

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 343

AC 010 333

AUTHOR Wang, Virginia Li; Ephross, Paul H.
TITLE Poor But Not Forgotten. An Evaluative Study of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Maryland.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Cooperative Extension Service.
REPORT NO Monogr-1
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 44p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Data Collection, *Home Health Aides, Interviews, *Low Income Groups, *Nutrition Instruction, *Program Evaluation, Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS Maryland

ABSTRACT

An evaluative study of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Maryland was made. The study aimed at the assessment of the results of this program currently conducted by the University of Maryland. The object of the program is to influence homemakers to change and improve family nutritional practices. This study focused on the educational tasks of non-professional aides in effecting this change. The general research strategy employed was twofold. First, the direct service recipient, the homemaker (usually of low-income status), and the direct service provider, the aide (often of similar background), were made the primary sources of data. Secondly, this evaluation sought to measure change over time. Visits were made by supervisors to selected sites (three) for study. Three interviewers in each county selected were recruited and hired by the supervising agents. Using a table of random numbers, a 50% random sample was drawn from the population of homemakers being served by the program during December 1969. All data gathering interviews with homemakers took place during January 1970. A coding system was developed, and the data was coded and put on punched cards for sorting purposes. Data obtained directly from homemakers indicates that the program was seen as helpful. The contributions of the aides are what has made the program successful. It is concluded that the program should be continued and expanded. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.



POOR BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Virginia Li Wang
Paul H. Ephross

ED050343

IC 010 353

Cooperative Extension Service University of Maryland College Park, Maryland

Monograph 1

Monograph 1
Published 1970
Price \$1.00

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics,
Extension Service, University of Maryland and United States De-
partment of Agriculture Cooperating. Robert E. Wagner, Director.
Distributed in Furtherance of Acts of Congress of May 8 and June
30, 1914.

ED050343

POOR BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

**An Evaluative Study Of The
Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program
In Maryland**

by

Virginia Li Wang
Cooperative Extension Service
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

and

Paul H. Ephross
School of Social Work
University of Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland

FOREWORD

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program of the Cooperative Extension Service has enjoyed remarkable success from its beginning little more than a year ago. It is meeting its primary goal of improving the nutritional practices of low income families.

Outstanding as it has been, much can be done to give the program greater strength. High on the list is the kind of evaluative research reported in this publication which points to ways to buttress the weaknesses and build on the strengths.

This innovative study evaluates a new and effective program that is responsive to a real need and generates hope among the disadvantaged. It serves as an example of the kind of evaluation which all program areas should receive. As the demand for services to society -- whether they be educational or otherwise -- continues to increase, budget problems become more acute. More and more, survival of programs will be determined by guidelines established through meaningful evaluation.

This report demonstrates the wisdom of close cooperation among individuals, representing different divisions of the same agency, who have complementary resources and expertise to contribute to a program.

Robert E. Wagner
Director, Cooperative Extension Service
University of Maryland

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Chapter I The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Maryland	1
Chapter II The Study Design	6
Chapter III Methodology	9
Chapter IV Findings: The Homemakers Speak	12
Chapter V Findings: The Aides Reflect	18
Chapter VI Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations for Next Steps	25
Bibliography	29
Appendix	30

PREFACE

Conducting an evaluative study is always a strain upon personnel and structures already overburdened by the demands of service delivery. In addition, the very terms "evaluation" and "research" are not calculated to relieve the doubts and fears of service delivery personnel. Within the complex structure of Extension, there are many staff members at state and county levels. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program brought into the picture the county aides as well as the low-income families whom they serve.

To try to thank each of the many persons who contributed to this study would be impossible. We are most grateful to Mrs. Nancy Kebschull and George Allen, Extension Agents in Allegany County, and to Mrs. Joan Tucker and Mrs. Doris Stivers, Agents in Caroline County. Their commitment to professionalism, their sense of responsibility and their ability to stick to a time schedule in the face of obstacles aided the study to be completed within the allotted time. Mrs. Melanie Gibson, Extension Agent in Charles County, was helpful in being willing to participate in pretesting the study instruments.

Acknowledgement is due to contributions of Mrs. Nancy Schneider of the State Staff, Extension Home Economics, especially in taking charge of pretesting the questionnaires and training interviewers. Also a member of the State Staff, Dr. Dorothy VanZandt's participation in a reliability check of data coding is much appreciated. Dr. Robert E. Wagner and Dr. Harold D. Smith, Director and Associate Director respectively of the Cooperative Extension Service, Dr. A. June Bricker, State Leader of Extension Home Economics, and Mrs. Judith A. Pheil, Food and Nutrition Specialist of Extension Home Economics, have all given this research effort firm and helpful support. In essence, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program developed under their direction and the very existence of the program reflects their commitments.

The true heroines of our study are the aides, who shared with us so generously their accumulated wisdom, the homemakers who allowed us to enter into the privacy of their homes and shared the details of their not always happy lives, and the interviewers who braved the vicissitudes of a Maryland winter to gather the interview data.

Our appreciation also goes to Mrs. Madelon Ferguson who typed the manuscript of this evaluation. Her patience and understanding have made our tasks much easier.

POOR BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

CHAPTER I

THE EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM IN MARYLAND

Background

This report is an evaluative study conducted during the winter and spring of 1970 of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Maryland. The study aimed at the assessment of the results of this program currently conducted by the Extension Home Economics department of the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland, United States Department of Agriculture cooperating.

The Cooperative Extension Service is created as an organic part of the land-grant university in each state in compliance with the responsibilities accepted under the Smith-Lever Act.¹ The Act established a nationwide system by which knowledge could be transmitted from researchers to the people. It directed attention toward improving the welfare of those in a position of relative social and economic disadvantage through programs in community development. It also carried the objective of improving the home environment as well as the capability of people to further the development and refinement of their institutions and organizations. The mandate was to supply educational measures for the individual and the family which would enhance human development and maximize the individual's contribution to his society.

Over half a century's span, much has been accomplished and much is now being re-emphasized in an attempt to provide learning experiences directed toward solving major social and economic problems of the country.² One recurrent criticism has been that Extension spends too much of its home economic effort with formally organized clubs with little attention given to non-members. Critics have said that the emphasis has at times been social rather than educational, that members are primarily middle-aged women from middle-income groups. Whether or not this has been the case, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program signifies a dynamic endeavor toward the original goals of the Cooperative Extension Service.

The program was initially funded in 1968 by the Federal Extension Service. In 1969, the hiring of aides to conduct a nutrition education program with low-income families on a six-month trial period began. In 1970, the appropriation was expanded and money was made available from regular Smith-Lever funds.

¹U.S. Congress, Committee on Agriculture, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work, Report No. 110, 63rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1913.

²USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee, "A People and A Spirit: A Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension," Colorado State University, Fort Collins, November, 1968.

According to the status report of February, 1970³, the target populations of the program are the hard-to-reach rural and urban poor of Maryland. Priority is given to working with those families not motivated to seek educational assistance and not currently served through the programs of other agencies. Special effort is directed toward reaching families with young children and the aged.

The societal context against which the program is conducted is worthy of comment. The 1960's were marked by two broad trends in service to the poor and disadvantaged. The poor were rediscovered by persons, agencies and institutions who had forgotten them. Symbols of this rediscovery were Harrington's The Other America,⁴ and President Johnson's announcement of the War on Poverty and the enormous wave of publicity it generated. Through a complex interaction of social forces, poverty and later hunger came to be unacceptable to the conscience of a country which had developed an affluence unparalleled in human history. Spurred by the Civil Rights movement of the early and mid-sixties, a wide variety of professions and institutions became sharply aware of the fact that while most of the poor are white, poverty and resultant personal and social ills are disproportionately concentrated among those of minority races.

At the same time, the past decade has been one of intense re-examination of the roles of professionals and non-professionals in service to the poor.⁵ In more than one profession, the comment was heard that professional backgrounds do not necessarily disqualify one from understanding the poor but simply were irrelevant to it. Some have suggested that the myth that the poor cannot be helped or are unwilling to help themselves lies in the distortions of perception which professionals tend to bring to the real life problems of the poor.⁶ In professions from medicine to librarianship, attempts are being made to employ indigenous non-professionals to bridge the service gap.⁷ The central theme of these efforts is the need to make less rigid previously sacrosanct structures of service delivery to those in greatest need.

Finally, the 1960's were characterized by greatly increased awareness of the problems of American cities. The deterioration of housing and services, the transformation of inner cities into black ghettos surrounded by white suburbs segregated by social class, problems of air and water pollution, increased crime and even more increased fear of crime became all the more sharply etched in the public mind as the decade drew to a close. Exacerbating many of these problems was the flight of poor families from rural areas to the large, metropolitan districts where they were unable to make the transition from rural to urban living, only adding to the problems of the cities.

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is responsive to each of these trends. It aims to serve low-income families with emphasis on nutrition. It employs indigenous non-professionals as front-line service delivery personnel. It serves a high proportion of its families in rural areas and in small towns.

³ Maryland Cooperative Extension Service, "Status of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program." College Park, Maryland, February, 1970 (mimeographed).

⁴ Michael Harrington, The Other America (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963).

⁵ Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, New Careers for the Poor. (New York: The Free Press, 1965.)

⁶ Harris Chaiklin, "Motivating the Poor," in Benjamin Schlesinger (ed.), Poverty in the United States and Canada, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966, pp. 14-15.)

⁷ For an example of creative use of non-professionals, see Harris Chaiklin, Richard Sterne and Paul H. Eplross, Community Organization and Services to Improve Family Living, II, Baltimore: Research Center, School of Social Work, University of Maryland for the Baltimore City Department of Social Services, 1969.

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program

Initiated in January, 1969, the program is now operational in Allegany, Anne Arundel, Caroline, Charles, Dorchester, Garrett, Montgomery, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, Somerset, St. Mary's, Washington, and Wicomico Counties, and Baltimore City.

On February 1, 1970, there were 74 aides employed in 13 counties and Baltimore City. During the previous calendar year, 51 aides worked in 9 counties and Baltimore City, assisting 8,112 persons representing 1,476 families.

Extension aides are selected primarily from the community in which they live and work, in keeping with the concept of "hiring the poor to serve the poor." They are recruited, trained and supervised by designated county Extension Home Economists, assisted by other members of the county and state staffs and cooperating agency personnel. Inservice training is provided to the supervising agents and aides on a continuing basis by specialists on the state staff and other personnel. As the aides are recruited, they attend three weeks of intensive training before starting field work. The supervising agent provides continuing training to the aides in group sessions and individual consultation. In teaching the relationship of food and nutrition to health and emotional stability, the aide emphasizes meal planning, selection and buying, and food preparation.

The supervising agent works closely with advisory committees. She coordinates the program with those of other agencies serving the poor in extending the program to families in need of assistance.

The aides work closely with the person most responsible for meeting the food and nutrition needs of family members. In most instances this is the homemaker, but assistance is also given to teenage girls, boys and/or the father when advisable.

Among the educational methods used by aides are home visits, group meetings, demonstrations, tours, exhibits, newsletters, news releases, radio and television. Special emphasis is given to utilizing the food, equipment, and other resources available to these families.

Daily logs written by the aides serve as a tool for evaluation and supervision by the supervising agent and are a basis for evaluation and program development for the state staff. Other records and reports are required at monthly and six-month intervals by the Federal Extension Service. The Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture is responsible for monitoring of the program.

The Sample Counties and Their Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Programs

Two counties in Maryland were selected as the locales for the evaluative study. They were chosen because they represent not only the geographic but also the demographic extremes of the counties in which the program is in operation. The two, Allegany and Caroline, also illustrate the variables in program establishment.

Allegany County lies in the Appalachian region of Western Maryland and is bordered by Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Washington and Garrett Counties. The county originated as a land and water transportation gateway to the West. These activities together with coal mining made Cumberland an industrial town as well as the County Seat. The lack of agricultural development in this mountainous terrain coupled with industrialization and transportation gave Allegany County a flavor of urban living. However, in recent years the depletion of the best coal deposits, the decline of surface transportation and a resettling and plateauing of manufacturing after World War II left Allegany County in a static growth situation.

The situation of Allegany County in the 1960's is summarized quite aptly in the county comprehensive plan as follows:⁸

"On April 1, 1960, there were 84,169 people living in Allegany County, as reported by the U. S. Census. This was about 5,400 fewer persons than in 1950. The actual loss was much more than this, however, if the natural increase due to births is taken into account. Births, less deaths, should have produced an increase of some 13,000 to 14,000 persons during the 1950's, but this normal increase was lost by out-migration along with the 5,400 actually reported. The total loss was therefore more nearly 18,000 to 19,000 persons, a very real loss in human resources. This is the first decade in the county's history for which a population loss was recorded. It is a symptom of serious economic difficulties."

The initiation of the program in Allegany County was greatly facilitated by the immediate involvement of public agencies and officials. The objectives, purposes, etc. of the program were shared with the School Board, the Health Department, the Social Services Department, the Community Action Agency, the Department of Employment Security and the Board of County Commissioners. Their advice and cooperation were solicited. As a result, they provided considerable assistance for the recruitment of aides, the identification of locales to be served, the listing of potential needs, and the training of aides. This early involvement paved the way for subsequent referrals and joint participation in programs.

Persons who expressed significant interest in the job were asked to submit applications to the Allegany County Extension Office. Twelve applicants merited interviews and of those, six were re-interviewed. The second interviews were conducted in the applicants' homes. They provided opportunities to talk with the applicant in a more familiar setting, thus making it easier for her to talk about homemaking skills, family life and her own aspirations about the job. The selection process was thought to be a very important one.

During the basic training phase, the circle of involvement widened as local colleges and other public and private organizations provided resources and facilities for training. Although the emphasis of the training was on basic nutrition, the total training was broad based to include human behavior and individual development. The basic training was divided into three segments - Understanding Self, Understanding Youth, and Understanding Family Living. These segments of training provided a logical way of teaching technical information to the aides. The continuing training usually consists of a half-day session each week. The emphasis of the training reflects needs and requests of program families and aides.

Caroline County is the fourth smallest county in Maryland and the only landlocked county on the Eastern Shore. It is one of the three middle counties on the Eastern Shore and is bounded entirely on the east by the state of Delaware, on the south by Dorchester County, and on the west by Queen Anne's and Talbot Counties. Although somewhat isolated from the large metropolitan areas, Baltimore, Washington and Wilmington are only slightly over an hour away by automobile.

In the geographic heart of the Delmarva Peninsula, Caroline County has a population of 20,100, with the County Seat in Denton, a mean annual temperature of 55.8 degrees and an annual precipitation of 45.08 inches. One of the rich farming sections of the Eastern Shore, this county has a diversified agricultural economy in which poultry production and the cultivation of field crops, such as corn and small

⁸ Comprehensive Master Plan, Allegany County, 1965, p. 7.

grains, and garden products are important industries. The county also has other industry. These include fertilizer plants, flour mills, fruit and vegetable canneries, poultry processing plants, milk condensaries, garment and button manufacturers, plastics plants manufacture of electrical elements, and a box manufacturing plant. However, the feelings of separateness and xenophobia prevalent on the Eastern Shore have often been remarked by journalists and visitors. Only slowly are these attitudes beginning to give way as the resort potential of the coast is beginning to be developed in earnest.

According to the 1960 Census data, the population of Caroline County was 79.3% white and 20.3% black. Thirty-seven and one-half percent of all families had a median household income of \$3,000 or less in 1960. This figure represented more than twice the statewide average of 15%. Only 5.9% of the households had an income of \$10,000 or more, or about one-third of the state ratio of 20%. Between 1950 and 1960, there was a 6.7% increase in population. About 8.5% of the population are 60 years and over.

During the recruitment phase, the program was explained to various agencies, organizations, and interested persons to gain their support. Consequently, the Department of Social Service supplied many names of clients who might be contacted to apply for the job. The Health Department, Employment Security, Cafeteria Supervisors, Homemakers Clubs, Board of Education, and Ministerial Association also cooperated in like manner.

Five aides were selected by the County Extension staff from the 37 persons who applied. The basic outline for the 3-week intensive training period was adapted from Federal Extension Service materials.⁹ Specific lesson plans, illustrative materials, preparation for teaching and periodic self-assessments were part of the training design. The basic nutrition phase of the training was intensive, involving for the trainees not only learning but in some instances "unlearning" prior misconceptions about nutrition. Comparative shopping tours together with meetings with representatives from health, welfare and vocational agencies were employed. A by-product of the training design has been the support of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program by the other agencies with whom liaison was established during the training period. Numerous examples of cooperation and help from nurses, the Rehabilitation Center, the Department of Social Services and the Board of Education can be cited.

Continuous training has been an integral part of the program. Both aides and supervising agents have been aware of the need for training and problem-solving in areas other than nutrition. The regular responsibilities of the supervisor have included reading and responding to aides' logs, development of teaching materials, and individual meetings with aides as indicated.

In summary, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in both of the counties selected, as in other counties, represents important innovation for the Cooperative Extension Service. The program's concern for the poor, its use of non-professionals, its employment of an active, reaching-out, case-finding approach and its assumption that the poor have the capacity to learn and change their nutrition practices are significant new directions, reflective of broader societal impact upon Extension. The program contains within itself the possibility of a significant new impact upon the lives of the poor.

⁹ USDA Federal Extension Booklet, FA-681, Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low-Income Families, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY DESIGN

The Program as a Basis for Evaluation

Evaluative research of programs designed to change patterns of family life poses several problems over and above the sizeable difficulties of evaluative research in any form. Some of these problems in this study can be illustrated by considering the goals of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in some detail.

On the one hand, the program has as its operational objective improving families' nutritional intake and practices. It is not meant as a substitute for services which other agencies in the service constellation should be providing. Aides are being employed to influence dietary practices of families, not as third-hand social workers nor as remedies for gaps or lacks in the services of other agencies. To forget the specific objective of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program would be to sink into a morass of generalized goals such as "fighting the effects of poverty" - an unmeasurable morass in which other attempts at evaluation have frequently sunk.

On the other hand, it is clear that what and how people cook and eat are part of how people live. Individual and family nutritional practices are part of an interrelated system of values, norms, beliefs and other elements of life-style. To think a program can affect nutritional understanding and practices without an awareness of the totality of families' lives is to ignore masses of research in the social and behavioral sciences.

The complex auspices under which the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is conducted add two additional variables. This program includes funds and efforts from the federal, state and county levels. Its operation involves personnel at a variety of levels with a variety of educational, professional and political backgrounds. Opportunities for inter-organizational tangents of interest are many. The program is conducted in a variety of counties with a variety of specialized histories and attitudes on the part of leadership within each county. The variance within each county is also very great. The program involves cooperation with a multitude of health, welfare, educational and social agencies. In all evaluative research, one needs to be aware of the complex cross-currents of personal and institutional self-interest. Perhaps this is even more the case in regard to a program as complex as the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.

The general research strategy employed was twofold. First, the direct service recipient, the homemaker, and the direct service provider, the aide, were made the primary sources of data. This seems to the investigators to be consonant with the rediscovery mentioned above - namely, that service recipients have much to tell us about the quality and nature of the services they receive, and have a perfect right to have their assessments taken seriously into account. Thus, while data were solicited in various forms from administrative personnel, homemakers and aides were the primary sources of data for the study and care was taken not to contaminate the data by making them available to county personnel above the level of aide.

Secondly, this evaluation sought to measure change over time. A before-after design would have been optimal but was not possible for several reasons. For one, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program depends upon case-finding. Thus, there is no population of homemakers until they have been located and inducted into the program by the aide. Once inducted, they are service recipients and are no longer appropriate sources of "before" measures. Also, as is commonly the case, so much energy is needed to be invested in starting the program operation that staff had little opportunity to invest in evaluation until the program was well under way.

The measurement of change was done largely by asking homemakers and aides to judge their own change. In other words, there is a retrospective element to the study. Homemakers and aides were asked to provide their own baselines, as it were, with questionnaire items asking directly about the extent and amount of change as each had experienced it. The potential drawbacks of this strategy are clear, in that what was obtained was subjective assessment in each case. The advantages, in addition to feasibility, include recognition of the fact that the homemaker is not merely a passive (and hopefully grateful) recipient of a one-way giving process. The homemaker is seen as an integral part of the helping process itself and as a valued source of feedback.

This study was designed to take into account several other elements of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program:

1) The innovative nature of the program determined the type of wide-range, somewhat open-ended data-gathering instruments.

2) The interrelatedness of nutritional practices with other aspects of life was taken into account in the attempt to obtain a general measure of "hope" for the future. Our assumption here is that a major effect of intervention by the program into otherwise low-hope families would be an increased level of hope for the future.

3) Use of the homemakers and aides as primary sources for data would, it was thought, provide a valuable side-benefit for the program, by reinforcing the sense of importance and pride in the program so necessary for its further functioning.

A note regarding confidentiality is in order. It has been our experience, together with that of other researchers, that elaborate devices to ensure confidentiality are unnecessary. This seems to be the case provided that a simple, truthful statement of intent of the study is shared with the client, and that professional staff are helped to see the study as an asset, rather than as a threat. Aides were not interviewed by immediate superiors, nor service recipients by the aide (nor the agent) directly responsible for giving them service. Disinterested persons were employed to conduct the interviews. Data instruments were coded by number; data analysis and findings were kept anonymous.

Focus of the Study

The aim of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is to influence homemakers to change and improve family nutritional practices. This study focused on the educational tasks of the aide in providing change in the dietary practices of the homemakers.

Though the aides' duties are educational in the broadest sense, action towards change, not merely education or understanding, is the goal of the program.

The study asked:

- I. To what extent do homemakers see their nutrition practices as having changed during the time they have been served by aides? In what ways?
- II. Have the aides conveyed to homemakers a sense of greater hope for themselves and their families as a result of their learnings from the program?
- III. Are there patterns of aides' activities which have been used with families showing the greatest change? the least change?
- IV. How similar are aides' and homemakers' perceptions of change? Do those families in which the homemaker felt she had made substantial changes also rank high on the aides' rating of change?
- V. When do aides consider a family ready for discharge from the program? What are the criteria for success?

Design

The design called for two counties to be selected as the locale for the study. Each homemaker in the county was interviewed by a person other than the aide who renders direct service. Interviews were conducted according to a schedule containing both open-ended and closed-ended items. This was known as the "Homemakers' Questionnaire."¹ This schedule obtained face-sheet data such as age, family composition, a rough measure of income, interviewer's rating of quality of housing and similar information. The questionnaire had on it a code number, preassigned to each program family in the county.² This code number enabled later compilation of all of the data for processing a given family. This instrument provided data relevant to Questions I, II and the homemakers' parts of Questions IV and V of the study focus.

Aides were asked to fill out a written questionnaire regarding their work with each program family included in the sample.³ This was referred to as the "Aides' Questionnaire." In an effort to obtain clear information without compromising confidentiality, a commitment was made to aides that these raw questionnaires would not be made available to the supervising agents for evaluative purposes, and the cases were listed on the completed questionnaires by number. Data obtained through this questionnaire were designed to cast light on Questions III and IV.

A third source of data was the result of a meeting with all of the aides in the county to discuss Question V. The data obtained through this method were necessarily more exploratory and tentative than the other data; they should prove useful as a beginning step towards solving a problem highlighted by a previous study.⁴

A Note on Cause and Effect

The establishment of cause-effect relationships has always been a crucial problem in evaluating the effects of a program which aims at changing behavior. The design of this study did not attack this question directly. That is, there is no built-in control to establish that any changes found in homemakers' behavior might not have taken place anyway over the time span involved. Technically, the study is at the descriptive level, for the most part.

However, one is probably on firmer ground in attributing any changes found to the effects of the program in this study than in others. For one thing, the relatively isolated, smaller communities where most of the program families live were not likely to be served by a variety of change-inducing influences. For another, few, if any other programs, seek directly to affect food and nutrition practices. Thus, findings may be taken as a rough index of the effectiveness of aides' educational tasks.

It should also be noted that the evaluation was not designed to measure overall effectiveness of the program. Thus, for example, although demographic data provided a rough measure of which families are being served by the program, we did not study directly whether the neediest of families of the county are being served, nor the proportion of all needy families who are being served. The study accepted the present homemaker population and worked forward from there. Nor were there measures of supervisory or training effectiveness, aide selection or internal administrative functioning. These must await a more elaborate, wide-ranging study.

¹ A copy of this questionnaire may be found in Appendix A, pp 30 - 34

² A program family is defined as a family or individual who had voluntarily participated in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.

³ For a copy of the Aides' Questionnaire, see Appendix B, pp 35 - 37

⁴ Datagraphics Corporation, "Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program Evaluation, January to July, 1969", U. S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service, November, 1969.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Preliminary Preparation

When this study was proposed, the senior investigator visited Allegany and Caroline Counties to confer with the supervising agents and County Task Force. During the visits, the research proposal was shared and the intent of the study made clear. The agents assisted in reviewing and revising the two proposed study instruments. This was especially helpful since they were able to bridge the cultural gap in communication by simplifying the language of the questionnaire so that they were clearly understandable to the aides and families. A similar visit was made to Charles County, which was selected as the site for pretesting.

It was decided that three non-staff interviewers for each county were needed to administer the Homemakers' Questionnaire. These interviewers were recruited by the county staff and trained by a member of the state staff. To facilitate the interviewer's work, the aides made arrangements with the families for the interviewers' visit. In addition, the supervising agent sent a letter to each family explaining the study and asking for their cooperation. All interviews were made exactly one year after the beginning of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Maryland.

Care was taken to anticipate any feelings of threats, real or unreal, to all persons concerned which may come from the evaluation study. It was explained that the data resulting from the study would be seen only by the investigators, and would not be used for personnel evaluation.

Pretesting of the Study Instruments

Pretesting was carried out in Charles County. The Aides' Questionnaire was administered to the 5 Extension aides by a staff member from the state office. The staff member also conducted a group interview to discuss two questions: "How can you tell when a homemaker no longer needs the program?" and "What kind of training do you still need to do your job?" She also interviewed the 5 program families on whom the aides had reported using the Homemakers' Questionnaire.

Training of Interviewers

Three interviewers in each county were recruited and hired by the supervising agents. All six women were not actively employed at the time of the study. Four had previously worked in professional capacities prior to assuming the roles of homemaker. All were judged capable of establishing rapport with the program families.

Training of the interviewers was conducted by the state staff member who in turn had been trained by the investigators. She worked with the two groups of interviewers in the counties two weeks in advance of the actual study. They discussed interviewing techniques and role-played potential problem situations.

Sample Selection

Using a table of random numbers, a 50% random sample was drawn from the population of homemakers being served by the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program during December 1969. The only additional criterion for inclusion in the sample was the requirement that the homemakers must have been served by the program for three months prior to the interview. A total of 136 families was obtained, 68 from each county. Due to inability to reach a few homemakers (12, largely because of employment) and a minimal refusal rate (6), it was necessary to reach into the pool of randomly selected substitutions to replace these families.

During the course of the study, it became clear that illness on the part of one of the Allegheny aides and resultant irregularity of service had produced an atypical situation for the homemakers served by this aide. The investigators decided to discard the 17 families served by this aide, leaving a total of 119 homemakers who composed the final sample, 68 from Caroline County and 51 from Allegheny County.¹

Data Collection

Despite the Maryland winter weather, all of the data-gathering interviews with homemakers took place during January 1970. This represents a genuine achievement in view of the isolation in which many sample families live and the difficulties of communicating with families, many of whom lack telephones.

During the data collection period, a day was set aside in each county for the state staff member to administer the Aides' Questionnaire to the aides of each county. The aides filled out the questionnaire in writing. This was followed by a tape-recorded group interview in which training needs and criteria for family "graduation" from the program were probed. The group interview was conducted by the state staff member in one county and by the junior investigator in the other. In Caroline County, one aide who had just left the program for reasons unrelated to job performance took part in the study, filling out the Aides' Questionnaire by mail. To underscore the efficiency of the process, all of the aides' inputs had been received by the end of the month.

Data Analysis

A coding system was developed and the data were coded and put on IBM cards for sorting purposes. A reliability check of the dietary recall items was performed by a professional nutritionist on the state staff. Since the researchers considered these items the most difficult on which to obtain coding reliability, it was thought that the level of agreement should serve as a rough reliability indicator for the other items. Agreement was obtained on 90.1% of the dietary recall items.²

In analyzing the data, race has been used as the primary analytic variable. As has been mentioned, all of the sample's homemakers of one county are white, the majority of the other county's black. Thus, using race as a variable gives a rough indication of the differences between counties. Further, an unusual feature of this program is its attempt to bridge supposed racial gaps in communication. Thus, in Caroline County, not only do some white aides work with black homemakers, but some black aides work with white homemakers. In the opinion of the researchers, this is regrettably unusual, not only within Extension but within a wide gamut of service programs. Where race as a variable detected differences, they will be presented. The fact that more differences were not found by race should speak forcefully to those responsible for planning the future of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and to others throughout the country as well.

The findings to be presented in the succeeding Chapters represent only a partial presentation. Like most evaluative studies, this one generated much more data than can be presented within the limitations of space. The authors would be pleased to make data available for secondary analysis upon application and plan further data analysis on their own parts.

¹ The researchers are aware of no reason to suppose that discarding these homemakers skewed the data obtained. However, the process as reported here is detail so that the reader may keep in mind this possible limitation of the validity of the findings.

² Of the remaining items, 4.55% of the 357 dietary recall items yielded disagreement by 1 step on a 4-point scale; the remaining 4.55% yielded disagreement by more than 1 step.

A By-Product of the Study

Throughout the process of the study, both investigators were constantly impressed with the amount of learning for program staff which was a by-product of the evaluation process. Discussions about the study, about possible findings were combined with attempts to handle the feelings generated by the study. An uneven but valued aura of pride and importance developed about the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program during the course of the study. Further, though this is difficult to prove, it is our assessment that precision and order in record-keeping and in administrative functioning in general were improved for the two counties which participated in the study. This is not new in the history of evaluative research; rather, it underscores the need for a program of ongoing evaluation of a scientific nature within Extension.

Let us next "listen" to the homemakers.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: THE HOMEMAKERS SPEAK

The Families Served

The families served by the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program are bitterly poor, for the most part.¹

Table 1 Reported income per month from all sources for all family members, by age.
Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970

Race	Income	Under \$100	\$100-199	\$200-299	\$300-399	\$400 or more	(No. of cases)
White		5	11	22	12	10	(60)
Black		11	17	13	9	9	(59)
Total		16	28	35	21	19	(119)

Further confirmation of the depth of poverty can be found from the fact that 53% (63) of the homemakers could not specify what additional food items they would buy if they had an extra \$5.00 per week. In fact, 19% answered, "are you kidding?" These homemakers live on one side or the other of the edge of hunger much of the time. Their children, an average of 3.1 for white families and 3.2 for black families, do too. A characteristic of budgets of families below the poverty line is the fact that they cannot be balanced, by definition, while providing adequately for human needs. The effects of continued and continuous deprivation on the lives of children and families is too well documented to need discussion here.

There are both positive and negative implications for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program to be drawn from the income figures. On the one hand, the program is reaching families for whom it was designed. Unquestionably, it serves low-income homemakers. The negative implication is the poor long-term prognosis ensured by continued life in poverty. Mayer has commented on the self-defeating quality of teaching homemakers the need for better and more varied nutrition and then denying them the financial resources to put into operation what they have learned.² The ability of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program aides to help families to utilize the Food Stamp Program bridges this gap in part, but only in part.

¹ It should be noted that the Federally defined poverty line, \$3653 for a non-farm family at the time of the study, for 1970, refers to a family of four. As will be pointed out below, the mean family size of the sample was 5.2. Thus, 79 of the 119 families (66%) were below the poverty line for much smaller families. Very few of the sample families are above the poverty line for families of their size.

² Jean Mayer, Remarks at a Meeting sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, April 30, 1970.

Whites and blacks each made up 50% of the sample (60 and 59, respectively). Sixty-eight percent of the homemakers were between the ages of 20 and 44, 15% over 60. Reflecting the racial composition of the two counties, all 51 of the Allegany homemakers are white, while 59 of the 68 Caroline homemakers are black. Twenty-two percent (15) of the Caroline homemakers were over 60. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program aides encountered scenes of incredible pathos in the homes of some of these aged persons. For the sample as a whole, 72% (86) were currently married; the majority of the others were separated or widowed. Most of the families had either both parents or two or more adults in the home (82%); only 18% were single-parent, female-headed families. The mean number of persons in the home was 5.2. Caroline homemakers averaged 3.4 children in the home, Allegany homemakers, 2.7.

Throughout the report of findings, we shall be pointing to the few dissimilarities between the samples drawn from the two counties. The similarity otherwise found is notable since the Caroline sample was largely black and the Allegany sample entirely white. Furthermore, as has been pointed out, Allegany County is part of Maryland's Appalachia, while Caroline County is in the heart of the Eastern Shore.

Homemakers' Perceptions of The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program

Homemakers feel that the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program has been helpful to them, and that the help has been with nutritional practices and Food Stamps. Almost all homemakers (90% of the whites and 97% of the blacks) stated that the aide had been helpful. The positive assessment of the aide is help shown through not only formal questions but additional material volunteered by homemakers throughout the research interviews. The intervention of the aide has made a difference in the view of the homemakers. Interestingly, however, one out of twelve of the white homemakers (8%) was not sure that the aide had helped. This proportion rose to 20% who didn't know and 23% who answered "no" when asked whether the aide would be helpful in the future. None of the black homemakers felt the aide had not been helpful; 2% and 24% respectively, weren't sure or thought the aide would not be helpful in the future. These figures may reflect greater unwillingness to commit one's self on the part of the white families. Eighty-two percent of whites and 78% of blacks felt that the most important ways aides had helped was with nutrition practices, including food buying and use of the Food Stamp program.

As will be pointed out below, aides perceived themselves as having started with help in areas other than nutrition with a sizeable proportion of families. The homemakers, however, were quite clear as to the point of the program.

Homemakers have learned to use foods they had not previously used.

Table 2 Homemakers who reported using a different food as a result of aide's help.

Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent)

	Yesterday		Other Time	
	White	Black	White	Black
Yes	45	29	80	66
No	53	69	15	34
Don't know & N.A.	2	2	5	-
Total	100	100	100	100
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)	(60)	(59)

White homemakers were more likely to have used a new food "yesterday" (the day before the interview) than were black homemakers (45% compared to 27%) and to have used a new food at some time (80% compared to 66%). For the entire sample, however, 73% of the homemakers could specify a new food they had used which they had learned about from an aide.

A seeming paradox is posed by the findings that black homemakers were, if anything, more positive about the aide's contribution but were somewhat less likely to have used a new food. The writers suggest that the emotional impact of the aide's intervention and concern may have had more meaning to the black homemakers. Since the majority of them live in Caroline County, in a highly traditional part of the state, the novelty of having someone care and demonstrate her caring may have been greater for these homemakers. Though speculative, this interpretation is supported by several other small racial differences in our findings.

Specific Nutritional Practices

Homemakers were asked to recall as precisely as possible what they had "fixed" for their families the previous day, including all food intake by their families. While nutritional practices have improved, they still leave a great deal to be desired.

Table 3 Ratings of nutritional adequacy of the previous day's meals.
Allegheny and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970

	Number	Percent
Well-balanced	78	22
Fairly well-balanced	123	35
Not well-balanced	54	15
Clearly inadequate or not provided	96	27
No answer, don't know	6	2
Total	357	101 ^a

^a Percentages add to 101 because of errors caused by rounding.

Table 3 indicates the nutritional practices of homemakers who were in the midst of participating in a program designed to improve their families' diets. Given this fact, the data contained in Table 3 are a basis for concern. This is not to imply that the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program had not improved homemakers' practices; there is every evidence that it had. Rather, the previous levels of nutritional practice must have been shockingly low.

A review of the raw data on which Table 3 is based makes this point clear. The 119 members of the sample were asked to recall 3 meals each "yesterday," for a total of 357 meals. Of these, 39, or 11% had been missed. While the majority of these were lunches, in 4 cases the family had not eaten supper the night before. The realities of hunger are underscored by remembering that these families included 3+ children, on the average. To give the effects of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program their due, the 57% of meals judged by nutritionists to be fairly well-balanced or well-balanced is doubtlessly much higher than would have been the case without the program. It should also be noted that there was a tendency for black homemakers to

report adequate meals less often than white homemakers.³ In summary, then, homemakers report having been helped by aides with improving nutritional practices. There is evidence that they have been helped. Despite this help, nutritional standards for the families of these homemakers are well below what they ought to be in order to serve as underpinning for healthy family life and child development.

The aides' contributions with regard to bringing homemakers eligible for the Food Stamp program into contact with the program will be discussed in greater detail below. The frequency with which homemakers referred to Food Stamps as a major benefit of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program makes it clear that for these, primarily rural families the theoretical availability of Food Stamps is not the point. Problems of transportation, isolation, the need to collect sizeable amounts of cash in order to benefit from the program and the whole "official" nature of the program had combined to prevent homemakers from using the stamps.⁴

Homemaker's Views of the Future

Homemaker's views of the future were stressed in the study for two reasons. First, it was thought that these perceptions would be helpful in and of themselves in influencing the future direction of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Secondly, some of the questions asked were designed to yield quasi-projective information about the homemakers, with a view towards attempting to measure some of the less tangible effects of the program.

As was indicated above, 57% of the white homemakers and 74% of the black homemakers looked forward to the aide being helpful to them in the future. However, most of the homemakers were looking forward to help in areas other than nutrition.

Table 4 Ways aide can help in future as perceived by homemakers.

Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

	1st Mentioned		2nd Mentioned	
	White	Black	White	Black
Food and nutrition	42	44	13	27
Family problems				
Money and resource management				
Specific crisis	58	56	87	73
Housekeeping				
Parental practices				
Total	100	100	100	100
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)	(60)	(59)

Each homemaker could indicate two areas in which she looked forward to help. Without distinction as to race, a majority of the concerns mentioned second dealt with areas other than nutrition. Family problems, money and resource management, help with a specific crisis, housekeeping practices and parental practices with children were the problems most often mentioned.

³This tendency was statistically significant at the .10 level by chi-square test, for a zero-order table; $\chi^2 = 271$, $df=1$.

⁴Recent accomplished and proposed changes in administration of the Food Stamp program are addressed to the unreal expectation that applicants will have large sums of money at one time.

The taped interviews with aides yield clues as to the meaning of Table 4. The process of building a relationship with these deprived homemakers in order to teach better nutrition resulted in success. Relationships were built. Trust developed. Aides became significant figures in homemakers' lives and repeatedly expressed their amazement at the depth with which intimate aspects of homemakers' lives and problems were shared with them. Living in deprivation and often in isolation as well, homemakers often seized upon the opportunity to share, relate, ventilate and seek help.

Having begun to experience the aide as a helping person, homemakers understandably tended to generalize their view of the aide. Thus, as shown by Table 4, the majority of homemakers served looked forward to obtaining help in other areas of their lives, not just nutrition. The implications of homemakers' expectations are worthy of the most careful consideration in planning the future of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. To expect the aides to become generic, "all things to all homemakers," is clearly unrealistic. To restrict the focus of aides' work with these homemakers too severely would be to perpetrate a cruel hoax — to "promise" a helping relationship and then not to respond to asking for help. This will be discussed further in Chapter VI.

There is general agreement that the lives of the poor are characterized by hopelessness. Caught in continuous deprivation, daily reminded of the difference between their realities and those of the affluent society around them, the poor have little reason to hope that the future holds a better fate. In this study, an increased level of hope is considered a component of program output. That is, it was hypothesized that one outcome of meaningful intervention in homemakers' lives by the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program would be an increased level of hope for the future.

Homemakers served by the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program were quite hopeful about the future. The researchers attribute much of this hope to the effects of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Forty-two per cent of the white homemakers thought that things were getting better for people like themselves; the comparable figure for blacks was 46%. Twenty-eight per cent thought that things were getting worse compared to 24% of blacks. There seems no real basis other than the effects of the program to explain these findings.

Homemakers were also asked how well they thought their families would be doing 5 years hence. Homemakers of both races were hopeful. Black homemakers were somewhat more hopeful than whites, and were more willing to commit themselves to dare to give voice to their hopes for the future.

Table 5 *Homemakers' anticipations of life for their families 5 years hence.*
Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

<i>Life will be</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>
Much better	20	39
A little better	38	36
About the same	13	20
Worse	3	5
Can't answer, don't know	25	—
Total	99 ^a	100
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)

^a Percentages add to 99 because of errors caused by rounding.

The higher level of hope among black homemakers is intriguing. In part, the black homemakers may be reflecting a sense of progress carried over from the social changes of the past decade. Or, as has been speculated above, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program may have had greater effect on the black homemakers. Conversely, the lower level of hope among whites may reflect the dispirit which is characteristic of many residents of Appalachia. The high proportion of white homemakers who would not commit themselves to an answer may be further indication of the sub-culture of Allegany County. In the writers' opinion, however, the fact that 58% of the whites and 75% of the blacks look upon their families' futures with hope is indirect but clear evidence for the impact of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.

Summary

Data obtained directly from homemakers indicates that the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program was seen as helpful by the low-income homemakers who were its primary service recipients. Homemakers felt helped primarily regarding nutritional practices. A majority thought the aides would continue to be of help to them in the future, primarily in areas other than nutrition, *per se*. Homemakers' dietary practices, though improved, were still not at acceptable levels. Three in four homemakers could specify a new food which they had learned about from their aide and had used. Homemakers were hopeful about the future to such an extent that the inference has been drawn that the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program generated hope. Finally, as is made apparent by the contents of this Chapter, the low-income homemakers served as patient, thoughtful and capable sources of data. This is important for future evaluative studies of the poor - they can speak for themselves, and well.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: THE AIDES REFLECT

The Aide's Job from Within

Aides paid a great deal of attention at first to building relationships and helping homemakers with their immediate problems whether or not those problems dealt with nutrition.

Table 6 Aides' reported first priorities in working with families, at first and during January, 1970. Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

Activity	Homemaker:	Priority at First		Priority Now	
		White	Black	White	Black
Giving nutrition information		40	29	18	44
Getting acquainted and understanding each other		10	41	-	-
Buying food wisely		13	8	63	14
Showing value of Food Stamps and how to get them		18	7	7	10
Teaching use of new foods		15	5	5	14
Preserving and growing food		3	10	5	7
Other and not sure		1	-	2	12
Total		100	100	100	101 ^a
(No. of cases)		(60)	(59)	(60)	(59)

^a Percentages add to 101 because of errors caused by rounding.

More white-homemakers than black (40% compared to 29%) were approached directly with a focus on giving nutrition information. Black homemakers were more likely to be approached with a focus on getting acquainted and understanding each other (41% rather than 10%). On the other hand, after a minimum of three months, aides were more likely to be focusing on giving blacks specific nutrition information

than whites. Aides were far more likely to be giving priority to teaching white homemakers to buy food wisely than emphasizing the same topic with blacks (63% rather than 14%). These differences need further consideration.

In the opinion of the researchers, the Allegany County aides, who served exclusively white families, used specific teaching as their "foot in the door technique." Thus, for example, nutrition information, food-buying information, information about Food Stamps and teaching new foods were the first priority with 86% of the white homemakers. Another pattern was more typical with black homemakers — one which might be called "starting with the homemaker rather than with the agenda." Both of these approaches seem to have been effective. Perhaps both should be taught to aides, with one or the other receiving emphasis depending upon local conditions.

Even where aides focused at first on specific nutritional teaching, building a relationship was given a strong second priority. With white homemakers, where as we have seen specific nutritional teaching was given first priority at the outset, aides reported that getting acquainted and understanding each other was their initial second priority with 63% of the families. In other words, the difference between focusing on nutrition and focusing on building a relationship is one of degrees, not of extremes. Interestingly, with black homemakers, aides continued to see helping in general as an important secondary priority, and named it for 51% of the black homemakers.

Aides were more satisfied with the amount of time they have been able to spend with white homemakers than with black. Aides would have liked to have been able to spend more time with 63% of the black homemakers but only with 42% of the white homemakers. On the other hand, for the total sample, the aides felt they had spent enough time with exactly 50% of the homemakers, a high proportion in view of the short period the program had been in operation at the time of the evaluation.

Aides have worked with families in many areas of family living. Aides reported having worked in areas in addition to nutrition with 72% of the white families and 61% of the black families. Two broad areas of helping emerge. First are areas related to the homemaker role directly, such as helping with housekeeping, obtaining and demonstrating the use of handicrafts materials, bringing used clothing. Helping in these ways was characterized as typical by aides and elicited little sense of strain. The second area is that of serving as what may broadly be characterized a non-professional in mental health and a referral agent. Aides invested greatly in bringing homemakers and their families into contact with appropriate resources within the county — hospitals, mental health facilities, schools, legal resources, social service departments, and the like. But also, aides were used by homemakers as sources of counselling with family problems, parenting problems, specific life crises and marital crises. It was with regard to this latter area that aides clearly felt the greatest strain and expressed themselves frequently as needing to know more.

For example, in one group interview, aides described poignantly one situation after another involving clear psychopathology and bizarre behavior on the part of family members. They stressed their difficulty in putting such behavior into perspective, in judging what represents danger to other family members and what does not. One may sympathize easily with this problem. Making such judgments is not easy for qualified professionals. But in the situation of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, the aide may be the only representative of any agency who has contact with the family; she is even more likely to be the only "official" person to make frequent home visits and thus see the family in their own natural setting. This expressed need on the part of aides needs thoughtful consideration in planning the future of this program and in designing similar programs in the future.

Aides did an effective job of developing and utilizing other resources within the counties on behalf of their families. Although this evaluation did not develop "hard" data as to quantity, there is extensive evidence of great activity on the part of aides (and through their efforts supervising agents) to refer and bring into contact homemakers and their families and various available resources. A major problem in this area is transportation. Given the isolation in which many Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program families live, the difficulties involved in obtaining transportation and in scheduling, referrals were most effective when aides took family members to clinics, hospitals, etc. This raises various administrative problems for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, among them the use of aides' time, expenses of transportation and others. Nevertheless, the aides spontaneously rediscovered what other helping programs have long known - telling people where to go is not the same as making sure that they go there. Some of the aides expressed interest in developing the use of volunteers for transportation purposes, and this is worthy of further consideration.

Cooperation from other agencies was generally very good. The difficult and complex preparation which was done before the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program began paid dividends in the willingness of voluntary and governmental agencies to cooperate on behalf of program families. This is not to say that there were not problems generated by rigidity of policy on the part of other programs as well as aides' feelings of defensiveness. Aides often felt frustrated, especially at instances in which families "fell between" the administrative and operational policies of other systems. For example, one of the aides asked one of the researchers plaintively whether there was any way to reduce (sic!) a family's OASDI (Social Security) payment by \$5.00, so as to make the family eligible for the Food Stamp program.

These instances, of course, reflect a much broader problem of society than the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program can be expected to tackle. In case after case, however, school personnel, medical personnel and many others made themselves available and stretched their availability once families requiring their assistance had been brought to their attention. The aides have to their credit uncounted immunizations, resolutions of school registration difficulties and many other helpful activities which are difficult to sense in a merely statistical way.

In actually working with homemakers around nutrition, aides sometimes felt handicapped by the lack of instructional materials at a level appropriate to the education of Expanded Food and Nutrition Program homemakers. Much of the available teaching material, including most of that produced by Extension itself, demands a relatively high standard of literacy. While the great majority of Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program homemakers are literate, many are at an elementary-school reading level. There is a need for teaching materials appropriate to this level of literacy. An additional frustration was encountered in teaching food-buying practices, for example, to those homemakers who are illiterate. Consumer education is indeed difficult with these homemakers, who fall easy prey to brightly colored boxes and over-enthusiastic pictures on food containers.

One of the aide's greatest strengths lies in intimate knowledge of the demographic and social stratification features of the county. Aides generally felt the difficulties connected with being known as an indigenous member of the community were far outweighed by the intimacy of their knowledge. It would take years for any professional person to develop the sensitivity displayed by aides as to how persons from area X have traditionally felt towards persons from area Y. Aides are also sensitive to kinship patterns often overlooked by professionals.

Aide's Perceptions

Aides tended to be hopeful for the future of families with whom they worked. They are less hopeful for the future of black families than are the black homemakers.

Table 7 Perceptions of the future for persons like the homemaker.
Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

	<i>Homemakers Perceive People Like Themselves</i>		<i>Aide Perceived People Like Homemaker</i>	
	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>
Better	42	46	52	32
Worse	22	24	35	47
About the same	28	29	5	3
Can't answer	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100	101 ^a	100	99 ^a
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)	(60)	(59)

^a Percentages do not add to 100 because of errors caused by rounding.

Table 8 Perceptions of the future for the homemaker's own family.
Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

	<i>Aide's</i>		<i>Homemaker: Herself</i>	
	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>
Much better	28	19	20	39
A little better	27	31	38	36
About the same	42	49	13	20
Worse	3	-	3	5
Can't answer	-	<u>2</u>	<u>25</u>	-
Total	100	101 ^a	99 ^a	100
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)	(60)	(59)

^a Percentages do not add to 100 because of errors caused by rounding.

As can be seen from Table 7, aides thought the future would be better for persons like the homemaker in 52% of the cases for whites, compared with 42% of the homemakers themselves, but for 32% of the blacks, compared with 46% of the black homemakers. Table 8 indicates that when asked specifically about the particular family, 58% of the white homemakers thought things would improve, as did the aides

for 58% of the cases. With regard to black homemakers, 75% of them thought things would improve for their families, but aides reached the same conclusion for only 50% of the black families.

What is being suggested here is not a major criticism of the aides. Given the quasi-projective nature of the question, the aides may in fact be more nearly correct. Rather, the researchers suggest that the aides, like the society of which we are all part, perceive differently families' chances to improve themselves and that race is often an important variable. The implication for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is continued care and attention to helping aides deal with their feelings and continued education about race.

Aides did not consider most Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program families ready to "graduate" from the program at the time of the study.

Table 9 Aides' perceptions of families' readiness to "graduate".

Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

	White	Black
Yes	7	3
No	82	65
Not Sure	12	31
Totals	101 ^a	99 ^a
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)

^a Totals do not add to 100 because of errors caused by rounding.

The findings presented in Table 9 were partly to be expected. Given the sample inclusion criteria, some families had been in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program for barely 3 months and some of those families with whom aides had not been able to work as extensively as they would have liked. Since the data were gathered, however, the question of when a family becomes ready to "graduate" has become more and more important. The sizeable proportion of black homemakers who drew a "not sure" rating (31%) together with the smaller proportion of white homemakers (12%) are worthy of further study.

In discussions with the aides, the problem of judging readiness to "graduate" has been clarified to some extent. The problem as aides perceive it lies in the paucity of other programs into which homemakers can "graduate." All of the aides, to their great credit, are distinctly uncomfortable just dropping families. They consider this to be likely to result in retrogression on the part of the homemakers and see the need for structures within which homemakers can maintain and extend their gains. The establishment of a club structure for "graduates" of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program has been suggested.

Perhaps because of the short time homemakers had been in the program, the researchers have not been able to derive objective differences between those homemakers judged ready or possibly ready to "graduate" and those judged unready.

Neither patterns of aides' activities nor homemakers' self-descriptions are useful in differentiating the two groups. This should be a primary focus of further evaluative research.

Aides' morale is generally high. Common organizational problems were frequently mentioned, as might be expected. However, the aides feel involved in something important. They feel that they have been helpful in others' lives. Several aides stressed the importance of their connection with the state staff and their generally positive assessment of the value of their training. The researchers suggest that momentum has clearly been developed behind the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Maintaining this momentum, once the program is no longer a novelty, will require ongoing effort. Like all non-professionals, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program aides need consistent support and help. It is not to be expected that they will continue to grow in capacity and learn without continued input both from county and from state staff. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program has been and will continue to be a heavy drain on the time and energies of the supervising agents, and no one should indulge in the fantasy that it will not continue to make demands upon Extension staff.

Aides were able to define clear training needs for themselves in the future.

Table 10 Perceived training needs, first priorities.

Allegany and Caroline Counties, Maryland, January, 1970 (in percent).

	<i>In order to work better with</i>	
	<i>White Homemakers</i>	<i>Black Homemakers</i>
More about nutrition	7	8
More about other topics:		
Housekeeping		
Child rearing		
Family problems		
How people learn		
Greater understanding of self	57	66
Community resources and how to use them		
More in general		
Miscellaneous		
No specific needs	37	25
Total	101 ^a	99 ^{aa}
(No. of cases)	(60)	(59)

^a Percentages add to 101 because of errors caused by rounding.

^{aa} Percentages add to 99 because of errors caused by rounding.

Aides feel well trained about nutritional topics. They think they need more simplified materials. However, the primary expressed need is for more training in areas peripheral to nutrition, such as housekeeping, and for more related to how to help both in knowledge and in skill. Some of these expressions of need for training have been met through the ongoing training program since the data were gathered. Others remain as a prospective agenda for future training.

Summary

The contributions of the aides are what has made the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program highly successful. The program has demonstrated that it is possible to recruit, train and place in the field women whose backgrounds in some cases are not extremely different from those of homemakers served by the program. The aides, in turn, have demonstrated a capacity to learn, to benefit from training and supervision, to establish relationships with homemakers who are generally considered hard-to-reach and to work with them effectively in order to improve their nutritional practices and to improve their family's lives in many areas. There is some indication of not quite so good a "fit" between the perceptions of aides relative to black homemakers, though there is every evidence that aides have been both helpful and effective with these women. Much more work remains to be done relative to establishing and testing criteria for "graduation" from the program. Skilled use has been made of other community resources. Specifically, a lack has been identified — there is need of a structure into which "graduating" homemakers can move. Future training of aides needs to focus upon their perceived needs for information and skills in work with families in areas in addition to nutrition.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT STEPS

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, begun in Maryland in 1969, represents a significant, meaningful new step for Extension services. It has as its goal the reaching and teaching of low-income homemakers in order to improve their nutritional practices for themselves and their families. It was undertaken as part of a rediscovery of the realities of poverty and its effects which is taking place throughout our society. Its proximate goal is change in nutritional practice. Its longer-range goal is nothing less than improving the lives of families and of the children being raised in them.

An extremely thorough and thoughtful job of preparation was done prior to the inception of the program in each county. This preparation was made necessary not only by the complexities of fundings which underlie the program but also by a growing sophistication about the need for marshalling a county's resources on behalf of poor families instead of having people fall "in the cracks" between narrowly defined services. Non-professionals, aides, were carefully selected and trained. Supervision has been provided by county personnel, training by state personnel with a great deal of coordination between the two.

This study was undertaken in two widely disparate counties, Allegany and Caroline, located not only at geographical but also at subcultural extremes of Maryland. In some ways, the study represents innovation as much as the program does. It was clear from the outset that the purpose of the study would be to measure the effects of the program, using scientific techniques, to the extent possible.

Data were gathered by means of research interviews with a probability sample of homemakers in the two counties, by written questionnaires completed by the aide for each of the homemakers interviewed and by tape-recorded group interviews with the aides of each county. Pure and uncontaminated data rarely exists in the real world of social scientists, let alone in the complexities of a many-layered service program. Care was taken, however, to eliminate sources of bias and distortion of the data. Homemakers were interviewed by outside interviewers who had been hired for this purpose and trained by a member of the state staff. The purposes of the study were carefully explained to aides. Data provided by aides was immediately "whisked away" by state office personnel, and a commitment made that it would not be used for administrative purposes. Data were coded, a reliability check conducted on a difficult part of the data, and data analysis was conducted only by the investigators.

As is common with evaluative studies, foci evolved during the course of the research process. Some of the questions contained in the original research proposal no longer seem as controversial. Were the study to be replicated, emphasis would be given to other areas. However, to summarize the findings, the original questions will be used as headings.

1. To what extent do homemakers see their nutritional practices as having changed during the time they have been served by aides? In what ways?

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program has had great impact upon the low-income homemakers who have been served. Homemakers and aides are agreed that nutritional practices have changed as a result of the

program. New foods are being employed. New and previously used foods are being prepared differently. Principles of planning a balanced diet have been taught and learned. Principles of wise buying have been learned. Unquestionably, there has been a substantial upgrading of nutritional intake for the homemakers and for their families, including the children of these families. While adequacy of diet has not been attained across the board, the improvement is striking in view of the fact that the economic income of the families served has not been affected by the program. Many families have been helped to utilize the Food Stamp program, making a wider range and larger quantity of food available.

The key to making the program a success has been the validity of the aide concept. Aides have demonstrated their ability to reach homemakers previously unreached and considered hard-to-reach. There is no suggestion that all of those homemakers who could benefit from the program have been reached. More of them need to enjoy the benefits of the program. However, the aide structure has demonstrated effectiveness. The aides' intimate knowledge and understanding of the communities in which they work has enabled doors to open to them which would open only reluctantly to professionals, and those professionals are not available in sufficient quantity in the two counties studied.

Racial difference has constituted no barrier to this program's effectiveness. There are some small indications of difference by race. These are small by comparison to the similarities. Based on the findings of this study, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program should feel free not to ignore teaching aides about race and its impact upon people, but to ignore race in the selection and assignment of aides. At a time when extremists of many stripes present racial difference as an impermeable barrier, this program has demonstrated that this is not the case when aides come to help.

It is not possible for aides to help homemakers with nutrition without becoming major helping persons within the limited life-space of these homemakers. Aides and their supervisors wisely recognized this. With some families, aides presented themselves as generic helpers and then focused progressively on nutritional matters. With others, they utilized food and nutrition as an initial focus, as content around which to build a helping relationship. With these latter, the relationship tended to generalize once established, so that other matters of concern to the homemaker became bases for aides' helping activities. At the same time, aides were able to keep their identities clear, to avoid falling into the fantasies of omnipotence and to use themselves constructively with other agencies and services.

II. Have the aides conveyed to homemakers a sense of greater hope for themselves and their families as a result of their learnings from the program?

The findings of this study give an affirmative answer to this question. Considering the deep and continuous deprivation in which a majority of the homemakers live, their level of hope for the future is inexplicable unless one sees the level of hope as an output of the project. The aides have come into the lives of people who perceive themselves correctly as forgotten, in many cases. Often isolated geographically, not sharing in the mass media-propagated images of the good life, often looked upon as burdens by the communities of which they are part, the poor served by this project could see the value in the aide's visits, her caring and her dependability renewed signals of self-worth. Aides' anecdotes overflow with individual examples. A 2-year old girl had not stood or walked, not because of physical deficit but because in the bleakness and hopelessness of her environment there seemed no reason to. She began to achieve her physical potential as the aide worked with her mother. The mother whose passive hostility had led her to the belief that her family would be poisoned if she

washed her refrigerator responded to the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program aide's rolling up her sleeves and demonstrating that the only significant change after washing the refrigerator was a sharp decline in the previously overpowering odor. A little girl did not have dark hair, as the aide originally thought; several washings revealed the fact that her hair was blonde.

In the process of their work, aides have sensitized not only homemakers but the broader community as well. The legal, medical, social and educational institutions of the two counties have been reminded of tasks yet to do by aides' advocacy on behalf of their homemakers. The aides, as residents of the respective counties, have the ability to stir others to action in a manner difficult for "outsiders."

In the long run, of course, one of the major outcomes of this program will be seen in those who are now children. The payoff of improved family nutrition will be more productive lives, better physical and emotional health, greater mental acumen.

III. Are there patterns of aides' activities which have been employed with families showing the greatest change?

The findings of this study do not allow us to answer this question definitively at this point. Too little time had elapsed between the inception of the program and the time of the study for clear differences in level of outcome to emerge. What does seem clear is that higher levels of hope for the future seem to be associated with more time spent by the aide. That is, the percentage of families reporting high levels of hope for the future is higher for those families with whom aides report having spent a great deal of time than for those with whom aides wished they had spent more time. Future evaluative research should focus on this association and test it in a more rigorous way.

IV. How similar are aides' and homemakers' perceptions of change? That is, do those families whose nutritional practices the homemaker considers to be changing the most also rank high on the aides' ratings of change?

The findings of this study allow us to say only that the vast majority of homemakers report that they have learned and changed nutritional practices and the aides judge homemakers' change similarly. Throughout the study, there is such a high level of agreement between aide and homemaker that the writers have deliberately stressed those few instances where the agreement is somewhat lower.

It is suggested that a next step in evaluation of the outcomes of this program be a serious attempt at measuring dimensions of the actual learning and teaching process. Such a study would enable a more definitive answer to be given to this question.

V. When do aides consider a family ready for discharge from the program? What are the criteria for success?

In the judgment of the researchers, this question cannot be answered until there has been established a structure into which homemakers can "graduate." For the majority of the women served by the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, conventional social and recreational groupings are not available. Transportation is lacking, factors of different social class act as barriers, family demands are heavy. There needs to be a middle step between the

intensive and meaningful service of the program and being left to one's own devices. The perception that recommending a family for "graduation" means cutting them adrift makes establishing valid criteria for "graduation" difficult and ensures the fact that the more the aide cares about a family, the less likely she is to recommend them for "graduation."

Three major recommendations emerge from the present study. First, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is a remarkable example of a program which is meeting its basic goals. It should be continued and expanded. Careful and continuous attention needs to be devoted to maintaining the momentum already established. Structural safeguards need to be provided so that the fantasy does not develop that the program will continue on its own. Aides' needs for ongoing training in areas in addition to nutrition need to be honored and curriculum carefully planned. Teaching materials appropriate to the limited literacy levels of the homemakers need to be developed, tested and made available to the aides. The fact that Extension carries with it little of the stigma that regrettably attends many other helping programs makes continued sponsorship under Extension auspices crucial.

Second, this program offers unique opportunities for further evaluative research which can benefit not only Extension but a wide range of programs designed to serve low-income and hard-to-reach persons and families. We have referred to the need for further investigation into the variables which directly affect the learning and teaching process. Cost-benefit analysis is another area of research which should be explored. Assessment of the differential effects of various structures would be helpful.

Third, this program effectively puts the Cooperative Extension Service into the arena of social change. In facing its responsibilities to the low-income homemaker as squarely as in conducting this program, Extension acquires a rightful joy of accomplishment. It also acquires a challenge. The advocacy role which individual aides have adopted on behalf of individual homemakers must be matched by a concern on the part of Extension with bringing about the kinds of communities within which families, adults and individuals can grow and live in dignity. The Cooperative Extension Service is uniquely placed to help to bring this about. Free from stigma as charity to low-income persons, it is also free from stigma as political within the broader society.

To have invested so much in service to low-income families without acquiring a broader concern would be pointless. To take the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program as a starting point gives meaning to the enormous efforts of all who have made the program what it is.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chaiklin, Harris. "Motivating the Poor," in Benjamin Schlesinger (Editor), Poverty in the United States and Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Chaiklin, Harris, Sterne, Richard, and Ephross, Paul H. Community Organization and Services to Improve Family Living, II. Baltimore: Research Center, School of Social Work, University of Maryland for the Baltimore City Department of Social Services, 1969.
- Comprehensive Master Plan, Allegany County, Maryland, 1965.
- Datagraphics Corporation, "Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program Evaluation, January to July, 1969," U. S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service, November, 1969.
- Harrington, Michael. The Other America. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Maryland Cooperative Extension Service. "Status of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program." College Park, Maryland, February, 1970 (mimeographed).
- Pearl, Arthur and Riessman, Frank. New Careers for the Poor. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- U. S. Congress, Committee on Agriculture, Report No. 110. Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work. 63rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1913.
- USDA Federal Extension Booklet, PA-681. "Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low-Income Families." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee. "A People and A Spirit: A Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension," Fort Collins, Colorado, November, 1968.

APPENDIX A

HOMEMAKER QUESTIONNAIRE

Serial No. _____

Do Not
Write in
This Space.
For Office
Use Only.

"As you probably know, the University of Maryland is conducting a study to find out how we can improve the Food and Nutrition Education Program. I'd like to ask you some questions about yourself and your family. There is really no "right" or "wrong" answer, but we just want to know how you feel about the program. We will appreciate your help very much."

1,2,3 _____

(Note: Starred items (*) to be checked off by interviewer.)

4 _____

4. *Race 1) W _____ 2) N _____

5. Marital Status: 1) Single _____ 2) Married _____
3) Divorced _____ 4) Separated _____

5 _____

6. Age: 1) 15-19 _____ 2) 20-24 _____ 3) 25-29 _____ 4) 30-34 _____
5) 35-39 _____ 6) 40-44 _____ 7) 45-49 _____ 8) 50-59 _____
9) 60 or + _____

6 _____

7-8. Who else lives in the home? (Not names; just relationships to homemaker and ages.)

Relationship	Age
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7 _____
8 _____
9 _____

9. About how much money comes into your household each month? (Earnings of all family members under the roof; Social Security public assistance, pensions, etc.)

Less than \$100. _____ \$100. to \$150. _____ \$150. to \$199. _____
\$200. to \$249. _____ \$250. to \$299. _____ \$300. to \$349 _____
\$350. to \$399. _____ \$400. to \$449. _____ \$450. to \$499. _____
\$500. to \$549. _____ \$550. to \$599. _____ over \$600 _____

10 _____

For Office
Use Only.

10. In general, do you think your Aide has been helpful to you?

1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't Know

11

11. If yes, how has she helped you most?

12
13

12. If no, why not?

14

13. Are there ways you want your Aide to help you from now on?

1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't Know

15

14. How? List:

16
17

15. In general, do you think things are getting better or worse for people like yourself?

1) Better 3) Worse

18

2) About the same 4) Can't answer

16. Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about food. What did you fix your family for supper last night? List foods:

19

For Office
Use Only.

17. What did you fix for lunch yesterday? List foods:

20 _____

18. What did you fix for breakfast yesterday? List foods:

21 _____

19. What about snacks? List foods:

22 _____

20. If you had \$5.00 extra, what foods would you have served to your family yesterday? List foods:

23 _____

24 _____

21. Going back to these three meals, were there any foods that you ate yesterday that you had learned about from your Extension Aide?

25 _____

1) _____ Yes 2) _____ No 3) _____ Don't know

22. If so, which ones? List:

26 _____

27 _____

For Office
Use Only.

23. Do you buy different foods than you used to because of what you've learned from your Aide?

- 1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't know

24. Which ones? List:

28

29

25. How often do you buy these new foods?

- 1) Twice a week or more often 3) Every two weeks

- 2) Once a week 4) Other

26. Do you cook any foods differently than you used to because of what you've learned from your Aide?

- 1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't know

27. Which ones? List:

30

31

32

33

28. How often do you make these new recipes?

- 1) Daily 3) Once a week

- 2) Couple times a week 4) Sometimes

29. How well do you think you and your family will be doing five years from now?

- 1) Much better 3) About the same

- 2) A little better 4) Worse off

34

35

For Office
Use Only.

30. In general, has your family's life changed very much in the past year or two?

1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't know

36

31. If yes, what has been the biggest change? List:

37

"You've been very helpful. Before I go, are there any comments about the Food and Nutrition Education Program that you'd like to make?"

38

32.* Interviewer's assessment of home conditions as to cleanliness, neatness and general maintenance?

1) Good 2) Fair 3) Bad

39

4) Very Bad

Thanks again for your help. Good-bye.

APPENDIX B

AIDES' QUESTIONNAIRE

	Family No. _____	Do Not Write in This Space. For Office Use Only.
38. Aide's Code number		40 _____
39. How much time have you spent working with this family?		
___ This is one of the families with this whom I've worked most	1	
___ I haven't been able to work with this family as much as I would have liked to	2	41 _____
40. When you first started working with this family, what did you concentrate on. (Check no more than two)		
___ Better food-buying practices	1	
___ Handing out, supplying, interpreting and developing recipes	2	42 _____
___ Show the value of food stamps and how to get them	3	43 _____
___ Home food supply and preservation - garden, mini-garden	4	
___ Teaching use of new foods	5	
___ Just getting acquainted and understanding each other	6	
41. What do you concentrate on now? (Check no more than two)		
___ Better food-buying practices	1	
___ Handing out, supplying, interpreting and developing recipes	2	44 _____
___ Show the value of food stamps and how to get them	3	45 _____
___ Home food supply and preservation - garden, mini-garden	4	
___ Teaching use of new food	5	
___ Just getting acquainted and understanding each other	6	
___ I'm not really sure; help in general	7	
42. How active a part have you played as an aide with this home-maker?		
___ I've had to be very active and do things for her	1	
___ I mainly teach and demonstrate	2	46 _____
___ I make suggestions and teach, but she follows through on her own	3	
___ I just give her ideas then she tries them out	4	

43. How has this homemaker responded to your help?

1. Very well 2. Pretty well
3. Not so well 4. She's not
been cooperative

For Office
Use Only.

47

44. How much has this homemaker changed her nutrition practices

1. Enormously 3. Some
2. A lot 4. Little if any

48

45. Explain, if you like:

48

46. Have you been helpful to this homemaker in other ways besides nutrition?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

50

47. If yes, in which ways?

51

48. If no, why

52

49. Do you have any plans for your next steps with this homemaker?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

53

50. If yes, what are they?

54

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 51. Do you think this homemaker is ready to "graduate" from the program? | For Office Use Only. |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure | <u>55</u> |
| 52. How often do you have to change your plans because something happened to the family? | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Very often 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Never | <u>56</u> |
| 53. In general, do you think things are getting better or worse for people like this homemaker? | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Better 2. <input type="checkbox"/> About the same | <u>57</u> |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Worse 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer | |
| 54. In general, how do you think this family will be doing five years from now? | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Much better 3. <input type="checkbox"/> About the same | <u>58</u> |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> A little better 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Worse off | |
| 55. In general, has this family's life changed very much since you've begun to work with them? | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know | <u>59</u> |
| 56. If yes, what has been the biggest change? | <u>60</u> |
| | |
| 57. As a housekeeper does this homemaker do well with what she has (cleanliness, neatness and general maintenance?) | |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Good 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Fair 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Bad | |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Very Bad | <u>61</u> |
| 58. What kinds of training do you need to be of more help to this family? | <u>62</u> |
| | <u>63</u> |
| | |
| Many thanks for your help. We hope that your help will enable families to receive even better service from the program! | Generic. |
| | <u>64</u> |

APPENDIX C

EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To enroll and assist 75 families/Aides during a fiscal year.
2. To enroll all eligible program families in the Food Stamp Program.
3. To enroll children of all eligible program families in the School Lunch Program.
4. To concentrate the efforts of this program on the young and phase into other activities those families with no children under age 19 at home.
5. To help young families living in poverty* or near poverty acquire the knowledge, skills, and changed behavior necessary for improving the nutritional level of the diet to the point where each member of the family is consuming
 - a. Two or more servings of milk per day.
 - b. Two or more servings of meat per day.
 - c. Four or more servings of vegetables and fruit per day.
 - d. Four or more servings of bread and cereal per day.
6. To assist families to utilize the community resources offered by various service agencies.
 - a. Health Department
 - Prenatal and postnatal care
 - Sick baby clinic
 - Immunization
 - Planned parenthood
 - Other services
 - b. Social Service
 - General Public Assistance
 - Old Age Assistance
 - Public Aid for Needy Blind
 - Public Aid for the Totally and Permanently Disabled
 - Unemployment Compensation
 - Aid for Families with Dependent Children
 - Medicaid to the Indigent
 - Homemakers Service
 - Food Stamp Program
 - c. Public Schools
 - Adult education classes
 - Headstart, Summer Youth Program, etc.
 - School Lunch Program
 - d. Housing Authority
 - e. Vocational Rehabilitation Service
 - f. Department of Employment Security
 - g. Religious and civic groups

ERIC Clearinghouse

JUL 1 1971

on Adult Education

* Poverty, as defined in SEMIS Codes for FY 1971, "... an annual income of \$3,600 or less for a family of four. The \$3,600 base increases \$600 for each family member beyond four persons."