	NP > PP > AP
Higher education expected	NP < PP > AP
Willing to "move to a strange place" to get ahead	NP > PP > AP
Willing not to "see folks often" to get ahead	NP > PP < AP

How long do the boys, now about to finish grade school, expect to continue their schooling? Slightly over a third of the Poor boys felt they would or could attend college or technical training; over a half of the sons in more prosperous families were aiming above the high school level. (Table 52) A measure of the difference in their desires is seen in their present enjoyment of the school situation. An immediate reaction to their responses to the question on ability to go on to higher education is that they are not realistic in their appraisal of expense. The confident trust in their parents by some and the sense of self-reliance expressed by other boys are poignant clues to this researcher of the resilience of human nature in the throes of social disadvantage.

TABLE 52

EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF BOYS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Educational Aspirations (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Technical or college education expected	42.9	33.4	39.1	57.2	44.0
Expect education expenses will be paid by:					
Parents	32.1	33.3	32.6	28.6	31.5
Working or scholarship	43.4	35.9	40.2	45.7	41.7
Never thought of it	24.5	30.8	27.2	25.7	26.8

Typical Differences

In this section we have indicated, as we proceeded, how the groups compared with each other. More frequently than not, the boys in families that are interested in the community centers (PP) have appeared more similar to those of our control group (AP) than the sons in disinclined families. An over-all picture of the greater tendency toward upward mobility in PP boys is observed in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3

PROGRESSIVE TENDENCIES FROM NP TO AP BOYS ON ITEMS INDICATIVE OF POTENTIAL UPWARD MOBILITY

Higher scores on "Drive to Get Ahead" index	NP > PP > AP
Self employment preferred	NP > PP > AP
Believe success results from hard work	NP > PP > AP
Good to excellent chances of getting ahead	NP > PP > AP
Normal in age for grade	NP > PP > AP
Liking for school	NP > PP > AP
Reading of books	NP > PP > AP

We attempted a composite score for the various types of mobility to ascertain intergenerational trends from the previous generation of adult males to the present and on to the future. Our success was considerably limited by the effects of the fantasy period on the newest generation. One significant difference was detected which supports our over-all impression of the greater potential of the PP sons. They, like their fathers, seem to be possessed of the spirit of vertical mobility. Table 53 lists the results of the various measures we utilized. The fact that the boys, who come from families with the least extensive spatial mobility experience, are inclined toward leaving the home state implies to this researcher that these PP families are more aware of the current limited opportunities for the future generation in Knox County than are the NP homes.

TABLE 53

POTENTIAL SPATIAL MOBILITY BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Potential Social Mobility (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
"Low" Spatial Mobility experienced by the family thus far	71.4	48.7	62.1	69.4	64.1
Mothers willing to let son go out of home state	57.2	56.4	56.9	62.9	58.8
Closeness to home considered by mothers as most important thing for sons' life work	10.7	28.2	17.9	5.6	14.5
"High" potential spatial mobility	51.8	66.6	57.6	50.0	55.5

Mothers' Aspiration for Their Boys

Mothers, presumably through their nurturant role, are thought to be more important in the indoctrination of their children than are fathers. Hyman (1957) suggests that "youth of both sexes and all classes are closer in their values to adult women than to adult men." For that researcher as for many others, mothers wield a greater influence in the transmission of values. Therefore, the values the mother places on formal education, job satisfactions, and qualities of personal character might be expected to become implanted in her son. This would be particularly true if affective relations have been maintained between the two persons. A high level of aspiration would be related to a high valuation of formal training.

It might be argued that the identification of the son with the father is a more powerful determinant than the espousal of values in the ultimate achievement of the boy. This is claimed to be especially true if a warm succorant relationship develops between the two males. (McKinley, 1964) Dynes, Clark, and Dinitz (1956) discovered a positive association between levels of aspiration in children and satisfactory interpersonal relationships in the family of procreation. Unsatisfactory relationships were conducive to low levels of aspiration. Rosen and D'Andrade (1957) supplemented this postulation by their studies of need achievement. Fathers in their research sample who were high in authoritarianism and dominance had sons with low N-Ach.*

---

*The psychologists' symbol for need-achievement.

The questions we are raising in this section relate to the research conclusions just noted. What are the values of the selected mothers in regard to certain elements considered essential in their sons' personality development? These aspirations must be compared with the mothers' expectations (realistic estimations) of the chances of their boys obtaining a certain status regardless of whether that status is desired or not. A second query arises out of the assumption that aspirations can be accomplished only if the need achievement level is sufficient to support it, other things being equal. What are the chances of the boys in this sample for reaching the status desired by their mothers? What are the possible complications which may limit the boys' achievement?

We have uncovered evidence of some authoritarianism in the family circle, although not as much as had been predicted. The families are not as matricentric either as many urban lower class families. The diversity of the family support and power structures implies that caution must be taken not to reach a simple conclusion concerning the prognosis of the chances of individual boys or groups of boys. But, again, some calculations are called for in our evaluation obligation as to what the community centers have done and can do to heighten aspirations, to stimulate motivation, and to bring opportunities for achievement into being to accommodate the hopes and drives of this special target group.

Our Sample

Part of the ideology of American life is that important positions can be achieved. Fewer statuses are ascribed. But these positions require formal education to attain them, frequently levels of systematic schooling that are formidable to lower class persons. It can be assumed that a favorable attitude toward such careers reflects an acceptance of the desirability of commensurate amounts of education.

Mothers and sons were offered a check list of occupations which was a cross-section of the work and professional positions with which both were thought to be familiar. We sought a measure of esteem each generation accorded the positions as well as indicants of the aspirations that parent and child had for such occupations. The responses were taken in the Time I stage of interviewing when the boys were still in the fifth grade. As an appended table reveals, discrepancies exist between parental and child perceptions. Middle class careers are much more preferred by the mothers. The lower esteem held for an appointed enforcement officer in contrast to the prestige granted elected officials is a reflection of the county's political situation. The mothers are more appreciative of the church and school as agencies with prestige. An impression of real difference between the mothers is supported by the rather consistent tendency of NP and PP women to disagree. Significant differences appear in the acceptance of the less prestigeful jobs (except "labor") as occupations they would "like" their sons to have. PP mothers seem favorable to most of the positions but NP mothers clearly have higher aspirations for their children.

Sons are revealing some independent concern for their own lives. Table 54 suggests that the more involvement of their families the less agreement of sons with mothers on the prestige of positions. This may indicate a higher n-Ach for NP boys and also higher aspirations since their mothers hold loftier goals than the PP parents.

TABLE 54

CONSENSUS ON SON'S CAREER BY TYPES OF POOR FAMILIES (percents by columns)

Consensus on Son's Career	Poor Families	
	NP (N-34)	PP (N-20)
Boy's choice of job agrees with mother's	44.1	70.0
Boy's choice of job disagrees with mother's	55.9	30.0

$X^2 = 3.39$, df = 1, $p < 1.0$

Another aspect of the consideration that parents, especially mothers, give to the occupational choice of their offspring is the effect it can have on the family solidarity they cherish. When we asked the homemakers to pick the most important of three desiderata which might govern their son's eventual choice of jobs, a dramatic contrast emerged between the analytic groups. All mothers were alike in their order of preferences, placing family ties lowest in rank. But the PP, although more concerned about economic security and one's enjoyment of his job, rated nearness to home substantially higher in importance. Higher in their familistic scores, as we shall re-emphasize in our concluding chapter, PP mothers could comprise a diversified group containing some who are so traditional that family is the supreme value. Nevertheless,

the participating type is quite dissimilar from the others in these valuations.

TABLE 55

DESIDERATA IN CHOICE OF SONS' JOB BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Most Important Thing in Choice of Life-work of Son	Poor Families				
	NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
Money	17.9	30.8	23.2	22.2	22.9
Enjoyment	71.4	41.0	58.9	72.2	62.6
Closeness to home	10.7	28.2	17.9	5.6	14.5

Difference between NP and PP: $X^2 = 9.19$, df = 2, $p < .05$

Difference between PP and AP: $X^2 = 9.31$, df = 2, $p < .01$

What qualities of personal character are cherished by the mothers for their children? Kohn's (1959) investigation of parental values and stratification derived substantial differences in a sample of classes in Washington, D. C. We incorporated a modification of his major question in our schedules. Both research designs included mother and pubescent son as respondent. The question was: "Which three of the things listed are the most important in a boy of fifth-grade age?" The selection of a particular characteristic or quality indicated a cherished value. Table 56 reveals comparisons between the groups in our study.

TABLE 56

BEHAVIOR QUALITIES IN CHILD DESIRED BY MOTHERS AND SONS BY TYPES OF POOR FAMILIES

Behavior Qualities Desired (in percentages)	Poor Families		
	NP	PP	Total
Qualities selected as one of the 3 important ones by mothers.			
Religiosity	83.9	76.9	81.1
Honesty	85.7	71.8	80.0
Hard work	33.9	41.0	36.8
Ambition	35.7	30.8	33.7
Dependability	33.9	30.8	32.6
Obedience	8.9	17.9	12.6
Consideration of others	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mothers selecting more qualities of external imposed standards	69.6	76.9	72.6
Boys selecting more qualities of external imposed standards	84.9[a]	63.2[a]	75.8
Two or more choices of boys coincide* with those of mothers	32.3	30.7	31.5

a = X^2 for the difference between NP and PP was found to be significant at $<.05$.

*Choices were viewed in terms of qualities of external imposed standards as against those of internal dynamics. Coincidence or lack of it was based on these broad categories of choices.

The features that Knox County's quite rural Poor mothers would most prefer to characterize their sons' behavior were "religious," honest, and hard-working, in that order. Kohn's working class mothers agreed with ours in the high valuation of honesty but placed more weight on happiness, obedience, and considerateness. Disregarding the first quality, "religious," which we equated with the item, "acts in a serious way," and which could have covered more than one trait, we note that ambition and dependability are nearly as important to our selected mothers as was industry. Obedience was quite low in their estimation.

For intra-comparison and further analysis we introduced a discriminating criterion suggested by the literature, namely, the major concern in the parent's mind about why the child should behave certain ways. We called the standards "externally imposed" if the child was expected to conform to his surrounding associates. If his own sense of well-being was more highly valued we defined the standard as "internally" generated. As expected, the mothers tended to prefer those features which would make their sons more acceptable to the boys' family and environing groups. We compared sons' choices with those of their mothers and found that the sons were even more aware of the external pressures for respectability. The fact that two thirds of the boys disagreed with their parents about which qualities pay highest dividends does not detract from the general inference that the lower class families are not oriented toward an appreciation of the internal dynamics of self-control. It is not surprising that persons so much under control of outside pressures should concede valuation to

their demands. The surprise is the low esteem accorded obedience by the mothers. They make up for it in their supreme valuation of all that the term "religious" connoted to them.

Underlying plans which most parents entertain for their children is a desire for as much formal education as the child needs and the parents can provide. We have seen the faith that some boys have manifested in their parents supporting them through college. Such support involves more than money; it implies high aspiration, of course, but it requires parental pressure to achieve in the lower school levels and motivation for children to persevere in fulfilling their achievement need.

Kahl (1953) argues that the chief force compelling working class boys on to higher levels of education is this parental pressure which emanates from a drive on the part of the parents to "get ahead" and not just "get by." How many parents in a poverty area such as the one under study can hope to serve their children in the way that Kahl describes effective working class parents do who "see their children through"? The constant encouragement from early in the child's career in school, the requirement of good performance and provision of reward, and discussion of available job opportunities, all seem beyond the capacity of semi-literate, poverty plagued, frustrated and tired parents.

TABLE 57

SCHOOLING DESIRED BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE (PERCENT BY COLUMNS)

Schooling Desired for Boys by Mothers	Poor Families				
	NP (N=56)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=95)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=131)
Up to 8th grade	0.0	2.6	1.1	0.0	0.8
High school	41.1	28.2	35.8	22.2	32.1
College	58.9	69.2	63.1	77.8	67.2

That the selected families have high aspirations is seen in Table 57. Where there is hope there is life. The differential values attributed to college education reveal an appreciation of schooling among these lower class parents. The virtual lack of satisfaction with sons achieving only eight grades of education suggests the traditional farm family's conception of the limited value of more than an elementary education is no longer operative in most of Knox County. The presence of the denominational college in the county seat community may account for some of the favorable rating. Hyman (1957) sees such lofty aspirations, when they are accompanied by limited realistic opportunities, as a pattern that generates deviant behavior. If the child continues to internalize the aspirations of his mother, the likelihood of serious psychological strain is produced when the chances for achieving the goals are negligible. High schools in the area are presently working to

implement the aspirations. A college education is feasible as the boys well know who are taught daily by successful male graduates of Union College and the state universities not too far away.

It should be remembered that nine out of ten mothers in the Poor families were disappointed in the schooling they were able to get. Many recognized the void and inadequacy in their lives resulting from their abbreviated formal training. Consequently, the boys were made aware of their mother's-and-fathers'-aspiration for them. Their n-Ach seems comparatively high when we look at Table 58. However, the youngsters are also aware of the odds against them. Once more the trend is in the expected direction for the analytic categories. However, when asked what they would do if they were to be offered a job opportunity as soon as they were old enough to fill it, more than half would defer the immediate gratification which must have been highly appealing. They claimed they would choose to finish at least their high school education. Two thirds acknowledged that their parents would insist on the decision.

Two clues for the unraveling of the possibilities of some upward mobility for the boys are furnished by Hyman (1957) in his survey. The individual may maintain his goals for occupational success and suitable training and "accomodate himself to his lesser opportunities so as to guard against the experience of frustration and failure" being suffered by his parents. He may also be attracted to occupations in which he observes persons from disadvantaged and minority groups achieving extraordinary success. Both sets of Poor boys "dreamed" of becoming musicians or professional athletes. PP women to a lesser

degree saw political positions in this light. (See appended table).

TABLE 58

IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION FOR BOY'S LATER LIFE
BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Importance of Education (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Boys expecting to get education beyond grade school	84.0	89.0	85.8	97.1	88.9
Boys expecting to get education beyond high school	42.9	33.4	39.1	55.2	44.0
Boys who would not like to take up a job till they finish high school.	51.9	54.5	52.9	68.8	57.3
Boys who feel that their mothers would like them to finish high school before taking a job	66.7	76.7	70.3	75.0	71.6
Boys who feel that their fathers would like them to finish high school before taking up a job	65.5	67.9	66.3	64.3	65.8
Boys reporting liking for school	57.1	60.5	58.5	66.7	60.8

Typical Trends and Differences

Substantial differences that were noted in the discussion of mothers' aspirations for their sons are found in some of the expressions of the boys. NP mothers are slightly more discriminating in their hopes for their sons' work future and appear, therefore, to entertain higher occupational and educational goals for the boys.

NP boys seem to be internalizing these aims. Both mothers and sons in this categorical type are impressed with need for the individual enjoying his work. PP mothers are much more concerned with family ties. This could be a reason why they are more interested in a program that will rehabilitate their husbands and children. Only a slight difference is encountered in the percentages of parents who would like their children to go to college. Despite the fact that NP mothers have generally higher educational aspirations for their boys, a few less anticipate that their sons could attend school that long.

When we try to evaluate the more subtle individual differences, we are handicapped by the diversity of personalities within our types and the still developing identities of the young respondents. We are limited thus to presumptive evidence. The problem of discrepancy between aspirations and expectations and its potential for frustration and deviant behavior have been noted. If we were to hazard an educated guess we would suggest the NP mothers and sons are moving toward greater problems by generating more status discrepancy than the PP family members. We cannot adequately substantiate this without the research techniques of the psychologist. The impression increases, however, of greater presence of characteristics associated with the authoritarian spirit in the life styles of the non-involved families. Christie and Garcia (1951) have proffered the view that the lack of education produces authoritarianism. According to this perspective, this pervasive personality configuration is culturally determined. Persons predisposed by their sub-culture to be less equalitarian can become less prejudiced, less restrictive and dogmatic, and more person-oriented by more education.

Sharers in the Socialization Process

Unless persons retreat or regress on contact with significant extrafamilial "others," the preparation for adulthood will involve many developmental experts (and amateurs) and some change agencies and their personnel. The expected result of the required dynamic of reorganization is social understanding, social skills, richer enculturation, vocational guidance, and personal maturity.

Bernard Barber (1957) in his analysis of the contribution to the lower class child of one of the primary agencies in the socialization process concludes that it has exercised "only a limited influence in overcoming the socializing effects of the child's family." He means the public school. Because so much stress has been placed on the value of education in general, and for the lower class especially, we are forced to offer a brief description of the schools our sample children have been and will be attending if they remain in Knox County. We have alluded to the interaction of the family members and the schools throughout but now we focus on the latter's contribution to the boys as a leading extra-familial socializing agent.

It is clear from our data and from observation that the school system has an appreciative constituency in our selected families; they believe in the value of education. It is also obvious that a sizeable proportion of the boys, as early as the fifth grade, were not open and responsive to academic objectives and the scholastic venture. This is in spite of an increase in the county in average daily attendance and percentages of enrollees completing a given

year. What accounts for the reaction against the school of nearly a half of the fifth grade boys, early in the term and with so little else of an alternative attraction?

The county system has radically improved its transportation and free lunch programs. It has eliminated many inadequate buildings by consolidation. In 1958 there were 61 one room structures; by 1966 only 17 remained and these could be abolished if children could be transported from their remote homes. Several large modern consolidated schools are centrally located. More than a half of the boys are enrolled in these schools. Less than a fourth attend school in substandard buildings.

The curriculum expansion of the upper levels has been impressive and the facilitating aids in the lower levels are comparable to many schools in larger communities. Of course, lower class children are restless there as well.

The faculty is rather highly educated--87 percent have a minimum of four years of college. The sex ratio is not abnormal (66 percent female).* The male teachers seem capable of being attractive reference figures and role models. Native to the area for the most part, they have either stayed in, or returned to, the area on completion of graduation. Conversations with them yielded impressions of concern and active co-operation with the community action concept. Several principals were neutral to our request for permission to interview their pupils during school hours but the spirit of the rest was favorable

---

*The faculty of the sixth grade teachers is sixty percent male. (11 men, 7 women)

to both the KCCAP and to our evaluation. The interviewing team and this researcher were pleasantly surprised at the almost complete lack of antagonism expressed toward the project. The experience at the homes was also quite without significant difficulty (in spite of five refusals), but the school contact left nothing to be desired.

What of the students? With few upper-class schoolmates (middle and upper combined total about ten percent), some of the problems present in urban schools are not current in the Knox County elementary system. Little relative status discrepancy can occur unless it arises in the interaction of children whose families are "on welfare" with those whose fathers "work." The middle class teacher vs. "lower" class child relationship is more likely to cause difficulties. But unless we indict the whole American public school system for being non-relevant (many have), the school children in most of the 15 schools we visited were being Americanized. This usually means middle class ways and values are taught and supposed to be "caught." But can these children be taught?

The education-deprived parents have been described. We do not know their IQ's but similar fellow citizens have been tested and rated generally sub-normal. The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test was given to two schools our boys attend. The average IQ was below 75 for grades 1, 2 and 3 in years that would have included some of our children. Allowing for the usual criticisms of such tests for lower class children and, additionally, for the rural context, one would have to judge the native intelligence as critically low. It implies "a verbal destitution"

in the homes which may be due to the use of a sort of Appalachian dialect. (The spelling of the fifth grade boys contributed many new ways of shortening and lengthening words used daily in the mass media.) Retardation, disaffection, alienation, and "dropping out" are to be expected unless special education techniques are utilized. Since "the plasticity of intelligence tends to decrease with increasing age," (Ausubel, 1965) the problem has to be attacked early. Ausubel reports

> "that ten-year old boys of high socio-economic status make higher scores than ten-year old boys of low socio-economic status on tests of both verbal and mechanical ability, but at age 16 are only superior on the verbal tests."

Here, we have a hint on the cause of disinterest and a key to the arousal of new enthusiasm. Because "it is evident that the possibility, for complete reversability of environmentally induced retardation in verbal intelligence, decreases as children advance in age" (Ausubel), the cumulative development deficit can be prevented by technical and mechanical training introduced much earlier in the school system. The boys themselves, not sensing their handicap, opted for "college" about three times as often as for technical school, when asked for their educational aspirations.

But the general need, broadcast everywhere, is for all future workers to have a high school education. The morale shattering experience of slowly but surely slipping backward, as the years pass, takes its toll. The sense of demeaned social status suffered by the boy's family takes on a personal note as "failed the first grade," "slow learner in the second grade," "retarded reader in the third grade" become his reputation. That so many last until our typical

ninth grade drop-out, described in Chapter II, is a tribute to the fortitude of all concerned.

Further analysis of the academic predicament is unnecessary and beyond the scope of this report. But several other features of the family-related problem of educational frustration must be mentioned before we move on to the final chapter on the prospects of social change among the selected families and in the target area.

Few of our boys have at all reached the period that Erikson calls the "age of identify vs. role diffusion (confusion)." (1965) They must have successfully developed the four "ego qualities"--a near miracle in situations of chronic economic deprivation--so that their ego "is strong enough to integrate the time-table of the organism with the structure of social institutions," (Erikson) They are about to move into the critical denouement of all the previous, pre-adolescent, complicated reactions to their family and their world. "Some youth adapt to this crisis by declaring a prolonged moratorium on progress toward adult responsibilities." (Willie, 1964) That most, in Knox County, do not choose criminality or conflict, of the three typical kinds of adaptation to their situation, means the third is almost inevitable, retreat; unless the change agents who have lived in the area, and those recently arrived, act to remove the deprivation and/or incipient alienation. What are the prospects for that action? How has KCCAP enacted its rehabilitative role?

CHAPTER X

PROSPECTS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Our task, as we envisioned it, was to evaluate the impact of the community action program KCCAP on the families and their members not so much in terms of what has happened in the past three years in family living, but of what could occur in the decade it might take to establish real socio-cultural change. We disclaimed at the outset the possibility of much quick transition or of measuring the indicants of change. We are not much impressed with current indices or yearly rates of social reorganization. But we did surmise, and on that basis joined the Evaluation research team, that Poor families that became involved in the endeavor of their community, to initiate and carry through social action for self-improvement, would be basically different in family ideology and life style from those that depended on themselves primarily or exclusively.

We thought that the co-operative families if they were very active would generate changes in their own family version of the dominant culture toward which they would have to hold a favorable attitude. With participation in specific ameliorative projects might come personal improvement that could work for rehabilitation for at least some family members and, hence, stabilize the family. We realized, however, that personal, individual reorganization might also result in greater family instability, particularly of the kinship group if not of the nuclear unit. Adherents of the traditional status quo, some too hopelessly defeated, could be

members of the same families in which others were still open and responsive to change. Intra-family conflict could disorganize these groups.

We initiated our portion of the research with our sympathies tending toward participating families and, especially, toward the children. These will all too soon be continuing the cycle of poverty in new families, unless some intervention is exerted. We believe in social action and community co-operation. We admire some individualists and, as most Americans, appreciate achievement. We hold little brief for the "rugged" type who disdain any contribution to the social welfare as non-obligatory for the self-sufficient and debilitating to the recipient.

Our design included dual objectives. We sought first, to ascertain if, indeed, there were traits that would distinguish between Poor families using participation as the discriminating variable. We did not see how involvement thus far could account for the distinctiveness; rather we expected the differences would predispose or preclude the new social participation. We anticipated that the major hypothesis expressed in the original research proposal was correct, that the Participating Poor would have more characteristic traits similar to the dominant middle class in the society than would the Non-Participating Poor. Seeking some representative group with which we could compare PP and NP families we concluded (perhaps in error) that families who were fellow-residents of the Poor but who were earning incomes that placed them above the arbitrarily set poverty line (AP) would be likely to reflect the dominant patterns that could be practiced in the area.

Our second purpose was actually an exploratory survey and a somewhat socio-psychological probe of family relations in Poor families. Our aim was to find clues for prediction of the life chances of young boys in the county. On the basis of how the KCCAP is working we sought to develop suggestions for making the agency an effective, developmental force.

The reader is by now acquainted with how we selected the particular families for study. From several of the interview responses we determined that the majority of the 95 Poor families (59 percent) were negligibly involved in the community action program. Thirty-seven percent of the total sample of 131 families had one or more members continuing to participate when we collected our data. About eighty (79.6) percent of the families in this purposive sample, who were actively involved, were Poor as defined in this paper. We were more interested in the families with sub-normal incomes. Hence, we have focussed on the 39 PP families as one of our two major analytic groups. We kept the ten AP families under observation since the community program is based on the concept of total participation as well as "maximum" involvement of the Poor.

Reasons Why Poor Families Do Not Participate

We set out to discover why the 56 NP families were disinclined toward the community centers or the KCCAP. Was it the distance from their home to the nearest neighborhood center? Was it lack of transportation or ability to reach the activity site? For members of 13 families it seemed to be. However, Table 59 indicates a weak negative association or direction in the relationship between participation and accessibility.

Forty percent of the NP who had never visited the center lived within two miles of it. And, of those who came once or twice, similar numbers were reported regardless of proximity. A larger proportion (four out of five) who were initially interested but stopped attending did live closer. About two-thirds of the PP families lived within two miles of their center but one third had to travel more than easy walking distance to attend.

TABLE 59

DISTANCE BETWEEN HOME AND CLOSEST COMMUNITY CENTER BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE (PERCENTS BY COLUMNS)

Distance	Poor Families				
	NP (N=53)	PP (N=39)	Total Poor (N=92)	AP (N=36)	Total Sample (N=128)
Less than 1 mile	34.0	48.7	40.2	22.2	35.2
1 mile to 2 miles	18.9	15.4	17.4	27.8	20.3
2 miles to 6 miles	43.4	33.3	39.1	38.9	39.0
Over 6 miles	3.8	2.6	3.1	11.1	5.5

Differences between NP and PP: $X^2 = 3.05$, df = 3, not significant at .05
G = -.233

Our figures in this respect somewhat differ from those reported in other parts of the Evaluation. Perhaps the inclusion of a proportion of urban residents is responsible for our deviating findings. But, as we shall see, neither distance nor propinquity appears to be as important as other factors.

We checked lack of participation for its relation to demographic and social characteristics. The results shown in an appended table failed to yield any substantial difference using the variables of age, education, family income or husband's occupation.

In a list of the reasons, elicited in response to the direct question posed to the mothers by the interviewer, illness, long work hours, and other hampering explanations were reported for their own lack of attendance. The majority, however, admitted to lack of interest and, as previously mentioned, many were critical of the social innovation. Furthermore, a similar number of PP mothers gave some of the same handicaps for their personal absence (a few even with unappreciative remarks of the center). Yet, other family members continued to participate. Thus, the difference between the NP women and the PP, who continued to attend once they started, bespeaks some attitudinal distinctions that call for explication. The much more substantial differential in the persistence of other family members in the two types implies contrasting perceptions of the merits of involvement.

An odd finding, to which we called attention earlier, is the current favorable impression of the center of about half the NP homemakers. Why do these refuse or fail to take part? Not all are unable, forbidden by husband, or detained by other commitments. We turn, momentarily, to examine the sample's general reaction to the center and note that the greatest enthusiasm is expressed by the older wives, by those with medium education, by wives of unskilled workers and by mothers in families with higher income.

A final observation on the non-involvement in centers by the NP families focuses on the special programs to which Poor families might have been attracted whether they supported the centers or not. We debated whether their use of KCCAP services was sufficient to include the recipients in the PP category. Our negative decision was substantiated by the significant difference in the utilization of the non-center projects by the two analytic types we arbitrarily constructed. (See Table 8 in Chapter III) The PP families did not exploit the projects as much as KCCAP might have desired or expected; many might not have had needs that the Counseling Center or Early Childhood Program could serve. But they were so similar, generally, to the NP in structural components that this would not account for the real contrast.

The Formal Participation of NP Families

Elsewhere we have discussed the formal associational activity of the Poor in religious organizations and other institutionalized groups. NP families tended to be less involved than PP units but hardly significantly so. The paucity of participants among the Poor, in anything formal except the Church, precludes this aspect of the homes being a substantial reason for NP not being attracted to the new community effort. They certainly did not refuse to participate in or fail to support KCCAP because they were too involved in other organizations. PP families were more active than NP in their religious associations. The very brief attachment to the local action groups of the few NP who attended gave one person a position in the Association of Local Action Groups. It was not sufficient to sustain his interest. No

difference was found between the two types in other formal organizational activity. The boys in NP families, like their parents, abstained from attendance and, of course, were not therefore in positions of leadership. The PP boys were not much different, except in regard to KCCAP programs, probably because of their age. They did, however, participate in the centers substantially more than NP boys.

The Informal Associational Interaction

A quick review of the findings previously discussed concerning dependence and satisfactions, which the PP as well as NP experienced in their absorption with relatives and neighbors, yields a proposition implied but not as yet stated. The participating type of adult person (and their families usually follow although individual differences operate) tends to participate in as much as he can; conversely, those who do not participate in a measurable way with family and friends do not participate at all.

We are approaching the nub of the question of non-participation. It would seem as if life styles of individuals and that of families (probably in reciprocal interaction) make some people "joiners," others not; some people easy and comfortable in company, others not; some people more extroverted and other-oriented, the rest not. This does not exclude the influence of environmental factors nor does it preclude the possibility of change. It simply calls attention to the importance of the predisposition to participate or not in any new project. And this attitude is a result of the development of the ideological and emotional systems in humans. Life styles take on new consequence, seen in this perspective.

There was some hope expressed that the activity of an informal nature in these neighborhoods of the poverty areas could be capitalized. Some folks enjoy each other's interests in friendly banter; they visit frequently not only out of obligation or in reciprocating service but for pleasure. Why not build on these networks? Why not redirect, by organization and management, the cliques and companionship groups, the family get-togethers and even the religious fellowships? In our preliminary report we pointed to the potential for social action in the already existing small informal gatherings. But is it feasible to conceive of an easy transition from the familiar, unstructured fellowship so emotionally satisfying to a non-familiar (objective), increasingly formalized organization? Brager and Specht (1967) write to this question in an evaluation of the community development program of the Mobilization For Youth. They doubt the validity of the assumptions that "informal groups which emerge out of individual needs will develop an interest in community problems" or that "successful experience in informal groups will lead to a willingness to experiment with other forms of group life." They go on to say what is a growing impression of many who have tried to manage the transition--"social brokerage"--that there is "neither an inevitable evolution of forms of group life nor any necessary transferability of social experiences."

We may have seemed to utter a contradiction to this in our own contention above that participation in one type of association predisposes involvement in others. We see the conclusions, however, as quite congruent. Tendencies to take part in exclusive types of social inter-

action may not necessarily lead to a willingness to participate in formal organization but the converse does seem true. We suggest that those who do show an interest in any community organization and stay with it are those whose attitudes are favorable to more inclusive interaction. It is this disposition on which we shall shortly base our critique of the intensity of the participation of the PP families and its durability.

The impact of the KCCAP depends on "maximum participation of the Poor" not only in terms of numbers of participants but also in terms of amounts of co-operative effort expended and the degree of community interest or altruism. It is our contention that, unless those who engage in the community endeavor are or become community-conscious and concerned about social issues and not just personal needs, the KCCAP's contribution is limited. Of course, as Coleman (1957) argues, "interpersonal relationships, rather than issues, are the sources of social cohesion." But the warmth of informal association can turn into the heat of community conflict if the participants are not broadly pro-social.

Substantive Reasons for Non-Participation

We have reached the moment of truth in our examination of the reasons why three-fifths of the Poor families do not choose to participate. The verb <u>choose</u> is the key. We shall disregard for the time being those who cannot get to the centers but might want to participate if they were not ill or could get transportation. What of the others who are not psyciologically handicapped? A section of our report was devoted to "contraculture." We now return to further

consideration of its presence in the life-styles of some of our selected families. In a contracultural perspective the conflict element is central. Those who hold such a world view are sectarian in spirit and vice-versa. We have shown that NP families who are set against the new community program are in some ways similar to those Above Poor. In some respects the NP families tend to expouse the dominant values of the American culture. In their apparent appreciation of education, in their high occupational aspirations for their sons, and in some of the conformist values they wish embodied in their boys' behavior, the NP mothers reflect their desire to maintain their membership in the larger society. But they may also be demonstrating their alienation and isolation from the community in their exaggeration of the doctrine of self-help (also an American value). Some of their comments, as well as general observations by the interviewers, reveal their deep animosity to those depending on the various levels of government for survival. A proportion of the NP families are economically autonomous but over half of them accept public help. Some of the latter were frank in their admission that they had lost whatever interest they had in the centers when a member of the family failed to secure a job provided at or by the project.

The great majority of the NP families are affiliated with a small religious association. Five sixths of the NP mothers attend some church, a larger proportion affiliated than that of the PP. The latter proved to be more active and intense in their religiosity than the NP but their participation at the church itself was directly related to their proximity to the building. NP families were widely distributed by

their church; over half lived more than two miles away. The differences between the participating and non-participating groups were so small in respect to religious doctrine that what we infer from the responses of the latter in this regard would seem true of the PP families. But it is precisely this similarity in belief and ideology which suggested we should turn our attention to a religious dimension which Glock and Stark (1965) have called "the consequential." This element of religious commitment deals with the secular effects of the religious experience. The authors define it as "prescriptions which specify what people ought to do in their relations with other people as a consequence of their religion." We have limited data from which to judge the secular effects. What we have would indicate that the diversity within the groups is too great to permit meaningful calculations of the segments. There is, for example, a similar number of Pentacostal families in the two analytical groups. Since these families would be suspected to be more contracultural than the others the differences in their consequential behavior warranted comparison--but their number in either case was too small for statistical analysis.

The size of the Baptist proportions and the relatively high percentage of these who were not "welfare" dependents in the NP group may account for the presence of certain contracultural attitudes. The dominance of Baptists in the region has been remarked and the suggestion made that the superiority in numbers of this sect-like religious aggregate may account for some of their lack of sociability and non-participation in community endeavor.

The evidence is not strong enough to support the conclusion that the NP families are as a group in conflict with society; however, the elements of conflict are more likely inter-familial or between residential segments divided by the length of time they have lived in the region or neighborhood. The political feuds and strife between families, described in another section of this Evaluation as present in sections of the county, undoubtedly feed and are fed by the separatist spirit associated with another ideological force quite alive in our Poor families--Familism.

Yet, the strength of the family solidarity in the total sample--AP even more familistic in certain item measures--keeps one from claiming that a majority of the families do not participate because of family ties and the satisfaction of personal needs within the kinship group. The trend as shown in the Familism Index Scores derived from boys responses is more toward AP--our Knox County upwardly mobile and conforming group--and away from NP. Were it not for the prevailing insignificant differences on many items, one might have scrutinized the data for NP's departure from some familistic values. PP is more familistic and, it will be remembered, were unable to depart the region and are less willing to have their children do so. The safest thing to say is that PP families are more willing to associate in the community organization with other families than are the NP. This may be simply tautological.

The reasons then for certain families not participating are too complicated to permit a generalization. Factors, not mentioned here but used in other research, have been examined and seem less influential than the ones we have included for study. Our research has surely supported the assumption that lower class families are too diversified to permit any-single factor deterministic influence.

Nevertheless, the impact of the KCCAP endeavor is blunted by the number of families that do not participate and cannot be improved directly. The most that can be expected in the case of non-participants, if the social action movement is finally mounted, is an improvement in the opportunity system. But can the enterprise become viable if only a minority of the people who have the most at stake actively support the social action. As Cottrell (1967) declares in his foreword to a recent anthology on Community Action against Poverty, "A community falls short of its competence for collaborative effort in identifying needs, setting goals, and implementing them to the extent that any of its significant component parts are unable to interact effectively with others." There is no gainsaying that the NP families are a significant component.

Reasons Why PP Families Do Participate

Most of the unlikely reasons to account for some families participating while others do not have been presented as we discussed the factors thought to be associated with non-participation. What are the more valid explicating factors in the decision of PP families to continue their involvement after the flurry of excitement had passed and NP neighbors were no longer attending? If it be true that "lower income

people do not participate much or for long in organized voluntary structures which tie so many middle class people to a community," (Irelan and Besner, 1966) how can we explain those who do?

We have suggested throughout this paper several cogent reasons. We found PP families responding in a fashion that suggested the spirit of upward mobility if not much of the substance. It seemed also that they were more realistic--less idealistic and "fantastic"--in their aspirations for educational achievement and occupational choice than NP families. Lower goals and medium expectations promise at least less discrepancy and the probability of more modest achievement because of lower achievement need.

The frustrations and failures of PP fathers and mothers have been less complicated by contact with the outside world of work and urban living. Their social deprivation was somewhat resolved by a religious solution of belonging to a fellowship and carrying on heightened religious activity in the home. A too meager income denoting economic deprivation has, for many, been supplemented by wealth transfers and participation in some government program such as W.E.&T. (Work, Experience, and Training Program). The sobriquet of "Happy Pappy" was evidently endured because the income was steady and was being at least somewhat earned.

Already involved in a government arrangement for improving their economic security, some of the PP families may have had one of the following personal reasons for taking part in the newest program: 1) They felt compelled to do so to keep their relation favorable with the agency on which they depended. 2) They saw a possibility, which others did not valuate highly, that this time it might be different--

they could join the war on poverty because it was really their enemy. 3) They were the participating type and enjoyed interpersonal relations. The new diversion was attractive. We wish we could have put the question directly to them. Obviously, we could not have relied on their answers. Families could more safely give reasons why they did not participate. We tried the indirect approach. We asked the boys what they thought "the OEO might do in Knox County." Their responses were quite revealing. Table 60 shows PP boys were substantially different from NP boys in checking an objective in which they were most interested. We thought this might get at reasons for supporting the centers.

TABLE 60

PERCEPTION OF OEO GOALS BY BOY BY FAMILY TYPES AND TOTAL SAMPLE

OEO Goals (in percentages)	Poor Families				
	NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Raise income of poor people	58.9	64.1	61.1	45.7	56.9
Provide steady work for poor people	62.5	53.8	58.9	40.0	53.8
Make people around here better	33.9	48.7	40.0	45.7	41.5
Help poor help themselves	60.7	53.8	57.9	62.9	59.2
Help poor work together	26.8	30.8	28.4	37.1	30.8
Provide job training for poor	57.1	35.9	48.4	62.9	52.3

This discriminating social sense of the pre-adolescents is also an indicator of the awareness generated by the publicity of KCCAP concerning the objectives. These boys had heard the message; and they were accepting

it to a considerable degree. The word was that OEO wanted to "help poor people help themselves;" the program was to "get people to work together." The former was more difficult to accept but the latter had a stirring sound, surprisingly so to the NP boys as well.

We pursued the line of questioning by following with a pair of statements on which the boys, then in the fifth grade, were to offer their opinion. Table 61 indicates the dilemma in which we put them. Should the government provide only work or only welfare relief? The poll results are indicative of the positive valuation families place on work (self-help) and sheds a little light on the incentives PP families have as they go to the centers.

TABLE 61

BOYS' OPINIONS ON GOVERNMENT POLICY FOR TREATMENT OF POOR BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Treatment of Poor (in percentages)	Poor Families NP	PP	Total Poor	AP	Total Sample
Govt. should only provide work*	57.2	65.8	61.3	44.1	56.7
Govt. should only provide welfare*	49.1	44.7	47.3	35.3	44.1

*Some of the boys have checked both statements.

Toward a Profile of Participating Families

The plight of the PP seems much worse than that of the NP. The participating families have had more children. They have more unemployed offspring living at home, and had, in 1967, lower annual incomes than those who do not choose to support the social action. PP fathers include greater proportions unemployed and lower percentages of hours worked per week and year. A little over a third of the PP family total incomes were self-earned while the NP managed that way in nearly a half of the cases. The above create an impression which may be misleading. The comparisons in each item were short of statistical significance. We found, as mentioned earlier, a kind of profile tendency emerging for the participating families from numerous data runs. More statistical analysis might have produced a sharper picture. The continuing difficulty is the variety of combinations of items which turn up. The factor with highest discriminating power thus eluded us. A factor analysis might have uncovered such but we were unable to perform one with our data in the allotted period for the study.

The participating family heads and homemakers tend to be in their forties. The husband had below average schooling compared to others in the sample and works fewer hours and days. The wife is the somewhat better educated spouse and has never worked in the labor force. They are native Knox Countians who have not lived away from the region. They are more highly traditional in religion, comparatively, and, despite the mother's greater permissiveness in child care which she may have learned from a little reading, she and her husband are more traditional, i.e., stricter with their family than NP seem to be. They are more realistic,

in aspirations and expectations for their children. They are apparently high participators in the kinds of activities that they can manage to engage in, including the activities of KCCAP. Unfortunately for the analyst, this same set of characteristics, except the participating tendency, fits a sizeable number of those in NP families.

That the PP families are quite viable is reflected in their continued involvement in social action. It seems plausible that their chief objective is the improvement of their economic condition and their participation is largely based on their version of the doctrine of self-help. The NP families have chosen the more exclusive tactic in implementing their conviction of helping themselves. It may be that they are the more stable of the two groups. Their drive for more upward mobility was exerted earlier and is now spent in elevating their aspirations for their young children. If their younger offspring are to make the upward move, the parents realize the sons may have to out-migrate. The elders can endure the status quo. They chose to settle for that condition years ago.

The PP families have been frustrated for the duration of their family cycle. Their situation is presently a little better than it was earlier.[21] Their recent slight improvement has whetted their interest in consolidating their meager gains by further support of the social concern that has helped them to help themselves for some time. The parents are still struggling, aspiring to self-improvement, however slight that might be, and to make more certain the achievement of their younger children. Their earnest desire is that the family can be kept together and remain in the area. The opportunity system in Knox County needs to be greatly

expanded if this goal is to be achieved. What can be done to accelerate the rehabilitation must be supported. We doubt if all this is as clear to either set of families as it seems when inscribed in this report but subconsciously at least their behavior reflects these motivations.

Our general hypothesis is not supported if we compare our Poor families with the middle class families of urban America. It is generally supported when we compare the two Poor types with our Knox County control group. The impression is rather clear that the AP group is composed of many families that would be similar to the aspiring upper lower class in many larger communities. We originally conceived of our sample as being comprised of three levels of the lower class stratum. As our early contacts with the county informed us and our data have now revealed, the sample may contain a few hard-core poverty families that might be placed on the lower-lower level. However, the more appropriate designation for the total sample is that it consists of "aggregates clustering around various points on a continuum." Most seem closer to the top of the lower ranking than toward the bottom. PP families tend to aspire to reach that top. Realistically, they could not go higher than that. Their lingering aspiration is a middle class valuation.

To return to the earlier question of why each of 39 families continue to be represented by one or more of their members, when this Evaluation was made, is to bring us to the first of two major issues in this report. Is KCCAP reaching the families that need it and want the improvement it offers? The answer must be affirmative if we qualify this judgment with a number of careful refining remarks. We finish

our discussion of the first objective of our research with some further speculations and suggestions.

KCCAP and Participating Families

Surely all of the Poor families need the economic improvement that a "bootstrap" move might accomplish. Only the minority of these families are motivated to engage in the co-operative effort. If they are to be satisfied the fathers must be enabled to secure jobs they can fill. This entails the opening up of the county to new small industries. As this is written two current newspaper announcements are relevant to the success of such an industrial renewal. The recently elected state governor (representing the party strongly supported in Knox County) recognizes that the bulk of the poverty group prefer jobs to doles.[22] Sensing the situation, as we have also found it in our data analysis, Governor Nunn argued that "they (Eastern Kentuckians) would rather have self-supporting employment in their home areas than to go elsewhere." He proposes developing industrial sites to attract industry into the region. Knox County was not a cited area and this places an added burden on the KCCAP if it is to serve the perceived best interests of its present supporters among our families.

A second development is the curtailing of the W.E.&T program. Its planned replacement is the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) which will cut the 225 men in Knox County who have reaped the maximum benefits permitted (36 months) to around a tenth of that number (25 to 35). Scarcity of federal funds has forced a slash in appropriations. The federal budget cutbacks make the continuation of men in government

subsidy, who have been in the W. E. &T project, seem impossible.[23]

The impact of KCCAP on the Poor families may be seriously stunted unless the emphasis is accelerated and concentrated on the economic aspects of the program. We have questioned from the outset the probability of much cultural change in the families of the county in three years. If social changes that have been initiated and are somewhat supported for the perceived purpose of broadening the job opportunity system are thwarted by the federal austerity policy the prognosis for lasting cultural change may be negative.

KCCAP and Grade School Children

The aspect in the War on Poverty that has the strongest public support is the "Head-Start" project. Interest and upkeep for the other programs diminishes with the increase in age of the disadvantaged individual. Consequently, the older child might be the forgotten person were it not for an intentional focus by the community action movement on the adolescent youth. Some such programs include intermediates between ten and the mid-teens. KCCAP has involved a proportion of these youngsters in its activities. To the extent that a minority of the boys in this study sample have participated, measurable results were found. But less than a fourth of the Poor boys engaged in the programs enough to acknowledge appreciation. Of those who reported receiving specific help, the percentages in Table 62 indicate the emphasis of the activities and the perceptions of the children. The proffered service seems to be broad but the effect is confined to a few. Realizing the extent of the needs of these boys, one would have hoped for a much wider and solider impact.

TABLE 62

SPECIFIC HELP RECEIVED BY BOYS WHO HAVE BEEN TO CENTERS BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Help Received	Poor Families				
	NP (N=13)	PP (N=16)	Total Poor (N=29)	AP (N=12)	Total Sample (N=41)
Helped with school work	30.8	26.7	28.6	25.0	27.5
Helped learn to play new games	76.9	57.1	66.7	47.7	57.5
Helped learn to get along with people	30.8	28.6	29.6	41.7	37.5
Helped develop habit of reading	38.5	21.4	29.6	33.3	30.0
Helped know training needed to get job in Knox County	15.4	35.7	25.9	33.3	27.5
Helped know types of jobs available outside of Knox County	7.7	28.6	18.6	25.0	20.0

A slightly larger proportion of the boys have attended the neighborhood centers than other projects, but two-thirds have had no exposure to this form of community experience. School and church groups comprise their formal participation (except for recreational team activities). The vast majority have no opportunity for initiation into social action. Other American children have probably not too much greater personal encounter with neighborhood or community-wide social action; but their families do and will enculturate them for future involvement. Social maturation is stunted when the child is limited to spontaneous, informal association. If, in addition, he is surrounded by a general pessimism engendered by his family's negative reaction to

the establishing of a community enterprise, he can hardly be expected to develop on his own an eventual motivation to take part in a constructive social effort.

The school becomes the instrumentality for teaching the needed social consciousness and concern just as it is the vehicle for mobility. However, that institution can fulfill neither function if it cannot get the active support of the family. It is highly doubtful if the school as a change agent can accomplish much social training without general, genuine adult co-operation.

The School as a Vehicle for Mobility

Realism and idealism were mixed in the responses of the boys in this sample concerning their life chances. They were grossly idealistic ("fantastic") about continuing the familistic tradition, about their chances for education beyond high school, and about some of the vocations in which they were interested. The sons of the Poor were much more realistic about the need for education and training, about the relation of "hard work" to achievement and sacrifices to success, and about their life chances in general. Identical majorities of the sons in Poor families thought education would help, but the future for them looked presently only poor to fair. On the verge of effecting their personal identity, their life ahead looms rather bleak. Individually aware of the high aspirations of their parents for them, they are about to be defeated by the low expectations that will operate only to "demotivate" them. The cycle of poverty cannot be broken in such a situation without social change bearing down on this crucial change target.

These boys have strongly internalized the family ties and obligations. PP sons especially valuate their family and kinship group. They seem destined to retain the familism they have been taught so effectively. Can they migrate successfully? How can they continue to hold their aspirations if they are emotionally unable to leave the home area? What programs can serve their needs?

The school has not had a salient influence on their older siblings; most did not attend long enough to be affected. An analysis of the educational achievement of the rest of the present generation in the sample shows the probable outcome of the sixth graders if educational policies are not drastically changed. The levels of schooling reached by those already past the usual terminal ages for such educational accomplishments appear in Table 63.

TABLE 63

SIBLINGS EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AS COMPARED TO POSSIBLE LEVEL OF SCHOOLING FOR THEIR AGE* BY FAMILY TYPES AND BY TOTAL SAMPLE (PERCENTS BY COLUMNS)

Educational Attainment	Poor Families				
	NP (N=40)	PP (N=30)	Total Poor (N=70)	AP (N=22)	Total Sample (N=92)
Could have but have not:					
Attended high school	35.5	23.3	31.4	0.0	23.9
Graduated from high school	12.5	23.3	17.1	0.0	13.0
Attended college	17.5	23.3	20.0	40.9	25.0
Graduated from college	2.5	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.0
Could have and have:					
Attended high school	27.5	23.3	25.7	36.4	28.3
Graduated from high sch.	0.0	3.3	1.4	13.6	4.3
Attended College	2.5	3.3	2.9	0.0	2.2
Graduated from college	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	2.2

*Children under 16 were not considered.

Earlier in this chapter we pictured the hopes of the two sets of Poor families for their sons as being perceptibly diverse in respect to where the boys as men would have to live. NP are willing for them to live wherever they can find the occupation that will furnish a livelihood. PP, on the other hand, hope that jobs can be found close to, if not in, Knox County. In light of these family choices and the life styles that have produced them, NP boys need socialization supplements in the schools to prepare them for the strange, outside social adaptation. PP boys need job training and an improved opportunity system in the region to accommodate their home-bound aspirations. The schools have to offer the curriculum and the counselling, and successful adult models to emulate and reference figures to motivate. Furthermore, a broad testing program must be set up to discover those who can leave and those whose life compulsions require them to stay.

What are the prospects for this sort of educational innovation--a planned form of social change? We have stressed the need for Federal aid to expand the work advantages of the fathers. Aid from all governmental levels--funds, creative curricular concepts, and leadership--is imperative to develop the capacities of their sons. (Hersey, 1965)

The highest status destination most likely for the potentially upward mobile boys is the one comprised of skilled workers. Why then should they not, as early as the seventh grade, be vocationally trained in these rural schools to exploit their mechanical interests? If by sixteen they are capable of being equal to their middle class counterparts in this type of intelligence, why not shape their capacity into skills and abilities that will be marketable? (Webster, 1966)

Suggestions for Planned Social Change

The KCCAP proposed and subsequently altered the services that it called its Family Development Program. We urge a reexamination of the needs in light of our evaluation and a renewed major emphasis on several of its now diffused objectives. Without amplication, which a native group and resource persons in the various specializations could better do, we list them as being legitimated by the foregoing findings.

1) Parent Education--Broadly defined, it would include informal group activities, formal instruction (literacy, fine arts, homemaking skills and child care principles), and home volunteer aides to reach those who cannot or will not come to the centers.

2) Family Life and Sex Education--The school systems in the larger society are instituting K-12 curricular units and classes in the preparation for healthy sexuality, planned parenthood (urgently needed to limit lower class family size), and effective marriage and parenthood.

3) Home Improvement--Model homes and improved housing to replace and rehabilitate deteriorating homes.

4) Counseling and Legal Aid--To serve as a referral agent, offer personal and family therapy, and acquaint the family members with their privileges, rights and non-utilized regional resources.

5) Vocational Training--In the schools, at the centers, in the homes, every where it can be done. (Holler, Burchinal, Taves, 1963).

Prospects for Adoption of Social Change

The institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina in its "Propositional Inventory on Sociocultural Change" (Honigman et al., 1961) reports conclusions by Nash in his studies of Under-developed countries that are relevant to this Evaluation. Further changes in Knox County may be expected, according to Nash, (1958) "when the innovation:

1. Has the effect of raising the net income of the society.
2. Results in the employment of persons 'who traditionally would not be income producers.'
3. 'Presents an alternative economic opportunity entailing occupational roles requiring new behavior.'"

Findings in this study suggest that this host population for developmental change recommendations would generate further changes if, as Ornati (1965) has claimed, "the personal patrimony with which the poor face the labor market outside their neighborhood" were reconstructed. If the under-employed fathers were working, and perhaps more mothers; if the sons were tooled to travel the distance they can endure away from home; and if the families were reenforced in their fight for survival, the tendencies for further espousal of the dominant culture would be facilitated.

The fulfillment of these conditions (the "ifs" above) must be carried on with appreciation of the intrinsic values of the regional sub-culture. We would forecast the diminution of the force of the fatalistic ideology. As pessimism is replaced by the awareness that aspirations are not futile and failure is not always to be expected, a cultural change can be forecast. Upward mobile urban persons have not

been overly handicapped by fundamentalism. A refined and adjusted family solidarity can grow out of familism. The Smiths, Browns, Mills, Sizemores, Grubbs, and Grays (predominant names in our sample of families) are like other white Anglo-Saxon Protestant Americans who are securely in the "swim of things" in the mainstream of society.

NOTES

[1]Estimates on present income averages have been derived by Knox County CAP personnel from their own research based on samples and data taken from the Federal 1960 census and from state agency studies.

[2]Three sources of information were available in determining family participation: the mother (homemaker), the son, and the center director. The three seemed to be in agreement in most cases, but there were several instances where they differed. In such cases, we relied on the mother's responses to three or four direct questions on participation, its duration, and who in the family were active at the time of the interview. We assumed she had the surest knowledge of the three sources and checked for consistency in all of her responses.

[3]See note 1.

[4]Data on the Knox County school district were secured from the county administrative offices. We are indebted to Mr. John H. Jones, supervisor of instruction, for many things including the list and addresses of the school boys, their teachers, and several studies his office had conducted on the testing program, attendance rates, and characteristics of drop-outs.

[5]It is interesting to note that while the percentage change in per capita income for the whole state was less in the years 1960-65 than in the years 1950-60, for Knox County it was approximately the reverse. In Knox County the percentage change in per capita income for the years 1960-65 was 51.9 as opposed to 27.8 reported for the years 1950-60. The corresponding figures for the whole state were: 33.6 for the years 1960-65 and 64.6 for the years 1950-60. (See Kelly, 1966, Table 47).

[6]A brief description of the progress of the Family Development Program since its inception was furnished by John Jackson, Community Center Projects Director, in a communication dated June 28, 1968.

[7]KCCAP was enabled to budget some funds to a special housing renovation program which was carried on in all 14 center areas. This money was divided on the basis of the number of households in each center area. The amounts for each house improvement carried the stipulation that the repairs would be made as a team project of family heads and other available adult males.

[8]Knox Quality Homes, Incorporated, has erected model houses at cost ($3,000 - $4,000). A number of the W.E.&T. workers were deployed to assist in the construction.

[9]The Counseling Center director went on half-time employment on July 1, 1967. Since September 1, 1967 the Center has lost its director and their program was terminated.

[10]Visits for the purpose of receiving advice and aids in planning parenthood have generally increased, according to health records in the OEO offices. A more detailed report appears elsewhere in the evaluation.

[11]A published account of the annual meeting of the North Concord District Baptist Association reveals over 40 local congregations exist in the county. A rather impressive report is included of several sub-organizations of the various churches with district and local officers named.

[12]In this and occasionally during the rest of the report, certain differences are mentioned in terms of direction and tendency in keeping with the major hypothesis, although the measures only approach (P .20) but do not reach levels that are statistically significant. The reader is reminded that our N for our groups is quite small and large deviations would be necessary to show differences that could be accepted at .05 level of probability.

[13]Our data have revealed that the present level of education attained by NP wives is not higher than that attained by PP wives. As such, the higher educational mobility experienced by the NP wives seems to be indicative of the fact that the parental families of NP wives had been comparatively lower in their educational attainments than those of the PP wives.

[14]An article in the Lexington, Kentucky Herald-Leader, June 23, 1968 describes the moves being made by the state agencies and private enterprise to bring new small industry into the region.

[15]Standardized questions were secured from a number of studies and modified to be included in the four questionnaire schedules utilized in this study. Beside those mentioned in the manuscript, the following sources furnished questions on the respective aspects of family life being examined: Delbert Miller, Handbook on Research Design and Social Measurement, Social Science Series, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964), several series of questions to secure composite scores (indices) on factors such as Familism, Alienation, and Anomia; Charles Westoff and others, Family Growth in Metropolitan America, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), series of questions on Mobility, Aspirations, and Level of Satisfaction; Eugene Litwak, "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, 25; 9-21, questions on Extended Family Orientation and Status; and Donald McKinley, Social Class and Family Life, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), questions on Boy's Perceptions and Aspirations.

[16]The extensive questionnaire prepared by Herbst for young boys required an intensive and rather complicated process of response choices. We decided to use only the information offered by our sample of boys on the contributions the sons reported they and their fathers made to the task performance in their family by whether either male served most of the time rather than by other degrees of regularity.

[17]The study of a West Virginia mining community has hypothesized that coal mining produces an occupational group homogeneous and distinct enough to be differentiated from other groups in the area. Miners are expected to develop norms and behavior that will affect family role relationships. Irvin Goffman in his Encounters (Bobbs-Merrill, 1961) and George Simmel, earlier, in The Web of Group Affiliations (Free Press, 1955) have postulated that male occupations which require near total involvement, and solidarity to cope with dangerous situations, will discourage husband participation in family responsibilities as being non-masculine.

[18]The reviews of the literature on class differentials in parental perceptions, role-taking, and child care practices in Bronfenbrenner, op. cit., in R. Cavan, "Subcultural Variations and Mobility," in Christensen, (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family, op. cit., in E. Duvall, Family Development (J. B. Lippincott Co., 1965), and J. Bossard and E. Ball, The Sociology of Child Development (Harper and Brothers, 1960) were examined for the suggested hypothesis. The current spate of studies reported in professional journals and reviews given in government agency literature on family aspects of the war on poverty were consulted.

[19]"Herbst arrived at four types of family interaction patterns (Husband Dominance, Wife Dominance, Autonomic, and Syncratic Cooperative) by taking into consideration the interplay of two variables: the activity itself and the mode of decision about the activity. For the present analysis, we had not undertaken the intricate procedure used by Herbst in deriving his typology. Instead, we had decided to rely on the "decision" variable alone and used "Overall Conjugal Role types" as we have termed them here to denote how the important decisions were generally reached by the two spouses concerning family activities. For this we asked a set of questions dealing with who makes the final decision on the nine items related to family affairs (see question 94 in Mother's Schedule Time 1). We developed a typology by taking account of the maximum number of times the responses "separate," "husband," "wife" or "joint" were checked. When "joint" was marked the largest number of times, we typed the spousal pair "syncratic"; when "husband" was checked the maximum number of times we termed the conjugal role type "husband dominance," and so on."

[20]Ely Chinoy in several studies of automobile workers, Leonard Reissman in Class and American Society (Free Press, 1959), Joseph Kahl in The American Class Structure (Rinehard and Co., 1957), and Herbert Hyman in "The Value Systems of Different Classes," op. cit., report evidence of the relatively high aspirations of young boys of the lower or working class. The levels may become depressed as the boys with age become more realistic and less specifically encouraged or supported by parents who have indoctrinated them with achievement values but stimulated little motivation.

[21]The homemaker respondents proved quite frank in their general statements about the contributions the OEO had made to their family and to the neighborhood. Their remarks proved useful to the researcher as a check on the other responses and as indicators of basic attitudes and perspectives of the individuals and their families.

[22]See note 14.

[23]A report out of Washington to the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, metropolitan daily newspaper, July 2, 1968, called attention to three features of the projected new approach: (1) A drop in the number of men to be involved; (2) Men are to be paid "an hourly wage based on the time they work, rather than monthly grant based on the size of their family;" and (3) The program will put less emphasis on skill-training and job orientation courses which it is presumed have not been beneficial to middle-aged men with little education and poor prospects. The first two may offset the merit of the third for many of the heads of large families in the area under study. See also July 27, 1968 issue of New Republic pp. 8-9, for an evaluation of W.E.&T. versus C.E.P. in Kentucky.

List of Works Cited

Ausubel, D. P., "Effects of Cultural Deprivation on Learning Patterns," Audiovisual Instruction, 10:10-12, January, 1965.

Bach, G., "Father-Fantasies and Father Typing in Father-Separated Children," Child Development, 1964, 17:63-80.

Bandura, Albert, "Psychotherapy as a Learning Process," in Arthur W. Staats, Human Learning, Studies Extending Conditioning Principles to Complex Behavior, New York: Holt and Co., 1964.

Barber, Bernard, Social Stratification, A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1957.

Barnett, H. G., "Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change," quoted in G. Kushner, et al., What Accounts For Socio-Cultural Change? A Propositional Inventory, Institute for Research in Social Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1962.

Beaglehole, E., "Evaluation Techniques for Induced Technological Change," in Gilbert Kushner et al., What Accounts For Socio-Cultural Change? A Propositional Inventory, Institute for Research in Social Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1962.

Berelson, B., and G. A. Steiner, Human Behavior, An Inventory of Scientific Findings, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Bott, E., Family and Social Network, London: Lavistock Publications, 1957.

Brager, G. and Harry Specht, "Social Action By the Poor: Prospects, Problems, and Strategies," in G. Brager and F. Purcell, (eds.), Community Action Against Poverty, New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Publishers, 1967.

Bronfenbrenner, U., "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in E. E. Maccoby, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Holt and Co., 1958.

Brown, J. S., "The Conjugal Family and the Extended Family Group," American Sociological Review, 17:297-306.

Caudill, H., "The Permanent Poor," The Atlantic Monthly, June, 1964 pp. 49-53.

Christensen, H., (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family, Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co., 1964.

Christie, R. and J. Garcia, "Subcultural Variation In Authoritarian Personality," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 46:457-469.

Clapp, R., "The Large Low-Income Family," in Hylan Lewis, Child-Rearing Among Low-Income Families, Washington, D. C." Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1961, p. 14.

Cohen, Albert, and H. Hodges, "Lower-Blue-Collar Characteristics," Social Problems, Spring, 1963, pp. 303-334.

Coleman, J. S., Community Conflict, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Cottrell, Leonard, "Foreword" in G. Brager and F. Purcell, (eds.) . Community Action Against Poverty, New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Publishers, 1967.

Cubine, W., "Voluntary Association and Religious Participation in Knox County," unpublished paper, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

Dager, E., "Socialization and Personality Development in The Child," in H. Christensen, Handbook of Marriage and the Family, Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co., 1964.

Deutsch, M., "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in A. H. Passow, (ed.), Education in Depressed Areas, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, pp. 163-179.

Dynes, R., A. C. Clarke, and S. Dinitz, "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable," American Sociological Review, 21:2, pp. 212-215.

Elkin, F., The Child and Society, The Process of Socialization, New York: Random House, Inc., 1960.

Erikson, Erik, Childhood and Society, 2nd ed., New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1963.

Ford, T. F., "Religious Thought and Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians as Revealed By An Attitude Survey," The Review of Religious Research, 1961, 3:1-15.

_____, (ed.) The Southern Appalachian Region--A Social and Cultural Survey, Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1963.

Freedman, R., "Migration Differentials in the City As A Whole," in P. Hatt and A. Reiss, Jr., Reader in Urban Sociology, New York: The Free Press, 1951, pp. 205-221.

Frenkel-Brunswick, E., "Further Explorations By a Contributor to 'The Authoritarian Personality'," in R. Christie and M. Jahoda (eds.) Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality." Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954, pp. 226-275.

Gans, Herbert, The Urban Villagers, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Ginzberg, Eli, Occupational Choice, An Approach To A General Theory, New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Gladden, J. and J. Christensen, "Emergence of Urban Values in Mining Families in Eastern Kentucky," Rural Sociology, 1956, 21:135-139.

Glock, C. Y. and R. Stark, Religion and Society in Tension, Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1965.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S., Americans View Their Mental Health, New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Haggstrom, W., "The Power of the Poor," in F. Riessman, J. Cohen, and A. Vearl, (eds.), Mental Health of the Poor, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Haller, A., L. Burchinal, and M. Taves, "Rural Youth Need Help in Choosing Occupations," Circular Bulletin 235, Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963.

Herbst, P., "The Measurement of Family Relationships," Human Relations, 5:pp. 3-5.

Hersey, J. "Education: An Antidote to Poverty," Journal of the American Association of University Women, May, 1965.

Hodges, H., Jr., "Peninsula People: Social Stratification in a California Megalopolis," in W. Kallenback and H. Hodges, Jr., Education and Society: A Book of Readings, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.

_____, Social Stratification, Class in America, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1964.

Hoult, T., The Sociology of Religion, New York: Dryden Press, 1958.

Howard, H., The Economic History of Knox County, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, 1937.

Hyman, H., "The Value Systems of Different Classes," in R. Bendix and S. Lipset (eds.), Class, Status, and Power, A Reader in Social Stratification, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Irelan, L. and A. Besner, Low-Income Life Styles, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Welfare Administration Publication No. 14.

Jarvis, J. A., Factors Influencing Political Behavior in Bell, Clay, Knox, Whitley, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, 1948.

Janowitz, M. and Marvick, D., "Authoritarianism and Political Behavior," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1953, 17:185-201.

Kahl, J., "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 1953, 23, pp. 186-201.

Kaplan, S. and A. Delbecq, "Perceived Hindrance to Social Change in a Poverty Program," Sociology and Social Research, 52:2, pp. 269-278.

Keesing, F., "Cultural Anthropology: the Science of Custom" quoted in G. Kushner, What Accounts For Socio-Cultural Change? A Propositional Inventory, Institute for Research in Social Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1962.

Kelly, C., "Eastern Kentucky: A Descriptive Analysis of the Population," Unpublished Master's Research, University of Kentucky, 1968.

Kohn, M., "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64: 337-351.

Komarovsky, M., Blue-Collar Marriage, New York: Random House, Inc. 1964.

Lynn, D. and Sawrey, W., "The Effects of Father-Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 258-262.

Lenski, G., The Religious Factor, New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Lewis, Hylan, Child-Rearing Among Low-Income Families, Washington, D. C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1961, p. 14.

Lewis, O., "The Culture of Poverty," Scientific American, 1966, 215:20-25.

Litwak, E., "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25:9-21.

Maccoby, E., "Role-Taking in Childhood and Its Consequences For Social Learning," Child Development, 1959, 30: 239-252.

McCandless, B., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

McKinley, D., Social Class and Family Life, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Mogey, J., Family and Neighborhood, London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Moynihan, D., "Foreword to Paperback Edition," in A Myrdal, Nation and Family, Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1968.

Mussen, P., J. Conger, and J. Kagan, Child Development and Personality, (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Myrdal, A., Nation and Family, Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1968.

Nash, M., "The Multiple Society in Economic Development" quoted in G. Kushner, What Accounts For Socio-Cultural Change? A Propositional Inventory, Institute for Research in Social Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1962.

Ornati, O., Poverty in America, Washington, D. C.: National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty, 1964. Mimeographed.

_____, "Poverty, Affluence, and Opportunity," in G. Brager and F. Purcell, (eds.), Community Action Against Poverty, New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Publishers, 1967.

Oxendine, W., A History of Barbourville, Kentucky, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, 1954.

Rees, R., The Knox County Development Association: A Study of A Community Action Course, University of Kentucky, Cooperative Extension Service, 1966, Mimeographed.

Riessman, F. and S. M. Miller, "Social Class and Projective Tests," in F. Riessman, J. Cohen, and A. Pearl, (eds.), Mental Health of the Poor, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Rosen, B. C. and R. D'Andrade, "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, 1959, 22:185-217.

Schwarzweller, H., "Family Ties, Migration and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky," Bulletin 691, University of Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1964.

_____, and J. Segger, "Kinship Involvement: A Factor in the Adjustment of Rural Migrants," Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1967, 29:662-671.

Sears, R., "A Theoretical Framework For Personality and Social Behavior," American Psychologist, 1951, 6:476-483.

_____, E. Maccoby, and H. Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, New York: Harper and Row, 1957 quoted in B. McCandless, Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____, L. Rau and R. Alpert, Identification and Child Rearing, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Simpson, R. and Max Miller, "Social Status and Anomia," Social Problems, 1963, 10:256-264.

Skeels, H. and I. Harms, "Children With Inferior Social Histories: Their Mental Development in Adoptive Homes," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1948, 72:283-294.

Stark, W., The Sociology of Religion, Volume II, New York: Fordham University Press, 1967.

Stephenson, J., Patterns of Adaptation In A Changing Mountain Community: Stress and Health. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina. To be published.

Stolz, L., Father Relations of War-Born Children, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1954.

Sussman, M., "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?," Social Problems, 1959, 6:333-340.

Thorpe, L. and V. Johnson, Child Psychology and Development, New York: Ronald Press, 1962.

U. S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1967, (88th edition), Washington, D. C. 1967.

Voss, H., A. Wendling and D. Elliott, Delinquency, Dropout, and the Social Milieu of the School, Progress Report, 1966, Mimeographed.

Weatherford, W. D. and E. Brewer, Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia, New York: Friendship Press, 1962.

Webster, S., (ed.) The Disadvantaged Learner, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.

Weller, J., Yesterday's People, Lexington, Kentucky: The University of Kentucky Press, 1965.

Whiting, B. (ed.), Six Cultures: Studies in Child Rearing, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.

Willie, C., "Antisocial Behavior Among Disadvantaged Youth: Some Observations on Prevention for Teachers," in S. Webster The Disadvantaged Learner, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.

Wilson, B., Sects and Society, Berkely: University of California Press, 1961.

Yinger, J. M., "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25:625-633.

APPENDIX A

PROCEDURE USED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF INDICES

Several indices (composite scores) were developed for the analysis of data for the present study. For each of these indices several items, which were thought to correspond with the property of the concept under consideration for measurement, were selected and were included in the interviewing schedules. The responses to each of these items were first coded separately.* The scores of the various "valid" items were then combined to form a composite score--an index--which could be treated as an ordinal scale.

Decisions as to which items were valid for the concept being measured by the index were based on two different types of criteria deemed to be suitable for the types of data that were used for this study. For the construction of those indices which were related to certain behavioral aspects, such as contact with relatives, index of neighborliness, etc., the items were selected on the basis of their face validity. In the case of other indices which were considered to be tapping certain values, attitudes or beliefs, the items were not selected simply on the basis of their face validity, but, instead, were submitted to the process of item analysis. Only those items were included which were found to be consistent with the concept being tapped by the proposed index. Thus, for

---

*Code numbers for the various categories of responses were not always the same as those given in the schedules. These were changed and were given suitable number according to the requirement of concerned index.

the construction of such indices as Drive to Get Ahead in Life, Familism and Fatalism, etc., item analysis was done before obtaining composite scores for them.

Having thus briefly outlined the procedure that was followed for the selection of items for developing the composite scores, we now proceed to enumerate the various items that formed the different indices that we developed for the analysis of our data.

Composition of Indices

Contact with Relatives Index--The composite score for the "Contact with Relatives Index" was developed by combining the scores of following items: number of contacts per week with wife's relatives, number of contacts per week with husband's relatives, number of visits per month to wife's relatives, number of visits per month to husband's relatives, number of visits per month from wife's relatives, and number of visits per month from husband's relatives (Mothers Schedule: Time 1 /MSI/: question 29).

Mutual Aid (Relatives) Index--This index was constituted by combining the scores of: extent of help rendered to and received from relatives, feeling of a sense of responsibility for helping relatives, expectation of help from relatives, and expectation of help from relatives in comparison with that from neighbors (MSI: questions 33, 34, and 44).

Kinship Ties Index--Composite scores obtained for the "Contact with Relatives Index" and "Mutual Aid (Relatives) Index" jointly constituted the Kinship Ties Index.

Contact with Neighbors Index--This index was composed of the joint scores of the following: numbers of persons visited regularly in the neighborhood, frequency of visits to neighbors, number of neighbors visited, and ranking of neighbors among the persons most often visited. (MSI: questions 35, 40 and 36).

Mutual Aid (Neighbors) Index--Constituted by adding scores of: exchange of things with neighbors, sense of responsibility for helping neighbors, expectations of help from neighbors, and expectations of help from neighbors as compared with expectations toward relatives (MSI: questions 39, 42 and 42 and 44).

Index of Neighborliness--Constructed by taking the sum of the scores obtained for the above two indices.

Index of Use of Mass Media--Constituted by combining the scores of the following items: regularity of newspaper and magazine reading (MSI questions 46 and 47), and frequency of radio listening or T.V. watching by both husband and wife (MSI question 48), as well as by the fifth grade boy (question 10, /‾Boys Schedule: Time I /‾BSI‾/).

Strength of Satisfaction with "Mother-Wife" Role--Two items considered for this composite score were: wife's conception about woman's main job and wife's feeling for doing something else (MSI: question 96). The respondents who conceived of wife's role mainly in terms of staying at home and not being anxious to work or do something else were given high scores for the extent of satisfaction with wife's role on these

two items separately. The respondents who believed that women should work outside the home and were themselves anxious to do something else were given low scores on these two items. The scores of these two items were finally combined to form the composite score for the above index.

Autocratic-Syncratic Index--Constructed by combining the scores for a battery of items dealing with decision-making ideology (MSI: question 94). For these items the choice for joint decision by husband and wife was given a higher score than the ones given for either husband's or wife's solitary decision. The lowest composite scores for these items, therefore, formed the more autocratic, and the highest scores represented the more syncratic type of family.

Overall Conjugal Role Type--Determined by taking into account the responses obtained for the same battery of items (MSI: question 94) dealing with the decision-making ideology. As the question provided for alternatives from which respondent had to choose one, the typology was developed by enumerating the maximum number of times the response "separate," "husband," "wife," or "joint," was checked. When "husband" was checked the maximum number of times we called the family "husband dominance type"; when "wife" was checked for maximum time it was considered a "wife dominance type"; when both were checked an equally large number of times the type was termed "mixed dominance"; when "joint" had maximum checks the family was labelled "syncratic," and where "separate" figured out for most of the items it was typed "autocratic."

Wife's Perception of Husband's Role--Developed by taking into account two sets of items: one related to who usually does certain household chores "husband," "wife," "husband and wife jointly" or any other (MSI: question 95); the other tapped the extent to which husband had participated in the care of the fifth grader (MSI: question 74). By giving a greater weight to the husband checked each time in the first set of items, and by assessing husband's contribution both as to the amount of help and the number of items in which he had helped in the child care (for the second set), a composite score for the wife's perception of husband's role was finally developed by combining the total scores of these two different sets of items.

Family Formal Participation Index--Constituted by combining scores of the following items: participation by members of family in center activities (Mother's Schedule: Time II /MSII/: Column 13, p. 1); participation by any one in the family as a member, committee member, or office bearer in Local Action Groups, Association of Local Action Groups, and Knox County Economic Opportunity Council (MSII: Columns 43, 44 and 45, page 6); participation by any family members in service clubs, school service groups, labor unions, youth groups, farm group and "others" associations excluding church (MSII: Columns 46-51, p. 6); sixth-grade boy's holding an office of any club or team. (BSII: Column 44, p. 5).

Family Religious Participation Index--Formed by adding the scores of: frequency of church attendance by boy (BSII: Column 17, p. 10); frequency of attendance at church, special religious meeting and other religious activities by wife (MSII: Columns 9, 12, and 13, p. 17); and frequency of church attendance by father (MSI: question 50).

Total Family Formal Participation Index--Family Formal Participation Index and Family Religious Participation Index jointly constituted this composite score.

Wife's Religiosity Index--Composite scores for wife's Religiosity Index were obtained by combining the scores of the following: extent of religion practiced in the home, wife's frequency of going to religious services, frequency of talking with people about religious conditions, frequency of talking with minister about personal problems, frequency of attending special religious-sponsored group meetings, praying privately, extent to which Bible has helped her in life, and regularity in listening to radio or watching TV religious services (MSII: Columns, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 21, and 22, pp. 17 and 18).

Intergenerational Occupational Mobility Scores--Developed by comparing the occupational status of the father of the boy respondent with that of the lifetime job of the grandfather. For comparing the status level of the two, scores given to the various occupations in Appendix I of the Working Paper No. 15, U. S. Department of Commerce were considered and the upward and downward intergenerational mobility was then assessed on the basis of this comparison.

Aspirational Mobility Index--Constructed by taking into consideration the occupational statuses of grandfather and father and the occupational status to which the son aspired. If the boy's aspired occupational status was found to be higher than that of his father's present occupation (or his main job, if retired), and his father's occupational status was, in turn, found to be higher than, or similar to, that of his grandfather's occupational status, then the family scored the highest rank on the

Aspirational Mobility Index. If the boy's aspired occupation was found to be of lower status than that of his father, and his father's occupational status was, in turn, found to be lower or similar to that of his grandfather, then the family scored lowest rank on the Aspirational Mobility score.

Potential Occupational Mobility Index--Scores of the Actual Intergenerational Mobility and Aspirational Mobility jointly constituted the scores for this index.

Actual Spatial Mobility Index--Comprised of the sum of scores for the following items: number of places lived in other towns and counties by wife, number of years spent in other towns and counties by wife, number of places lived in other towns and counties by husband, and number of years spent by him in other towns and counties (MSI: questions 7 and 8).

Potential Spatial Mobility Index--Scores of the items dealing with the willingness of the sixth grader to go out of Knox County (BSII: Column 15, p. 2) and those of items dealing with mother's willingness to allow her children to leave Knox County (MSII: Column 64, p. 8) were added to the scores obtained on the Actual Spatial Mobility Index. All of these scores thus jointly constituted the composite scores for Potential Spatial Mobility Index.

Wife's Drive to Get Ahead Index--This index was like the one that Westoff developed (Westoff, 1961; see footnote 15). Some of the items included in Westoff's constructed index were not included. Some other items, which were originally not included in Westoff's index, were added to make the index more suitable for the population under study. Items included in this index were ones that measured the wife's willing-

ness to make the following sacrifices: leave familiar surroundings, leave friends, leave close relatives, keep quiet about religious views, move to a less pleasant neighborhood, live temporarily in less desirable housing (MSII: Columns 22-33, items a, b, d, e, g, i, and j, pp. 12-13).

Fatalism Index--Composite scores measuring the extent of fatalism in the homemakers was developed by combining the scores of ten items which were deemed to be tapping the person's fatalistic orientation as against his faith in one's capacity to control or dominate environment (MSII: Columns 43-51, p. 24).

Boy's Drive to Get Ahead Index--Like the Wife's Drive to Get Ahead Index, this index was similar to one developed by Westoff. He had constructed this index for measuring husband's drive to get ahead (Westoff, 1961). Our index, therefore, did not include all the items included in Westoff's construct. Some of them were dropped because they were not considered appropriate for this age group, and a few others were added. The items included were those that measured the boy's willingness to sacrifice the following in order to get ahead in life: go without vacations for several years, leave friends, move to a strange place, give up leisure time, do less interesting work, be prepared not to see parents and folks often (BSII: Columns 60-65, pp. 7 and 8).

Familism I--Items used to yield composite score for what we termed as "Familism I" were taken from Litwak's study (Litwak, 1960; see footnote 15). Unlike Litwak, we did not develop a three-fold typology consisting of Non-Family Orientation, Nuclear-Family Orientation and Extended-Family Orientation. Instead, we proceeded with measuring the general concept of familism through the use of the four items which

were concerned with boy's willingness to live, and spend time, with members of the nuclear as well as extended family. (BSII: Columns 30-34, items a, b, c, and d, pp. 10-11).

Familism II--Familism II is distinguishable from Familism I by virtue of the fact that items included in this index were deemed to be tapping boy's commitment to familistic orientation in terms of his moral obligations rather than in terms of physical nearness to members of the nuclear or extended family. Items for this index were taken from "Long Form of the Minnesota Survey of Opinion."* Not all the items related to familism in the "Long Form" were taken. Instead, only those items which were considered suitable for this age group were included, and the composite score for Familism II was obtained by adding the scores of these items (BSII: Columns 36-47, items a, b, c, d, i, j, k, and l, pp. 11-12).

---

*Here obtained from Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, McKay Social Science Series (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964, pp. 160-172).

APPENDIX B

APPENDED TABLES

TABLE I

OCCUPATIONAL CHOICES MARKED AS "LIKED," BY AGE AND FAMILY TYPES

Occupational Choices (in percentages)	Mothers			Sons		
	NP	PP	AP	NP	PP	AP
Minister*	94.5	92.3	86.1	NA	NA	NA
Teacher	89.3	92.3	86.1	44.2	58.1	34.3
Bookkeeper	80.4	82.1	69.4	10.0	16.7	22.9
Bank Teller	78.2	83.2	69.4	11.8	12.9	14.3
Doctor	69.6	79.5	72.2	26.9	28.6	32.4
Dept. Store Clerk	67.9	79.5	50.0	27.5	33.3	20.0
Musician	53.6	71.8	66.7	39.6	26.7	28.6
Mail Driver	67.3	79.5	41.7	35.2	38.7	20.0
Mechanic	53.6	76.9	50.0	57.7	72.2	62.9
Insurance Agent	52.7	76.3	50.0	35.3	33.3	22.9
Lawyer	57.1	61.5	61.1	34.0	46.9	29.4
Brick Layer	57.1	71.8	47.2	27.5	30.0	22.9
Laborer	56.4	53.8	44.4	13.7	10.0	20.6
Bus Driver	37.5	66.7	27.8	39.2	56.3	20.0
Football Professional	33.9	59.0	38.9	60.8	67.9	70.6
County Judge	41.3	51.3	25.0	36.5	51.9	20.0
Truck Driver	30.4	56.4	22.2	53.8	65.6	41.2
Politician*	21.4	41.0	13.9	NA	NA	NA
Policeman	10.7	28.2	16.7	58.5	54.8	47.1

*Minister and Politician were not included in the boy's list.

TABLE II

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
BY TWO TYPES OF POOR FAMILIES

Demographic and Social Characteristics	NP	PP
Wife's Age		
Under 40 years	41.1	38.5
40 years or over	58.9	61.5
Husband's Age		
Under 45 years	42.9	51.3
45 years or over	57.1	48.7
Wife's Education		
7th grade or less	55.4	53.8
8th grade	30.4	30.8
9th grade or more	14.3	15.4
Husband's Education		
7th grade or less	67.9	59.0
8th grade or more	32.1	41.0
Family Income		
Less than $2,500 per year	44.6	48.7
$2,500 per year or more	55.4	51.3
Husband's Occupation		
Unemployed or retired	39.3	43.6
Laborer (except farm and mine)	25.0	20.5
Service worker, operatives & kindred worker	26.7	23.0
Craftsman, foreman and kindred worker	8.9	12.8
Clerical, managerial or professional	0.0	0.0

Notes:

1. Columns for different categories in each characteristic totals approximately 100% allowing for rounding.

2. On none of these characteristics the X^2 difference between the NP and PP was found to be significant at $<.05$.

APPENDIX C

Mothers Schedule: Time I

Boys Schedule: Time I

Mothers Schedule: Time II

Boys Schedule: Time II

Area_____ Schedule Number_____

Date of Interview_____

SCHEDULE FOR

A STUDY OF EFFECTS OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

ON THE FAMILY

IN

KNOX COUNTY, KENTUCKY

UNDER

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

MOTHERS SCHEDULE

(Time I)

Respondent's Name_____

Present Address_____

Location of Residence_____

Interview began (time)_____

Interview completed (time)_____

Total interview time_____

Interviewer's Name_____

Introduction: Good morning (afternoon) My name is_____.

I am from the University of Kentucky and have been given the responsibility of collecting some information that is needed in connection with a research project that the OEO at U. K. is undertaking.

This research project is to study the effects of Community Action program on the families of Knox County. In order to do this we need to know some details about Knox County families and their participation in various formal and informal social activities. We are asking you to participate in this research project by answering some questions for us. All the replies you will give will be kept confidential.

I CHILDHOOD LOCALE AND PRE-MARITAL RESIDENCE

1. Where were you born?

_____1 same neighborhood
_____2 same area (east, west of route 25)
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

2. Where was your husband born?

_____1 same neighborhood
_____2 same area
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

3. Where was your father born?

_____1. same neighborhood
_____2 same area
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

4. Where was your mother born?

_____1 same neighborhood
_____2 same area
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

I CHILDHOOD LOCALE AND PRE-MARITAL RESIDENCE (cont.)

5. Where was your husband's father born?

_____1 same neighborhood
_____2 same area
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

6. Where was your husband's mother born?

_____1 same neighborhood
_____2 same area
_____3 Knox County
_____4 an adjoining county
_____5 Eastern Kentucky
_____6 other area of the state
_____7 out of state
a. where?_____

7. Have you lived for any considerable part of your life in another town or county? (5 years or more)

a.
_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If yes, ask,
where? 1 _____ 2_____ 3 _____

how long? 1 _____ 2_____ 3_____

8. Has your husband lived for any considerable part of his life in another town or county? (5 years or more)

a.
_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If yes, ask,

where? 1 _____ 2_____ 3_____

how long? 1 _____ 2_____ 3_____

9. How many different places have you lived in this area? (separate residences)

_____1 one
_____2 two-three
_____3 four-five
_____4 five or more

II MARRIAGE

10. Have you ever been married before?

a.

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If yes, ask,
How many times were you married before?

_____1 once
_____2 twice
_____3 three times
_____4 four or more times

c. If yes, ask,
In this (these) case(s) were you widowed or divorced? (If married more than twice, mark the number of times widowed and the number of times divorced in the blank before each alternative)

_____Widowed
_____Divorced

11. When were you and your husband (current husband or last husband) married? (Get exact a date as possible).

_____

12. When you married your (current) husband, was your wedding a civil ceremony, or was it a religious ceremony performed by a minister?

a.

_____1 Civil ceremony
_____2 religious ceremony

b. If religious ceremony, ask,
From what church (name, denomination) was this minister?

_____

13. If the ceremony was religious, ask,
Were either you or your husband, or both of you, members of his church?

_____1. No
_____2 Yes, wife
_____3 Yes, husband
_____4 Yes, both

III FAMILY COMPOSITION

14. a Could you please give me the names of all people who live and eat together in this household?

(LIST ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS. "HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS" INCLUDE ALL WHO LIVE AND EAT TOGETHER AS ONE UNIT. IF A BLANK IS "NOT APPLICABLE," PUT AN X.)

	NAME & RELATION TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	SEX	AGE	WAS IN SCHOOL ON APRIL 1st? YES What Grade?	NO Last Grade Completed	MARITAL STATUS M, S, D, W.	OLDER PEOPLE--NOT IN SCHOOL EMPLOYED? Full-time = F Part-time = P* Unemployed = U	1. TYPE OF WORK ENGAGED IN 2. IF UNEMPLOYED, IS PERSON AVAILABLE, ABLE TO WORK?
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

* Part-time is working less than 35 hours a week.

14. b *Do you have any sons or daughters living somewhere else?*

(List all sons and daughters living away from home; give all information as above, plus place of present residence: if same city or area, mark S)

	Name	Sex	Age	Was in school on April 1st? Yes What Grade?	Was in school on April 1st? No Last Grade Completed	MARITAL STATUS M, S, D, W.	Older People--Not in School: Employed? Full-time = F Part-time = P Unemployed = U	Older People--Not in School: Type of work Engaged in	Older People--Not in School: Where Does (he, she) Live Now?
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
6.									
7.									
8.									
9.									
10.									

14. c. Did you have any other children who are no longer living?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask,
How old did he (she, they) live to be? Age 1 _____
2 _____
3 _____
4 _____

(Code: total number of deceased children _____1 one
_____2 two
_____3 three
_____4 four or more
(mark number)

15. a. How many children did your mother have?

_____1 one
_____2 two
_____3 three
_____4 four
_____5 five
_____6 six
_____7 if seven or more, fill in number

16. a. Did your parents* or any of your brothers or sisters have more schooling than you did?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
If yes, ask,
Where does he (she, they) live now?

Sex M-F*	Address

b. Did any of your husband's brothers or sisters (or parents*) have more schooling than he did?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
If yes, ask,
Where does he (she, they) live now?

Sex M - F*	Address

* If parent, specify father/mother.

IV EMPLOYMENT

17. If husband is employed, ask:

* a. Who is your husband's present employer?_____

How many hours a week does he spend at this job?

_____1 0-9
_____2 10-19
_____3 20-29
_____4 30-39
_____5 40-49
_____6 50 or more

* b. Has he ever worked at any other occupation or job?

_____1. Yes
_____2. No

If yes, ask,
How long and at what was he employed?

	Type of Job	Employer	How long	State (if not Ky.)
Most recent (not present job)				
2nd most recent				
3rd most recent				
4th most recent				

c. What was your husband's income last year?

_____1 Under $3,000
_____2 $3,000 - 3,499.
_____3 $3,500 - 3,999.
_____4 $4,000 - 4,499.
_____5 $4,500 - 4,999.
_____6 $5,000 - 5,499.
_____7 $5,500 - 5,999.
_____8 $6,000 - Over

18. If wife is employed, ask,
*a. Who is your present employer?_____

How many hours a week do you spend at this job?

_____1 0 - 9
_____2 10-19
_____3 20-29
_____4 30-39
_____5 40-49
_____6 50 or more

b. What was your income last year?

_____1 Under $3,000
_____2 $3,000 - 3,499.
_____3 $3,500 - 3,999.
_____4 $4,000 - 4,499.
_____5 $4,500 - 4,999.
_____6 $5,000 - 5,499.
_____7 $5,500 - 5,999.
_____8 $6,000 - Over.

c. Have you ever worked at any other job?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask,
How long and at what were you employed?

	Type of Job	Employer	How Long	State (If not Ky.)
Most recent (not present job)				
2nd most recent				
3rd most recent				
4th most recent				

19.* Have you ever been enrolled in any special job training programs such as a vocational school for beauty shop workers, secretaries, and the like?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

a. If yes,
What type of training was this?_____

b. If yes,
Which one(s) did you complete?_____

20. What was the main life occupation of your father?

_____

21. What was the main life occupation of your husband's father?

_____

V HEALTH RECORD

22.* If you had been feeling bad and thought you needed a check up, where would you go?

_____1 Doctor
_____2 Other (Specify)

23.* If a member of your family were sick and you felt you needed some advice on whether or not to take him or her to a doctor, who would you ask? (Specify if neighbor, relative, etc.)

_____1 Member of immediate family
_____2 Other relative
_____3 Neighbor
_____4 Other (specify)

24.* For the most part, do you feel healthy enough to carry out the things you would like to do?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Other (specify)_____

25.* Has any member of the family been sick or injured during the past year?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes,

Name of Sick Person	Sickness or Injury	Was Doctor Used?	Hospitalized Over Night or Longer

26.* In the last six months, has anyone in the family been to see a dentist?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask,

How many members of the family have been?_____Number
For what reasons?

_____1 Periodic check up
_____2 Filling
_____3 Extraction
_____4 Dentures fitted
_____5 Other (specify)_____

If no, ask,

a. How long has it been since anyone in the family went to the dentist:

_____1 seven-eleven months
_____2 1 - 1½ years
_____3 19 months - 2 years
_____4 3 or more years (specify number)
_____5 never

If have ever gone, ask,

b. Where did they go to see him?
Town_____

c. How many miles is that from here?

_____1 less than 1 mile
_____2 2-4 miles
_____3 5-10 miles
_____4 11-15 miles
_____5 more than 15 miles (specify)

VI HOUSEHOLD

27.* Do you own (including buying) or do you rent?

_____1 own
_____2 rent, How much rent do you pay per month?_____
_____3 rent free

28. What major convenience or appliance do you not have and would most like to have?_____

29. Could you please give me the names of all your relatives and your husbands relatives (NAMES OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD) who live within a two hour drive of you. (BESIDE THE NAME OF THE HEAD, PUT THE NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD)

WIFE'S RELATIVES						HUSBAND'S RELATIVES					
NAME	Relation	Distance* Lives From You	No. Of Contacts Per Week	No. Of Visits By Them Per Mo.	No. Of Visits By You To Them Per Mo.	NAME	Relation	Distance* Lives From You	No. Of Contacts Per Week	No. Of Visits By Them Per Mo.	No. Of Visits By You To Them Per Mo.

* DISTANCE IN TRAVEL TIME

1 M = mother F = Father Son = Son Sis = Sister A = Aunt C = Cousin
GM = Grandmother GF = Grandfather D = Daughter B = Brother U = Uncle Ø = Any Other

30. Are there any of the above with whom you have some trouble or failing out or any problem which keeps you from seeing or visiting with them?

_____1 Yes
If yes, who are those_____
_____2 No

31. Who decides whether or not you or your family ever visit any relatives? You, your husband, or someone else?

_____1 Wife
_____2 Husband
_____3 Both
_____4 Other (specify)_____

32. Do you or your husband ever visit any of these relatives alone?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
Why_____

a. If yes, ask,
Do you or your husband (or both) visit alone often?
Wife: Often 1_____ Sometimes 2 _____ Rarely 3 _____
Husband: Often 1 _____ Sometimes 2 _____ Rarely 3 _____

33. a. Have you helped any of these persons (relatives in list) in any way during the past year?

_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

b. If yes, ask,
Whom have you helped? In what way(s) did you help them?

Relation		Type of Assistance
Husband	Wife	

c. Have you been helped by any of these people within the last year?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

d. If yes, ask: Who has helped you? In what way(s) have they helped you?

Relation		
Husband	Wife	Type of Assistance

34. a. Do you feel it is your duty to help your relatives at any time even though it may be difficult for you to do so?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Qualified Yes
_____4 Other

b. Do you think that almost all your relatives would be willing to help you if you needed help of any kind?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Qualified Yes
_____4 Other

VIII ASSOCIATION PREFERENCES

35.* Do you visit or talk with anyone in this neighborhood fairly often and regularly?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask:
Name the three or four with whom you talk or visit most often.

Persons Visited

_____
_____
_____
_____

Code Sequence:

0 none-low-low
1 one low-high
2 two-medium
3 high-low
4 four or more high-high

35. b. About how often do you have such talks or visits?_____

_____1 once a month or less (low-low)
_____2 more than once a month, but less than every two weeks (low-high)
_____3 once every two weeks to four days (medium)
_____4 every two or three days (high-low)
_____5 every day (high-high)

36. Who are the people you have over to your home most often?
(Put in rank order: - never, 1, 2, 3, 4)

_____1 neighbors
_____2 relatives
_____3 friends near by
_____4 other friends from a distance

37. Of the four persons who live in this area to whom you feel closest--the people you visit or who visit you--how many are relatives?

_____1 none
_____2 one
_____3 two
_____4 three
_____5 four

38. Do you and any of your neighbors go anywhere together, to places such as movies, to town, parties, church get-togethers?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask, Where?_____

39. Do you and any of your neighbors exchange or borrow from each other things like tools, food, household articles?

_____1 often
_____2 sometimes
_____3 rarely
_____4 never

40. How many of your neighbors' homes have you ever been in?

_____1 none
_____2 one or two
_____3 three-five
_____4 six or more

41. Have you served a meal to someone other than your family or kin in the last year?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, ask; Who?

_____1 minister
_____2 teacher
_____3 neighbor
_____4 other friend
_____5 children
_____6 other (specify)_____

42. Do you feel that it is your duty to help almost any of your neighbors at any time even though it might be difficult for you to do so?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Qualified Yes

43. Do you think that most of your neighbors would be willing to help you if you needed help of any kind?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Qualified Yes

44. Do you feel, in general, that your relatives or your neighbors would be more likely to help you, your husband, or your children in a time of trouble?

_____1 Relatives
_____2 Neighbors
_____3 Both equal
_____4 Neither

IX LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

45. We are interested in what you like to do during your "free time." Would you please tell me what you do with your spare time?

1 Type of Activity	2 Frequency possible	3 Frequency of Participation

46. Do you or any other member of your family take newspaper (s)?

____1 Yes
____2 No

If yes, ask:

a. Which are those newspapers?

Name	Place Where Published
1.	
2.	
3.	

b. Do you read any one of them?
____1 Yes
____2 No

c. If yes, which ones do you read?

_____

_____

d. Do you read them fairly regularly?

____1 Yes
____2 No

e. What parts of newspapers do you usually read?

If no, ask:

Is there someone who reads newspapers regularly and tells you the news?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, who is that person?

_____1 A relative
_____2 A neighbor

Which newspapers does he/she read?

_____

_____

_____

Does this person tell you regularly the news he/she reads? _____yes _____No

If yes, how regularly

_____1. Regularly
_____2. Not very regularly

Generally what sort of news do you get from this person?

_____

47. * Do you take any magazines, or does anyone in the family read magazines regularly and tell you about them?

____1 take magazines (check only if respondent takes and reads more than one magazine)
names of magazines _____
____ 2 Don't take magazines, but _____ reads them and tells me about them.
____ 3 Don't take magazines and seldom or never see them.

48. a. Do you own a radio?
____1 Yes
____2 No
If yes, how often do you listen to the radio? What are your favorite programs? How often does your husband listen to the radio? What are his favorite programs?

	How Often Listens	Favorite Program(s)
Husband		
Wife		

48. b. Do you own a TV?

____1 Yes
____2 No

If yes, ask: How often do you watch TV? What are your favorite programs. What about your husband--how often does he watch, and what are his favorite shows?

	How Often Watches	Favorite Programs
Husband		
Wife		

X FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS

49. * a. Do you belong to a church?

____1 Yes
____2 No

b. If no, ask:

Do you attend some church?

____3 Yes
____4 No

c. If yes, (to a or b) ask:

What church?_____

How often do you attend services?

_____1 never
_____2 less than once a month
_____3 one or two times a month
_____4 once a week or more

50. a. Does your husband belong to a church?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If no, ask:

Does he attend some church?

_____3 Yes
_____4 No

c. If yes (to a or b) ask:

What church?_____

How often does he attend:

_____1 never
_____2 less than twice a month
_____3 one or two times a month
_____4 once a week or more

51. a. Do you belong to any other organizations or clubs such as PTA, a union, etc.?

_____1 Yes, (list)
_____2 No

b. How often do you attend?

Name of Organization	No. of Scheduled Meetings	No. Times Attend

52. Does your husband belong to any other organizations or clubs?

_____1 Yes, (list)
_____2 No

b. How often does he attend?

Name of Organizations	No. of Scheduled Meetings	No. Times Attend

53. Can you say a little about other activities you would like to take part in? Why do you find it difficult to take part in them now?

Activity	Reason for not participating
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

If no answer for 53, ask # 54 and 55, otherwise, skip them and go over to # 56.

54. Do you feel that you should take part in other organizations? (Besides those you do take part in, or if you do not participate?)

a. If yes, What groups, clubs or organizations do you feel you should take part in? (List)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

55. Does your daily routine leave you any free time for other activities, or do you feel you have no free time for such things?

_____1 Have free time
_____2 Do not have free time

XI. INFORMAL ASSOCIATIONS

56. a. Is there any particular place around here where men often get together and visit?

_____1. Yes
_____2. No

If yes, Where?_____

b. Is there any particular place around Knox County outside this neighborhood where men often get together and visit?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, Where?_____

57. a. Is there any particular place around here where women often get together and visit?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, Where_____

b. Is there any particular place outside this neighborhood where women often get together?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If yes, Where?_____

58. a. How many times have you been to big cities such as Louisville, Knoxville, Ohio cities, etc?
_____Number of times

XII CONCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES IN PARENT-CHILD AND HUSBAND-WIFE RELATIONS

We want to ask you some questions about the activities of children. Some of these questions are about the child when he is very young and others about what may happen when he is older.

72. When a baby comes, a woman has to do many things. What do you think are the things you like the most and what bothers you the most about having a young baby in the house? (probe: was baby wanted or not)

a. Like most_____ b. Wanted (?) _____Yes _____No.

Bothers most_____

We are interested in talking with mothers about one child. Suppose we talk about your fifth-grade boy. (Substitute name for X)

73. Now would you think back to when X was a baby. Who took care of him mostly then?

_____1 Mother
_____2 Father
_____3 Other (specify)_____

If other, ask,

74. How much did your husband do in the way of taking care of X?

_____1 Much
_____2 Some
_____3 Little
_____4 Nothing

b. Did he ever change the baby's diapers? _____Yes _____No
Did he ever feed him: _____Yes _____No
Did he ever give him his bath? _____Yes _____No

75. a. How much did the "other" (in #74) do in the way of taking care of X?

_____1 Much
_____2 Some
_____3 Little
_____4 Nothing

b. What specific things did he/she do for X_____

_____

76. All babies cry, of course. Some mothers feel that if you pick up a baby every time it cries, you will spoil it. Others think you should never let a baby cry for very long. How do you feel about this? (probe: general emotional reaction: strict or lenient)

_____

77. Do you think babies are fun to take care of when they're very little, or do you think they're more interesting when they are older?

_____1 When little
_____2 When older

78. a. There has been a lot of talk as to whether it is better to have a regular feeding schedule for a baby, or to feed him whenever he is hungry. How do you feel about this?

_____1 Prefer regular schedule
_____2 Prefer to feed baby when it is hungry

b. If schedule, ask, How closely did you stick to that schedule?

_____1 Very closely
_____2 Moderately
_____3 Not very closely.

79. a. Some people allow their children to play and run around without clothes on. How do you feel about that when the child is indoors?

_____

b. How do you feel about that when the child is playing outdoors?____

_____

80. Here are some of the things that some parents expect their children to do. Which of these things did you expect of X and by what age?

Task	Age
a. Putting away own clothes	_____
b. Picking up his other things	_____
c. Running errands to a nearby store	_____
d. Dressing himself completely	_____

81. We'd like to get some ideas of the things X is allowed to do and the sort of things he isn't allowed to do.

a. For instance, what are your rules about bedtime, if you have any?

_____1 Goes to bed same time each night.
_____2 Goes when told
_____3 Goes when is tired, when wants to
_____4 Other (specify)_____

b. How much noise do you let him make around the house?

_____1 Does not allow any
_____2 Does not pay any attention

c. Do you let him listen to the radio or TV whenever he wants to?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

d. When X was younger, did you keep track of exactly what he was doing and where he was most of the time, or did you feel he could watch out for himself quite a bit when he was small?

_____1 Watch out for self.
_____2 Kept track of him most of the time.

82. Some parents expect their children to mind immediately when they tell them to be quiet or pick up something and so on. How do you feel about this?

_____1 Should mind at once.
_____2 Will tell child two or three times
_____3 Don't expect him to mind.
_____4 Other,(specify)_____

b. How does your husband feel about your son's minding?

_____1 Should mind at once.
_____2 Will tell child two or three times.
_____3 Doesn't expect him to mind.
_____4 Isn't interested
_____5 Other (specify) _____

83. How much do you have to keep after X to get him to do what he's supposed to do?

_____1 Very much
_____2 Some
_____3 Little or not at all
_____4 Other (specify)_____

84. a. If you ask X to do something and he jumps right up and does it, how do you react? (Do you say anything?)

_____1 Say, do nothing
_____2 Reward him (specify)_____
_____3 Praise him
_____4 Expect it
_____5 Other

b. If he doesn't do what you ask, do you ever just drop the subject, or do you always see that he does it?

_____1 Always see he does it.
_____2 Drop it.

c. Think about a time when X was 8 years old. He had just done something that you felt was very wrong, something that you have warned him never to do. What would you do at such times?

_____

85. Suppose a four-year-old child did something that makes his mother angry and excited. Should the mother punish the child right while she is angry or should she wait until she is calm.

_____1 Punish right away
_____2 Wait

Why?_____

86. a. Have you and your husband had different ideas about how you should make X mind you?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If yes, How?_____

87. a. Before X started to school did you teach him anything like reading words, or writing the alphabet, or drawing, or telling time--things like this?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. If yes, What?_____

88. a. How much schooling do you think a son of yours ought to get?

_____1 Number of years (elementary)
_____2 High school
_____3 College

b. Would your husband probably agree with you about this?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If no, What would your husband want your son to do?

---

89. a. Now we want to talk about whether you think there are differences in bringing up boys and bringing up girls. How important do you think it is for a boy of X's age to act like a real boy?

_____1 Very important
_____2 Rather important
_____3 Not important
_____4 Other_____

b. How do you feel about boys playing with dolls and that sort of thing?

_____1 Dislike
_____2 Is all right sometime
_____3 Is no problem--nothing wrong with it.

c. How about girls playing rough games and that sort of thing?

_____1 Dislike
_____2 Is all right sometime
_____3 Is no problem--nothing wrong with it.

90. a. Some people feel it is very important for a child to learn not to fight with other children. Other people feel there are times when a child has to learn to fight. How do you feel about this?

_____1 Child should not learn to fight back.
_____2 Child should know how to fight back.

b. Have you ever encouraged X to fight back?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

c. Now how about when X is playing with one of the other children in the neighborhood and there is a quarrel or a fight--how do you handle this?

---

91. a. We'd like to get some idea of how X acts when he's naughty. For example, when he has done something he knows you don't want him to do, when your back is turned. Does he ever come to your husband and admit he has done it without your asking him?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. When you ask him about something he has done/ does he usually admit or deny it?

____1 Admits
____2 Denies

92. a. What do you think is the best way to punish a fifth grader?

_____

b. What do you think your husband considers to be the best way to punish a fifth grader?_____

_____

93. We are wondering about who makes certain decisions about the children. In some families it is the mother, in others it is the father. How does it work out in yours?

For instance, who decides where X may go, or how much he must help around home?

____1 Mother
____2 Father
____3 Other (specify)_____

94. As you know, some husbands and wives talk about things and others do not. I am going to mention some things that might come up and I'd like to know if you think a husband and wife should discuss such things, and if they would, who should make the final decision?

Topic	Discuss		Who Should Make the Final Decision				
	Yes	No	Husband	Wife	Joint	Separate	Neither
1. Money matters, money problems, bills to be paid.....							
2. What to do in the free time you have...							
3. Whether to move to another house...							
4. What food you should have for dinner when company is coming							
5. What political candidate to vote for..							
6. Whether your 16-year old son should quit school...							
7. Whether your husband should change to a different job							
8. What would make this community a better place to live...							
9. Whether you should buy new things for the house.							

95. Here are some things that might be done by someone in the family. I would like you to tell me who would be most likely to do it (or if both of you might do it).

	Husband	Wife	Any Other (Specify)	Husband and Wife both
1. Painting rooms in the house, or other odd jobs				
2. Getting up at night to take care of children if they cry				
3. Deciding where to go for a holiday celebration				
4. Punishing the children if necessary				
5. Washing dishes				

96. Some mothers feel that their main job is to stay at home and take care of the children. At the same time they sometimes feel that they owe it to themselves to do some outside work or at least have some outside interests. What is your point of view on this?

_____

b. How well do you feel that you have been able to solve this problem?

_____1 Very well
_____2 Fairly well
_____3 Haven't been able to solve it
_____4 Other (specify)_____

c. Have you ever felt you'd rather be doing something else than what you are now doing?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Don't know
If yes, What?_____

97. Looking back to your childhood, how would you say that the way you raise your children is different from the way your mother raised you?

_____

98. a. Has there ever been something concerning child care that bothered you and you have felt you needed help from someone about it?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

b. To whom did you go for assistance when you wanted such help?

_____1 Relatives
_____2 Friend
_____3 Doctor
_____4 husband
_____5 Other (specify)_____

99. Have you ever read anything about how to raise a child?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If Yes, ask,
What have you read?_____

100. a What do you think is the ideal number of children for the average couple today?

_____Number

b. Do you think people ought to limit the number of children they have or leave it to nature?

_____1 Control
_____2 Leave it to nature
_____3 No opinion

c. (If the respondent believes people ought to limit the number of children, ask:)

Have you ever deliberately tried to limit the size of your family?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

101. Talking about X again, would you say that your husband is quicker to praise X, that both of you are quick to praise him, that neither of you is quick to praise him? (Use word other than 'praise', if necessary)

_____1 Husband
_____2 Wife
_____3 Both
_____4 Neither

b. Which parent, would you say, is X more likely to feel that he can talk things over with or who does he come to when he is upset or unhappy?

_____1 Husband
_____2 Wife
_____3 Both equally
_____4 Neither (specify if other)_____

102. If you had your choice about the kind of boy you'd like your son to be, what three things would you say you most want or like him to be?

_____1.
_____2.
_____3.

XIV LEVEL OF ASPIRATION FOR SELF AND CHILD

103. We all have our hopes and dreams, we all have things we want for ourselves and our children. Sometimes we feel we fall short of getting these things, sometimes we feel we have finally reached them. Do you ever feel that you have or might fall short of your hopes and dreams in any of the following?

	Yes	No
1. In getting the schooling you wanted?		
2. In doing the sort of work you like best?		
3. In living in the sort of home and neighborhood you had hoped for?		
4. In having as happy a marriage and home life as you dreamed of?		
5. In saving the money you had hoped to?		
6. In setting money aside for the future?		
(If works:) 7. In making headway in your job?		
8. In enjoying life as much as you had hoped?		

104. There are some things that people have said when they were asked about jobs and about life in general, Would you agree or disagree with them?

	Agree	Disagree
1. All a man should want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay to afford a nice car and eventually a home of his own.		
2. When a man is born the success he is going to have is already in the cards, so he might just as well accept it and not fight against it.		
3. The secret of happiness is not expecting too much out of life and being satisfied with what comes your way.		
4. Nothing is worth the sacrifice of moving away from ones parents.		
5. The best kind of job to have is one where you are part of an organization all working together even if you don't get individual credit.		

105. Some people think that just any young man with thrift, ability, and ambition has the opportunity to rise in the world, own his own home and earn at least $6,000 a year. Do you agree or disagree with this?

_____1 Agree
_____2 Disagree
_____3 Don't know

106. If your son was just getting out of high school and showed some promise, would you like to see him go into politics?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Don't know

b. I am going to read you a list of jobs. Which of the following would you like to see your son become? Which jobs would you be sorry to see him pick?

	Like	Dislike
Minister		
Bank teller		
Mechanic		
Bookkeeper		
Bus driver		
Department store salesman		
Doctor		
Professional football player		
Insurance agent		
Truck driver		
Lawyer		
Mail driver		
Laborer		
Musician		
Teacher		
Brick layer		
Policeman		
County judge		

107. When a young man is considering his life work which do you think is the most important thing he should think about in making his choice? (ask each of the following and check one).

_____1 The amount of money he will earn.
_____2 How much he will like or enjoy the job.
_____3 How close he will be to home.

b. Do you think your husband thinks this is the most important thing?

_____1 Yes
_____2 No
_____3 Isn't interested
If no, ask: Which one would he say is the most important?

_____

TO BE FILLED IN BY INTERVIEWER:

What is the general condition of the house?

_____1 Sound
_____2 Deteriorating
_____3 Dilapidated

Criteria used for rating condition of house:

1. Sound — Slight defects or none. Slight defects--lack of paint, slight damage to porch or steps--slight wearing away of mortar between bricks or masonry.

2. Deteriorating — One or more intermediate defects indicating lack of proper upkeep. Intermediate defects--holes, open cracks, rotten or missing materials in foundations, walls, roof, floors, or ceiling but not over large area--shaky or unsafe porch, steps or railings, broken or missing window panes--rotted or loose window frames or sashes that are no longer rainproof or windproof--broken or missing risers, or railings of outside or inside stairs--deep wear on door sills, door frames, outside or inside steps or fibers--missing bricks or cracks in chimney which are not serious enough to be a fire hazard--make-shift chimney, such as stove pipe or other uninsulated pipes leading directly from the stove to the outside through a hole in the roof, wall, or windows.

3. Dilapidated — One or more critical defects or a combination of intermediate defects. Critical defects--holes, open cracks, or rotted, loose or missing material (clapboard, siding, shingles, bricks, concrete, tile, plaster, or floor boards) over a large area of the foundation, outside walls, chimney, or inside walls, floors, or ceilings--substantial sagging of floors, walls or roof--extensive damage by storms, fire, or flood.

BOYS SCHEDULE

(Time I)

Boy's Name - _____

Father's Name: _____

Home address: _____

School: _____

INTRODUCTION:

My name is _____. I am from the University of Kentucky and am interested in learning about some of your ideas. I have some questions to ask you so that you can tell me what you think about certain things and about things you like and don't like.

This is not a test in any way. It will not be graded. I will read your answers just so that I can know more about you and about some of the things you think.

Do not discuss any question with anybody else. I want your own ideas so, of course, there is no reason to talk to someone else.

Answer each question as best you can; spell as best you can but do not worry if you can not spell a word exactly right. If you spell it as best you can, I will be able to read it.

I will read each question completely, and then you will write your answer. As I read the question, read silently with me. Please do not go ahead of the class. If you are unable to finish a question go on with the class anyway. You will have sometime at the end to answer the questions you did not finish. However, you probably will have plently of time to answer the questions as we go through them together.

Please use your best writing and mark your answers clearly.

1. a. How old are you?

_____ 10 years old
_____ 11 years old
_____ 12 years old
_____ 13 years old
_____ 14 years old
_____ 15 years old

b. When is your birthday? Jan._____, Feb._____, March_____
April_____, May_____, June_____, July_____, Aug._____
Sept._____, Oct._____, Nov._____, Dec._____.

2. a. What is the name of the place where you were born?
_____

b. Were you born in a hospital? Yes_____ No_____

3. a. How many brothers do you have? _____

b. How many sisters do you have? _____

4. a. How many years have you lived in your present home? _____years

b. About how many houses have you ever lived in?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 more

5. a. The kids that you play with most of the times at home, are they relatives (kins) of yours or are they mostly children of folks who live near you? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

relatives_____ neighbors_____

b. How about the kids you play with most of the time at school, are they kin of yours or are they mostly children of folks who live near you? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

relatives_____ neighbors_____

6. a. Are your best friends those who are related to you or children of other neighbors or school friends? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

relatives_____ neighbors_____ school friends_____

b. What are the names of your three best friends?
(WRITE DOWN THEIR NAMES FIRST, THEN PUT R BESIDE THOSE WHO ARE RELATIVES

(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

7. How often do you go to Sunday School or church? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

Almost all the time_____ Fairly often_____ Sometimes_____ Never_____

8. a. What is the farthest place you have travelled to?_____

b. What is the biggest city you have ever been in?_____

c. Have you ever ridden in: (PUT A CHECK MARK BESIDE NAME OF ONE IN WHICH YOU HAVE RIDDEN)

City or highway bus_____
Train_____
Taxi Cab_____
A Car_____

9. How about the things you are expected to do at home?

a. What are you supposed to do in or outside the house? (PUT A CHECK MARK AFTER EACH THING YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO DO AT HOME, PLEASE ANSWER AS MANY AS YOU DO)

Take care of brother or sister_____
Cut the grass_____
Go to the store for food and things_____
Take care of stove_____
Help Father with any work_____
Take care of animals_____
Work in garden or on farm_____
Make your bed_____
Pick up your clothes_____
Any other (WRITE IT IN)_____

b. Is there a set time for you to: (CHECK EACH ONE FOR WHICH THERE IS A SET TIME FOR YOU TO DO THESE THINGS)

Get up in the morning?_____
Do any work at home or for your family?_____
Eat your evening meal?_____
Go to bed?_____
Do homework?_____

10. How about the time when you are free to do what you want to do? Let's think about summertime first.

a. What games did you play?_____

_____

b. What else did you do when you were not playing games?_____

_____

c. Some children have what is called a hobby---like collecting things, making things, and taking care of animals. What sort of hobby do you have?_____

_____

d. About how many times a week did you usually watch TV or listen to the radio?

TV (CHECK ONLY ONE)

everyday_____
every other day_____
once a week_____
a couple of times a month_____
never_____

Radio (CHECK ONLY ONE)

everyday_____
every other day_____
once a week_____
a couple of times a month_____
never_____

e. About how often did you go to the movies? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

every week_____ twice a month_____
once a month_____ never_____

f. Did you read any books besides comic books? Yes_____ No_____

Now let's think of the same sort of questions, and answer them for days when you are in school and Saturdays and Sundays during the school year.

g. Do you work more or play more after school? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

work more_____ play more_____

h. When do you watch TV?

(I) Do you watch in the morning before school? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
never_____ sometimes_____everyday_____

(II) Do you watch in the afternoon after school? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
never_____sometimes_____everyday_____

(III) Do you watch in the evening after eating? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
never_____sometimes_____everyday_____

i. How many comic books did you read last week? (CIRCLE ONE)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

j. Have you gone to the movies at least once in the last month?
Yes_____ No_____

11. (Family relations.....)

a. When you were growing up, who seemed to be your father's favorite? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

I did_____ younger sister_____
older brother_____ father had no favorite_____
older sister_____ different ones at different times_____
younger brother_____

b. When you were growing up, who seemed to be your mother's favorite? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

I did_____
older brother_____
older sister_____
younger sister_____
younger sister_____
mother had no favorite_____
different ones at different times_____

c. Which parent is it easier for you to talk with? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

father a lot easier_____
father a little easier_____
both about the same_____
mother a little easier_____
mother a lot easier_____

d. Which parent is more likely to like something you do and tell you so? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

father a lot more_____
father a little more_____
both about the same_____
mother a little more_____
mother a lot more_____

e. Which parent seems to like you more? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

father a lot more_____
father a little more_____
both about the same_____
mother a little more_____
mother a lot more_____

f. When your parents disagree, whose side are you usually on? (CHECK ONLY ON

father's a lot more_____
father's a little more_____
both about the same_____
mother's a little more_____
mother's a lot more_____

g. Which parent punishes you more? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

father a lot more_____
father a little more_____
both about the same_____
mother a little more_____
mother a lot more_____

h. Who decides where you may go or what you may do? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

father a lot more_____
father a little more_____
both about the same_____
mother a little more_____
mother a lot more_____

12. FAMILY ORGANIZATION AND ROUTINE

In answering the following questions you should do the following:

First, This is the meaning of each letter:
M= Mother, F= Father, O= Other adults, X= you, B= brothers, S= sisters

Then, Answer in the following way:
If the answer is "most of the time" then put a circle around the letter.
If the answer is "helps sometimes" then underline the letter.

For instance, let's do "a" together:

. (MARK EACH LETTER IN ONLY ONE WAY)

a. Who sees to it that the children in your family get out of the bed at th right time? M F O X B S

b. Who sees to it that the children get washed and dressed?
M F O X B S

c. Who gets dad's breakfast?
M F O X B S

d. Who gets your breakfast?
M F O X B S

e. Who buys the food?
M F O X B S

f. Who does the washing?
M F O X B S

g. Who does the ironing?
M F O X B S

h. Who mows the lawn?
M F O **X** B S

i. Who chops the wood?
M F O X B S

j. If something gets broken who fixes it?
M F O X B S

k. Who cooks the meals?
M F O X B S

l. Who sees to it that you eat all the food you are given?
M F O X B S

m. Who clears the table?
M F O X B S

n. Who does the dishes?
M F O X B S

o. Who gives you your spending money?
M F O X B S

p. Who goes to visit mother's relatives?
M F O X B S

q. Who invites visitors to your house?
M F O X B S

r. Who goes to the movies at night?
M F O X B S

s. Who goes to visit father's relatives?
M F O X B S

t. Who sends you to bed?
M F O X B S

u. Who locks up the house at night?
M F O X B S

13. SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND GOALS

a. In general, how do you like school? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

_____a lot
_____some
_____don't know
_____not much
_____don't like it at all

b. What one subject do you like best at school?_____

c. Which one do you do poorest in?_____

d. When you finish the eighth grade do you want to go to high school?
Yes_____ No_____

e. If you finish high school would you want to go to college if you had the chance? Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

f. How many of your brothers and sisters are still in school?
brothers_____ sisters_____ none_____

g. How many of you brothers have graduated from high school? WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YOUR brothers_____ sisters_____ none_____

h. Has anyone in your family ever been a policeman or some other officer in the government? Yes_____ No_____
If yes,
What office?_____ Which member?_____

14. ASPIRATIONS

a. What famous person would you like to be like when you grow up?
_____

b. Why would you want to be like this person?_____

c. Now, name some one who is famous that you would not like to be like
_____

d. Why would you not like to be like this person?_____

e. Now tell which person whom you actually know that you would like to be like when you grow up._____

f. Why would you like to be like this person?_____

g. Now tell which person whom you actually know that you would not like to be like when you grow up._____

h. Why would you not like to be like this person?_____
_____

15. OCCUPATIONAL INTERESTS AND GOALS

a. We are going to read a list of jobs and want you to tell whether you would or would not want to have them when you are older.

	WOULD	WOULD NOT
bank teller		
mechanic		
bookkeeper		
bus driver		
department store salesman		
doctor		
professional football player		
insurance agent		

	WOULD	WOULD NOT
truck driver		
lawyer		
mail driver		
laborer		
musician		
teacher		
brick layer		
policeman		
county judge		

b. When you finally deicde on the job you will work at during your adult life, which of these three things will you consider most? Which the least? (PUT + BESIDE MOST IMPORTANT AND A "0" BESIDE LEAST IMPORTANT AND LEAVE ONE BLANK)

1. how much money you will make_____
2. whether you like the job or not_____
3. how close it is to home_____

c. What kind of job do you actually think you will be in when you grow up?

_____

d. If you got a chance soon to enter that job, which would you do: (CHECK ONLY ONE)

1. quit school and take it_____
2. finish at least eighth grade before taking any job_____
3. finish at least high school before taking any job_____
4. take the job and plan to get more schooling later_____

e. What would your mother say? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

1. quit school and take it_____
2. finish at least eighth grade before taking any job_____
3. finish at least high school before taking any job_____
4. take the job and plan to get more schooling later_____

f. What would your father say? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

1. quit school and take it_____
2. finish at least eighth grade before taking any job_____
3. finish at least high school before taking any job_____
4. take the job and plan to get more schooling later_____

SCHOOL_____ Case Number _____

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Study of Knox County Community Action Program
Under the
Office of Economic Opportunity
(Family Behavior Patterns)

MOTHERS SCHEDULE
(Time II)

Respondent's Name:_____

Son's Name:_____

Community Area*:_____

Interview began at: _____AM _____PM

Interview ended at: _____AM _____PM

Total interview time: _____

Interviewer's name:_____

INTRODUCTION: Good morning (afternoon). My name is _____. I am from the University of Kentucky and have been given the responsibility of collecting some information that is needed in connection with a research project that U. K. is undertaking.

This research project is to study the effects of Community action program on the families of Knox County. In order to do this we need to know some details about Knox County families and their participation in various formal and informal social activities. We had approached you last year also, and very much appreciated your cooperation in giving us the information. We are asking you to participate in this research project by answering some more questions for us. All the replies you will give will be kept <u>confidential</u>.

For office use only:

ID Number ___ ___ ___ (1 2 3)

Card number 7/4

Community ___ ___ (5 6)

I. EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN KCOEO PROGRAMS

7. Have you heard about community centers operated by the government in Knox County?

1_____no
2_____yes

8. If yes, which is the closest center from where you live? _____

_____

9. Approximately how far is the center from your home?

1_____less than ½ mile
2_____between ½ mile to 1 mile
3_____1 mile to 1½ miles
4_____1½ miles to 2 miles
5_____2 miles to 3 miles
6_____3 miles to 4 miles
7_____4 miles to 5 miles
8_____5 miles to 6 miles
9_____over 6 miles

10. Have you or any other member of your family ever visited the community center in your neighborhood?

1_____no
2_____yes

11. Have you or any other member of your family ever taken part in any activities at the community center?

1_____no
2_____yes

12. If answer to question #11 is "NO" ask: Why have you <u>never</u> taken part in any activities at the community center?

_____ ( )

_____ ( )

13. If answer to question #11 is "YES," ask: Who participated in the community center activities?

2_____children only
3_____mother only
4_____father only
5_____mother and father
6_____mother and children
7_____father and children
8_____mother, father, and children
1_____not applicable

14. If you have taken part in the center's activities in the past do you still continue to participate?

2_____no
3_____yes
1_____not applicable (never participated)

15-16. If answer to question #14 is "NO", ask:

a. When did you stop participating in the center?

2_____after one or two visits
3_____after participating for a month or two
4_____after two-six months of participation
5_____after seven-twelve months of participation
6_____after participating for more than one year
1_____not applicable

b. Why did you stop participating in the center?

_____ ( )

_____ ( )

17. Do the other members of your family who have taken part in the center's activities in the past still continue to participate?

2_____yes (all continue to participate)
3_____yes (some continue to participate)
4_____no (none continues to participate)
1_____not applicable (none ever participated)

18. If answer to question #17 is "3" or "4" ask: Why did they stop participating? _____

_____

( )
( )

19. Do you or any other member of your family ever discuss the activities of the community center at home?

1_____no
2_____yes

20-21. If answer to question 19 is "YES" ask:

a. Who tends to like most the programs and activities of the center?

3_____children
4_____mother
5_____father
6_____4 and 5
7_____4 and/or 5 and children
2_____none
1_____not applicable (never discussed)

b. Who dislikes most, the programs and activities of the center?

3_____children
4_____mother
5_____father
6_____4 and 5
7_____4 and/or 5 and children
2_____none
1_____not applicable

22. What is your opinion about the community center?

2_____very poor
3_____poor
4_____average
5_____good
6_____excellent

23. What is your husband's opinion about the community center?

2_____very poor
3_____poor
4_____average
5_____good
6_____excellent

24. Have you heard of the Family Development Program?

1_____no
2_____yes

25. Have you or your family ever taken part in any activities of the Family Development Program?

1_____no
2_____yes

26. If answer is "NO," ask: Why have you never participated? _____

_____ ( )

_____ ( )

27. If the answer to question #25 is "YES," ask: Do you still continue to participate in the Family Development Program?

2_____no
3_____yes
1_____not applicable

28. What specific activities of the Family Development Program appear to be most useful for your neighborhood? _____

_____

29. What specific activities of the Family Development Program are of special interest to you? _____

_____ ( )
( )

You are perhaps aware that there are certain other programs that are being operated by the government in Knox County. We would like to know about your family's participation in them as well.

Programs	Not Applicable 1*	PARTICIPATION None 2	Very Little 3	Occassionally 4	Most of the Time 5	Regularly 6
30. Counseling Center						
31. Early Childhood Program						
32. Health Program						
33. Youth Activities Program						
34. Other (specify)						

*Will include:
1) No such program in the neighborhood
2) No family member of appropriate age

35. Now looking back at the various programs operated by the government under KCOEO, are there any programs which have helped you with some aspects of your family life?

Programs	Aspects of family life helped
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

( )

( )

In general, do you think there have been any real changes in the last two years or three years around here? We would like you to think about this general question in regard, specifically, to each of the following?

36. In jobs and ways of finding them?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, in what ways?

_____

_____

37. In income and level of living?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, how? _____

_____

38. In the way things are run or decisions are made in this neighborhood?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, how, or in what ways? _____

_____

39. In the way things are run or decisions are made in this county?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, in what ways?

_____

_____

40. In the way schools are run in Knox County?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, in what ways?

_____

_____

41.. In the way welfare works here in Knox County?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, in what ways?

_____

_____

42. In the way recreation is organized or available in Knox County?

2_____no change 3_____changed If changed, in what ways?

_____

Have you or any other member of your family ever been a member, or a committee member, or an officer of the following?

	Was/Now A Member			Was/Now A Committee Member			Was/Now An Officer		
	No 1	Was 2	Now 2	No 1	Was 3	Now 3	No 1	Was 4	Now 4
43. Your Center or Neighborhood's Local Action Group									
44. Your Association of Local Action Group									
45. The Knox County Economic Opportunity Council									

II. PARTICIPATION IN OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Do you or any other member of your family belong to and/or participate in any of the following kinds of organizations?

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION	Membership No (1)	Membership Yes	Member/s wife	Member/s husband	Member/s child	Participation Never 2	Participation Sometimes 3	Participation Regularly 4
46. Service Clubs, such as Rotary, Jr. Chamber of Commerce, etc.								
47. School Service Groups, such as PTA or Alumni Association, etc.								
48. Labor Unions such as United Construction Workers, American Federation of Labor, United Mine Workers of America, etc.								
49. Youth Groups, such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Club, NYC, Future Farmers of America.								
50. Farm Organization, such as Farmer's Union, Farm Bureau, Grange, etc.								
51. Other Organizations not listed above Specify.								

_____ _____

_____ _____

III. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND MOBILITY

52. What was your total family income last year?

1_____less than $1,000
2_____$1,000 -1,499
3_____$1,500-1,999
4_____$2,000-2,499
5_____$2,500-2,999
6_____$3,000-3,499
7_____$3,500-3,999
8_____$4,000-5,999
9_____$6,000-and over

53. How does your family income compare with what it was earlier in your married life?

1_____much more earlier than at present
2_____somewhat more
3_____about the same
4_____somewhat less
5_____much less

54.55. What is your husband's present job? (GET DETAILS)

_____( )

_____( )

56. What was your husband's job right after your marriage?

_____( )
( )

57. q If husband is unemployed, ASK: How long has your husband been unemployed?

1_____not applicable (Husband is not unemployed)
2_____laid off temporarily
3_____less than a month
4_____a month --(less than) 6 months
5_____6 months--(less than) a year
6_____one year--(less than) 2 years
7_____2 years--(less than) 5 years
8_____5 years--(less than) 10 years
9_____10 years or more

58. If the husband is unemployed, ASK: Is he available for work?

1_____not applicable (husband is not retired)
2_____no (is disabled)
3_____yes, but is not very keen to get work
4_____yes, and is quite anxious to get work

59. If the husband is retired, ASK: How long has he been retired?

1_____not applicable (husband is employed)
2_____less than a month
3_____a month--(less than) 6 months
4_____6 months--(less than) a year
5_____1 year--(less than) 2 years
6_____2 years--(less than) 5 years
7_____5 years--(less than) 10 years
8_____10 years or more

60-61. If the husband is retired or unemployed ASK: What had been his main job? _____( )

_____( )

62. Are there any male children in your family who are not in school and who are not employed?

1_____no
_____yes

If yes, ASK: How many?

2_____one
3_____two
4_____three
5_____four or more

63. Are there any female children in your family who are not in school and who are not employed?

1_____no
_____yes

If yes, ASK: How many?

2_____one
3_____two
4_____three
5_____four or more

64. Would you be willing for your children to take a job somewhere else?

1_____no
2_____yes, but would want them to try only in Knox County
3_____yes, but would want them to try only in Eastern Kentucky
4_____yes, but would want them to try only in neighboring states
5_____yes, but would want them to try only in Kentucky State
6_____yes, and would want them to try in distant states as well

65. Last year did your family get any income from?

1_____farming
2_____unemployed fathers (W.E.&T.)
3_____Aid to Dependent Children
3_____public assistance
1_____government pension
1_____your job
1_____your husband's job
1_____your children's job
2_____any combination of 1 and 3 (specify) _____

66. Does your family have any piece of land on which it grows things?

1_____no, does not have any land
2_____yes, has a piece but does not grow things on it
3_____yes, has a piece and grows things on it but does not sell them
4_____yes, has a piece, and grows things on it and sells them

67. Does your husband do some other work, in addition to his main job, to supplement the family income?

1_____no
2_____yes (specify) _____

and how many days out of the year? _____( )
( )

68. Do you own or do you rent this house?

1_____own
2_____rent free
3_____rent, how much? _____per month

69. If the answer to question #68 is "1" ASK: Did you or your husband inherit this house or did both of you buy/construct it?

2_____wife inherited
3_____husband inherited
4_____bought
5_____constructed
1_____not applicable

For Office Use Only:

_____ _____ _____ 8 _____ _____
1 2 3 4 5

IV FEELING OF ECONOMIC SECURITY AND FUTURE HOPES AND ASPIRATIONS

6. In general how would you describe your present financial condition?

1_____not too good
2_____fair
3_____good
4_____very good

7. Did you ever face the possibility of your husband getting a large cut in income or being out of work for several months?

1_____yes
2_____no

8. On the whole, what would you say your financial future looks like?

1_____uncertain, don't know, depends
2_____not too good
3_____fair
4_____good
5_____very good

9. Are there times when you feel you have to deny yourself of many things you want because of your income?

1_____yes
2_____no

10. Suppose you run into an unexpected heavy expense, do you feel that your income and savings will be enough to handle them?

1_____no
2_____depends on_____
3_____yes

11. All in all, what kind of breaks do you feel you and your husband are having financially?

4_____very good
3_____good
2_____fair
1_____not too good or poor

12. How important is it for you to have a bigger income?

1_____not very important
2_____very important

13. How does your husband feel about it?

1_____feels that it is not very important to have a bigger income
2_____feels that it is very important to have a bigger income

14. Would you be satisfied if your son "X" when he reaches his father's age is in the same kind of work that his father is now in?

1_____yes
2_____no

15. Would you be satisfied if your children receive the same amount of education as you and/or your husband have?

1_____yes
2_____no

16. Would you be satisfied if your children, when they reach your age, have the same income and live in the same way as you and your husband do?

1_____yes
2_____no

17. How much schooling do you think "X" ought to get?

1_____grade school
2_____high school
3_____college

18. Do you expect your children to go beyond eighth grade of school and also to college or business training?

1_____no; probably not
2_____depends on _____
3_____yes beyond eighth grade
4_____yes beyond high school

19. If you are interested in their getting a college education, how do you expect this college education to be paid for? _____

_____

( )
( )

20. Would you be willing to send your daughter/s to college even if it meant serious financial hardship for the family?

1_____no
2_____qualified yes_____
3_____yes

21. Would you be willing to send your son/s to college even if it meant serious financial hardship for the family?

1_____no
2_____qualified yes_____
3_____yes

22-33.

People feel differently about the importance of getting ahead in life. Some people would give up a lot in order to get ahead, while others will think that other things are more important and will not be willing to give them up. I shall read to you some such things and would like you to respond to them according to how you feel about them.

a. If getting ahead meant that you had to move to a strange part of the country, would you be willing to move?

1_____no
3_____yes

b. If moving meant you were to lose your friends would you still be willing to move?

1_____would not be willing
2_____would be willing to leave them
3_____would be glad to

c. Would you be willing to entertain people because they were connected with your husband's work, even though you might not like them?

1_____no
3_____yes

d. In order to get ahead, would you be willing to become more active in community organizations and clubs not of your own choice?

1_____no
3_____yes

e. Would you be willing to leave your close relatives in order to get ahead?

1_____would not be willing
2_____would prefer not
3_____would be willing to leave them
4_____would be glad to

f. Would you be willing to postpone having another child in order to get ahead?

1_____no
3_____yes

g. Would you be willing to keep quiet about your religious views in order to get ahead?

1_____no
3_____yes

h. Would you be willing to join another church in order to get ahead?

1_____not applicable (does not belong to a church)
2_____no
4_____yes

i. Would you be willing to move to a less pleasant neighborhood temporarily in order to get ahead?

1_____no
3_____Yes

j. Would you be willing to live temporarily in less desirable housing in order to get ahead?

1_____no
3_____yes

k. Would you be willing to have your husband take a chance on a job that he might be less certain of holding, if it had better opportunities?

1_____no
3_____yes

l. If getting ahead meant that you would see less of your husband because he would spend more time at work, would you be willing to do this?

1_____no
3_____yes

34. Some people think that just any young man with thrift, ability, and ambition has the opportunity to rise in the world, own his own home and earn at least $6,000 a year. Do you agree or disagree with this?

1_____agree
2_____don't know
3_____disagree

35. When a young man is considering his life work which do you think is the most important thing he could think about in making his choice? (ask each of the following and check one)

_____the amount of money he will earn
_____how much he will like or enjoy the job ( )
_____how close he will be to home ( )

36. If your husband was asked the same question as the one above what do you think will be his reply?

_____the amount of money is important in making a choice
_____the amount of enjoyment is important in making a choice
_____the nearness to home is important
_____hubband is not interested in these matters ( )
_____don't know ( )

37. Some people feel they can make pretty definite plans for their lives for the next few years, while others feel that they are not in a position to plan ahead. How about you?

1_____no, I am not able to plan ahead
3_____yes, I am able to plan ahead

38. Do you think you know, and are you looking forward to, the kind of life you will have after the next few years?

1_____no
3_____yes

39. How much would you admire or disapprove of a person who is satisfied with his lot in life?

4____admire him much for it
3___think it is alright
2____be mildly disapproving of him
1____be highly disapproving of him

40-41. If you had your choice about the kind of boy you'd like your son to be, what three of the following things would you say you most want or like him to be?

_____affectionate
_____ambitious
_____considerate
_____dependable
_____good mannered
_____honest
_____hard working
_____obedient
_____popular/well liked
_____religious
_____restrained (possessing self-control)

( )40
( )

( )41
( )

V. FAMILISM: NUCLEAR AND EXTENDED FAMILY INTERACTION

42. How often do you attend events such as fairs, sport events, games, picnics, movies etc. together as a whole family?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Only some of the time 3_____Usually; 4_____almost always

43. How often do you go to town together as a whole family?

1____Hardly ever; 2_____Only some of the time 3____Usually; 4____almost always

44. How often do you do things together in the evenings as a whole family?

1____Hardly ever; 2_____Only some of the time 3_____Usually; 4____almost always

45. How often do you work on farm or in home together as a whole family?

1____Hardly ever; 2____Only some of the time 3____Usually 4_____almost always

46. How often does your family conduct religious activities together?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Some times; 3_____Quite often

47. How often do you discuss important things like your future with your husband?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Sometimes; 3_____Quite often

48. How often do you discuss your children's future with your husband?

1_____Hardly ever; 2____Sometimes; 3_____Quite often

49. How often do you help your children with their school work and problems?

1_____Hardly ever; 2____Sometimes; 3_____Quite often

50. How often do you discuss your children's school situation with the teacher?

1____Hardly ever; 2____Sometimes 3_____ Quite often

51. How often do you participate with your sons in their vocational activities or hobbies?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Sometimes; 3_____Quite often

52. How often does your husband participate with sons in their vocational activities or hobbies?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Sometimes; 3____Quite often

53. How often can you count on someone to take care of the children?

1_____Hardly ever; 2_____Only some of the time; 3_____Usually; 4____almost always

54. How often can you count on your husband to take care of the children?

1_____hardly ever; 2_____only some of the time; 3_____usually

4_____Almost always

55. Who besides your husband and children help you in your household tasks?

1_____no one
2_____your mother
2_____your sister
3_____your husband's mother
3_____your husband's sister
4_____(any combination of 2 and 3)
5_____other relatives
6_____neighbors

56. How often can you count on someone other than your husband to help you around the house?

1_____hardly ever; 2_____sometimes; 3_____often; 4_____very often

For Office Use Only

1 2 3 4 5

VI RELIGIOUSNESS

6. Which church are you now attending?
   1_____None
   2_____Baptist
   3_____Christian (Disciples of Christ)
   4_____Church of Christ
   5_____Holiness
   6_____Lutheran
   7_____Methodist
   8_____Presbyterian
   9_____Other (specify)_____

7. How far is your home from your church building?
   1_____less than ½ mile
   2_____between ½ mile and 1 mile
   3_____1 mile to 1½ miles
   4_____1½ miles to 2 miles
   5_____2 miles to 3 miles
   6_____3 miles to 4 miles
   7_____4 miles to 5 miles
   8_____5 miles to 6 miles
   9_____over 6 miles
   0_____not applicable (does not attend any church)

8. To what extent is religion included in the home activities of your family? (For example, family prayers, reading the Bible or other religious materials, saying grace at meals and so forth.)
   1_____never
   2_____hardly ever
   3_____once in a while
   4_____once a week
   5_____daily

9-13. How often do you do the following? (Check)

	Never	A few times a year or less	About twice a month	Every week	More than once a week
	1	2	3	4	5
Go to a regular religious service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Talk with people about their religious conditinn	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Talk over with a minister your personal problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Attend special religious sponsored group meeting or activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

14. Do you pray privately (other than in church)?

1_____no
2_____yes

15. If yes, ask, what are the two most important reasons for which you pray? CHECK ONLY TWO.

_____as a Christian duty
_____to find comfort when I am feeling low
_____to strengthen my faith
_____to try to learn God's will and seek His guidance
_____because it gives me a feeling of being closer to God
_____to ask forgiveness for something I have done
_____To ask God to bring someone else to Christian faith and belief
_____To be in touch with God and thank Him for what He has done
_____Other (specify) _____

( )
( )

16-20. Have you ever prayed during your adult years for following purposes?

	1 No	2 Yes
To ask for some material thing (a car, new house)	_____	_____
To ask God to keep some misfortune from happening to you	_____	_____
To ask God to restore your health	_____	_____
To ask God to restore someone else's health	_____	_____
None of these	_____	_____

21. Thinking now of your daily life and decisions that you have to constantly make about how to spend your time, how to act with other people, how to bring up your children, to what extent does what you have read in the Bible help you in making everyday decisions in your life?

1_____to be frank I hardly ever think of the Bible and what it has to say as I go about in my daily life.
2_____While I can't think of specific examples, nevertheless I feel sure that the Bible is still of help in my daily life.
3_____I can think of specific times when it has helped me in a very direct way in making decisions in life.
4_____Other (specify) _____

_____

22. Do you ever make it a point of listening to, or watching, religious services on radio or television?

2_____No, never or practically never
3_____Very seldom
4_____Yes, sometimes
5_____Yes, regularly
1_____Not applicable

23. How religious minded would you say you say you are? (In comparison with most of the people you know)

1_____not at all
2_____less than most
3_____about the same
4_____more than most
5_____very religious

24. How do you feel about the future of the Protestant Church in general?

4_____It will probably gain more influence
3_____It will continue about the same
2_____It will probably lose some influence
1_____It will probably grow rather weak

25. Do you think your church should offer a full program of recreation for its youth?

1_____no
2_____yes

26. Do you think your church should offer programs of social activities for all age groups?

1_____no
2_____ yes

27. Would you like somebody in your family to be a missionary who might have to leave the country?

1_____no
2_____yes

VII. OPINIONS ABOUT CHILDREN AND WOMAN'S ROLE

A. Different parents expect different things from their children. Some parents expect complete obedience from their children while others encourage their children to think for themselves. Likewise, there are parents who believe that their children especially when they are staying with them should hand over almost all of their earnings to their parents while there are other parents who do not expect any money from their children. We would like to know how you feel about these things.

28. 1____Children under 18 should always obey their elders
2____Children under 18 should obey their parents and older brothers if their parents tell them to do so.
3____Children should be encouraged to think for themselves.

29. 1____Children (residing with parents) should hand over all their earnings to their parents
2____Parents should expect their children to hand over some (board) of their earnings to them
3____Parents should not expect any money from their children but may take it if offered.

B. Having children means different things to different people and at times husband and wife also have different views on having children. We would like to know your ideas and your husband's about having children.

30. Let us begin with the reasons for desiring children. I shall read to you some of the reasons people give for desiring children and would like you to tell me which two of them appear to be the most important to you:

____having children is important because it is the main purpose of one's getting married
____having children is important because a woman is not a woman unless she bears children
____children are fun, it is fun to watch them growing
____one needs them for continuation of one's family name
____having children is important because it helps the husband to prove that he is a man
____having children is important because they are needed for one's old age comforts
____having children is important because heaven will be a happier place with a large family
____having children is important because they help around the house
____children prevent loneliness
____having children is important because the first child needs company

( )
( )

31. What would be your husband's response to these?

_____having children is important because it is the main purpose of one's getting married.
_____having children is important because a woman is not a woman unless she bears children
_____children are fun, it is fun to watch them growing
_____one needs them for continuation of one's family name
_____having children is important because it helps the husband prove that he is a man
_____having children is important because they are needed for one's old age comforts
_____ having children is important because heaven will be a happier place with a large family
_____having children is important because they help around the house and farm
_____children prevent loneliness
_____having children is important because the first child needs company

32. How many children should a couple have?

1_____not more than two
2_____three to four
3_____five to six
4_____seven to eight
5_____nine to ten
6_____more than ten (specify) _____
7_____one should have as many as one can afford
7_____one should have as many as one's health would permit
8_____one should have as many as God gives
9_____other (specify) _____

33. What do you think is your husband's view about it?

1_____not more than two
2_____three to four
3_____five to six
4_____seven to eight
5_____nine to ten
6_____more than ten(specify) _____
7_____one should have as many as one can afford
7_____one should have as many as one's health would permit
8_____one should have as many as God gives
9_____other (Specify) _____

34. Do you think any couple can limit the number of children if they want to?

1_____no
2_____yes

*35. Do you think that one should try to control the number of children or leave it to nature?

1_____control
2_____leave it to nature

*36. If a couple decides to limit the number of children who do you think should have the major responsibility for doing something about it?

1_____wife
2_____husband
3_____both equally

37. Have you ever discussed limiting the number of children in your family with your husband?

1_____no
2_____yes

*38. Have you ever tried to do something about it?

1_____no
2_____yes

*39. If yes, what has been your husband's reaction?

2_____ resistance
3_____indifference
4_____active cooperation
1_____not applicable

40. Thinking of all the women you know, which of the following best describes the one you most admire?

1_____A woman who is a good cook and a good housekeeper
2_____A woman to whom nothing is more important than keeping her children well-fed and properly cared for.
6_____A woman who gives more importance to outside the home interest, expecially the ones which are of interest to her husband, so that she and her husband have many common things to talk about.
9_____A woman who is more concerned with "outside interests" because she herself wants to go ahead individually

3____Combination of 1 and 2
4____Combination of 1 or 2 and 6
5____Combination of 1 and 2 and 6
7____Combination of 4 and 9
8____Combination of 6 and 9

41. How sure are you that you have found the answer to the meaning and purpose of life?

1____I am quite certain and I pretty much grew up knowing these things

2____I am quite certain, although at one time I was pretty uncertain

3____I am uncertain whether or not I have found them

4____I don't really believe there are answers to these questions

40-51. Thus far we have been talking specifically about you and your family. Let us now spend some time talking of general things in life. I shall read to you some statements concerning some general things of life and would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with them.

Poverty just happens and nothing much can be done to prevent it.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

One may work hard but success and failure lie in the hands of God.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

It does not make any difference whether or not you plan for future because most of the things that happen, happen because God wished them to be so.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

One's future is so unpredictable that no one can possibly know what type of life one will have after the next few days.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

Having faith is better for solving important problems in life than thinking them through.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

When in doubt the best thing is to stop and ask God what to do.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

Most difficulties in life can be over come by prayers.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

One should not worry too much about the welfare of one's children because God who brings them on earth knows best how to provide for them.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse not better.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

God has a plan for the life of every individual.

1_____agree 3_____disagree

TO BE FILLED IN BY INTERVIEWER

Overall Response:

_____a. enthusiasm
_____b. willing cooperation
_____c. passive response
_____d. reluctance

Points on which she was enthusiastic: (if any)

a._____
b._____
c._____
d._____

Points on which she tried to by-pass the issue: (if any)

a._____
b._____
c._____
d._____

Points on which she expressed her feeling of definite reluctance in answering the questions: (if any)

a._____
b._____
c._____
d._____

Actual distance between her home and the closest center: _____miles

Actual distance between her home and her church building: _____miles

Any other information that you can add about her and her family situation?

_____

Any special comment or feeling noticed on OEO program in anyway?

BOYS SCHEDULE

(Time II)

Name _____
Last First Middle

Age _____ Years Birth Month _____

Father's Name _____

Mother's Name _____

Address _____

School _____

For Office Use:

I.D. Number ___ ___ ___
1 2 3

Card Number 0
4

School ___ ___
5 6

7. Where do you live? (CHECK ONE)

_____Artemus
_____Bailey Switch
_____Bethel
_____Cannon
_____Clate
_____Flat Lick
_____Golden Creek
_____Grays
_____Groves
_____Harp's Fork
_____Jackson
_____Kay Jay
_____Ketchen
_____Messer
_____Middle Fork
_____Prichard Branch
_____Turkey Creek
_____Trosper Creek
_____Wilton
_____Other (specify) _____
_____Don't Know

( )
( )

8. Who lives in your house with you? (CHECK ALL THOSE WHO ARE LIVING WITH YOU)

_____Mother
_____Father
_____Brother/s
_____Sister/s
_____Mother's parent/s
_____Father's parent/s
_____Mother's brother
_____Mother's sister
_____Father's brother
_____Father's sister
_____Cousin/s
_____Nephew/niece
_____Other/s, how many? _____

( )
( )

9. What is your father's job? (CHECK THE ONE WHICH COMES CLOSEST TO WHAT YOUR FATHER DOES)

_____Accountant
_____Lawyer
_____Barber
_____Carpenter
_____Civil Servant
_____Clerk
_____Coal Miner
_____Construction Worker
_____Janitor
_____Doctor
_____Elected Officer
_____Electrician
_____Electronics technician
_____Engineer
_____Factory worker
_____Farmer
_____Day Laborer
_____Policeman
_____Mason
_____Mechanic
_____Store Keeper
_____Preacher
_____Undertaker
_____Painter
_____Druggist
_____Post Master
_____Railroad worker
_____Salesman
_____Sawmill worker
_____Teacher
_____Truck/bus driver
_____W. E. & T.
_____Unemployed
_____Retired
_____Don't Know

( )
( )

10. Of all the jobs you might have, would you rather have the job your father has?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

11-12 What kind of job would you like to have when you are grown up?

_____

( )
( )

13. Jobs now are described as unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, professional, etc. In which of the following categories would the job of your choice (which you just wrote) fit?

_____unskilled
_____semiskilled
_____skilled
_____white collar
_____business
_____profession
_____don't know

( )
( )

14. Would you rather work for someone else who would pay you or would you prefer to work by yourself?

1_____rather work for someone else
2_____rather not work for someone else

15. Would you be willing to leave Knox County to get the kind of job you like?

_____Yes
1_____No

If you say "yes", how far would you be willing to go?

2_____Eastern Kentucky
3_____Any part of Kentucky
4_____Another nearby state (like Tenn. or Ohio)
5_____Any far off state (like New York, Florida)

16. What kind of schooling do you think a person ought to get in order to have the kind of job you would like to have?

_____Grade school
_____High school
_____College
_____Technical or special education
_____Don't Know

( )
( )

17. How much schooling do you expect to get?

1_____Grade school
2_____High school
3_____College
4_____Technical or special education

18. If you are interested in getting high school or college education how do you expect it to be paid for?
2_____I hope my parents will pay for it.
3_____I am sure that my parents will pay for it.
4_____I may get some scholarship.
5_____I will work in order to pay for my education.
6_____I have never thought about it.

19. How do you like your school this year?
5_____very much
4_____quite a bit
3_____don't know
2_____not much
1_____don't like it at all

20. What subject do you like the best? (CHECK ONE)
1_____History
2_____Geography
3_____English
4_____Math
5_____Music
6_____Science
7_____Spelling
8_____Other (specify) _____

21-28 In view of the job that you would like to have when you grow up, which subjects are very important for you to learn?
(CHECK AS MANY AS YOU THINK ARE IMPORTANT)
_____History
_____Geography
_____English
_____Math
_____Music
_____Science
_____Spelling
_____Other (specify) _____

NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT YOUR TWO CLOSEST FRIENDS

Let us start with one of them.

What is his name? _____

29. How much schooling does he expect to get?
1_____Grade school
2_____High school
3_____College
4_____Technical or special education
0_____Don't know

30. What is his father's job _____ ( )
( )

Now let us know something about your other friend

What is his name? _____

31. How much schooling does he expect to get?
1_____grade school
2_____high school
3_____college
4_____technical or special education
0_____don't know

32. What is his father's job? _____ ( )
( )

33-38 SOME PEOPLE LIKE FRIENDS AND COMPANY MORE THAN OTHERS. BELOW ARE STATEMENTS ABOUT FRIENDS AND SOCIAL LIVING. INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THEM BY CHECKING "YES" IF YOU AGREE AND "NO" IS YOU DISAGREE.
(CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER EACH TIME)

a. I would like to live in a neighborhood where neighbors visit with each other quite often?
2_____Yes 1_____No

b. I just can not think of going out on a trip unless I have some friends joining me.
2_____Yes 1_____No

c. I enjoy my studies and other things that I do so much that I do not have much time to spend with my friends.
1_____Yes 2_____No

d. I do not care to have much to do with those boys whose ideas are different from mine.
1_____Yes 2_____No

e. I enjoy going to those places only where I can meet many people.
2_____Yes 1_____No

f. I would like to have a big house with enough space for my friends to come by and visit with me whenever they feel like it.
2_____Yes 1_____No

39. Is there any particular place around your community (other than your school) where you often get together with either boys or girls?

2_____Yes
1_____No If yes, name it. _____

40-41 Are there any places in Knox County outside your neighborhood where you get together with either boys or girls?

2_____Yes
1_____No

If yes, name them 2 _____

3 _____

4 _____

( )
( )

42. Do you belong to any organization or club such as Boy Scouts, 4-H club, Future Farmers of America etc.?

2_____Yes
1_____No

If yes, name them

2_____

3_____

4_____

5_____

43. Have you ever been a member of an athletic team?

2_____Yes
1_____No

44. Have you ever been an officer of a club or an athletic team?

2_____Yes
1_____No

45. Do you ever take part in any meeting where people ask you what you think?

2_____Yes
1_____No

46. Did you ever say what you think out loud to the group in a meeting?

2_____Yes
1_____No

47. Have you ever heard about the community centers operated by the government in Knox County, under the OEO program?

2_____Yes
1_____No

48. If yes, what is the closest one from where you live?

1_____Barbourville
2_____Bethel
3_____Cannon
4_____Flat Lick
5_____Fount
6_____Grays
7_____Grove
8_____Jackson
9_____Kay Jay
10_____Ketchen
11_____Messer
12_____Middle Fork
13_____Rosenwald-Boone
14_____Wilton
15_____Other (specify) _____

49. About how far is your home from the closest center to you?

1_____less than ½ mile
2_____between ½ mile and 1 mile
3_____1 mile to 1½ miles
4_____1½ miles to 2 miles
5_____2 miles to 3 miles
6_____3 miles to 4 miles
7_____4 miles to 5 miles
8_____5 miles to 6 miles
9_____over six miles

50. Did you ever go to an OEO community center?

2_____Yes
1_____No

51. Have you ever taken part in any of the community center's activities?

2_____have taken part
1_____have never taken part

52. How long has it been since you started taking part in the community center activities?

2_____less than 6 months
3_____6 months to 1 year
4_____more than one year
1_____have never taken part

53. Have you taken part in a center's activities in the past, but do not do so now?

2_____used to take part but no longer do so
3_____still take part
1_____have never taken part in a center's activities

54. If you did take part in the center's activities but have stopped, why did you stop? (Give specific reasons)

_____

_____

( )
( )

55. What do you think about the community center?

2_____poor
3_____average
4_____good
1_____never thought about it

56. In what way would you say the center's activities have been of some help to you? (CHECK AS MANY AS ARE TRUE IN YOUR CASE. BUT OMIT THIS QUESTION IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN TO A COMMUNITY CENTER)

_____helped me with my school work
_____helped me learn to play some new kinds of games
_____helped me learn how to get along with different kinds of persons
_____helped me develop habit of reading books
_____helped me know the type of training I should have to get a job here in Knox County
_____Helped me know what types of jobs I can get if I move out of Knox County
_____none of these
_____any other (write it down) _____
( )
( )

57. Do people get ahead more for being good at something or just because they are "lucky and know the right people"?

1._____people get ahead more for being good at something
2._____people get ahead because they are "lucky and know the right people"

58. How important is it for you personally to get ahead in life?

1_____not very important
2_____very important

59. Realistically speaking, how good do you think your own chances are of getting ahead?

4_____excellent 3_____good 2_____fair 1_____not much chance

60-65 PEOPLE FEEL DIFFERENTLY ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF GETTING AHEAD IN WORK AND IN LIFE GENERALLY. SOME BOYS WOULD GIVE UP A LOT IN ORDER TO GET AHEAD WHILE OTHER BOYS WOULD FEEL THAT OTHER THINGS ARE MORE IMPORTANT AND WOULD NOT BE WILLING TO GIVE THEM UP. GIVEN BELOW IS A LIST OF SUCH THINGS. PLEASE TRY TO ANSWER EITHER "YES" OR "NO" TO EACH OF THESE QUESTIONS.

a. For example, if getting ahead meant that you would have to go without any vacations for several years, will you be willing to do this?

2_____Yes
1_____No

b. Would you be willing to leave your friends in order to succeed in life?

2_____yes
1_____no

c. Would you be willing to give up your leisure time in order to get ahead?

2_____yes
1_____no

d. Would you be willing to move to a strange part of the country in order to get ahead?

2_____yes
1_____no

e. Would you be willing to do less interesting and less enjoyable work in order to get ahead?

2_____yes
1_____no

f. If getting ahead involves not seeing your parents and folks very often would you be willing to go away to work?

2_____yes
1_____no

66. How important do you think it will be for you to get money and material things later in your life?

2_____very important
1_____not very important

67-71. Pick only three of the following which you consider are most important things to get out of life. (CHECK ONLY THREE)

_____owning your own home
_____having a lot of money
_____having lots of friends
_____having people to look up to you
_____having a good steady job

72. Suppose your family unexpectedly got a large sum of money--say $2,000--what would you like to have them do with that money?

_____

( )
( )

For office use only:

1	2	3	4	5	6
			1	1	

7. Some children are interested in collecting things, or taking care of animals, or making things. Which one of the three have you been doing the most? (CHECK ONE)

1_____collecting things
2_____taking care of animals
3_____making things
4_____any other interest (hobby)
5_____none

8. What exactly have you done/made in the past one year as a part of your interest in the above? _____

_____

_____

( )
( )

9. How often does your father help you with this interest?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

10. How often does your mother help you with it?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

11. How often does your father help you with your school work?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

12. How often does your mother help you with your school work?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

13. How often do you help your father with things he does around the house, or farm, or in his workshop, etc?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

14. How often do you help your mother with her work?
1_____hardly ever 2_____sometimes 3_____almost always

15. Do you belong to a church?
2_____yes
1_____no

16. Have you been baptized?
2_____yes
1_____no

17. How often do you go to a religious service of any kind?

1_____never
2_____less than once a month
3_____two to three times a month
4_____every week
5_____more than once a week

18. How often do you pray at home?

1_____never
2_____less than once a month
3_____two to three times a month
4_____every week
5_____more than once a week
6_____every day

19. How religious do you think you are?

1_____not very religious
2_____somewhat religious
3_____very religious

20. Would you like to be a preacher?

2_____yes
1_____no

21-29. Here is a list of the kinds of public servants we have in our county. Check the two you like least.

_____community center's director
_____county judge
_____doctor
_____lawyer
_____minister
_____policeman
_____principal
_____teacher
_____youth counselor

( )
( )

30-34. In the following statements indicate whether you agree or disagree. (CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER EACH TIME)

a. When I grow up I would like to live in a place where it will be easy for relatives to get together.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

b. When I grow up I would like to have a house with enough space for my parents to feel free to move in with me.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

c. I would like my whole family to spend evenings together.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

d. I want a house where most of my family members can spend time together.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

e. It is important for me to own material things such as home, car or clothing, which are better than those of my parents and our neighbors.

2_____yes 1_____no

25. Below is a list of qualities that are considered good for boys to have and to develop in them. We would like you to check from this list the three qualities which you would like to have.

_____being affectionate
_____being ambitious
_____being considerate
_____being dependable
_____being good mannered
_____being honest
_____being hard working
_____being obedient
_____being popular/ well-liked
_____being religious
_____having self control

36-47. BELOW IS A LIST OF STATEMENTS ABOUT THE FAMILY AND LIFE IN GENERAL. READ ALL THE STATEMENTS CAREFULLY WITH ME. CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH STATEMENT.

a. In planning for the future, parents should be considered first.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

b. A boy should be willing to sacrifice everything for his family.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

c. Parents are inclined to be old fashioned in their ideas.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

d. Ones greatest duty is to his family.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

e. The future is too uncertain for a person to plan on having a family.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

f. Education is of no help in getting a job today.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

g. A man with ability and willingness to work hard has a good chance of being successful today.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

h. Success in life seems to depend more on luck than on real ability.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

i. Children under 18 should always obey their parents.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

j. A person should always support his uncles, aunts, and cousins, if they are in need.

2_____agree 1_____disagree

k. A family should always talk over important decisions with close relatives (like uncles, aunts, first-cousins)

2_____agree 1_____disagree

l. Parents expect too much from their children.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

48-53. Now, finally, we would like to know your ideas about what the Office of Economic Opportunity should do in Knox County. Listed below are some things that the OEO program might do in Knox County. Check the three that you think are most important.

_____Help to raise income of poor people

_____Help to provide steady work for poor people

_____Help to make people around here better

_____Help poor people to help themselves

_____Help to get people to work together in the community

_____Help to provide job training for poor people

54-55. Would you agree or disagree with the following:

a. I think the government should spend money only to provide work for poor people.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

b. I think the government should spend money only to provide welfare relief for poor people.

1_____agree 2_____disagree

56. If you were in charge of your Community Center, what one thing would you do to make things better around here?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP