DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 384 VT 012 958

AUTHOR	Zeller, Frederick A.; Miller, Robert W.
TITLE	Strengthening Labor's Role in the War on Poverty. Labor Leadership Training for Community Action in Appalachia.
INSTITUTION	West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. West Virginia Center for Appalachian Studies and Development.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ILS-RS-1
NOTE	92p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Action Programs (Community), Case Studies, *Leadership Training, *Manpower Utilization, *Poverty Programs, *Program Evaluation, Project Training Methods, Trainees
IDENTIFIERS	*Appalachia

ABSTRACT

This report describes the training provided by West Virginia University in cooperation with the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council, of 114 union leaders in the Appalachian Region for work in community action. Some objectives of the training periods, divided into four 1-week sessions, were to help the leaders organize low-income groups for effective self-help activities, to build support for the anti-poverty program within the ranks of labor, to get the trainees thoroughly committed to community action, and to help them realize the importance and relevance of their own roles. The project had a positive impact on improving the attitudes of labor members toward the people in Appalachia, it helped bring out the leader qualities in the trainees, and it strengthened many efforts toward erasing the poverty conditions. It was recommended that this type of program be considered in other areas of the country. (GEB)

REPORT
SERIES NO. 1

STRENGTHENING LABOR'S ROLE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Labor Leadership Training for Community Action in Appalachia

THE INSTITUTE FOR LABOR STUDIES
APPALACHIAN CENTER
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
MORGANTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA

THE INSTITUTE FOR LABOR STUDIES

Functions of the Institute

(1) To conduct an adult education program of University grade for the worker and his Union;
(2) To complement the educational and informational opportunities of an ever-developing urban industrial society;
(3) To assist through education and studies the development of the perspective of the worker, and the manner in which he relates himself to the institutional environment in which he works and lives;
(4) To establish West Virginia University as an intellectual and research center on matters concerned with the problems and opportunities of the workers in a developing society;
(5) To provide educational and research assistance to central labor bodies.

Programs of the Institute

(1) The Union Leadership Academy.
(2) Institutes, conferences, and such other short courses covering educational needs not met by long-term programming.
(3) Research projects pertaining to manpower and labor problems and trends.

Organization of the Institute

The Institute for Labor Studies was established September 1, 1964. The present Institute superceded the Labor Education Service which had carried on labor education programs in West Virginia since 1959.

For Further Information Contact:
Institute for Labor Studies
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
Tel. 293-3323

STRENGTHENING LABOR'S ROLE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Labor Leadership Training for Community Action in Appalachia

A Report of CAP 66-9205
To
The Office of Economic Opportunity

By
Frederick A. Zeller
Project Director

Robert W. Miller
Associate Project Director

Institute for Labor Studies
West Virginia University Center for Appalachian Studies
And Development
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This is a revised draft of the final report of CAP 66-9205, a project designed to train a number of union leaders from ten Appalachian States to help them become more effective leaders in the war against poverty, and in so doing, to involve organized labor more intensively in that effort. With financial resources provided by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity and West Virginia University's Appalachian Center, the project was carried out by the Center's Institute for Labor Studies with the close cooperation and solid support of the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council.

This report is an attempt to describe both the project's methodology and its impact. Awareness of the limited amount of dollar resources available to the Office of Economic Opportunity relative to the almost unlimited need for them resulted in our attempt to evaluate the project somewhat more cautiously and conservatively than might have been the case in other circumstances.

We have deliberately tended to minimize the project's success where any doubt existed about the causes or significance of labor's community action efforts. Whether or not we have succeeded in accomplishing this is best determined by the reader's comparison of the available data and our generalizations based on them.

We admit, however, that evaluation of an effort of this kind is exceedingly difficult, especially one begun while the project was in progress and completed shortly thereafter. First, it is difficult to separate dependent and independent variables with any degree of precision. Next, certain data collection instruments had to be avoided for reasons mentioned in the text. But perhaps most important of all, a project such as this based on both developing particular skills and changing attitudes, and the results of both may not become apparent for many years.

Despite these difficulties, decisions made by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the labor movement, and the University must be based on the best evidence available. We hope this evidence is provided in this report. We hope, too, that the parts of this report which are supported by impressionistic conclusions will be duly considered and regarded as sincere efforts to analyze important phenomena which could not be treated with more objective data.

Needless to say, while we are willing to accept the responsibility for the shortcomings of this project, we wish to express our thanks to those who gave us support, encouragement, and ideas for its design and implementation.

In addition to the University and the Office of Economic Opportunity, we are indebted to the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council, particularly to its chairman, Miles Stanley. Without his efforts this project would not have been possible. Without the Council's support it would have been fruitless.

We also owe a debt of gratitude to West Virginia University's Vice-President Ernest J. Nesius, who found many solutions for administrative problems which had to be overcome.

In addition, the outcome of the project was affected importantly by James Nelson, West Virginia Labor Federation, and the project's staff associates, Robert Winn, Roger Rines and Ronald Ludin. Berkley Watterson and John Carney of the AFL-CIO made significant contributions to the project during its most precarious moments.

Also, we are grateful to Dr. Herbert S. Parnes, of the Ohio State University's Department of Economics who read a draft of the report and offered a number of constructive suggestions which are embodied in this version.

Last, but not least, we owe much to our wives and children, who accepted much less than was their right to demand while this project was conducted. We hope their sacrifices are investments which will lead to a better society in Appalachia.

At the time this is written, the project has been refunded and will continue until July 1, 1968, under the direction of Robert Winn. His staff includes Stephen Cook, Assistant Director of the project, Roger Rines, Edmund Rollo, and Susan Hartmann. James Nelson continues as the Council's coordinator.

FREDERICK A. ZELLER
Project Director and Director of
the Institute for Labor Studies

ROBERT W. MILLER
Associate Project Director and
Assistant Director of the Institute
for Labor Studies

CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Development and Background of the Project

Analysis done in 1965 by several staff members of the Institute for Labor Studies produced the conclusions that the success or failure of anti-poverty efforts would be heavily dependent upon the quantity and quality of local leadership, and that the existence of such leadership could not be assumed, particularly in the Appalachian Region. Moreover, it was concluded that one of the most likely sources of effective community action leadership was the Region's labor movement.

After extensive discussions, agreement was reached between the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council and West Virginia University to attempt to seek support for a project which would have the goal of training approximately 100 union leaders for work in community action.

The University's role, to be carried out by its Institute for Labor Studies, was conceived to be that of designing and providing the training as well as providing follow-up field services of an education-research nature. The Council's role was to be that of selecting the trainees and, thereafter, providing them with support and encouragement.

Accordingly, a proposal was prepared by the University, in consultation with the Council, and forwarded to the Office of Economic Opportunity. After several revisions, the project was funded in late November, 1965, for a period ending November 30, 1966.

In the broadest terms, the goal of the project was to begin to create a new base of leadership for community action in Appalachia. To accomplish this it was intended that training prepare and motivate participating union officials to succeed in assuming the following roles:

(1) to help to communicate the philosophy and aims of the Economic Opportunity Act to low-income groups;
(2) to help organize low-income groups for effective self-help activities;
(3) to facilitate a meaningful dialogue between low-income groups and other segments of Appalachian society;

(4) to promote the development of a decision-making process within Appalachian CAPs which would be informed, progressive, and specifically responsive to the needs of low-income groups;
(5) to generate community support for CAP and other programs of war against poverty in localities where such support did not exist;
(6) to build support for the anti-poverty program within the ranks of labor so that the considerable skills and resources of labor in Appalachia would contribute fully to the anti-poverty effort;
(7) to help facilitate consensus and coordination among various community interest groups and agencies which influence local anti-poverty programs;
(8) to provide information concerning the problems of the poor and the techniques of community action to CAP board members, representives of low-income groups, interested citizens, and other union members

Accomplishment of these roles constituted the specific sub-goals of the project.

The project's budget provided for a part-time director, a full-time associate director and three full-time project associates. The director, Frederick Zeller, and associate director, Robert Miller, were already on the University's staff and began their work immediately after the announcement of the acceptance of the project.

The three project associates were appointed during the first four months of 1966. They were Robert Winn, Ronald Ludin, and Roger Rines. Although the associates were required to perform certain duties at the project's headquarters at West Virginia University as well as serve on the instructional staff during the periods of formal training, their primary responsibility was to provide education-research services to the trainees in their home communities and also report field experiences to project headquarters.

The importance of the field reports was based on the hope that the design of the training could be based on the actual problems encountered by the trainees in their efforts to function as community action leaders.

Each associate was assigned to a certain portion of Appalachian Region.

Robert Winn's area included the Appalachian portions of Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Maryland. Ronald Ludin's area included the Appalachian portions of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. And Roger Rines' area included the Appalachian portions of Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee.

During the first few months of the project's history, it became apparent that the Appalachian Council was being asked to do more

than it was able to do without additional resources, which were not available with its limited budget. Therefore, the Council and the University agreed to submit another proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity requesting funds to permit the Council to add a full-time coordinator to its staff to integrate the work of organized labor and the University's project staff. The proposal was approved and became effective on December 1, 1966, when the new position was filled by James Nelson.

Because of certain delays occasioned by the difficulties of finding staff and working out the details of the project, two requests were made to extend the grant without additional funds. The first request was for an extension from a terminal date of November 30, 1966 to March 31, 1967. The second was for an extension to May 31, 1967. Both requests were approved.

With respect to the development of the schedule of training sessions, it became necessary to depart from the proposed training plan, although these departments had more to do with procedure than substance. As it was executed, the project included four weeks of training.

The first week of training was held at Mont Chateau, near Morgantown, West Virginia, during the week of April 3 to 8, 1966; the second, in Morgantown during the week of April 24 to 29, 1966, the third, at Roanoke, Virginia, during the week of October 2 to 7, 1966, and the fourth week at Gatlinburg, Tennessee, during the week of January 2 to 7, 1967.

The trainees at the sessions were of two types. One type was the state representative, an individual designated by the principal officer of each of the ten cooperating state labor federations to serve as each federation's state-wide community action coordinator. He was to be responsible for coordinating and assisting the work of the other trainees (local representatives) in the state.

Originally, it was planned to do some of the training of the two groups separately; however, this proved to be impractical from the outset and was never attempted. On the other hand, it was contemplated originally that the state representatives would serve in an instructional capacity from time to time during the four weeks of formal training and some of them actually did serve in this capacity.

Throughout the execution of the project, the Institute and the Council attempted to work on a cooperative basis with an open exchange of views and information. The details of the design of the training sessions were a product of the two parties.

John Carney and Berkley Watterson represented the Council in planning the first two weeks and James Nelson functioned in that capacity during the last two weeks. Another example of such

efforts is that the project staff attended a number of the Council's meetings to make progress reports, and, in turn, got the reactions and views of the Council's members. As a final example, no major decisions were made without consulting Council Chairman Miles Stanley.

The concern for close integration of effort and exchange of information and views was necessary for a number of reasons. First, when two different organizations come together for a joint effort such as this, there is always the possibility of unintended consequences.

For example, the project staff's first loyalty and orientation was to the University. This being so, the possibility existed that the staff could plan some project, or engage in some activity, which inadvertently could affect the internal equilibrium of a cooperating labor organization. This would be undesirable from both the point of the Council and of the University, which is concerned solely with education and not the internal politics of the groups with which it works.

Then, too, the project staff's work had to end just short of the "action", admittedly a hazy boundary. Therefore, in order to be able to decide when and where to intervene with their own resources, the labor organizations had to be fully informed about the current status of the project's work.

While, as might have been expected, there were some misunderstandings between the Council and the University's project staff during the eighteen-month duration of the project, the partnership, on the whole, was cordial and stable enough to overcome the disagreements and achieve complete support of the necessary work. Both parties made concessions when their positions were in conflict.

Design of the Training

During the month of December, 1966, the project director and the associate director spent most of their time attempting to conceptualize the project in more detail. Following this, it was decided to convene a group composed of representatives of labor, outside consultants, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and West Virginia University in Washington, D. C. on January 13, 1966, to evaluate the staff's concepts and preliminary plans. The following points were generally agreed upon, and they served as guiding principles throughout the remainder of the project:

(1) a well conceived training program could produce more effective community action leadership among Appalachian trade union officials, although such

work surely would tend to reduce resources available for their unions' internal work;

(2) the Council and its affiliates value the aims of community action highly enough to accept the costs of organized labor's involvement in such projects;

(3) it must be expected that the union officials selected for training would have various degrees of sophistication as labor and community leaders, and the project's plans would have to reflect this;

(4) the training must awaken in the trainees a commitment to their communities and the Appalachian Region which may transcend the short-run interests of the labor movement;

(5) the trainees must receive the active support of the top leaders in the labor movement;

(6) the trainees must be prepared by the training to attract broad support for their work at the community level, including support both from organized labor and other groups as well;

(7) one of the first tasks which the trainees must perform in their communities is the establishment of Economic Opportunity Committees composed of representatives of organized labor; following that, the trainees must train the members to function as community action leaders; (in some cases such committees already had been formed by this date);

(8) various training methodologies must be employed by the training staff;

(9) the project staff must have continuing information about the trainees' field experiences in order to gear the formal training to actual needs;

(10) despite the obvious difficulties, it would be necessary to collect all available data about the project's results in order to assess its value both from the point of view of organized labor and the University.

Following the meeting in Washington, detailed training plans were devised by the project staff and the Council's representatives in the periods prior to the scheduled dates for the four training weeks. Each week was planned separately, reflecting reports from the field, but at the same time the plans were based on a general strategy which can be summarized as follows:

(1) attempt to get the trainees thoroughly committed to community action, including the reduction of un-

employment and poverty and the acceleration of the development of their communities and the Region;

(2) help them to perceive the importance and relevance of their own role and that of their labor organizations in efforts to eliminate poverty;

(3) give them the opportunity to become highly knowledgeable about the political, social, and economic factors which combine to produce the present condition of the Region;

(4) help them see the relationship between the committees' and Region's problems and means available for solving them;

(5) provide them with the opportunity to obtain an extensive knowledge of Federal, state, and other programs which are potential suppliers of resources for community action;

(6) help them develop the ability to understand and implement the strategy necessary to interrelate action programs into a comprehensive attack on social problems;

(7) and, present them with the opportunity to further develop their abilities to work with people both within and outside the labor movement.

Having structured the training weeks along these lines, training methods were selected for the promise they offered for accomplishing project objectives. When the need was to transmit a large amount of information in short periods of time, lectures were used. When attitudinal change was attempted, or when in-depth understanding was required, discussion and laboratory type techniques were used. In some instances, discussion leaders or trainers worked with fairly small groups, and in other instances the groups were left to produce their own leaders.

Additionally, use was made of such techniques as "task forces", groups which were given specific assignments such as the preparation of proposals or comprehensive program plans based on simulated data, and role playing, such as making presentations before simulated CAP Boards or groups of poor people.

Instructional personnel were drawn from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, the following: the project staff, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State, University of Minnesota, Temple University, Council of Southern Mountains, Ford Foundation, West Virginia University, Office of Economic Opportunity and

various other Federal and state agencies, and various divisions of the AFL-CIO.

Whenever possible, the instructors, and especially discussion leaders and trainers, were selected on the basis of their reputations for working effectively with adults in a nonauthoritarian fashion. Not surprisely, the most successful instructional personnel were those from the field of labor education, although this is not to say that experience in labor education per se necessarily is proof of adequacy. All of the highly successful labor educators involved in this project are people of widely recognized competency.

Compared to most adult education programs, the approach of this project was intense. The training weeks were long in the sense that many of the days and evenings were completely scheduled with one activity or another. And the training units were such that the trainees were frequently in tense situations and almost must have felt some degree of pressure.

Then, too, in the periods between the training weeks, the trainees were contacted fairly frequently by the project associates, so that seldom, if ever, within the duration of the project were the trainees able to experience relief from these various pressures.

The result of this intense approach, in combination with factors discussed elsewhere, appears to have been a contribution to the establishment and maintenance of group cohesion and identity. This appears to have led to the feeling that the trainees did not want to let the group down either in terms of their participation in the training or community action efforts.

In any event, although we had been advised rather frequently by those consulted about the training design that unionists would not accept an intensive program, the great majority of the trainees seemed to thrive on it, especially during the last three weeks. One consultant to the project, who also served on the instructional staff, had this to say about the trainees reaction to the training:

> In general, I was very impressed with the group. At no time was anyone late for a session or absent with the exception of (a trainee) who, as you know, went to the hospital. Nearly every individual accepted his responsibility in the project, they did the work that was assigned to them, even under great time pressures that were presented by the structure of the program. I think it is extremely important to maintain the groups as they are presently constituted, and I think this will contribute to greater involvement to the project as a whole, for as these individuals have an opportunity to work more closely . . ., they will begin to share more in terms of their skills and knowledge.

An important part of the strategy of the training was to relate training to specific action on the part of the trainees whenever possible. One illustration of this centers upon the establishment of the Economic Opportunity Committees. During the first week, the trainees were told that their assignment on returning home was to organize an Economic Opportunity Committee in their central body or local union (if one had not already been organized) prior to their returning for the second week of training.

Following that they were given a unit of training which centered on how to do that task, including how to conduct meetings of the committees, what subjects to discuss, and what action the committees should consider. In addition, they were given sets of questions about their communities, etc. to be considered by the committees with the instruction to return with the committees' answers to the questions.

When they returned for the second week of training, one of the first subjects taken up was their success or failure in the assignment and the reasons for either.

Also the committees' responses to the questions were reported, analyzed, and evaluated in discussion group settings. Those who had failed to organize the committees were given constructive criticism and suggestions for future attempts by those who had succeeded and the training staff.

One other illustration is that over the course of the training, the trainees were given such assignments as devising community action proposals which dealt with problems they could identify in their own communities, making practice presentations to "CAP boards" composed of other trainers and staff members who played roles similar to those described as realistic in the various specific communities in which the trainees reside, and making presentations describing and interpreting CAP and other anti-poverty programs before "community groups", again made up of other trainees attempting to play specific realistic roles.

The trainees were told that upon their return home they would be expected to actually attempt these actions and, later, report their results to the other trainees and instructional staff. In a later training period, such follow-up was completed.

The effect of this approach was to indicate to the trainees specific expectations and then, later, put them "on the spot" for reports of their efforts and an analysis of the conditions which produced the results they obtained.

To have to report that nothing was attempted proved to be extremely embarassing to some trainees and in the several instances in which such reports were made, the trainees in that situation became more aggressive and active.

To this it should be added that it would have been difficult for the trainees to completely fabricate reports of their community action efforts because of the project's staff associates, who visited the trainees in their home communities and in some cases actually witnessed, and provided on-the-spot consultation and advice bearing on the trainees' community action work.

But, in addition to their value for helping secure valid reports of trainees' activities, the project associates were able to make specific assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the project's training components and this produced a "feedback" which enabled shifts in the design of the training geared to the needs and problems of the trainees. Thus, the project had a built-in correction mechanism.

Conduct of the Training

A considerable amount of attention was given to the physical arrangements for the training sessions as well as the trainees' lodging. The staff believed that it was important for the training and lodging to occur in the same facility in order to keep the group located closely together for long periods of time.

This was done both to faciliate the development of interpersonal relations among the trainees and between the trainees and the staff members as well as to minimize the extent of time required to get to and from the training areas.

In one case, however, the meeting rooms and food and lodging facilities were located some blocks apart because no alternative existed. But in all four cases the arrangements were such that most of the trainees continually worked together, ate together, and were lodged in the same structure.

Moreover, in all four cases arrangements were made to have a recreation room available so that the group would have a common meeting place even after the formal or planned session were over. Most of the trainees took advantage of these opportunities for informal meetings and relaxation.

Then, too, it should be mentioned that the type of training design followed required the availability of seven to nine small rooms for the discussion groups as well as a large room capable of seating, preferably in front of tables, 100 or more people.

Although no critical problems developed during any of the four training weeks, several minor ones were encountered which required some attention.

First, since the trainees were not from high income groups, it was necessary to have the lost wages, per diem allowances, and

travel reimbursements available on the last day of training during each of the four weeks.[1]

Since the University normally does not make such payments until claims are filed and processed **after the fact** (in this case after the conclusion of a training week), special efforts were needed to develop alternative procedures. After several months of uncertainty prior to the first week of training, the University's business managers developed such procedures.

Turning to the instructional aspects of the first several training weeks, one of the first problems encountered was that the trainees felt that the program did not contain as much "content" as it should have had. By "content" they were referring to the examination of specific solutions for specific problems which they felt existed in their communities.

In part this can be attributed to their impatience, since the program's designers believed they could best convey the complex nature of the communities' problems only after a thorough examination of the problems of the Appalachian Region. And in part this can be attributed to the use of a certain amount of informal, relatively unstructured instructional techniques.

The use of such techniques grew out of the view of some of the program's designers that explicit provision would have to be made to provide an opportunity for the trainees to become a group, sharing common goals, concerns, and sensitivities. While such a provision was useful and probably necessary, it was found that interaction leading to a positive group feeling took place primarily during the trainees "extra-curricular" relationships with each other.

When this became apparent, more and more attention was given to designing training sessions with a built-in problem-oriented focus. Thereafter, the "lack of content" criticism largely disappeared.

Finally, another problem which became evident as the project progressed was that it was somewhat difficult to schedule the training weeks in a manner which left all of the cooperating labor federations completely satisfied. Special care had to be taken to avoid union conventions, major collective bargaining sessions, and periods characterized by labor organizations' political action activities, such as periods prior to elections and during state legislative sessions. While this problem was not unexpected, it was not realized beforehand how difficult it would be to solve to the satisfaction of all major organizations involved in this project.

---

[1]The state regulations governing the University's disbursement system did not allow payments for travel, except for commercially provided transportation, until three or four weeks following each training week.

Roles of the State Coordinators

Each of the labor federations in the ten states was to designate a union leader to provide leadership and coordination of the community action activities performed by the other trainees in his home community. As it turned out, some states did not have designated state coordinators. However, in those cases, the responsibility for community action leadership at the state level usually was assumed by the principal officers of the state labor federations. Thus, through meetings and consultation of the various state coordinators, provision was made for an integrated community action effort on a state and, even, an interstate basis.

During the initial discussion phases of the project there was some uncertainty about the details of the role to be played both by the state coordinators, and the project associates, discussed below. This subject was the object of early discussions by the project staff, the Appalachian Council's members, and the designated coordinators themselves.

The principal concern of the project staff was that those representing West Virginia University would always be constrained by the need to stop somewhere short of the "action" phase of community action, a phase in which value judgements both are made and interjected into purposive efforts to realize its goals. Another concern, as mentioned above, was that university staff members had no right to, and should not, become involved in the internal affairs of the union organizations cooperating in the project. At the same time, it was realized that value judgments would have to be made, programs would have to be designed around their implications, and that internal changes within the unions were inevitable. Growing out of this context, the roles of the staff members and state coordinators were defined and agreed upon by all concerned during the first week of training in April, 1966.

One of the state coordinators' most important functions was that of helping other trainees gain acceptance as members of the governing boards of the community action agencies when they were unable to achieve those positions through their own efforts. It was agreed that success in this endeavor would depend upon whether or not other conditions could be met.

For example, the trainees' acceptance as board members would depend in part upon the extent to which organized labor indicated it was both interested in community action and willing to commit its resources and influence to it. Thus, the state coordinators agreed to be responsible for helping to generate such interest and commitments at the state and community levels within the federated and

national union organizations. Included in this effort was the coordinators' intent to include discussions and training dealing with the philosophy and procedures of community action in the various AFL-CIO summer schools held in the Region during the summer of 1966. These intentions were fulfilled, with these sessions being conducted by officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity, project staff members, and AFL-CIO officials from both state and national levels.

Another important function was the coordinators' agreement to provide technical assistance to the community labor leaders on matters dealing with community action, either when requested to do so by those leaders or by the project staff. Thus, the project staff members were able to extricate themselves from situations involving important actions which, in their judgement, were inappropriate for intervention by a state university.

Other functions agreed upon by the state coordinators included the following: maintaining communications flows among the trainees in the communities, the community action agencies, and the project staff; making advance arrangements for community visits by the project staff, thus helping to make those visits more productive than they might otherwise have been; and, working to maintain the original group of trainees as intact as possible during the life of the project, or, when necessary to replace those who had to leave, to seek out and select the most qualified replacements available. In addition, some of the state coordinators were to be used in some instructional capacity during the later training weeks.

For the most part, these functions were performed at least adequately. In some instances in which the state coordinators' positions were not filled, or the designated person was unable to fulfill the obligations of the position, the functions were performed by other federation officers or representatives. Because of this, the project staff members were able to maintain their neutrality, and none of the staff members were associated with any internal union disputes.

Roles of the Project's Field Staff

As explained above, the three project associates had responsibility for maintaining close contact with trainees in the geographic areas to which they were assigned. This contact was necessary for two basic reasons. One was the need to learn first-hand about the trainees' problems and their strengths and limitations in order to base succeeding training weeks concretely upon the needs for training.

The other reason was that it was believed the trainees might have some difficulty in applying the ideas contained in the training

weeks to the problems and opportunities encountered in their communities. If so, the field staff visiting the trainees and economic opportunity committee members in their home communities would be able to relate the content of the training to specific problems which could be observed.

In fact, the field staff's contacts served both purposes. The design of the last three training weeks was modified importantly by the data fed back from the "field". And, the community labor leaders were given and accepted advice which led to their overcoming barriers which, if they had remained for long, might have resulted in their becoming disappointed with labor's involvement in community action.

Because of the vastness of the region to be served, the project's field staff had to be located in central locations. One was stationed with the project headquarters at Morgantown, West Virginia, one was at Roanoke, Virginia, and one was at Knoxville, Tennessee. While this decision seems to have been the appropriate one in that it reduced travel time and costs and permitted a greater number of staff visits, it was not without its disadvantages. The two people located in Roanoke and Knoxville were the two most inexperienced in terms of university labor education. Thus, while they needed the most supervision, in fact they received very little. But even if they had been more experienced, problems still would have been encountered in terms of attempting to coordinate closely three far-flung offices.

However, by far the greatest problem associated with the field staff was that the extent of the job imposed on the three people who held those positions was simply too great. Instead of three people, six, seven, or eight would have been a more realistic number. Indeed, there is some reason for believing that it might have been more worth-while to reduce the formal training time in order to use more of the project's resources for hiring more field staff members. At the same time, that would have been a difficult decision to make in view of the belief that four weeks of training was just barely adequate.

One other observation is that trade union experience and/or labor education experience are not in themselves adequate preparation for the demands of the field staff member's role. Obviously, of course, such staff members need to become experts in all facets of community action. The project demonstrated that such expertise can be acquired by experience, study, counsel, and training. However, there also was great need to evaluate the effects of the project in the field in order to strengthen the training. This required some ability to interview the trainees, economic opportunity committee members, and others in great depth. In addition, there was need to

make precise estimates of social change or lack thereof, along with an analysis of the relevant variables.

Experience gained in this project produced the conclusion that the generation and feedback of such data are not likely to be obtained to the desirable degree from people who are not trained in the social sciences and experienced in the design and execution of survey and behavioral research. On the other hand, it is highly doubtful that candidates for the staff of a project such as this will ever have all of the desirable characteristics. It was fortunate for all concerned that the project was able to attract people of the caliber it did.

CHAPTER 2
The Trainees

Selection of the Trainees

The agreement between West Virginia University and the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council was that the Council would be responsible for selecting the people to be trained from among union leaders in Appalachia. As will be demonstrated later in this report, the Council's members discharged this responsibility in a creditable manner.

This is not to claim that all of the people selected proved to be ideal in terms of the goals of this project and, hence, that the selection procedures were perfect. They were not. But, considering that although the principal officers of the state labor federations were in the best position to select trainees to represent their states, they were not certain which people would make the most "ideal" trainees, and considering that they lacked the time and resources to invest in the selection procedure, the results they achieved were good.

The actual selection of trainees was preceded by a number of events. First, the project was discussed at a meeting of the Appalachian Council in San Francisco in December, 1965, and Council members were reminded of their obligation to select a tentatively assigned number of trainees from each of their states.

Next, the project staff was asked by Council Chairman Miles C. Stanley, to provide a statement of suggestions about the qualifications which the trainees should have. Acting upon the staff's agreement to prepare such a statement, Stanley sent the Council members a letter early in January, 1966, informing them that they subsequently would receive guidelines for trainee selection, and suggesting that, "While selecting procedure should be considered now, you may wish to delay actual selection of central body trainees until it becomes clearer just what the project will entail."

After receiving the project staff's suggestions, Chairman Stanley sent to the Council's members a memorandum containing a set of guidelines. According to the memorandum:

> While selection of the participants for the project rests with the ten State Central Bodies working in cooperation with the local Central Bodies in the region, it is sincerely hoped that great care and responsibility will be exercised in the actual selection process.
>
> The following guidelines are suggested to assist Central Bodies in screening applicants for the project:

(1) First and foremost he should be an active trade unionist, one who has demonstrated leadership abilities through service as a union officer, committee chairman, shop steward, or active delegate to the Central Body.

(2) He should be acquainted with the organizational structure of the labor movement, as well as union policies, procedures, and programs.

(3) He should have the respect and support of the local labor leadership.

(4) He should be a person with the capacity and desire to explore new ideas and to challenge his own assumptions; one who enjoys the give-and-take of discussion and the opportunity to test and try new approaches to problems.

(5) He should have inherent respect for, and the ability to work with, others.

(6) If a community action program is underway in the community, the labor member of the governing body of this agency should be given preference. If such agency does not exist it would be highly desirable that the delegate selected have some experience with community action through service on a board or committee of an existing community health or welfare agency or some similar experience.

(7) Lastly, he should be a person willing to make a commitment to the year-long program.

During February and March, 1966, Berkley Watterson, acting as a representative of the Appalachian Council, contacted all of the Council's members to determine what steps they were taking to select trainees, to advise them in more detail with respect to the characteristics the trainees should have in his opinion, and to insure that all the states together would not recruit more trainees than the project's budget could support.

Working closely with the project staff and Miles Stanley, Watterson's work was invaluable and resulted in a group of trainees which exceeded the project staff's expectations in terms of quality. Also contributing to this result in important ways was George T. Guernsey, Assistant Director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Education. Guernsey made extensive personal contacts among labor leaders in the Region to insure that the more promising leaders were among the applicants considered as trainees, and released announcements of the project in labor circles in Appalachia using the official stationery of the AFL-CIO headquarters.

The first week of training, held April 3 - 8, 1966, was attended by ninety-five labor leaders from Appalachia. These trainees, as well as those attending the following three training weeks, received a lost wage allowance of $20 per day, not exceeding $100 per week, $16 per day per diem allowance, and travel expenses, provided that they certified that these items were not otherwise reimbursed.

As expected, not all of the original ninety-five people completed all four weeks of training. However, although the project staff anticipated a drop-out rate of between 40 to 50 per cent over the course of the four weeks, a total of seventy-six trainees completed all four weeks. Since the Council decided to replace drop-outs, as well as to permit those who had to miss one or two weeks to return to the project, six people completed three weeks and twenty-seven completed two weeks. Only nine trainees completed only one week of training. Thus, a total of 118 union leaders, including designated state coordinators, were involved in the training.

In a number of cases, trainees not completing all four weeks of the program were prevented from doing so by factors beyond their control: several were unable to continue in attendance because of illness; some missed one of the weeks because of problems being experienced by their unions which required their presence elsewhere than at the training sites; some of the original trainees left the positions they occupied and, hence, no longer were appropriate training candidates; and, some others were absent because of personal problems such as illness or death of members of their families. Then, too, some of those who missed one or more of the training weeks either lost interest in the goals of the project or never did have an adequate commitment to them.

Characteristics of the Trainees

For purposes of describing the characteristics of the trainees as a group, as well as analyzing their leadership performance, it was decided that four state coordinators holding full-time union positions should be excluded from description. Therefore, for purposes of this report, the total number of trainees will be considered to be 114.

As shown in Table 1, a vast majority of the trainees were 31 years of age or older. This reflects the frequently noted fact that those under thirty years of age are seldom union leaders even at the community level, either because younger people are not interested in playing such roles or because they lack the conventional qualifications for union leadership, such as holding a skilled job or having extensive union experience as an activist.

TABLE 1

AGES OF THE TRAINEES

Age Group	Number of Trainees
20 - 29	12
30 - 39	43
40 - 49	40
50 - 59	14
60 - 69	1
NO DATA	4
TOTAL	114

Ninety-eight of the trainees were married and ninety were Protestants, nine were Catholic, four belonged to no formal religion and eleven did not report their religious affiliation. With respect to average annual earnings, three reported average annual earnings of less than $3000, twenty-one earned between $3000 and $4999, forty-seven earned between $5000 and $6999, twenty-four earned between $7000 and $8999, twelve earned between $9000 and $10,999, and two earned $11,000 or more. Five trainees did not report their income.

These average annual earnings data indicate that the majority of the trainees from whom these data were collected received less income from the lost time allowances than they would have earned had they stayed on the job during the training weeks. At the same time, their receipt of per diem and the fact of doing something other than their routine work were compensating factors. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether or not the trainees would have been able to participate in the training had the various allowances been much lower than they were.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF HOURS THE TRAINEES SPENT ON UNION AFFAIRS PER WEEK

Number of Hours Per Week	Number of Trainees
0 - 2	11
3 - 5	14
6 - 9	16
10 - 14	16
15 - 19	2
20 OR MORE	24
NO DATA	31
TOTAL	114

One hundred of the trainees had never experienced involuntary unemployment. In general, the trainees tended to be active unionists and leaders, at least according to their own perceptions of themselves. Table 2 provides an indication of the extent of their union activity in terms of hours spent per week on union affairs.

Most of the trainees were union officers: twenty-seven were presidents, secretaries, or treasurers of their local unions; thirty-two were central body officers or delegates; and thirteen were officers of state federations.

Questions about leadership behavior revealed that seventy-eight trainees had made past attempts at leadership within their unions. Also, sixty-two reported attempts at leadership within the community. Moreover, seventy-five of the trainees indicated their belief that they had leadership abilities in general.

The geographic distribution of the 114 trainees is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE TRAINEES

States	Number of Trainees
Alabama	9
Georgia	12
Kentucky	10
Maryland	8
North Carolina	8
Ohio	16
South Carolina	8
Tennessee	12
Virginia	8
West Virginia	23
TOTAL	114

Most of the trainees had reasonably good education achievement levels, with seventy-two reporting high school diplomas, or equivalent, and, of these, twenty-three had educational attainments beyond high school, either in college or technical schools.

As expected, many of the trainees tended to have positive attitudes about community action and the anti-poverty war and labor's involvement in it. Of the ninety-five trainees at the first training week, sixty-two believed the chances for success of the anti-poverty programs were "good", while thirty-one believed unions could contribute to the success of the antipoverty programs, with eighty-seven maintaining that unions should be heavily involved in them.

At the same time, the original group of ninety-five trainees was somewhat more conservative when asked to estimate the amount of support they expected union organizations to give to those programs. For example, when asked how much support they expected central bodies to give, thirty-three said "much", forty-four said "some", and eleven said "little". (Six people did not answer the question.)

The foregoing data about the trainees help to depict the type of people who participated in the project although admittedly they are inadequate in terms of a satisfactorily complete description. Moreover, these data do not reflect some of the changes in many of the trainees which occurred between the various training weeks and the weeks they spent in their home communities.

For the most part, the trainees possessed an interesting mix of heterogeneous characteristics despite their common union leadership background. For example, one discussion leader commented during the first training week that, "I was stuck by the wide variance of people in the group. One girl didn't know what union she was in. Others in the group are very knowledgeable." Another discussion leader stated that the range of diversity among the group was wide in terms of members' exposure to the problems associated with poverty and poor people. Part of this was due to the fact that some of the trainees had some experience with Community Action Programs in their home areas while others did not.

The diverse backgrounds of those in the group did result in a few minor problems. The most notable of these was that during the first week of training there was some tendency for those training who had some knowledge of community action and the problems of Appalachia to become impatient during the periods devoted to explaining the fundamentals of these subjects. However such complaints almost completely disappeared by the time the second training week was held.

All in all, the judgement of the project staff, and others who participated in an instructional capacity during the four training weeks as well, was that the quality of the major group of trainees exceeded expectations. At the same time, it is true that having had the experience afforded by the project, the labor movement in the Region has become more aware of which people are most likely to be the best candidates for such training and subsequent community leadership.

CHAPTER 3
Evaluation

Introduction:

THE GOALS AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

There were several reasons why the project staff felt it was vital to undertake major efforts to conduct a continuing evaluation of the project. First, it seemed important that some measure of the extent to which the project succeeded in accomplishing its goals should be provided. Aside from OEO's understandable interest in such a measure, it was felt that an assessment of success would constitute a vital portion of any public record of the project.

Another important reason for evaluation was that the design of the training itself was to be built on a feedback of information about the practical problems faced by trainees in attempts to further community action. Only through continuing assessment of the trainees' progress was it possible to relate community action problems to training content and method.

A third reason for evaluation was that a record of the experience gained during the project could provide a vital source of information for the design of future projects of a similar type. The project staff was, in fact, acutely aware from the beginning of the project that they were participants in a somewhat unique and pathfinding venture, and that they had a special responsibility to preserve records which would facilitate future training-action efforts.

And, lastly, evaluation was considered to be important for its potential to generate basic knowledge of both theoretical and applied relevance about processes of adult education, social action, and social change.

Each of these four reasons for evaluation constituted, in effect, four separate aims of evaluation. And, as with most research, the accomplishment of these aims depended upon being able to measure in some fashion the impact or effect that a planned event (in this case the training and follow-up) was intended to produce.

Thus, the nature and conduct of the evaluation was shaped largely by the specific goals which were originally conceptualized for the project and which were listed at the outset of this report. The task was to measure the extent to which these project goals were achieved, and to analyze and describe the factors and circumstances which facilitated or hindered their achievement. To emphasize the

importance of the influence of these goals in the planning of the evaluation, they will be listed again:

(1) to help to communicate the philosophy and aim of the Economic Opportunity Act to low-income groups;

(2) to help organize low-income groups for effective self-help activities;

(3) to facilitate a meaningful dialogue between low-income groups and other segments of Appalachian society;

(4) to promote the development of a decision-making process within Appalachian CAP's which would be informed, progressive, and specifically responsive to the needs of low-income groups;

(5) to generate community support for CAP and other programs of the war against poverty in localities where such support did not exist;

(6) to build support for the anti-poverty program within the ranks of labor so that the considerable skills and resources of labor in Appalachia would contribute fully to the anti-poverty effort;

(7) to help facilitate consensus and coordination among various community interest groups and agencies which influence local anti-poverty programs;

(8) to provide information concerning the problems of the poor and the techniques of community action to CAP board members, representatives of low-income groups, interested citizens, and other union members.

Among the most difficult problems encountered in assessing progress toward these goals was the lack of both resources and methods to measure results with the most desirable degree of objectivity and precision. The crux of the problem was to find a method of accurately describing the over-all behavior in response to the training of the trainees as a group, and then to describe what relationship, if any, that behavior had to effective community action as represented in the project goals.

Further, in the interests of complete objectivity, the community action leadership behavior of the trainees before training should have been compared to their leadership behavior after training, and the results matched against any changes in a similar group of unionists who had not undergone training. In practice it was impos-

sible, for a variety of reasons, to accomplish these measurements by the use of techniques which would satisfy a research purist.

Obstacles which prevented the application of the most elegant evaluation design included: the lack of time, energy, and money which would have been required; the possibility that intervention of vigorous research efforts would have interfered with the operation of the action-oriented project; and the understandable opposition of representatives of the labor movement to the use of research techniques which conceivably could create internal political problems in their organizations.

Nevertheless, despite these problems, the project staff feels that it has been able to accumulate about the trainees activities a useful body of information which provides a basis for an essentially valid assessment of the project. A number of different methods were used to collect the information:

(1) the trainees own reports of their attitudes and activities, obtained through questionnaires, interviews, letters, and informal conversations;

(2) the observations of the staff made in the field, at training sessions, and through personal contacts with trainees, CAP officials, OEO officials, and other community leaders in the trainees' home communities;

(3) the results of a limited survey of union central bodies not involved in the project, to assess their anti-poverty activities in comparison with those of project-involved central bodies;

(4) the results of a survey of CAP directors' opinions about the contributions of the trainees to anti-poverty efforts in their communities or areas;

(5) the compilation of case studies of individual trainees' progress from the beginning of the project to its completion; and

(6) the record of involvement of the Appalachian Council, AFL-CIO, and the Institute for Labor Studies in separate anti-poverty projects generated by their commitment to the community action leadership project.

Although each of these approaches to describing the behavior of the trainees, or assessing the impact of the training in producing that behavior, may have certain weaknesses from the standpoint of research methodology, in total the approaches tend to complement one another and produce a broad and relatively valid picture of the outcome of the project.

The following presentation of the results of the project has been organized around the different methods of evaluation which was used. Each method will be considered, the approach to data collection will be briefly described, and the findings will be presented and discussed.

Where appropriate, the discussion of findings will interweave information collected by different methods to illustrate how the various types of evidence of results buttress each other. Finally, a general discussion of all data including impressions of the staff, will attempt to draw integrated conclusions about the project's impact.

REPORTS OF THE TRAINEES

It was impossible as well as undesirable, for a number of reasons, for the project staff or other evaluators to observe directly most of the community action leadership behavior of the trainees in their home communities. Yet, it was important to know the extent of different types of such behavior the trainees were engaging in, how intensive their efforts were, and what the effect was.

In the absence of opportunity to observe the trainees' leadership efforts at first hand, it was decided that the trainees own reports of their feelings and activities would constitute an important source of information about what they actually had done in their communities during the life of the project.

Accordingly, several different types of devices were used to elicit and record such information, including: a project registration blank which asked for information about the trainees' past union activities; a personal background questionnaire intended to collect data on past community activities and attitudes as well as personal characteristics; a workbook on community characteristics in which trainees were asked to list, among other things, certain types of activities engaged in and personal attitudes held, an interview survey of all trainees concerning their activities, performed in their home communities midway through the project and again at the end of the project; and miscellaneous questionnaires about activities and attitudes, used as training devices and repeated periodically during the training sessions.

In the case of each of these data collection instruments, every effort was made to insure that a completed instrument was obtained from every trainee. However, particularly in the case of the interviews, the workbooks, and the training device questionnaires, it was not possible to obtain data from every trainee who participated in the project because some dropped out before the instruments were administered and others joined after it would have been appropriate to ask certain questions.

Other reasons for not obtaining 100 per cent coverage of trainees with all questionnaires were serious illnesses of trainees at the time of surveys, inability to arrange appropriate times for interviewing, and, to a very limited extent, some lack of cooperation on the part of trainees.

But replies were obtained from the vast majority of trainees for every questionnaire, and almost complete information was available for those who remained with the project from beginning to end or who were especially active.

The final interview was by far the most important device for learning about trainees' activities. Coming at the end of the project, it provided an opportunity for a reporting of the final sum of activities, and succeeded in reaching a larger number of trainees. Completed final interviews were obtained from 92 of the 114 trainees who had been involved at one time or another in the project.

The interviewing was done in the trainees' homes by two of the project associates and by four trainees who were especially selected and trained by the staff for interviewing. These trainees-interviewers, who did the bulk of the interviewing, were themselves interviewed before undertaking their evaluation assignment. The project staff reasoned that there was an advantage in using trainees as interviewers because of the belief that the respondents would be more likely to give honest answers to fellow trainees.

The questions asked during the interview tended to be unstructured for the most part in that the trainee being interviewed had to supply his own answers rather than simply check or select a prelisted choice. Records of the completed interviews later were carefully read and answers were listed. Then categories of answers were devised and a systematic list of categories was set up for each question.

The records of the interviews were than read once again and answers to each question were judged and assigned to the appropriate category for the question. Following that, tabulations were made of the number of trainees whose answers fit in each category.

The following information, derived from the trainees' own reports about their project activities, was taken primarily from the final interviews, also is based on certain items drawn from the various other sources of data mentioned previously. The presentation is divided into two parts; one reports on activities by individuals; the other deals with the trainees' success in generating activity by others in their communities, including their central bodies and other union organizations.

Since in several cases more than one trainee came from the same community or central body, it was necessary to report activities, attitudes, facts, and problems which pertained to the total effort of all trainees in a community.

It also seemed important to report by communities in order to assess the efforts against poverty made by the total labor movement at the community level rather than just the efforts of trainees alone. An important project goal was to employ trainees as catalytic agents to get local labor movements moving in the war against poverty. Therefore, the efforts of the central labor bodies as a whole were of prime interest.

As an initial step toward reaching the project's goals, it is important to note that the project was designed to create a solid base of organizational support and community influence from which trainees' activities would derive maximum meaning. One aspect of the task of building such a base was the organization by trainees of "Economic Opportunity Committees" within their local central bodies or local unions.

During the first week of training, trainees were encouraged to undertake the organization of such committees as an immediate step upon returning home. (A more complete account of the results and implications of the organizations of these committees will follow in the section on results by communities.

For now, it should be pointed out that this first step in project strategy was accomplished fully and without delay.) Out of forty-four communities represented by the trainees from whom complete final evaluation reports were received, in only six cases was no Economic Opportunity Committee formed, and in five of these cases the failure occurred in a community in which there was no central labor body.

The project staff also is aware that several committees were formed in other communities by trainees from whom final reports were not available, bringing the total of committees formed to well over 40. Thus, the project strategy succeeded at its first step: a base of support for the trainees within their local labor movements was built.

Individual Results

It was the hope of the project staff, as well as an important project subgoal, that trainees would utilize their bases of organizational support to seek and obtain positions of influence within the apparatus of their communities' anti-poverty efforts. From such positions, their training could have maximum impact upon the quantity and quality of programs intended to alleviate the condition of the Appalachian poor.

It was also a goal of the project that trainees would work toward the organization of formal community efforts against poverty in communities in which no formal programs existed. The reports about their positions and activities prepared by the trainees themselves provide some evidence concerning the relative success of the project in achieving these goals.

Considering first the reports of positions obtained, the trainees were asked whether they had been members of CAP boards of directors or other anti-poverty advisory or policy-making bodies before they became participants in the project. They were asked also what positions they he'd at the end of the project.

Answers to these questions were obtained from 90 out of 114 trainees. Of these 90, 24 reported having been on CAP boards before training, but 60 reported holding such positions after training, for a net gain of 36 trainees in these important seats of influence. At least part of this increase can reasonably be attributed to the project.

Thus, after the project, only one-third of the trainees from whom information was available did not hold a top policy-making position in their local anti-poverty agency. And, in a substantial number of these cases the reason no position was held was either because other trainees or labor representatives from the same community occupied board seats and there was just no room to serve in such a capacity, or because no community action agency existed in the trainees' area.

Other types of formal positions in addition to those on CAP boards were also reported having been obtained by the trainees, apparently as a result of the project. Out of the 92 trainees from whom interviews were obtained at the end of the project, 31 reported serving members of advisory committees to CAP programs and other anti-poverty programs such as Head Start, Neighborhood Centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Only five trainees reported having held such positions before training. In addition, at the end of training 13 trainees reported membership in community councils of the poor — only five had held such positions before training; and 23 reported they held official positions in guiding labor-sponsored anti-poverty projects — only eight of these 23 had been so involved before training. (This does not include a number of trainees who occupied full-time jobs in service anti-poverty programs which grew out of this training project. This result is discussed later in this report.)

Involvement of the trainees in a broad range of activities against poverty was an aim of the project so it was hoped that trainees would help out in their local communities in ways other than serving on CAP advisory boards, notwithstanding the importance of that role. As an attempt to assess the broader involvement of trainees, they were asked whether they were engaged in community activities in capacities other than CAP board membership. Of the 92 surveyed, 61 reported involvement in other capacities. Of these, only 2 had been engaged in other capacities before the project.

But, merely obtaining positions from which leadership could be exerted was not the final goal for the trainees since, in addition, other activities could constitute a vastly more important goal. Determining these activities was an interesting and challenging area of evaluation.

To get at this question, participants in the project were asked what activities they had engaged in to aid the war against poverty which they would attribute to the influence of the project. They were also asked to estimate the number of hours they had spent in these activities. Although the accuracy of the information on hours spent depends heavily upon the honesty and memory of the trainees, it is useful if interpreted cautiously.

The information provides a rough measure of the intensity of the efforts made by project participants and a measure of the relative emphasis they placed on different types of activities. Table 4 indicates the number and percentage of trainees, out of the 92 from whom final interviews were obtained, who mentioned engaging in certain types of community activities to aid the poor. For ease of analysis, the specific activities reported were categorized into the types shown in the table by the project staff.

TABLE 4

THE TRAINEES' ANTI-POVERTY ACTIVITIES

Type of Activity	No. of Trainees Reporting (N=92)*	Percentage
Direct work with the poor (organizing)	25	27
Direct work with the poor (counseling, education, service)	15	16
Work with other community groups on specific anti-poverty projects	24	26
Work on labor-sponsored anti-poverty projects	25	27
Personal contacts with CAP and other community leaders (including formal meetings)	70	76
Work with other community groups to organize their efforts or educate them about poverty	24	26
Work within the labor movement to organize efforts or educate about poverty	47	51
Miscellaneous	12	13

*Since many trainees mentioned engaging in several different types of activities, the numbers total more than 92 and the percentages more than 100.

Although, as is evident from the table, substantial numbers of trainees engaged in each type of activity, including direct work with the poor, certain activities were reported more frequently than others. Personal contacts within the community and within the labor movement for purposes of advising, educating, or creating interest in efforts to aid the poor, as well as planning such efforts, were reported most frequently.

Such activities are illustrative of the type of leadership for which the project participants were best fitted, both in terms of background and training, and were a major aim of the project. However, data on the number of hours spent in project activities tend to modify somewhat the picture of the trainees' efforts.

For example, 76 per cent of the participants reported engaging in leadership efforts with other community groups and officials: the total number of hours reported spent in this capacity was 5032. On the other hand, only 27 per cent of the trainees mentioned working on specific labor-sponsored anti-poverty efforts, but this group reported putting in a total of 4478 hours.

Thus, it would appear that some activities attracted more intensive involvement than others. Furthermore, other data reveal that many of the trainees who engaged in broad leadership efforts within the community or labor movement also participated in one or more other, specific, and more time-consuming efforts against poverty.

The total number of hours, for all activities combined reported spent by the 92 trainees interviewed totaled 18,748, but this tends to underestimate considerably the hours in anti-poverty efforts generated by the project.

The total does not include time spent by the 22 trainees who were not interviewed. Nor does it include the hours put in by state labor federation officials or those spent by the four most active state coordinators who took part in the project but were excluded from consideration in this report because they were full-time union officials who often acted more in the capacity of project staff members than as trainees.

But, an even greater shortcoming of the total is that it does not include the hours put in by the several hundred members of Economic Opportunity Committees who were recruited by trainees and persuaded to add their efforts to labor's role in the local fight against poverty. Thus, the actual amount of time spent to aid the poor, which was a direct result of the project, would total vastly more than the above figures would indicate.

It should be added that because the participants in the project were almost exclusively full-time workers in factories, mills, offices, and stores, the hours available for project work were limited

predominantly to evening and weekend time, periods when competition of attention to family and other responsibilities was great.

As a measure of the project's success, these figures on activities and hours speak for themselves. Whether the amount of effort represented constitutes success is in large part a matter of personal judgement about what would be reasonable to expect in the way of immediate results from a training project.

We do not have precise figures on the number of traineess who did little or nothing — and there were some of these. On the other hand, many of the trainees have become sufficiently caught up in anti-poverty work that it seems reasonable to suggest that their commitment to continue their work will carry them into many future community action activities.

When asked if they had personal plans to continue working for the success of the war against poverty, 92 per cent of those interviewed replied in the affirmative, and 77 per cent were able to state specific plans which they had in mind. For the group which continues to work in the future, the effort expended to date in community action activities will constitute only a tiny fraction of what will ultimately be spent in the service of attempts to alleviate poverty and other social problems. The project staff has its own opinion about the meaning of the effort that the project trainees have made and will state this in a subsequent section of this report.

It is important to add that the quality of the participants' efforts in terms of the nature and extent of specific action stimulated and progress made toward helping the poor is much more important than the quantity of those efforts. Some evidence of the quality of the impact of the trainees' attempts at leadership is contained in the case studies and the judgements of CAP directors and project staff members to be presented later.

For now, returning to the picture we have attempted to create of the pattern of the trainees' project related activities, the point was made that leadership involves influence. To explore trainees' attempts at leadership, they were asked who they felt they had been successful in influencing.

Of the 92 trainees surveyed at the end of the project, 82 per cent mentioned having tried to influence union members and officials, 64 per cent mentioned having tried to influence CAP board members and other community leaders and residents, and 51 per cent mentioned the poor as objects of attempts at influence.

As far as success in these efforts was concerned, 36 per cent were willing to state that they had succeeded in influencing union members and officials to change their concept of poverty and to become more involved and better informed about the war against poverty. 38 per cent said they had stimulated community leaders and

residents to greater interest and involvement, and 8 per cent specifically mentioned having been successful with the poor.

It is believed that the trainees were inclined to be somewhat modest in their estimates of successful influence because feedback of the results of such efforts is often unavailable or delayed. In other words, the trainees were not always fully aware of the impact of their activities. It should be added that the median number of individuals each trainee reported having contacted for purposes of stimulating greater interest in the problems of poverty was 75.

A major portion of the leadership role which the project participants attempted to assume consisted of informing others about poverty and the programs of the war against it. In effect, the participants tried to pass along their training to others in an effort to move them to greater understanding of poverty, greater support of quality programs to combat it, and actual participation in various community action endeavors.

The flavor of this role is captured well in a letter to the project staff written spontaneously by a trainee who attended only the final week of training. This trainee, from Alabama, was admittedly highly motivated for such a latecomer to the project, but his report is more typical than atypical of trainee activities. An excerpt from the letter, written one month after the training experience, follows:

> Since the training week, I have seen the local CAP board directors and chairmen and attained a list of CAP board members. I visited all but two members. I could not find or contact these two because of incorrect addresses. I asked each one what they knew about OEO and its functions. Most had no knowledge of it at all. So then I went to see Mr. ....., the CAP director and told him that since the board had little knowledge, that labor would like to put on a training seminar for CAP board members and interested citizens. His answer was yes. A tentative date was set so as to give our central body time to furnish our printed material.
>
> In the past month I have given some CAP board members the books on various OEO programs and told them the ones that were on high and low priority. I have contacted the local United Fund board and got a union member on the board. . . I have talked to Mrs. ..... of the welfare department. . . she is a CAP board member. I have talked to Mr. ..... of the state employment service. I have found out that he is doing very little for those that have no high school education. He does not believe in training anyone under various programs available until someone ca'ls in for such help. But a man in his position should know what is in demand nation-wide

> and be training them for said jobs. He does have an MDTA advisory committee that has held only one meeting since its existence. . . . I do admit that our central body is far behind others but we can and will do what a central body should do for and about OEO.

This letter tends to provide what summaries and categories of activities cannot provide — the concrete detail and flavor of what the trainees have done and are attempting in the way of challenging their communities to move faster and further in their anti-poverty efforts.

The project staff is aware of numerous other trainees who have done as much or more in a leadership capacity as the author of the letter, only the others have not been as willing or as able to communicate about the details of their activities. We would suggest that much of the essence of leadership activity is lost in the telling, particularly when it must be reduced to dry figures.

Other examples of concrete and specific accomplishments which have been reported by trainees deserve brief mention. In four instances trainees have been responsible for the formation of community action agencies in areas where none existed previously.

In numerous instances trainees have sponsored elections of low-income representatives to CAP boards, or have succeeded in getting by-laws of action agencies rewritten to insure more adequate participation by the poor. Union halls have been turned over for use as day care centers, study centers, and clothing distribution centers.

Community conferences on problems of poverty have been sponsored and held successfully as a result of trainees' efforts. These, and other examples of specific accomplishments, will be listed and elaborated on in a later section of this report dealing with trainees' activities by communities.

But, accomplishments were not without problems. In response to a question concerning the single greatest obstacle which had personally hindered trainees in their project activities, the following answers were given:

Thus, the most prevalently reported personal obstacle for project participants was a lack of time to spend in pursuit of the project goals. It is difficult to see how this obstacle might have been lessened, considering that the participants held down full-time jobs and, in addition, were active people with leadership responsibilities in their union organizations.

Moreover, considering the large number of hours which were reported spent in pursuit of the project's goals, the obstacle of insufficient time may represent as much recognition of the enormity of task involved in getting communities moving in the war against

poverty as it does any absolute failure to spend time on project activities.

TABLE 5

OBSTACLES TO PROJECT ACTIVITY
(IN PER CENT OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED)

Obstacle	Per cent N=92)
No obstacle	30
Lack of sufficient time to accomplish aims	28
Lack of support from other union members	13
Lack of support from public agencies	7
Other community leaders hinder CAP operation	7
Public is not motivated about poverty program	6
Opposition to organized labor in community	4
Personal failure to gain positions of influence	2
Operation of CAP board is inefficient	1
Did not answer question	2
	100

Trainees were also asked what they thought were the biggest obstacles to winning the war against poverty in their own communities and in the country at large. Their opinions are interesting because they reflect the actual experiences of a number of citizens trying to lead anti-poverty efforts in their own communities.

They are also interesting for what they reveal of the trainees' sophistication concerning the goals and problems of OEO's programs. The actual question was: What do you think is the biggest obstacle to winning the war against poverty? The results obtained from this question are shown in Table 6.

The most prevalently perceived obstacle by far was apathy and lack of information on the part of the public. If the war against poverty is a citizens' war, as it would seem to have to be in order to succeed, this obstacle, if perceived accurately, would indicate that more needs to be done in Appalachia to inform and involve more of the public in the struggle.

The trainees' response to one additional question related to perception of obstacles to the alleviation of poverty is worthy of note. They were asked, in essence, what they felt was the chief reason for poverty. Approximately 95 per cent mentioned factors such as lack of education and skill among the poor, lack of opportunity and exploitation and discrimination.

In other words, the trainees chose the sophisticated view that poverty was a result of various social and environmental forces.

rather than a product of human perversity. They did not tend to blame the poor for the existence of poverty.

TABLE 6

OPINIONS CONCERNING OBSTACLES TO THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY (IN PER CENT OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED)

Obstacle	Mentioned as a community problem (N=92)	Mentioned as a nationwide problem (N=92)
Lack of information and involvement on the part of the public — "Apathy"	40.2	32.6
Lack of funds and educational and employment opportunities for the poor	16.3	8.6
Lack of motivation and fear of red tape on part of the poor	10.8	3.2
Poor attitudes of the public toward Federal programs	8.6	8.6
Class and race discrimination — poor communications between groups	8.6	5.4
Political factionalism	7.6	18.4
Desire to take advantage of the poor for personal gain	3.2	--
Personal inadequacy in combating existing conditions	1.1	--
Unwillingness of country to finance programs	--	11.9
Different answers needed for different regions	--	2.2
Did not answer question	3.8	8.9
TOTAL	100.2	99.8

In this respect they seem better fitted to initiate constructive approaches to combat poverty than an average group of citizens, among whom one would expect to find a larger percentage of persons who take a punitive approach to the poor. It is probable that the training was partially responsible for the existence of these positive attitudes.

An examination of the trainees' attitudes toward the training and the conduct of the project constitutes the final portion of this section, which deals with individual results. As part of the final

evaluation interview, project participants were asked to estimate how much they knew about the war against poverty before the project in comparison to how much they knew after the project. The results are contained in Table 7.

TABLE 7
THE TRAINEES EVALUATION OF THEIR OWN INFORMATION ABOUT WAR AGAINST POVERTY (IN PER CENT OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED)

Extent of information	Before training (N=92)	After training (N=92)
Extremely well informed	0.0	17.6
Moderately well informed	12.1	79.1
Had some information	29.7	3.3
Poorly informed	19.8	0.0
Very poorly informed	37.4	0.0
TOTAL	98.0	100.0

Thus, at least by the trainees own evaluation, much was learned during the course of the project. To assess in part what the trainees' felt was the content of what they had learned, they were asked whether being a part of the project had changed their point of view about poverty. The most common replies were, "more knowledge of causes and amount of poverty present" (33 per cent) and "better opinion of poverty-stricken people". (18 per cent).

The trainees also were asked to estimate the benefit of the project to themselves, the poor, their community, and the labor movement. Concerning their own personal benefit from the project, trainees stated they had acquired useful information on government programs; had a better understanding of people, poverty, and their communities; had acquired self-confidence and skill in working with others; had become aware of poverty and inspired to help alleviate it; and had derived personal satisfaction from helping others. Only 2 per cent felt their participation in the project had been of no personal benefit.

Table 8 presents the opinions of the trainees concerning the benefit of the project to the poor, the region, and the labor movement.

When asked to comment how the conduct of the training itself might have been improved, 33 per cent of the trainees who replied had no suggestions and commented simply that it was a good program. Among those who had suggestions, the most prevalent comments were that training could have been improved by field trips and interviews with the poor, by more time for training, and by providing trainees with a choice of topics for discussion.

TABLE 8

THE TRAINEES' EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT (IN PER CENT OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED)

Worth of project	To the community (N=92)	To the poor (N=92)	To the labor movement (N=92)
Extremely valuable	34.8	39.3	39.3
Valuable	52.8	40.4	44.9
Moderate value	12.4	16.9	13.5
Little value	0.0	3.4	1.1
No value	0.0	0.0	1.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	99.9

Replies to two additional questions concerning what was most and least valuable in the training indicated that there was a modest tendency for the group to indicate that workshop discussions and information on government programs were most valuable and certain lectures least valuable. However, in neither case did a majority of trainees indicate these answers.

Finally, in answer to a set of questions inviting comment or how projects similar to this one could be improved in the future, the only agreement of even modest proportions among trainees was that greater care should be exercised in the future in selection of project participants. But less than twenty-five trainees mentioned this factor and no other suggestion was made by nearly as many. The dominant tendency seemed to be to have no suggestions, or to feel a good job had been done and nothing important could be added.

Community Results

As mentioned previously, the project staff considered it important to attempt an evaluation of the impact of the project on labor's total effort against poverty at the community level. A basic concept of the project was that the project goals would be reached through the leadership efforts of the trainees.

The nature of these efforts in terms of types of activities, hours spent, and individuals influenced already has been described. But, the more vital task of evaluation is to attempt to estimate the actual impact of the trainees' influence on anti-poverty programs in their communities.

The data obtained from individual trainees which are limited to their own activities fail to reflect all of the project accomplishments and problems resulting from these efforts or from the sum

or combination of efforts engaged in by more than one trainee in the same community. Also, there was more than one trainee per community in twenty-four out of the forty-four communities represented among the trainees in the final interview group. Moreover, even in communities with only one trainee, labor's activities against poverty included not only the trainees' efforts but also the efforts of other union members and committees influenced by them.

Consequently, the final evaluation interview contained questions which asked for information about certain aspects of the total local labor movement's activity in the war against poverty.

In analyzing responses to these questions, there was, in most cases, a consensus of answers among trainees from the same community. In cases in which trainees from the same community disagreed among themselves in their answers to questions about labor's activities, an average answer was chosen or the project staff made a judgment to accept the reports of certain trainees as more likely to be valid than those of others.

This judgement was based on the staff members' personal knowledge of the trainees and their local situations. The reports of trainees who were the only representatives of the project in their communities were accepted at face value.

In nine of the forty-four communities from which trainees in the final evaluation group came, there was no union central body. However, in four of these nine communities Economic Opportunity Committees were formed in local unions to provide a base of support for the trainees.

In only one community in which a central body existed did trainees fail to organize such a committee under central body auspices. Thus, union Economic Opportunity Committees were formed in thirty-eight of the forty-four communities constituting the focal point for evaluation.

The significance of these committees lies in the number of interested union members, in addition to the trainees, who were added to the project. Non-trainee union members totaled 253 among the thirty-eight committees formed.

In addition, the staff is aware of several other committees which were set up by trainees who were not reached for a final interview. Thus, counting trainees and non-trainee members of Economic Opportunity Committees, the project was responsible for involving at least 400 union members in support of the war against poverty.

Of course, not all committees or committee members were equally active and committed to anti-poverty efforts in their communities. Precise figures are not available on the nature and degree of committee members' activities. Nevertheless, the formation of

these committees served to commit the local labor movements to the local fight to help the poor, and served to provide concrete substance to labor's expression of concern for the success of this struggle.

As a sub-goal of the project, it was vital that a formal structure be built within labor to support a meaningful role in programs to alleviate poverty. The goal was achieved almost entirely at the local level, and was furthered by the project at the state and regional levels only.

Some evidence of the backing which the local labor movements gave to the Economic Opportunity Committee is contained in answers to specific questions about the degree and kind of support received. In thirty-six out of thirty-eight committees it was reported that "moderate" to "very strong" backing was received from the central body or local union, and twenty-one of these committees reported either "strong" or "very strong" support.

A more concrete indication of support lies in a reported total of $8769 in the form of cash, lost time, travel, postage, materials, etc. which was donated to the work of these committees by local unions and local and state central bodies.

The trainees themselves reported a total contribution of $10,417 to the project in the form of cash, lost time, and travel. This personal financial sacrifice on the part of the trainees amounted to more than $100 per individual and is a notable example of commitment to the project.

When the trainees own financial contributions are added to those of the local unions and central bodies, the grand total is $19,186. But this total would tend to be an underestimation of labor's actual financial contribution to the project, because the figure was obtained from only those trainees in the final interview group.

In addition, the figure does not include contributions of time and travel costs made to the project by state federation officers and other full-time union officials. If the contributions made to the project by certain union state coordinators, project planners and recruiters, and national AFL-CIO officials were added, the total would almost certainly be doubled.

As one indication of the support of the project given by all levels of union leadership, these in-kind financial contributions give some additional substance to the claim that labor is committed to the war against poverty in Appalachia.

On the other hand, not all of the trainees and the Economic Opportunity Committees received support from rank-and-file unionists. When trainees were asked whether the rank-and-file union members in their areas supported the work of the Economic Opportunity Committees, the reports from five committies indicated

that there was either no support or open aversion and opposition to the project.

Moreover, in nine additional communities it was reported that although there was no opposition, there was a lack of interest and involvement among the rank-and-file. Thus, in a substantial number of cases, the trainees lacked the moral support from their fellow unionists which might have made their jobs easier.

However, on the whole, the support given trainees by their local labor organizations seemed adequate. Moreover, in twenty-six of the communities covered by this report the project participants were not the only representatives of labor serving on CAP boards. In addition to the trainees who were on the boards, a total of fifty-eight non-trainee labor representatives served on boards in these twenty-six communities. Of these fifty-eight, twenty-seven were reported to have obtained their seats on the CAP boards as a direct result of project trainees' efforts.

Thus certain trainees succeeded in extending their base of support to the CAP boards themselves. In addition to the element of support provided by other labor representatives on the boards, these non-trainee board members were significant in that since they were able to work closely with other labor people, the potential constructive influence of the project on local anti-poverty policy making was multiplied.

Turning to the actual activities of labor undertaken in the war against poverty in the forty-four communities covered by this report, Tables 9, 10, and 11 present information obtained from answers to three questions about participation in local CAP policy making.

TABLE 9

GROUPS THAT LABOR WORKS WITH CLOSELY

Group	No. of communities* (N=44)
The poor	26
Minority groups	17
Community leaders (educators, ministers, politicians)	20
Elected Officials on CAP board	5
Fraternal organizations and others	2
None	6
Did not answer question	1

*More than one answer could be given.

TABLE 10

LABORS SPECIFIC INFLUENCE ON CAP BOARDS

Type of influence	No. of communities
Has equalized CAP board representation with the help of the poor and minority groups	15
Has worked with the poor to keep them informed and help them be influenced	9
Has initiated action on specific projects such as Head Start and job training	5
Has worked with minority groups to help them stand up to power structure	5
President of CAP board is a labor representive	5
No special influence	2
Did not answer question	3
TOTAL	44

TABLE 11

LABOR'S EFFORTS TO HELP LOW-INCOME GROUPS GAIN A FAIR HEARING

Type of efforts	No. of communities (N=44)
Has gotten realignment of members on the CAP board	10
Has supported projects desired by the poor	7
Has sponsored rewriting of CAP by-laws so that poor could elect representatives	6
Has helped poor gain consideration for employment as aides and secretaries	3
Has removed obstacles of meeting time and transportation so poor could attend CAP board meetings	2
Has gotten employers to raise wages of the poor to the minimum level	2
No special efforts made or needed	13
Did not answer question	1
TOTAL	44

The questions were: Do labor representatives on your CAP board work together especially closely with representatives of other groups from your community? Does labor working together with other groups exert any special influence on the board? Has labor in your area made any efforts to help the low-income groups gain fair representation in decisions that affect them?

When analyzing responses presented in these tables it is vital to note that although community action agencies existed in all forty-four communities from which reports were obtained, funded CAPs were not actually in operation in six of them.

In certain of these six communities, labor's attention to CAP affairs was less important than helping in other ways to further community progress in alleviating poverty. Moreover, in one of the forty-four communities, labor had no representative on the CAP board and in an additional three communities labor's representation did not include trainees.

Nevertheless, information presented in these tables indicates that in the communities touched by the project, labor has been particularly active on CAP boards to help insure that CAP policy was responsive to the poor. In those cases efforts were made to insure that the CAP boards listened to the poor and took their needs into account.

Experience of the project staff with various CAPs in Appalachia indicates that many of them have failed to involve the poor in planning and carrying out their activities.

In this respect, labor in the Region has apparently acted as a significant community force for changing this situation. It is doubtful that similarly effective results in bringing the poor into community deliberations could have been achieved by parties from outside of these communities.

The extent to which the trainees accepted the role of helping to insure that the war against poverty would be responsive to the poor is mirrored also in their responses in Table 12 to a question about labor's role in CAP board affairs.

Acceptance by labor of a role in support of the interests and participation of the poor was a goal of the project. Consequently, emphasis was placed on the importance of this role during certain aspects of the formal training. The foregoing data indicate that the training apparently achieved substantial success in furthering achievement of this project goal.

The trainees' leadership activities in CAP affairs also included the sponsorship of specific CAP projects. Our data indicate that in fifteen communities labor has been directly responsible for specific projects proposed to OEO or funded through CAP. But, in addition,

in seventeen communities labor has been responsible for anti-poverty projects accomplished independently of CAP.

TABLE 12

THE ROLE LABOR CONSIDERS IT MOST IMPORTANT TO PLAY IN CAP BOARD AFFAIRS

Role	No. of communities* (N=44)
To work actively with CAP to support the interests of the poor	33
General commitment to anything which will benefit the poor and the community	14
To work directly with poor to organize them and support their interests	12
To actively support manpower programs	9
To play a supporting role in education and public relations for CAP	7
Did not answer question	3

*More than one role was listed in some instances.

These projects of both CAP and non-CAP varieties include MDTA training, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Summer Work Programs, Nelson Amendment projects, neighborhood centers, legal services, Head Start, health programs, job corps recruitment and trainees adjustment projects, and various service projects for low-income groups.

In the area of manpower specifically, the reports of the trainees indicate that in twenty-three of our forty-four communities labor has either sponsored specific projects or at least taken steps to influence local CAPs to become active in seeking solutions for manpower problems.

Some examples of projects for which labor's central bodies and Economic Opportunity Committees have been responsible are:

(1) Four central bodies in Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia conducted one-day citizens' conferences on local poverty which were held in their communities. Other central bodies are actively planning similar conferences.

(2) A central body in Ohio has helped sponsor a conference on local manpower development.

(3) Two central bodies have set up day care centers in union halls for low-income children.

(4) A central body has set up an after-school-hours study hall in a local church for low-income children and is conducting a survey of school dropouts.

(5) At least four central bodies in Alabama, Kentucky and West Virginia have helped sponsor, arrange and conduct representation elections in low-income neighborhoods. Economic Opportunity Committee members have met periodically with the low-income groups.

(6) In West Virginia, a central body initiated and conducted a project to buy or collect clothing and shoes and distribute them to low-income families to enable them to participate in projects such as Head Start and Nelson Amendment work.

(7) In West Virginia, a central body provided transportation for low-income children to a summer youth camp.

(8) In West Virginia, a central body established and conducted a program to distribute free vitamins to low-income children.

(9) A central body in Georgia was responsible for a project which resulted in the purchase of facilities to be used for a day camp for low-income youth.

(10) In Georgia, a central body sponsored a successful fund-raising project to keep a school for the cerebral palsied from closing due to lack of funds.

(11) Central bodies in Kentucky and West Virginia are sponsoring projects to enlist other central bodies throughout the country to aid in the adjustment of Job Corps graduates to new jobs and new communities.

(12) A central body in South Carolina has been responsible for a project to teach sewing to low-income women. The same central body successfully sponsored a telephone campaign to keep a Head Start program from being terminated due to public opposition to requirements that it be integrated.

(13) A central body in West Virginia sponsored and helped to conduct a self-help project to build a playground in a low-income "hollow".

(14) In Kentucky, a central body sponsored a project to create apprenticeships in certain crafts and fill them with the unemployed.

(15) Central bodies in Maryland and West Virginia have been instrumental in initiating and supporting Neighborhood Youth Corps projects.

These examples do not exhaust the list of specific projects central bodies have undertaken. And, it should be remembered that trainees and central bodies also played a general leadership role in community efforts against poverty.

Information presented earlier in this report indicated the extent to which trainees have worked with low-income and community leaders in a board leadership capacity. Activities of trainees undertaken in a leadership role do not show up in a list of specific projects. Moreover, in many communities, considering the level of development of interest in an organization for anti-poverty programs, the only possible role for labor was to attempt broad community leadership.

As already pointed out, the assumption of such a role in several instances led to the reform of ineffective community action programs, or the initiation of such programs where they did not already exist.

With respect to labor's attempt to act in a leadership capacity, a considerable number of trainees have reported that in their communities labor has become a recognized source of information and expertness about the war against poverty.

The boards and even staffs of some CAPs are reported to be relying on the trainees for advice and guidance concerning programs. Such an outcome would seem as much a significant accomplishment of the training project as labor sponsorship of specific anti-poverty projects, and is directly in line with the stated goals of the training.

Subsequent sections of this report which deal with CAP directors' evaluations of the trainees and case studies of individual trainees will serve to elaborate both the specific labor-sponsored projects listed above and labor's general leadership role.

Some idea of what the trainees themselves think about the success of labor's leadership efforts at the community level can be gained from answers to a question which asked whether labor had been successful in attempts to gain support for the war against poverty among community citizens.

In twenty-three communities the trainees' answer was an unqualified yes, and in six additional communities it was a qualified answer that some success had been gained. In fourteen communities trainees did not feel they had been successful, and in one community no answer to the question was obtained.

The most prevalently used methods of gaining citizen support in communities in which successful influence was reported were: personal contacts with community leaders; meetings with local residents to educate them about the anti-poverty programs; meetings

with the poor for organizational and educational purposes; and the dissemination of printed educational materials to individuals and organizations.

It is interesting to note also that on the whole the trainees felt that labor itself had profited from this kind of involvement in efforts to move local citizens to become interested in problems of poverty.

Trainees were asked: "Has the labor movement in your area profited from its involvement in this project?" The answers indicated that in twenty-three communities it was felt that labor had profited because its status had been improved, and in twenty-three communities it was felt that labor had profited because its members had gained understanding of community problems and poverty, or had gained personal satisfaction from being of benefit to the poor and the community.

Both results were reported for the same community in several cases. An additional two communities reported that labor had gained indirectly because its members in poverty categories could participate in programs such as Head Start. In only eight of the forty-four communities in the evaluation was no benefit reported from labor's involvement.

Whether or not the trainees are entirely accurate in their judgments about benefits to labor, their opinions need not be heavily discounted. They do correspond to the judgments of project staff members. But even if they are correct only in part, they indicate that in a substantial number of communities central bodies participating in this project have been able to assume a successful leadership role. Failure would not have brought labor added respect from the wider community.

A final note concerning problems faced by central bodies should be added to this account of community results. Trainees were asked if labor encountered resistance from any special groups or individuals in its efforts to contribute to anti-poverty work. Tables 13 and 14 contain information obtained from answers to this question and an accompanying one concerning perceived reasons for resistance to labor's leadership activities.

From the standpoint of interest in the success of the anti-poverty programs, it was encouraging to find that in well over half of the communities in the sample no serious opposition was encountered to attempts to further anti-poverty work.

On the other hand, reports of the trainees indicate that in almost 40 per cent of the communities there was opposition, and in 30 per cent of the communities the opposition which reportedly existed was linked to vested interests in poverty held by the "power structure."

TABLE 13

GROUPS WHICH OPPOSED LABOR'S EFFORTS

Group	No. of communities* (N=44)
CAP board and staff	6
Non-business power structure (politicians, ministers, etc.)	5
Business power structure (corporation leaders, local businessmen)	4
Officials of public agencies and institutions (board of education, employment service, etc.)	4
The poor	3
Others	2
No groups opposed	26

*In some communities, more than one group opposed.

TABLE 14

PERCEIVED REASONS FOR OPPOSING LABOR

Reason	No. of communities* (N=44)
Anti-union feelings; fear of labor becoming more powerful and influential	10
Fear that the poverty program would become successful; vested interests in poverty	7
Desire to maintain low wages and discriminatory hiring policies	5
No opposition in community	26
Did not answer question	2

*In some communities, more than one reason was perceived.

It would appear that such opposition has been serious enough to block any meaningful progress by labor on behalf of the poor in a number of communities. However, in nine communities participants in the project reported that labor was successful in overcoming such opposition.

Problems preventing progress toward accomplishing project goals also were reported by trainees to have come from within the labor movement itself. The most prevalently mentioned was that trainees would have liked to have had a greater degree of commitment and participation on the part of rank-and-file union members.

This complaint, made in twenty communities, is of course commonly mentioned by many local labor officials in connection with normal leadership responsibilities within their union organizations.

Other problems which were reported as impeding the work of the Economic Opportunity Committees, and which could be considered as, at least in part, internal union problems, were obtaining funds, in nine communities and obtaining more support from labor leaders, in three communities.

A COMPARISON OF PROJECT AND NON-PROJECT ASSOCIATED CENTRAL BODIES

As part of the effort to learn about the impact of the project, data were gathered from a sample of non-project associated central bodies in order to compare their anti-poverty activities to those of central bodies involved in the project. Information upon which the comparison is based was collected by a mailed questionnaire sent to a sample of non-project central bodies in eight of the ten states included in the project.

Since the project primarily was directed at central bodies which were, for the most part, within the Appalachian portions of their states, a sizeable number of them in those states were not involved. Even in West Virginia, which is the only one of the states wholly within the Apalachian Region, certain central bodies for various reasons did not participate in the project.

The non-project central bodies constitute a group similar in many respects to those involved in the project: they are located in the same geographic areas; are affiliated with the same state labor federations; represent workers from similar industries and with similar backgrounds; and they are organized in communities of similar sizes.

These similarities made the central bodies an ideal control group and, consequently, a sample of them was chosen to be surveyed. It was hypothesized that if their anti-poverty activities were less extensive than those of the central bodies which had participated in the project, that finding would indicate that the project had generated meaningful action.

The central bodies surveyed were not selected randomly but, rather, were chosen to represent a range of sizes and locations similar to the range of participant bodies. Questionnaires with covering letters asking for cooperation were mailed to a total of forty-two of the non-project central bodies.

The mailing took place in March, 1967, at the same time that the final evaluation interviews were being conducted. A follow-up letter from the Appalachian Council requesting cooperation was also sent. The distribution of central bodies in the sample by states was representative of the distribution of project central bodies, with the exception of a heavier representation from Ohio.

A total of twenty-three replies was received which produced a return rate of close to 60 per cent: West Virginia, four; Georgia,

two: Ohio, seven; Tennessee, two; Virginia, three: North Carolina, two; South Carolina, two; and Kentucky, one.

Although the number of those who did not return their questionnaires conceivably could have biased the results, the project staff feels that it can be assumed that such a bias would tend to underestimate any differences found between project and non-project central bodies.

The logic upon which this assumption is based is that since the central bodies knew we were interested in what labor was doing in the way of anti-poverty work in their communities, those which had been active would be more likely to send back the questionnaires because they would have had something positive to report.

The questionnaire itself contained questions designed to elicit information about central body activities which could be matched against similar available information about the activities of the project central bodies.

Other questions concerning the non-project bodies' activities were also asked. These other questions were included in order to assess whether or not there were areas of anti-poverty work in which concentrations of effort might have varied between the project and non-project bodies.

The results of the comparison indicate that project associated central bodies were more effectively organized to conduct a leadership effort in the war against poverty, and that they were better represented among community action agencies and communites.

Whereas thirty-four of the thirty-five project central bodies in the final evaluation group had formed Economic Opportunity Committees, only two of twenty-three non-project central bodies had such committees.

Since it was possible that non-project central bodies might have designated an individual as a co-ordinator of labor's anti-poverty activities in their communities rather than have a committee, a question was asked about the existence of such a coordinator. Only three central bodies reported having appointed a coordinator, and one of these cases was one of the central bodies that reported having a committee.

Furthermore, in forty-three of the forty-four communities represented in the project there was labor representation on the policy making boards of community action agencies, including trainees in all but three of these communities.

In comparison, only twelve of the twenty-three non-project communities had such representation on the community action boards. In addition, six of the twelve non-project central bodies reporting representation were from Ohio, and Ohio central bodies

made up only a little less than one-third of the total number of non-participant central bodies reporting.

Therefore, the representation in the other seven states included in the sample was even poorer than the gross figures indicate. Moreover, very few of the non-project central bodies have representation on committees of other anti-poverty programs such as Head Start or Neighborhood Youth Corps: only two reported such representation.

Turning to donations made, in only six of the non-project communities was labor reported to have made either cash contributions or in-kind contributions, such as meeting spaces, to any war against poverty program or activity.

In comparison, it will be recalled from the findings presented in previous sections of this report that labor in the project communities contributed considerable amounts of money, time, and facilities.

The labor organizations in project associated communities also have been more active in work with the poor, including presenting educational programs to create interest in their problems.

More than 25 per cent of the project trainees reported they had worked to help organize the poor and 16 per cent mentioned working to serve the poor through direct contacts. And in twenty-eight of the forty-four project communities it was reported that labor works with representatives of the poor on matters related to CAP.

In contrast, in only two of the non-project communities did labor report that it had contributed in any way to organizing low-income groups in order to work jointly with them toward solutions of problems. Furthermore, sponsorship of educational programs concerning the problems of poverty has been infrequent among the non-project central bodies.

Only two of those bodies reported having been involved in the sponsorship of conferences on poverty and only five have had speakers at regular union meetings to explain the war against poverty to the membership.

On the other hand, organizational and educational efforts among the poor, the community, and labor were performed by a major portion of all of the project trainees.

Only in the general area of manpower problems has labor in non-project communities shown a moderate degree of activity. Eight of the twenty-three non-project central bodies reported having made efforts to find jobs for the poor, and five central bodies reported they have helped to include members of low-income and minority groups in apprenticeship training.

But this involvement also is more than matched by the participation of project central bodies in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

the Job Corps, Nelson Amendment projects, and general leadership efforts in behalf of manpower programs within CAPs.

Thus, evidence obtained from the survey of central bodies which have not participated in the training project indicates that considerably less has been done to further the anti-poverty war by these bodies than by the central bodies which have been part of the project.

Considered together with the data obtained from the other approaches to evaluation which were utilized, the evidence adds to a total picture of the project from which reasonable inferences may be drawn concerning impact. We believe it had a fairly important impact with respect to the war against poverty.

A SURVEY OF CAP DIRECTORS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE TRAINEES AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

In addition to the data presented in the preceding sections of this report, data about the trainees' community action activities were also collected from CAP directors in the trainees' home areas.

Although the directors could not be aware of all the trainees' activities, particularly those related to non-CAP community action, it was felt that their information and evaluations would provide another fairly objective picture of the project's results and also another benchmark for interpreting the data obtained from the trainees and other sources.

Altogether, there were forty-nine CAP agencies in the trainees' home communities and surrounding areas which appear to be relevant. The directors of each was sent a letter, signed by the project directors, which briefly indicated the nature of the project as well as the name(s) of the trainee(s) in his area. In addition, the letter asked each director to prepare a statement covering the following points: the extent and the ways the trainees(s) contributed to the work of the local community action agency; the extent and the ways the local community action agency received the support of organized labor, particularly organizations affiliated with the AFL-CIO; the impact the training project had for the success of the local community action agency; and any other comments which would be useful for evaluating the impact of the training project. Such statements were received from forty of the forty-nine CAP directors. Hence, we believe that we have a reasonably representative sample.

The information contained in the statements was studied and placed into categories in order to permit some quantification and summarization.

Table 15 contains data about the extent and nature of the trainees contributions to the work of the local community action agencies as perceived by the directors of those agencies.

TABLE 15

CAP DIRECTORS' VIEWS OF THE TRAINEES' CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CAP AGENCIES

Contributions	No. of Directors (N=40)
Trainees served in official CAP positions	23
Trainees demonstrate a cooperative attitude and a willingness to help with CAP work when asked to do so	18
Trainees are good sources of information needed for CAP work	14
Trainees have designed community action projects on their own initiative	11
Trainees have suggested new projects	6
Trainees are enthusiastic about CAP work	4
Trainees attend official CAP meetings frequently	3
Trainees have helped educate labor and the public on the value of CAP	3

These data indicate that most of the CAP directors have recognized that the trainees made some contributions to their agencies' work, with some directors quite enthusiastic about the trainees and the roles they played.

The following quotation, an example of this, also illustrates the type of situation in which organized labor is particularly able to be of help to CAP agencies:

> In response to your first question . . . through the early acquaintance developed with our AFL-CIO boys a relationship of mutual trust was developed. This relationship was invaluable in the settling of a dispute between (the CAP agency) and one of the local power groups. Without their support our (agency) was in serious difficulty . . . (and) the future of the entire (agency) was in serious jeopardy. Through the efforts of labor as well as others, the threat never materialized.

One other example:

> Because of the training the Institute for Labor Studies has given these men, they are able to help interpret (the) programs. We can depend on them to clear up misunderstandings on what can and cannot be done. Such as the red tape necessary, funding policies, and requirements of OEO.

Of course, not all of the trainees are contributors to CAP programs and, in some cases, the CAP directors are critical of what they have or have not done.

Three directors indicated that they could not evaluate the contributions of the trainees either because the agency was too new or insufficient time had elapsed to permit the trainees to have done much by the time they received our letter.

Three directors indicated that the trainees contributed nothing although they were given the opportunity to work with the agency.

And five directors mentioned some criticism of the trainees, although none of the five was completely negative in the matter. Their criticisms centered on the following: they expected the trainees to offer more ideas than they were offering; and, the trainees were engaging in too much "political" activity.

Then too, some of the criticism is difficult to evaluate, such as the following statement which could be interpreted in various ways:

> We believe they were genuinely interested, but the approach attempted by these three was in very poor taste. They would come to our meetings loaded down with the material which had been given to them. They always sat together. They always tended to give the impression they were representing 'labor', and they always spoke on authority from 'West Virginia University'. It seemed, generally speaking, they were trying to impress the group with their wealth of knowledge. Not once have these people, individually or as a group, approached this director in a spirit of helpfulness or with an idea for exploration relative to the betterment of our CAP . . . We believed we recognize the intent of the project, and we see it as something good. We feel that in some way the trainees should have been imbued with more humility in their endeavors rather than an approach to impress the group and in some instances a desire for personal recognition.

All in all, our conclusion is that most of the trainees, indeed all but a very small number, are recognized by their CAP directors as having made some contributions to the CAP agencies' work and that most of those making contributions are making important ones.

Accounting for the motive force for the trainees' contributions is a more difficult matter. Our request of the directors to evaluate the impact of the training project produced little precise data. This is not hard to understand because few of the directors were in a position where they could compare "before" and "after training" experiences.

Yet some estimate of the value of the project can be attempted from what data were obtained from the directors' efforts to evaluate the impact of the project along with the information they gave us about their views of the trainees' contributions to their CAP agencies.

Turning first to the trainees' contributions described in Table

15, some of these simply could not have been made without training of some kind since, by their own admission (discussed in a preceding section of this report) few of the trainees believed they were experts in CAP prior to the training.

Yet fourteen out of forty directors indicated that the trainees are good sources of information about CAP activity. In fact some of them indicated that the trainees knew far more about CAP than they did. Also, eleven directors indicated that trainees designed new community action projects and six said that trainees have suggested new projects. This is some evidence of the project's impact.

The directors' response to the request to evaluate the impact of the project provides other evidence, even though it is not as precise as one would desire.

One director said the training was a "positive experience" without further elaboration.

Three said that the project helped to create "enthusiasm" in the labor movement for involvement in anti-poverty efforts.

One said the project served as a "catalyst" to bring about the active participation of CAP agencies and labor in the war on poverty.

Ten mentioned value of the project for transmitting important information to the trainees.

Three said that more training projects of this type should be undertaken.

Three said the project contributed to the success of their CAP's without indicating "how".

Sixteen did not comment on the project's impact. And three said the project had no impact whatsoever.

Finally, we also believed it would be of some value to obtain the directors' views about the extent to which organized labor, particularly the AFL-CIO, provided support for their CAP agencies' efforts.

The primary reason for this was the need to assess the extent to which the trainees in the training project were able to secure the backing and support of the labor movement in their anti-poverty activities, thus multiplying their effectiveness.

Seventeen directors said that organized labor has been "most cooperative" with respect to community action projects. Seven said that labor has made in-kind or dollar contributions to their agencies.

Two said that because unions are aware of the condition of "working" people and the poor, they were able to function as a communications link between CAP agencies and the people who are the object of the agencies' concern. Two directors said that organized labor was helpful in "public education" in the sense of explaining the purposes of community action.

Three said that organized labor either initiated or helped in the formation of new community action agencies. Two indicated that their agencies had "satisfactory" relationships with labor.

Three said that they had no means of measuring labor's support. Four did not respond to the question. And, seven, (out of forty) directors said that organized labor did not provide much support to their agencies outside of representation on boards and committees.

An illustration of the type of contribution organized labor does (or could) make to community action agencies is provided by the following excerpt from one of the director's statement:

> The extent of support of the membership of the AFL-CIO in our area has been to provide complete support of our programs. One of the main efforts has been to provide resources for the understanding of the ideals and opportunities provided by the OEO Program. Other areas have been in the field of volunteer activities and cash donations to the existing programs and in providing information and guidance to the types of programs that would be beneficial for the area.

Further analysis of these data revealed that the directors who said that labor provided little or no help, or who were somewhat ambiguous about the question, tended strongly to be located in geographic areas which had relatively few unionists.

Thus, in some cases it would have been absolutely impossible for labor to provide any significant support for community action because of the movement's lack of power and influence in those areas.

The point which stands out, not surprisingly, is that in order to optimize the project's output, participants in this type of project must be drawn from areas in which organized labor is relatively strong.

In areas where organized labor is relatively strong there is a strong tendency for CAP directors to report that they receive significant support of diverse types from unions.

In general, however, the data obtained from the CAP directors indicate both that the training project had a noticeable positive impact for the success of the work of their community action agencies and that the labor movement is "backing-up" the efforts of the project's trainees to function as community action "leaders."

CHAPTER 4

Case Studies of Individual Trainees

During the course of the project, staff members — in particular, the Project Associates — came to know many trainees well, and acquired considerable knowledge of both their strengths and weaknesses.

Reports about some of the trainees also were available from officials of the labor movement who had maintained more-or-less continuing contact with them.

In addition, certain trainees were asked to prepare detailed written accounts of their participation in the project. Some of these same trainees came to be known well by the project director and associate project director through correspondence and personal conversations.

Utilizing this knowledge it is possible to piece together studies of some of the more interesting cases of individual trainees' progress and accomplishments in the project. Some of the cases tend to be longer and more detailed than others but all provide some of the individual flavor of the trainees' problems and successes.

As personalized accounts of the impact of the training project, the cases add a flesh-and-blood dimension to the evaluation. More importantly, they provide additional insight into the various ways in which participation in the project was translated into meaningful action to help alleviate poverty.

The cases chosen for presentation are not necessarily either typical, or atypical. They were selected because they illustrate particularly well the nature and extent of the influence the project was able to exert on certain individuals.

No cases of trainees who were influenced little or not at all by the project will be presented: there were a few of these but they constituted a small and distinct minority. Their cases do not concern our major point: that the project did have a considerable impact on many trainees.

Case A

Male trainee A was from a rural Appalachian county in one of the more southern states in the region covered by the project. Although trainee A was an active local union official, in the county of

his residence there was little or no organized union movement and anti-union sentiment ran strong.

The trainee, himself, was employed in another county so there was little or no chance for him to build a base of support or help for his efforts within labor in his own area.

Prior to his first week of training, as he put it, "I had read of the war on poverty in our local newspaper, but even when the President of the United States spoke on TV of so much poverty in the U. S., I paid little attention to him". Until he entered the project he had not been interested enough to determine whether there was an action agency in existence to fight poverty in his county.

The first week of training stimulated his interest in the problem of poverty and created curiosity about what was being done, but it left him with considerable uncertainty about the nature of what role, if any, he could play.

Upon returning home, his first step was to inquire about whether anything had been done to form an action agency in his county. These inquiries led to the offices of the county judge and a county extension agent. Trainee A found that these officials, at the urging of the state OEO technical assistance agency, were at that time looking for an interested citizen willing to spearhead a committee to form a county CAP.

Our trainee became the catalytic agent around which these efforts crystallized, and less than a week after the end of his first week of training, he helped to set up a community meeting to stimulate interest in a county CAP.

He was subsequently elected chairman of the county CAP committee. As he put it, "without the knowledge that the training school gave to me I fully believe that we could not have formed a working committee."

Shortly after returning from the project's second week of training, trainee A's county was asked to join three adjacent counties in a multi-county CAP. Trainee A was elected vice-president of the multi-county agency board of directors and was a leading force in readying the organization for effective action. The milti-county CAP was funded and presently has several projects underway.

He was instrumental in obtaining approval for one of these projects from the regional OEO office where it had been held up. He has also been effective in gaining support for CAP from the local ministerial association and local business people. At present he is holding a full-time position as a recruiter for the Job Corps.

Case B

Trainee B, a last minute nomination to the project from one of the deep southern states of Appalachia, was selected as a result of

his activity in union central body work and was notified of his selection about one week before training started.

At that time he had only the barest knowledge of the intent of the project, knew nothing of the war on poverty, and had never been involved in community work. Although he had doubts about his ability to contribute in a meaningful way to the project as he initially understood it, he decided he would try.

At the beginning of the project his attitude toward poverty was as represented in his own statement: "I was hard put to believe that very much poverty existed in the United States . . . let alone in my own county".

The training experience awakened B to the problem of poverty. He reported that after reading **In the Midst of Plenty** between the project's first and second training weeks, he remarked to his wife that they threw away as much food as some families had to exist on for a month.

After the second week of training, he was instrumental in forming an Economic Opportunity Committee in his central body, and since then has been responsible for organizing such committees within several local unions in neighboring counties that do not have central bodies.

He has shared his information about community action with these committees and is counting on them to be active in a new multi-county CAP in his area.

He personally became actively involved with his county CAP after his training and was named to its board of directors. He has played an important role in its operation.

At the time that B became a member of the CAP board, the action agency had achieved little or no substantial progress. Rewriting of by-laws and petty problems caused continual delays and the board was beset with frustration. No planning and development grant had been received. Arguing against a motion to disband the CAP under the circumstances, trainee B was helpful in getting the board to consider new avenues of approach. Partly as a result of his leadership, it was decided to redouble the efforts to establish an operational program.

The board shortly thereafter was asked to join forces with five other counties in an effort to obtain funding for a multi-county operation to which there was substantial opposition. With his specialized training, B was able to help to convince his board to go along with the multi-county idea.

At present he is functioning as a "resource person" for his board and has continued to work within labor. He has obtained agreement from his Economic Opportunity Committee that it will volunteer its services to help to organize and conduct representation

elections in target neighborhoods. In addition, his central body worked in helping to support and conduct a one-day community conference on the need for CAP.

Case C

A trainee from West Virginia was a labor representative to the board of directors of his county action agency at the time he was selected to participate in the project. In the fourteen months he spent as a board member prior to the project's first week of training, trainee C spent approximately fifty hours on community action affairs. This was a period of organization for his CAP during which by-laws were written, a staff was hired, and several projects funded.

However, he reported that: "There weren't many on the board who knew about OEO, HEW, OJT, MDTA, or any other Federal programs in that period. There was little or no participation of the poor in board affairs. There was little or no community involvement of the poor."

After the initial two weeks of project training, C and another trainee from his central body organized an Economic Opportunity Committee of eleven members. With the background of the basic philosophy of the war against poverty which they had learned during training, C and his colleague recognized the inadequacy of the degree of participation of the poor in the county CAP. The committee which they had formed decided it could move the CAP board to obtain greater involvement of the poor by an organizing campaign of its own.

A target area was chosen and an organizational meeting was advertised through local churches, labor organizations, and schools. Committee members met with citizens of the community, discussed the OEO programs which had been funded in the county and those planned for the future, and asked that a three member Community Committee be formed to join labor's Economic Opportunity Committee. The same procedure was used to organize three additional target communities.

The action which was taken led directly to the election of the chairmen of the target community committees to seats on the county action agency board. Subsequently, two of these representatives were elected to the board of directors of a newly formed multi-county agency.

Having achieved more equitable representation of the poor in his CAP, trainee C turned his attention to the mediation of an employee dispute on a Nelson Amendment project.

He was asked to chair the board's evaluation committee and was later elected vice-president of the board. Out of his involvement

in the Nelson Amendment project came an awareness that low-income employees of CAP and children attending Head Start classes did not have adequate clothing and shoes for participation in CAP programs during cold weather.

Labor's Economic Opportunity Committee initiated a project to help alleviate the situation. Contributions of cash and clothing were solicited from citizens and merchants of the county, clothing was collected and purchased, and the union hall opened two days a week for distribution of the clothing to low-income families. Some union wives helped in the project.

In some cases, needy families were identified through Head Start teachers who were invited to discuss the problems of low-income families with the committee. The program has provided help to more than 200 low income children and adults and it is anticipated that it will be continued on a permanent basis.

C has also acted as an evaluator of a neighboring multi-county CAP program. At present, he is the full-time director of a recently funded Neighborhood Youth Corps project in his area. Interestingly, the project is operating effectively despite local groups who claimed that it wasn't needed and wouldn't work even if it were needed.

Case D

Female trainee D, from one of the more southern states of Appalachia, is the vice-president of her local union.

During the first week of training, she suffered from feelings that she had nothing to contribute to the project. She tended to be shy and reserved and openly stated that although she wanted to help she would rather work alone in some capacity with the poor. In other words, she had very great doubts about being able to lead in the capacity that was being suggested to the trainees.

Upon returning home from the initial training experience, D helped organize an Economic Opportunity Committee and then offered her services as a volunteer to her local CAP. Subsequently, she spent several hundred hours recruiting for adult basic education classes in low-income neighborhoods.

Gaining confidence, commitment, and increasing interest as time passed, she initiated efforts to establish a child care center to facilitate attendance of low-income mothers at basic education classes. In addition, she began a project to provide sewing classes for women from low-income families. More recently, she has become involved in leadership efforts to achieve reorganization of the CAP board to more adequately represent low-income groups and has been responsible for a telephone campaign which helped save a Head Start program by marshalling public opinion in its favor.

Inasmuch as this woman knew little or nothing at the beginning of the project about the war against poverty or the problems which create poor people and considering her initial lack of faith in her ability to lead, the following excerpt from one of her letters speaks volumes:

> We have just completed the door-to-door application for Head Start this summer.
>
> Also, I met with Mr. ....., Director of the neighborhood centers and he said he wanted our volunteers to work in the centers teaching his low-income people to sew and carry out our "Home Service" project.
>
> The assistant director of CAP tried to get this project funded for us but was turned down, which we already knew would be the case. Mr. .... seemed rather enthused so now for the next few weeks we'll be looking for volunteers to fill these posts.

Trainee D's sincere compassion for the poor was reflected in conversations with her about the project. She also possessed an intense feeling of responsibility to do something to help because "the government has trained me and expects something in return". It is highly probable that her commitment will result in a continuing leadership role to help the poor in her community.

Case E

Female trainee E, from Virginia, was unfamiliar with anti-poverty programs before attending the first training week. Acting upon suggestions made during that training period she returned home and successfully organized an Economic Opportunity Committee within the labor movement in her county.

Her next step was to lead an inquiry into the state of anti-poverty efforts in her county. At the time no action agency had been formed, nor had any thought been given to forming one.

E met personally with the county commissioner, the mayor, and other interested civic officials to attempt to explain the importance of forming an action agency in the county. The information gained during her training experience was an indispensable aid in her attempts to develop community interest in doing something about the problems of the poor. Largely as a result of trainee E's efforts at leadership, a CAP organization for the county was formed. She was made the secretary of the board. The CAP organization subsequently was extended to include a tri-county area. Although at last report the tri-county CAP was not yet funded, it had been placed on the priority list for future funding.

Case F

Trainee F, from Ohio, was the chairman of the board of directors of his action agency when he entered the project April, 1966. He had served as chairman of his board since its inception in January, 1965, and in this capacity had encountered many problems, including not being able to get programs funded, even though the CAP director had worked on many ideas.

The image of the community action agency among the citizens in the county was poor and at the time he entered the training project the program development grant of his action agency was about to run out. Despite the joining of his agency into a tri-county CAP his feeling at the time was, "I was ready to quit if we did not get a Neighborhood Youth Corps project funded".

Attendance at the first two weeks of project training gave F the information and confidence he needed to redouble his efforts. In his own words:

> I am sure that had this school never come along the war on poverty program of our three counties would have been slowed down and probably been out of operation. The school helped because the shot in the arm I received was passed to the faithful group who worked with me in the county . . . after the first and second week of training, I came home determined we would somehow not let the poor people down.

Acting with his renewed confidence, he obtained a resignation from the CAP director, hired a new temporary director, and through his own personal contacts was able to get a Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school project funded.

Subsequently, trainee F was largely responsible for the funding of a conduct and administration grant for his agency and a legal aid project. He is still the chairman of the board of the tri-county CAP even though he says: "I felt that being president of the county AFL-CIO council was hurting the image of our CAP group but the other members of the board of trustees did not think so".

Recently, F was responsible for initiating action leading to the conduct of a tri-county manpower survey. A manpower committee was formed in his CAP and he was instrumental in organizing a manpower conference in his community with participants representing the U. S. Department of Labor, local welfare agencies, CAP staff, area employers, bankers, representatives of the poor, organized labor, and others. Again, in his words, "The Appalachian school can take credit for the . . . information on manpower development."

It seems clear that in this case the training project provided information to a trainee who was in desperate need of it and in a

position to use it to great advantage to get his community moving in the war against poverty.

Case G

Trainee G said: "Before the project my involvement in community problems was somewhat that of any other non-informed, unconcerned resident. I was active only in things that pertained to my personal being or welfare". G was, in essence, an average active union member at the time of his entry into training.

Interest in the war against poverty, generated by the first two weeks of training, led G to make a personal survey of anti-poverty activities in his area. His involvement in the project led to his appointment to a place on the board of advisors to the summer Head Start program in his county and to a seat on the program committee of the county CAP.

Trainee G subsequently became one of two trainees on his Economic Opportunity Committee to take major responsibility for a central body project in a designated CAP target area. Although designated as a target area, CAP funds were not available for any meaningful work in the area, which was one mile wide and fourteen miles long and contained 5000 families.

The central body project was to build a playground and multi-purpose community building on a seven and one-half acre tract of land. Largely through the efforts of G and two other trainees, a coal company was persuaded to donate the land, another firm agreed to donate stone, and still another to donate a truck to haul it.

The trainees also have attempted to get a Nelson Amendment proposal funded to put low-income men to work on the project. Much work already has been accomplished by men from the community who have worked as volunteers.

G also is active in the civil rights movement and has been able to use his considerable knowledge of the anti-poverty programs in this capacity. Recently, he has played an important role in attempts to establish an OIC program in his community. He has also served as a member of a survey team evaluating another CAP program in his state.

Summary

More cases such as the foregoing could be cited, but what has been presented provides adequate representation. Some cases tend to be dramatic. Others are less so. But all seem to illustrate an important point about the training project.

The effectiveness of the training was roughly in proportion to the trainees' own readiness, prior level of information, and community leadership status. The impact of the training on the indiv-

idual depended on these factors, and what was done with the training depended on the state of the war against poverty in the trainees' community, the strength of the labor movement, and the trainees' position in the movement and the community.

In effect, the trainees tended to use the training in their own ways in light of the needs of the community as they perceived them, and within the limits of their own personalities and abilities.

Yet, in almost every case a change in personal style and effectiveness also can be attributed to the project. Such changes, when combined with a trainees stepping into a void which needed to be filled by a willing leader, led to the most dramatic results.

CHAPTER 5

Other Results of the Training Project

Related Projects

In addition to the community action efforts engaged in by the trainees, the project has produced other results as well. These have come both from the labor movement and West Virginia University; and in some respects they could be considered as major achievements of the project, even though they cannot be fitted into the stated goals of the project as these were conceptualized prior to its' design.

First, the project provided a basis for the continuing development and strengthening of the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council, which is comprised of the state labor federations of the states in the Appalachian Region.

It is undoubtedly true that the Council, organized on the principle that organized labor has a strong interest in and commitment to work toward the economic and social development of Appalachia and all of its people, would have progressed with or without the project. But the point is that the project facilitated the Council's progress in that it provided a focus and outlet for its interest and energies.

Since the inception of the project, the Council and its affiliates have provided leadership for the sponsorship and execution of a number of other community action projects.

To a considerable extent, the project's trainees have been recruited to serve as staff members for these projects, as mentioned in preceding sections of this report. And, in many cases the projects have had the effect of drawing into the war against poverty union leaders and rank-and-file who were not reached directly by the training project. Some of the more noteworthy of these projects are as follows:

(1) **OPERATION HELPING HAND.** Sponsored by the (West Virginia) Kanawha Valley Labor Council, AFL-CIO, this project consists of the "adoption" of the Charleston, West Virginia Women's Job Corps Center by the Council. Essentially, the object of the project is to smooth the transition of the Job Corps Center's graduates from training to

the main-stream of life in American society. Resumes of all graduates are sent to the labor councils in the cities in which the graduates will live. In addition, each of these councils is given an explanation of the Job Corps and each of them is requested to extend a "helping hand" to the graduates of the Job Corps.

This project has attracted a certain amount of attention and interest beyond the Charleston area. The national AFL-CIO has sent information about it to every central labor council in or near a Job Corps Center with its indication of support for extension of the project. Thus, it is possible that in the future many more graduates of other Job Corps Centers will benefit from this kind of project. Furthermore, the Retail Clerks International Union has demonstrated some interest in placing Job Corps' trainees in retail sales training courses. If present plans are adopted, the Union will "adopt" certain of the Corps' graduates and its local unions will work to secure employment for them. If this is attempted and proven to be acceptable, the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council plans to contact other international unions and request them to offer similar assistance in their respective work jurisdictions.

(2) **VISTA TRAINING.** The West Virginia Labor Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, has contracted to conduct training programs for VISTA volunteers. At this time some of the training has been completed successfully. Several of the participants in the Union Leadership Training for Community Action Project served as staff members in the VISTA Training program.

(3) **JOB CORPS RECRUITMENT.** The AFL-CIO Appalachian Council has received funds to recruit participants for Job Corps' programs. The poverty areas of the states in the Appalachian Region are being canvassed to enlist 3500-5000 or more boys for the Job Corps' with major emphasis being given to locating the boys through the AFL-CIO local unions and central bodies in Appalachia. Fourteen trainees of this project have been given staff positions in the Job Corps Recruitment project.

(4) **NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS.** A Neighborhood Youth Corps "out-of-school" program has been established on a pilot basis in Morgantown, West Virginia. Directed by a trainee of this project,

it is sponsored by the West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO in cooperation with the Morgantown Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO. At present the program includes 100 young people, although it is anticipated that it will be expanded in the near future. The emphasis of this program is on experimentation in creating meaningful work experiences combined with remedial education experiences. If it proves successful, and all indications are favorable at this time, it will be extended to other areas of Appalachia in the future.

(5) **CAP EVALUATION.** At the request of the West Central West Virginia CAP, four of the project's trainees served as members of an evaluation group that made personal visits to each target group in a multi-county area. Similar requests for evaluation assistance have been received from other community action programs.

(6) **APPALACHIAN MANPOWER PROGRAM.** The AFL-CIO Appalachian Council has begun an "on-the-job" training project which will provide about 3000 job opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed. Financed by a grant from the U. S. Department of Labor, one feature of the project is that it is an attempt by the Council to work directly with employers and local union leaders in an effort to overcome the traditional hostility and opposition to certain occupational training programs. Several of the training project participants serve as staff members of this project.

Next, the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council and the Institute for Labor Studies of West Virginia University co-sponsored a "Manpower in Appalachia" conference in May, 1966, bringing together some of the foremost experts in the field of manpower development in the United States and more than 300 Appalachian labor, business and other leaders. The costs, borne by West Virginia University, were estimated at over $10,000.

Several important results can be attributed to this conference. The project staff and the Council shifted some of their efforts to the manpower development problem some months before it became generally popular to emphasize this activity. Indeed, the origin of some of the projects listed above can be traced to this conference.

Also, West Virginia University's Appalachian Center has negotiated an agreement with the Legislative Manpower Commission of West Virginia which provides for the organization of a system of manpower committees throughout this State to perform the follow-

ing functions: study the State's manpower problems and alternative solutions for them; propose programs to the State's Legislature for possible legislative implementation; and, initiate and support local community action programs.

This work, which inevitably will tend to center on the problems of the poor and the minority groups, will be supported primarily by West Virginia University and its cost is expected to amount to thousands of dollars annually. If this work is successful, it is possible that similar efforts will be made in other states.

In addition, a proposal was funded effective July 1, 1966, under Title I of the Higher Education Act to provide community action training for larger numbers of union leaders in West Virginia than were reached by the project being reported, although the training of necessity was and will be considerably less intensive as well as non-residential. This project, which has an annual budget of around $30,000 had one hundred thirty-four participants in the fiscal year 1966-1967.

Finally, at the suggestion of the project's staff, the University's Appalachian Center has begun an intensive CAP staff training project in McDowell County, West Virginia. This project, being conducted on an experimental basis, is supported entirely with University funds at the present time.

The projects listed in this section of the report are "spin-offs" relative to the major goals of the training project funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, it is suggested that they are significant accomplishments in themselves.

Furthermore, they illustrate the efforts made to multiply the impact of the project beyond the impact produced by the original trainees. Detailed reports of each of these "spin-off" projects will be prepared at the appropriate time which will indicate more precisely their accomplishments.

Impact of the Project on the Labor Movement, The Individual Trainees, and the War On Poverty

Introduction

It is inevitable that those people who are drawn into a movement such as the war on poverty find themselves experiencing many changes, with the usual division into "good" and "bad" categories. And the sincere combatant in Appalachia may experience many more

changes of a more intense nature simply because of the enormity and pervasive visibility of the problem to be solved in this region.

At the same time, organizations which enter into such wars also change. On balance they may become stronger, if the war is a popular one among their membership, or they may become weaker, if the war results in the dissipation of scarce resources.

The purpose of this section of the report is to attempt to assess the extent and nature to which the project has impacted on the labor movement, the individual trainees, and the Appalachian war on poverty.

It is recognized that this task is most intricate, dependent on impressionistic data, and probably premature since the results of the project may not unfold completely for a number of years. Moreover, the assessment presented is incomplete since it should also include, at the very least, the project staff and even West Virginia University. However, circumstances are such that inclusion of the latter two is not practical at this time.

Impact on the Labor Movement

Perhaps the most profound impact the project has had on the labor movement in Appalachia is that it seemingly has led to the growth of a more socially conscious unionism and union leadership. One of the project associates summed up his impression of the project's impact following a number of interviews with the trainees in his states as follows:

> The impact, to repeat these people, is that they've changed their attitudes. They've become more aware that labor must be active in the community. They've got to have broad-based community support and understanding of their total picture, not just their work-stoppage records and their militancy at the bargaining table. They've come to understand that they've got to span from the eight-hour-a-day to the twenty-four-hour-a-day union approach. They've come to realize that they must work together with all groups and that labor has something to give. . .

The evidence of the evolution to the "new" unionism stems from developments associated with the project which occurred within the labor organizations and which had the effect of changing the organizations' relations to their community.

One of the developments within the unions in Appalachia affected by the project is that many rank-and-file members have become more aware of, and have come to accept, the war on poverty more completely because they have seen and heard about their

leaders' efforts in that war. Then, too, they have been given explanations about it which they didn't get in the past.

In a growing number of instances they are becoming convinced that community action is a legitimate area of union operations, indeed one which is necessary to support the union movement's traditional programs. As this is occurring, more and more union members are becoming involved in community action work and, to all appearances, are gaining satisfactions from it they had not previously received from union membership.

Simultaneously, there are some preliminary indications that here and there union members are becoming dissatisfied with leaders who lack a commitment to social change which promises a better life for more and more people, this, of course, in addition to the conventional benefits from union membership.

This is not to say that the labor movement in Appalachia, or in the U. S., has developed the necessary and sufficient conditions for a radical change of its philosophy. What is suggested is that certain subtle changes are occurring which might later have serious implications for the Region's brand of unionism.

Our final example of an internal change is that the project has to some extent deepened the movement's leadership base. It has produced somewhat more sophisticated types of leaders, some of whom are beginning to question some of labor's customary practices.

In commenting on unionism and the war on poverty one young labor leader said:

> In the . . . central bodies and the state federations, their philosophy is involvement. But the international unions are not concerned about being involved at all. They're just not concerned with this thing. They're concerned with their own problems. . . . I'm thinking and I'm speaking of one particular area. . . . When you talk with poor people and you're a labor man, and you're interested in their problems, they look at you and say, 'I'd like to have a job. This is my problem, I'm unemployed. But your union is not interested in me because you have all of these qualifications'. (The internationals are) going to have to change some of their methods of operation. That is a touchy problem. . . . but I do think they're going to have to open up their friendship ranks.

Turning to the trainees' unions and their communities, labor's community action work resulted in some fairly fundamental changes of relationship in certain cases.

First, in a number of instances labor's new role had an impact on its image. In a growing number of communities the unions in-

creasingly are coming to be viewed as an effective source of community leadership.

Increasing public acceptance of this role probably is explained by labor's having shown itself to the community as having interests in community affairs which transcend the economic and other self-interests of its members.

Along with this, labor demonstrated it was willing to commit resources and energy to community affairs most in need of attention even through these problem areas—poverty, unemployment, etc. - are among the least attractive in which to perform in a "public service" capacity.

As a result, according to one project associate who was trying to pinpoint the real value of the trainees' work:

> . . . these people (the trainees), although they do represent organized labor, (made the communities understand) they're not the ogres that they were once made up to be. Some of these communities have been steeped in tradition which goes way back that labor is militant, is losing the members' and the public's interest, and is only interested in disrupting the community. But I think (the trainees) made (it) known that they can offer something to the community (without disrupting it). . . . by so doing they become acceptable. And the work 'labor' is not ugly any longer.

Another change of some consequence is that labor's work and closer contact with the poor evidently has produced a larger number of people with pro-labor attitudes.

Two other factors deserve to be mentioned. One is that in certain areas the trainees work in community action seems to have increased labor's political influence.

While this deserves additional study, several possible explanations for this are (1) that labor took a stand on an issue that had political overtones, which previously had been ignored, one way or another, by those with political influence. If so labor created a new political base. Or (2) that labor simply started making more "noise" than it had been in the past, thus coming closer to achievement of its political potential. In any event, in at least several geographic areas, certain elected officials have been subjected to various "liberalizing" pressures.

The other factor is that, one way or another, those associated with the field work of the project learned that in a number of communities labor by itself doesn't have sufficient strength to make the community action concept work.

In those cases, the trainees found that they would have to cultivate the support of other interest groups with whom they did not

have previous relationships. The effect of this has been for labor to "spread itself around" in a number of communities and, in some cases is walking in and out of more doors than it did in the past. Quite a few of these new relationships appear to be compatible and stable.

In essence, then, the project's impact on the Region's labor movement seems to be having started a gradual change in members' expectations about unionism while broadening its acceptance and influence in the community. If these trends continue it could well be that labor will strike the spark that will light the fire of social change in Appalachia.

Impact on the Trainees as Individuals

Some of the project's impact upon the trainees has already been described. A number of the trainees, especially among those from the more Southern States, completely changed their attitudes toward Negroes, abandoning discriminatory tendencies to all appearances.

Some of the trainees changed their attitudes and beliefs about the factors which cause and maintain poverty and came to recognize that much poverty is beyond the poor people's control.

And some of them finally began to see poverty as an important and fairly widespread social problem, both in the Appalachian Region and the rest of the country as well.

As significant as these changes are they were accompanied by still other changes which, in addition to the foregoing, have and will change the lives of many of the trainees in most profound ways.

For some, their work in community action already has helped them rise to higher positions in the labor movement. In the future, it is likely that still others will reach higher elective offices than would have been the case without the combination of the project's training and the "action" experiences it facilitated. In other cases, the trainees have experienced upward mobility within CAP agencies.

An interesting illustration of this is provided by one trainee who was not involved in his community's CAP agency but who today is president of its board of directors.

In still other cases, the trainees' work in community action led to their advancing within the structure of their communities. For example, one trainee who, by his own admission, was quite politically inactive prior to the project, ran for and won the position of mayor in his city. In addition we know of several other trainees who have become far more active in politics as a direct consequence of this community action work.

It is not claimed that the project had a great deal of success in creating new leaders. It is doubtful that one could make the transition between the "followers" types of personality and skills and those

associated with "leadership" with four weeks of training and a little more than one year's experience, no matter how high their quality.

But what the project probably did was to create a new leadership arena which, along with the trainees' action, guided and aided by the field support given to them, permitted certain of them to achieve leadership potentials denied to them by the situations they were in.

And with the achievement of higher positions, and with more widespread recognition in their communities, their roles and status changed in certain ways, some of which undoubtedly are producing more personal satisfactions for those experiencing them.

But in other cases the changes reinforced the efforts of the project. Traces of both these effects are evident in the following statement made by one of the trainees:

> For example, last night, in just going out to the bowling alley and bowling, so many people came around that I've been working with, and that I see, and started talking about the war on poverty. So, you know, you've got to be knowledgeable about the war on poverty to carry on a conversation with these people. They know I'm working in this war.

Perhaps the greatest changes of all are being experienced by about twenty-five to thirty trainees who have taken full-time positions in various anti-poverty programs. Not only have they experienced some or all of the changes described above, but their lives have been changed to the extent that a fairly drastic shift in occupations can produce.

According to what is known about this, the social and psychological changes have been as drastic as the occupational shifts. Since these occupational moves have been voluntary, one may assume that the trainees who made them saw them as opportunities to achieve more satisfactions of one kind or another.

The danger, or course, is that those trainees who experienced upward social mobility because of their community action work may lose the commitment which made that mobility possible. Effective community action requires staying in fairly close contact with the hard-core poor in one way or another. And this is a grim task.

Yet, thus far, those trainees who have made the greatest strides in terms of advancing their social status and position are among the ones who have been most willing to actually go into the homes of the poor, talk with them, and use that experience to guide their work. It will be interesting to follow their future histories in this matter.

In any event the fundamental point is that participation in the project has resulted in significant changes in the lives of many of the

trainees. For most, while they have been contributing to the welfare of others they have received their own rewards. If only the classical economist's conception of the competitive market worked as well!

Impact on the Poverty Program

Although quite a bit has already been presented with respect to the trainees' impact on the anti-poverty program, particularly the CAPs, we concluded it would be useful to present in summary form a description of that impact based both upon the data obtained from various sources and our own impressions.

The importance of this subject is that it represents the essence of the goals of the project - was the project successful or unsuccessful for facilitating and making community action efforts more effective?

First, many of the trainees are performing an important function by serving as sources of information about community action in their communities. They are providing this information to CAP staffs and governing boards as well as other interested parties in the community. For the most part, the trainees obtained their information as a direct result of the project, and some of it is being used to attempt new programs supported by previously untapped resources.

Next, many of those trainees who have been active in community action are helping to make the programs more responsive to the needs of the poor. They are able to do this because of the nature of the training, which was based in part on what is known about the poor, and their way of life, their visits to the areas and homes of the poor, and because many of them live among, or not far from, the poor.

The importance of this function probably is greater in Appalachia than say, the more urban areas of the country, which seem to generate rather articulate and sophisticated representatives of the poor and the racial minorities. In contrast, the poor in Appalachia have developed community leaders from among their ranks rather infrequently, and the CAP staffs and boards do not seem to be able to fill that void without other assistance such as has been provided by this project's trainees.

Also, a number of trainees have been instrumental in interpreting the philosophy and importance of community action to various groups and interests in their communities and, hence, have secured greater acceptance and support for the programs.

In a sense, they are performing a public relations function which appears to be useful for changing environments which, in many cases, were hostile to the anti-poverty program.

It seems likely that the trainees are able to play this role because they are part of their communities and, unlike CAP directors further-

more, have little to gain directly, for example, in an economic sense from the success of community action.

Another result is that the trainees' involvement in community action represents a transfer (perhaps extension is a bette. word) to the anti-poverty effort of leadership from the union movement, which has a tremendous need to develop leaders and has evolved the mechanisms for doing so. This appears to be particularly important inasmuch as the Region is noted for its relative lack of leadership at the community level.

Still another contribution made by some of the trainees was the creation of "frictions" within CAP agencies which produced re-evaluation of existing ineffective programs. In some cases, the simple fact of challenging certain programs produced the realization that they could not be defended and, in some cases, they were replaced with more effective ones.

As far as can be judged, the impact on the anti-poverty program which has already occurred as a result of the project will be continued, if not intensified in the future.

This is because the trainees apparently have developed deep commitments to the effort, in addition to having created situations which will continue to provide reinforcement for the continance of such work. For example, having come out strongly and publicly for community action, it would be difficult for the trainees to "pull out" or retreat from the positions they have adopted.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions and Recommendations

Obviously the principal means for enhancing the success of a project of this type is improvement in the procedures used for selecting the people to be trained. Those selected should be people who are most likely to use the training directly and effectively in community action work.

However, it must be emphasized that the Council was faced with two extremely difficult conditions in the matter of selection of the trainees.

First, the time interval between the date the project was funded and the date it officially began amounted to only a few days. Hence, there was little time for the Council to screen candidates in any depth and the selection criteria furnished the Council by the project's staff were not as precise and detailed as would have been desirable.

The second one was that even apart from the lack of time and more suitable guidelines for selection, the Council had inadequate resources to screen candidates in depth. This condition, it will be recalled, was at least somewhat improved later.

However, the existence of these conditions at the beginning of the project meant that there had to be a tendency for selection to be made more on the basis of "who's available?" than "who do we want?" In fact, in some cases all that was possible was for the principal officers of the state labor federations to request their central bodies to produce an assigned number of candidates, thus throwing the selection procedure into the hands of people who knew relatively little about the project's purposes.

This produced a number of unfavorable results, although we are unable to describe them in quantity and with precise estimate of their impact on the outcome of the project. Our judgement is that they did have some negative impact.

First, the selection procedure produced a somewhat uneven product in the sense that the trainees ranged between two extremes: exceptionally well qualified for the project, and very poorly qualified.

This placed a great deal of pressure on the design and implementation of the training. This follows from the proposition the more qualified any given set of trainees, the less perfect the train-

ing has to be to produce results which are judged to be "successful".

When, however, there is a considerable spread in the qualifications of a group that is to be trained the quality of the training becomes more important and it must bracket a wider range of sophistication.

While we believe that the project demonstrated that the bulk of the group which was selected was effectively trained, decisions about the nature and level of the training program had to be made very cautiously. Even so changes in the training were actually made during the conduct of the four training weeks to throw out what wasn't working and to strengthen approaches which were.

Other problems stemming from the unevenness of the quality produced by the selection procedure are evidenced by the relative effectiveness of the trainees' community action activities in their home communities. In some cases the trainees were not the "real" leaders of their locals and central bodies and in a few cases the trainees lacked experiences gained from holding the more demanding, principal positions in locals and central bodies.

In either case, such individuals lacked the influence within the labor movement necessary to obtain "back-up" for their work. In a few of these cases when the top elected officials of the organizations were not included in the project, but others in their organizations were, the trainees' efforts to mobilize those organizations' support for community action, or work with other groups in the communities, were viewed as political threats by the top leaders.

Needless to say, the activities of these trainees occasionally were repressed or made ineffective. And in both these cases, these trainees lacked the political skills necessary for effective community action work.

A point which must be taken into account when considering various selection procedures for a project of this type is that there is no guarantee that central body delegates are union leaders as the term is conventionally used. Of course they **may** be. But more frequently central body delegates are people who happen to be interested in the kind of work normally engaged in by central bodies.

Oftentimes they have not developed the type of leadership (including influence) and political skill necessary for survival in the top elected positions in the locals. Thus, while the central body is the logical focal point for a project which has to do with community action, considerable care must be taken to find the really well-qualified people in those organizations.

Then, too, we found that placing considerable reliance on selection through central bodies may, and did, lead to the exclusion of powerful labor organizations not affiliated with the central bodies

While this was not especially problematic in West Virginia, which is highly organized, in certain Appalachian States with relatively few unionists some of the real power of organized labor wasn't brought to bear because some of the largest locals were unaffiliated with the central bodies involved in the training project.

This difficulty couldn't have been resolved, however, unless ways could have been found to include unaffiliated locals in the central bodies' Economic Opportunity Committees. The solution for this would have to have been forged within the labor movement.

Although we have stressed the difficulties the selection process created for the conduct of this project there is also a positive aspect to this matter.

Even though the trainees possessed extremely diverse characteristics, the fact that the project accomplished as much as it did with this group is an indication that its design basically was sound.

Furthermore, it is a certain amount of proof that similar efforts could be extended rather widely within the labor movement with effectiveness. While it is undoubtedly true that much more could have been achieved with a homogeneous group of trainees, all with highly desirable qualities, something significant was achieved in circumstances which were less than favorable in terms of the project's probable outcome.

Yet, all in all, the judgment of the project's staff is that the trainee selection procedure was the greatest source of difficulty encountered.

At the same time there was no conceivable solution for it given the time and resources constraints which existed. In turn, this problem contributed to another one: the lack of commitment to the goals of the project among a few of those selected as trainees.

Although better selection might have made the problem of lack of commitment less significant, it could not have eliminated it. This is because at the beginning of the project there was considerable intensity of feeling against the anti-poverty programs among a small number of the trainees from the states in the more southern portions of the Appalachian Region.

This is attributable in part to the persistence of conservative economic attitudes in that part of the country. But, perhaps to a much greater extent, the anti-poverty programs, and probably other Federally supported programs as well, are viewed as efforts to secure racial integration.

Consequently, there was a tendency for some trainees to reject the project out-of-hand, even though they weren't always doing it consciously. An illustration of this type of problem is provided by quoting the remarks, somewhat paraphrased, of one of the trainees

from the deep South who was recalling the early weeks of the project and trying to assess its impact:

> Well, of course there's been an impact in my area, but its not the same as the impacts in the other areas. I think that the impact was that all of the trainees from my area had their attitudes about the war on poverty changed. Speaking for myself, I wasn't prejudiced, I just didn't know. I had never stopped to consider the long viewpoints on the whole problem. The war on poverty was what I read in the newspapers. It was a giveaway problem, it was Job Corps, and things like this. The people said it was a Negro program, and they want nothing to do with it. I didn't know.

In time, however, this problem began to break down and disappear. The remarks of the same trainee as cited above are instructive as to the mechanism that was in operation to produce this result:

> It was beneficial putting all of the people together because we did get to meet and spend four weeks with people like (a Negro trainee), and you not only learn different things, but you learn to accept these people and know that they're human beings and that they have feelings. I don't think that we're prejudiced in a way that most people think of Southerners as being prejudiced. We're just indifferent. Its something we never think about. Then we get out and meet (a Negro trainee) and (a Negro trainee) and (a Negro trainee) and they're nice people. You begin to realize this whereas before you wouldn't even think about it at all. Maybe I didn't really believe in segregation, maybe I believed in human rights, but (before the project) I wouldn't stand up before a group of people and defend them (the Negroes) and I wouldn't have gone out to lunch with one in (a city in South Carolina). Now I would with the ones I know because now I know them for what they are.

Of course, the fact that the racial question now is of little or no importance among the trainees doesn't mean that racial issues still are not problematic for the trainees' activities in their communities.

Some of those in the Southern States have reported to us that the existence of anti-Negro feelings among CAP board members and staff members continues to stop the types of projects which offer the most promise for reducing poverty.

Then, too, it is doubtful if the trainees could take strong stands against discrimination in those States at the present time without losing the support of their followers in their union organiza-

tions. Logically, their first task is to attempt to get the organizations' rank-and-file to the same position they are on with respect to racial and community action attitudes.

An additional problem associated with lack of commitment was that some of the trainees believed that poverty was the result of the unwillingness of some people to work, or to use rationally what incomes they received. And some of them were indifferent to the poverty issue simply because they weren't aware that it really existed. Again, however, these trainees tended to lose these characteristics as the project progressed.

Despite these problems, from the outset of the project it was recognized that training unionists to function as leaders in community action efforts, and to relate the union movement to that work, constituted a rather certain means of contributing to the anti-poverty effort.

To explain this, let us first state that the success or failure of a training-action project depends upon the extent to which there is motivation for the individual to join, continue, and be successful in the project. In the case of the project, the motivation could have been the intrinsic value of community action as perceived by the individual.

Viewed abstractly, there are probably relatively few people who would oppose in principle the anti-poverty program, including community action. Yet, working with the poor is not attractive to many people, so the abstract value of community action probably would not constitute a means sufficient to sustain interest and the expenditure of effort for the program.

In the case of trainees drawn from the labor movement, and in the case of a project which received the overt encouragement and leadership of trade union leaders who are widely known and respected a number of conditions necessary for the success of the project were established.

First, even though the trainees initially constituted much less than a homogeneous group (the problems connected with this are discussed in another section) one important thing they had in common was their knowledge that they were being trained to represent organized labor in the anti-poverty effort. They seemed to be extremely conscious that their successes or failures would reflect on the entire labor movement, which was of considerable importance to them.

Therefore, in a sense, they were "on the spot". Viewed as a whole, they had tremendous pressures to make the project succeed to the utmost of their abilities.

At the same time, few, if any organizations can energize and motivate their members to respond to any program or project. Typi-

cally, organizations exist for certain purposes and possess philosophies which provide certain constraints on their activities. Although these are not constants, at a certain point they may usually be regarded as such.

In terms of a project such as this, the labor movement was almost uniquely endowed with characteristics to support the effort in that it has long been noted for its concern for the downtrodden and those in the lower echelons of American Society. Those who are active in some aspect of unionism almost inevitably have internalized the norm of concern for such people.

Hence, the endorsement and overt support of the project by labor constituted a pressure of the movement upon some of the more dedicated of its members to live up to the standards to which they subscribed.

In addition, but related, although the trainees came from different states, were racially mixed, held a wide variety of positions and statuses in their labor organizations, were of different ages, had mixed educational backgrounds, and initially held considerably different attitudes toward social problems, over the course of the project they became a group which adopted a "success in community action" norm of its own which placed still further pressure on its members to act in certain ways.

It appears logical to attribute the evolution of the group quality to a combination of labor's endorsement of the project, the project's consistency with labor's more deeply held values, and the trainees' selection as labor's representatives.

Still another factor operating to the benefit of the project's success was the fact that in addition to the field support provided by the project's staff, the trainees received considerable ongoing support and encouragement from their central bodies, state federations and other union organizations.

Of course, the extent of such support and encouragement varied from state to state in proportion to the strength and influence of each state's labor federation. And along with this variation there was an evident variation in the extent and quality of the trainees' community action efforts.

For example, the trainees from Ohio and West Virginia, the states with the stronger labor movements, tended to be more effective than the trainees from the states in the deep South, where the strength of labor is as yet comparatively weak. However, the trainees from all of the states were supported by their state federations, central bodies and other union organizations.

Therefore, the training was provided to people who clearly were "structured" to respond to it. The "structure" had four components: labor leaders' endorsement and support for the project;

the consistency of labor's goals with the goals of the project; the evolution of the trainees from more-or-less of an aggregation to a cohesive group based on the value or the project and its success; and, the continuing support and encouragement provided on an almost day-to-day basis by the labor movement and the project's field staff.

That the confluence of these factors either existed or could be made to exist was recognized in the design of this project. Yet whatever success this project had or will have cannot be attributed solely to the design of the project.

This project was designed with reference to the nature of the labor movement and that important part of its structure which is embodied in it which is conducive to unionists' receptivity of an effort of this kind.

While there are certain general principles built into the project, it would not have had the same results as it has had if attempted with another group or organization outside of organized labor.

Training and education projects will be more or less successful insofar as they are designed with reference to the "structure" which will support or oppose them. And, their success will vary in proportion to the extent to which a structure exists which may be used to support and sustain the training and education.

At this point a **caveat** is entered. It has been recognized for some time that a semblance of a structure such as that discussed here can be created with certain instructional techniques, such as group discussion, laboratory type training, experiencial training, and the like.

However, research has revealed that, **ceteris paribus**, people undergoing such training will tend to revert to the behavior consistent with their environment following their training/education experiences i.e. usually their pre-training/education behavior.

Thus, in the absence of continuing training/education programs which alter people's attitudes, knowledge, and environments, a monumental task in most instances, the most powerful programs will be those which are based on a conciliation of deeply-held values, organizational norms, and ongoing support of behavior which may or may not be traditional but is consistent with those values and norms.

Based on the results of this project and other experiences, we reached four conclusions about the educational approach which is most effective for adult training and education:

(1) training and education which are related to specific action are likely to be more effective than training for general purposes, defining "effective" either in terms of measurable results of a "desirable" nature or results of any nature;

(2) training and education, to be followed by action, accompanied by "follow-up" both by the project staff in the field and the group being trained at the training sites, are likely to be more effective than projects which give people ideas and attitudes and then leave them to find their own pathway;

(3) training and education projects offered in the context of relatively permanent group reinforcement and support are likely to be more effective than projects which are based on "group" techniques offered to people who in reality are collections of individuals or aggregates;

(4) training and education projects based on deeply held values which previously have been afforded little opportunity for expression are likely to be more effective in a behavioral sense than those based on values which have been relatively more realized.

One additional observation is that the effectiveness of training for "action" does not necessarily rest on having all the "answers" built into the training plan from the beginning of the project. There are two reasons for this.

One is that if "feedback" is built into the project, the project's leaders can take corrective measures as experiences accumulate. The other is that if in fact action follows the training the trainees will tend to adjust their behavior from that which produces failure to that which produces success, although there is a limit to which the frustrations produced by failure will lead to altered approaches and continued action efforts.

Furthermore, experiences gained during this project support the conclusion that training-action projects do not have to include theoretical explanations of the problems which the action is intended to correct although the project's designers must have that knowledge.

People do not have to know why society is as it is to correct social problems. They do have to know what social conditions they prefer and what attempts to produce them are likely to be most successful. The extent of attention devoted to explaining why can be limited to the need to help people discover what they prefer compared to the existing state of affairs.

Obviously the relevance of this point is limited to action projects which rest upon a set of value judgments, and which are offered to people who are likely to concur with those judgments from the beginning or with some help in relating the project's judgments to their own beliefs.

In the judgment of the staff, this project was fairly successful in terms of the goals at which it was aimed - providing more extensive support and leadership for community action in the Appalachian Region.

Furthermore, we believe that labor's future role in community action in the Region will continue, and perhaps increase, even if the present Federally-supported programs were to be discontinued. However, we believe the project could have been somewhat more successful than it was if two additional changes could have been made.

First, more field staff members were needed both by the University and the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council. The addition of five to eight more people would have produced benefits vastly in excess of the added cost.

As it was, the three project associates and the Council's coordinator had too many people to assist in addition to the excessive travel costs (measured both in terms of actual dollar expenditures and lost time) necessary to reach them.

Second, the project could have been somewhat more successful if representatives of the poor could have been included in the training along with the unionists. This would have produced an important result.

This is that the two groups could have had an opportunity to learn to communicate and work together, with obvious benefits for both parties. In an effort to provide for this in the future on at least a demonstration basis, the Institute for Labor Studies has filed a proposal with the Office of Economic Opportunity to train a limited number of representatives of the poor who are serving on CAP governing boards. If this proposal is funded, an effort will be made to link, in some way, the representatives of the poor with the labor trainees.

It seems obvious that the training project reported in this document has set the stage to reach a greatly expanded number of unionists to enlist their commitment and energies for community action and the war on poverty.

At the present time the project we have been describing and analyzing has been refunded and will continue until June 1, 1968. The project has been redesigned and will be based on a less intense, non-residential series of week-end conferences and other activities with the goal of attempting to reach 1200 additional unionists in Appalachia.

Thus, utilizing the assistance of the original trainees, an effort will be made to capitalize on the gains made during the first months of the project. If present plans materialize, labor's community action work in this Region will be greatly multiplied.

Finally, although this project has been expensive, adding up to over $2500 per trainee, consideration should be given to its replication in other problem regions in the United States through universities in those areas.

This suggestion is based on the premise that if more labor leaders can participate in a project such as this on a national basis, the net effect may well be to multiply labor's concern and involvement in community action disproportionate to the additional numbers of trainees. Therefore, funding additional projects could prove to be a highly productive investment.

Publications of
The Institute for Labor Studies

REPRINT SERIES—Includes works published by staff members of the Institute.

INFORMATION SERIES—Includes papers which contain unique and imaginative ideas dealing with contemporary issues related to the work of the Institute.

RESEARCH SERIES—Includes reports of research carried out by the Institute staff that has not been published elsewhere.

REPORT SERIES—Includes regular reports of the Institute's programs and reports of special educational projects.

West Virginia University Bulletin
Series 68 No. 9-7 April 1968
Issued Monday, Wednesday, and Friday
Second Class Postage
Paid at Morgantown, W. Va. 26506

MPB 1-4 M. 65

92.