

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 609

RC 022 496

AUTHOR Egan, Rita
TITLE Gender Differences in Central Appalachian Students' Attitudes towards Poverty, Welfare and Work.
PUB DATE 2000-03-00
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Gender in Appalachia in the discussion "Piecing It Together: Ethnicity and Gender in Appalachia" (Huntington, WV, March 3-5, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Education Majors; Females; Higher Education; Males; *Poverty; Rural Youth; *Sex Differences; *Social Attitudes; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys; Welfare Recipients; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia (Central); Kentucky (East); *Welfare Reform

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on attitudes toward welfare and poverty among male and female students at a university in rural eastern Kentucky. The area has high poverty rates and low educational and employment levels, particularly among women. A 60-statement survey covering a wide range of social issues was completed by 390 undergraduates. About two-thirds of respondents were women, 81 percent were under 25, about half were education majors, and about half came from the university's service region of eastern Kentucky counties. Among seven categories covered by the survey, the greatest gender differences in attitude were found for questions about race; welfare, work, and poverty; and politics. The results demonstrate that students drawn from a region of socioeconomic deprivation had a high resistance to welfare as a means of supporting poor families. Overall, there was considerable support for the government's efforts to move welfare recipients from welfare to work, but also skepticism about the availability of jobs and the remuneration received. Over half of students believed that the government has a role in alleviating suffering in this region. Women were generally more sympathetic to the plight of the poor than men. Although some females felt strongly that even mothers with small children should work, most respondents were concerned that welfare policies should not have adverse effects on children. (Contains 21 references.) (SV)

**Gender Differences in Central Appalachian Students' Attitudes towards
Poverty, Welfare and Work**

Dr. Rita Egan

Morehead State University

**Paper presented at the
Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Gender in Appalachia Conference**

**PIECING IT TOGETHER:
Ethnicity and Gender in Appalachia
March 3-5**

**Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rita Egan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contact: Rita Egan (606 780 4690)

e-mail: ciscopaws@yahoo.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC 0222496



Gender Differences in Central Appalachian college students' attitudes towards poverty, welfare and work.

Nothing addresses the concerns of Americans more than employment. In the political sphere, Clinton's first platform was based on the slogan, "it is the economy, stupid". If political campaigns are anything to go by, voters also care about education, crime, punishment and moral behavior. But jobs, income and taxes drive an economy and no government will survive for long if these issues are not addressed. Certainly, welfare is a thorny issue because it is expensive to administer and there is a pervasive attitude that welfare recipients are lazy. Even though studies show that welfare provides barely enough income to support a family, citizens appear to resent this social safety net for supposedly wasting tax dollars on the unworthy poor. Thus, the question of welfare and anti-poverty programs have caused much controversy. To address such sentiments, several studies have sampled opinion amongst the general public. (Alston, J. & Dean, K., 1972; Kluegel, J., 1987; Schwartz, S., Robinson, M., 1991; Griffin, W.E., Ohenebaskyi, 1993) However, few studies have looked at the college student population and no studies have restricted their analysis to rural college students living in areas of high unemployment with an historical dependence on welfare. To counter this shortcoming, the study described below sought to analyze the attitudes of students attending an East Kentucky university in the later 1990s. and determine if there were any gender differences between students' responses.

The authors of a 1998 Report, *The Status of Women in Kentucky* noted that, "Kentucky women continue to face serious obstacles in achieving equality with men and with attaining standing equal to the average for women in the United States." (p. 5). Kentucky's women were earning just under 70 (69.2%) cents for every dollar earned by their male counterparts. Kentucky ranked 33rd in the nation in terms of the ratio between women's to men's earnings for full-time, year-round work. The number of Kentucky's employed women in managerial or professional occupations was under 25% (24.2%) placing Kentucky 47th in the nation. Only 12.1% of the women in the state had four or more years of college, and women in Kentucky were in the "bottom 10" in every conceivable category relating to employment and earnings composite index. Kentucky was ranked 45th in the nation in relation to women's poverty. As Jenks (1998) notes, "the devastation of poverty inevitably reaches outward, dragging down a person's health, access to necessary good and a sense of self." (<http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/women>).

It is clear from *the Status of Women in Kentucky* report that some women in Kentucky are amongst the poorest educated and most poverty stricken in the nation. This study sought to determine, therefore, if the female students attending a regional university in East Kentucky held different attitudes toward social issues than male students. More specifically, this paper will report on whether females students held different views on issues such as poverty, welfare and work differently from their male counterparts. This paper will also report on whether both male and female students' views on a broad range of social issues differed from elsewhere in the country.

Background

In July, 1996, a month before President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, the welfare reform law - Kentucky had more than 71,000

families receiving monthly cash assistance. The new law ended the AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) program and in Kentucky the Cabinet for Families and Children created a new program known as the Kentucky Transitional Assistance Program (KTAP). A five year limit was placed on individual's receipt of welfare and all unemployed adults were required to seek training or work.

As the study was being conducted, welfare rolls in Kentucky were declining rapidly. 2 ½ years after the law took effect welfare rolls had declined by one third. (Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children, Press Release, April, 1999). However, it is important to note that despite falling welfare rolls, Kentucky's poverty rate has remained stubbornly high. Low wages, coupled with a decline in the purchasing power of the dollar have left more than 80,000 working families living in poverty. Currently, less than 20% of poor families with children rely on welfare for the majority of their income and this figure is falling (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Kentucky Youth Advocates, Press Release, April, 1999). It was in a climate of radical welfare reform that students were surveyed as to their attitudes to poverty, welfare and work.

The university in which this study took place services 22 counties in Eastern Kentucky. 70% of the students attending this university live in the region, one of the poorest in the state as well as in the country as a whole. From one fourth to nearly one half of Kentucky's children currently live in poverty and this poverty is especially apparent in the university's service region (Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center, Executive Summary, 1998). For example, several of the university's adjacent counties have poverty rates that surpass the 40% level. As well, this region follows the national trend of a widening gap between the rich and the poor. The average income of the poorest fifth of families fell by \$3,660 between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s, from \$11,020 to \$7,360. The average income of the richest fifth of families increased by \$19,620 between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s, from \$79,590 to \$99,210. Average incomes, therefore, are deceptive. Although the average family income in Kentucky is around \$24,000 this figure tends to hide the disproportionate spread of wealth between the rich and the poor. (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Press Release, September 4, 1999.)

Similarly, educational levels are also generally lower in Kentucky than in other parts of the country. (Only 13.6% of Kentuckians over the age of 25 have bachelors degrees compared with 20.3% across the country). Furthermore, at the time this study was undertaken, the results of statewide Core Battery Testing in Kentucky revealed that some of the ten lowest scoring schools in Kentucky were to be found in the university's service region. The now defunct KIRIS (Kentucky Instructional Results Information System) tests indicated a tight relationship between low scores and high poverty levels (Cullen, 1999).

One of the more comprehensive studies undertaken in relation to welfare reform was conducted by five public policy organizations in 1993. The research consortium consisted of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Center for Law and Social Policy, the Joint Center for Policy and Economic Studies, the National Council of La Raza and the Children's Defense Fund. Summarizing this research Garin, Molyneux and DiVall (1994) reported that in the main "voters accept a conservative diagnosis of the problem (*i.e. that lack of effort by individuals was the main cause of poverty*), but do not accept conservative prescriptions." For example, in this

study, the successful transition into work was the highest rated goal for welfare reform. The majority of voters surveyed believed that the welfare system was flawed because it failed to achieve this goal and because projected welfare reforms would harm some innocent victims of poverty.

Voters, therefore, held contradictory positions on a number of issues. Despite the fact that Americans appear to blame individual effort rather than circumstance for poverty, 88% of voters in this study believed that poor children could be hurt through no fault of their own if their parents were cut off welfare after a two year period. Furthermore, although 93% of respondents believed that welfare recipients should be obliged to work for their welfare, only 47% believed that mother of infants and 60% that mothers of pre-school children should be required to work. The authors concluded that, “ Americans want to see the system fixed, not recipients or their children punished.”

This study revealed a good deal about voter opinion. However, there have been few studies that have sought to address demographic differences in attitudes to social issue or students’ attitudes in poor regions of the country. The research described below was aimed at collecting such data.

Surveys were administered to undergraduate students in their respective classrooms during April, June and July of 1998. We went to classrooms in order to draw from a wide range of classes. A total of 390 surveys from an undergraduate population of approximately 6500 were collected. Approximately 45% of respondents identified education as their major. The remainder were drawn from across the university disciplines.

The survey consisted of 60 statements covering a wide range of social issues as well as 14 demographic questions. Using a 5 point Likert scale, Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1), we had 22 items that directly related to work, welfare and poverty. For our independent variables we measured gender and age and analyzed the data through the differing bi-variate calculations of the t-test and through correlations.

Results

Sample characteristics

This sample had a large female presence since almost twice as many females as males responded to the survey. 81% of respondents were under 25 and the over 35 year old age group represented just 5% of the sample making age comparisons difficult. With a white student base only 11% of respondents were minorities (5% amongst the general student population). Being a commuter school, 56% of students sampled came from the university’s service region of surrounding Eastern Kentucky counties. Again, the population was like most college settings since only 17% of respondents were married, 6% were separated, divorced or widowed. 17% also had children.

Just under one half of students reported that they did not work for pay during term time. However, around 70% of students at this university receive some form of financial aid - either grants or loans. The amount of hours worked by students was distributed evenly. 12% of

students worked 8 hours weekly for pay, 15% worked more than 20 hours a week and 10% worked more than 30 hours.

Student attitudes

Gender Differences in attitudes towards social issues.

The 60 questions on the survey covered 7 topics: 1)race 2) welfare, work and poverty 3) politics 4) sex 5) education6) religion 7) crime. The chart below shows the percentage of questions in each category with gender differences in responses. Proportionately, questions related to race showed the most discrepancy between gender closely followed by questions related to work, welfare and poverty. These are analyzed below. There were no discernable differences in responses between gender amongst the questions related to religion and crime

type of question	percentage of questions that showed a gender different response
race	67
work	64
politics	50
sex	29
education	18
religion	0
crime	0

Work and Welfare

A summary of the gender differences in responses to work related questions are given in the chart below:

Gender Differences in Responses to Work Related Questions	males	females
	likert	scale
men and women should receive equal pay for equal work	4.7348	4.9502
Mothers should stay at home with pre-school children	2.8561	2.4896
If African Americans failed to succeed it is their own fault	3.209	2.7479
It is the responsibility of the government to reduce income inequality	3.0075	3.5083
Learning Disabled will be on welfare most of their lives	2.9701	2.4711
Federal government should raise minimum wage	3.5896	4.0207
Women avoid promotion because they don't like responsibility	2.0048	1.4689
Poor people are lazier than everyone else	2.1418	1.7054
Women are discriminated in the work place	2.7444	3.1618

In first addressing the matter of payment for work rendered, 98% of students agreed that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work. However, women (98.1%) were more strongly in agreement than men (96.3% v. 81.8%; $p=.000$). Although most students (86.2%) disagreed that women avoided promotion because they did not like responsibility, women felt more strongly about this than men (94.7 v 72.4%; $p=.000$). Just over one quarter of students (25.9%) agreed that women were rarely found in top management positions because they got married and had children. There were no differences noted between gender but there was strong positive correlation between the questions related to promotion and management positions (.1866) suggesting that around one quarter of students believe there may be social or cultural barriers to female advancement in the work place.

79% of students believed that welfare recipients should be required to work for their income. This figure is considerably lower than the percentage reported in the Garin, Molyneux and DiVall (1994) study (93%). However, 76% of believed that the current system of welfare discourages people from working indicating a somewhat conservative perception that the welfare system is still in need of some overhaul. Not surprisingly, there was a strong positive correlation between these two questions on the survey. (.2374).

Students were generally much more sympathetic towards the working poor. 71% of students believed that that the government in Washington should raise the minimum wage and women were more likely to agree with this statement than men ((77.2% v 59%; $p=.000$). Only 65% of students believed that there were plenty of jobs for welfare recipients who wanted to work and one in five (20%) disagreed. These two statements were negatively related (-0135) suggesting that those who believed in raising the minimum wage also believed there were not enough jobs for welfare recipients who really wanted to work. In fact less than one quarter (24%) of students agreed that most jobs in Kentucky paid enough to keep a family healthy and

these students were more likely support the raising of a minimum wage (negatively correlated - - 0135).

Just over 20% of students thought that to get better pay workers should join trade unions and about the same number disagreed. Interestingly, more than half of the students who responded to this question gave a neutral response. Those students who agreed that the government should raise the minimum wage were *more* likely to believe that to get better pay workers should join a trade union (.2238) and less likely to agree that most jobs in Kentucky paid enough to keep a family health (-.1269).

70% of students believed that mothers on welfare should be provided with free childcare so that they could take a paid job. Students who agreed with this statement however, were also *more* likely to report that poor people were poor due to circumstances beyond their control (.1236) and that the government should raise the minimum wage (.1064). They were *less* likely to agree that mothers on welfare should be required to work even if their children were too young to attend school. (-.1343) , that there were plenty of jobs for welfare recipients who really wanted to work (-.1429) or that poor people are lazier than everyone else. (-.1046)

Just over half (56%) of students agreed that mothers should never put a career before their family responsibilities but only 21% felt that mothers should stay at home and raise their children until their they were old enough to attend school. There was a strong positive correlation between these two questions. Those students who agreed that mothers should put family before career were *more* likely to agree that mothers should stay at home and raise their children until school age. (.3140) and that the government should raise the minimum wage (.1058). Interestingly, In response to the statement that mothers should stay at home, men were more likely to agree than women (28% v 17.5%; p=.002).

42% of students believed that mothers on welfare should be required to work even if their children were too young to attend school and women were more likely to agree to this statement than men (50.2% v 28.4%; p=.000). Students who responded positively to this statement were *more* likely to agree that mothers on welfare should receive free childcare to enable them to work (.1343), that all welfare recipients should be required to work for their money (.3606), that the current system of welfare discourages people from working (.2054) and that the government in Washington should raise the minimum wage (.1057). There was a strong negative correlation between the statement that mothers should stay at home and raise their children until they were old enough to attend school and the statement that mothers on welfare should be required to work even if their children were too young to attend school. (-.3327). 20% supported the first statement, 40% supported the second. It would appear that respondents were somewhat sympathetic to the notion of women caring for children until school going age, but less so if this meant mothers would be supported by the state.

These results indicate that compared with the national study there was more support for mothers to stay at home with children rather than work. The Garin, Molyneux and DiVall study (1994) reported that 60% of voters believed that mothers of pre-school children should be required to work. The number in this study was 51% .

Poverty

Just under half (49%) of students believed that in the United States everyone had the same opportunity to succeed in school. However, 48.4% believed that poverty was no excuse for low achievement in school. There was a positive correlation between these two questions (.2848). Just over one third of students (35%) agreed that most people were poor due to circumstances beyond their control but only 6% of students overall believed that poor people were lazier than anyone else. However, men were more likely to agree with this statement than women (11.9% v 2%; $p=.000$). These two statements were negatively correlated (-.1774).

Alston & Dean(1971) noted that there were differences regarding attribution of poverty between socioeconomic classes. The students in this study were not representative of the population of East Kentucky as a whole. Attendance at this university would automatically place respondents in the top two percentiles academically in the region. According to Nilson,(1981) people were more likely to blame individuals for being poor if they were exposed to a common view that poverty was brought about by lack of effort. Only two thirds of students in this study blamed individuals and a tiny minority (6%) believed that the poor are lazier than everyone else. Thus, despite being members of an educational elite, one third of students still believed that poverty could be attributed to external factors other than individual lack of effort.

More than half of the students (51.6%) believed that it was the responsibility of the government to reduce income inequality in the United States but women were much more likely to agree with this statement than men (57% v 41.1%; $p=.000$). Only 40%of students thought the government in Washington should reduce income inequality by raising the taxes of wealthy families. However, those who believed it was the government's responsibility also agreed that the government should raise the taxes of the wealthy (.2771).

Conclusion

The study has demonstrated that students drawn from a region of socioeconomic deprivation have a high resistance to welfare as a means of supporting poor families. Overall, there does seem to be considerable support for the government's efforts to move welfare recipients from welfare to work, but there is skepticism about the availability of jobs and the remuneration received. More than half the students surveyed believed that the government does have a role in alleviating suffering in this region and 4 out of 10 believe that the government should increase the taxes of the wealthy. Women were generally more sympathetic to the plight of the poor in this study and were more likely to seek some form of government intervention to alleviate poverty. Interestingly, some females felt strongly that mothers should work even when they had young children to raise. However, students were concerned that welfare policies should not adversely affect children and for this reason there was significant support for mothers to remain on welfare if their children were not of school going age. In this respect the students in this university appear to hold similar views to the general public.

References

- Alston, J. & Dean, K. (1972) Socioeconomic factors associated with attitudes towards welfare recipients and the cause of poverty. **Social Services Review**, 46, 13-23.
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (1997), **Pulling Apart: A State-by-State Analysis of Income Trends** (<http://www.cbpp.org/pa-rel.htm>)
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Kentucky Youth Advocates. Press Release. April, 1999.
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Press Release, September 4, 1999. **Gaps Between High-Income and Other Americans Will Reach Record Level in 1999, Analysis Finds**
- Cullen, Laura. (1999). *Poverty Obstructs success of KERA's testing goals*. **The Kentucky Gazette**, January 19).
- Garin, G., Molyneux, G., DiVall, L. *Public Attitudes Towards Welfare Reform*. **Social Policy**, Winter 1994, p 44-48
- Griffin, W.E. and Oheneba-sakyi. (1993). *Sociodemographic and political correlates of university students' causal attributions for poverty*. **Psychological Reports.**, vol. 73, 795-800.
- Huber,, J. and Form, W. (1973). **Income and ideology: an analysis of the American political formula**. New York. Free Press.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research (1998). **The Status of Women in Kentucky**. Kentucky Women Advocates. Louisville. KY
- Jenks, P. (1998). (1998) *The Future Well-Being of Women in Kentucky* .**Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center**. URL (<http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/women.htm>)
- Kentucky Cabinet for Workforce Development (1998)
(<http://www.state.ky.us/agencies/wforce/>)
- Kentucky Long-Term Policy . *Closing the Income Gap (1998) Emerging Issues for Kentucky*, Spring, 1998 http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/scan_s98.htm#3.
- Kentucky Long-Term Policy (1998) **The Context of Change: Trends, Innovations and Forces Affecting Kentucky's Future**. URL (<http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/trendrep.htm>)

Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center. (Spring 1998) *Welfare to Work an Unfamiliar Path for Some. Emerging Issues for Kentucky*. URL http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/scan_s98.htm#3.

Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center. (Spring, 1998) **A Strong Education-Earnings Link. Emerging Issues for Kentucky**, URL (http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/scan_s98.htm#2).

Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center (1998) *Too Few Jobs for Welfare Recipients* (1998) **Emerging Issues for Kentucky**, Winter 1998. URL http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/scan_w98.htm)

Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center **Executive Summary**. (1998). Frankfort, Kentucky.

Kentucky Cabinet for Families and Children (Press Release: April, 1999). Frankfort, Kentucky.

Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center (1998) *Too Few Jobs for Welfare Recipients* (1998) **Emerging Issues for Kentucky**, Winter 1998. URL http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/ltprc/scan_w98.htm)

Schwartz, S. and Robinson, M. (1991). *Attitudes towards poverty during undergraduate education*. **Journal of Social Work Education**, 1991, 27, 3, Fall, 290-296.

Kluegel, J. (1987). *Macro-Economic Spending, Beliefs about the Poor and Attitudes toward welfare spending*. **Social Problems**, 1987, 34, 1, Feb, 82-89.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

304 - 347 0467
606



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



Reproduction Release (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: *Gender Differences in Central Appalachian Students' Attitudes towards Poverty, Welfare + Work.*
Author(s): *Rita Egan*
Corporate Source:

Publication Date:
March, 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY ERIC
FOR REPRODUCTION IN MICROFILM
AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA ONLY.
THIS RELEASE IS LIMITED TO
ERIC ARCHIVAL COLLECTION

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY ERIC
FOR REPRODUCTION IN MICROFILM
AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA ONLY.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:

Rita Egan

Printed Name/Position/Title:

Organization/Address:

Morehead State University
Morehead, KY 40351

Telephone:

606 780 4690

Fax:

606 783 5044

E-mail Address:

CISCOPAWS@YAHOO.COM

Date:

July 19/2000

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

Acquisitions
ERIC/CRESS at AEL
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325-1348
Toll Free: 800-624-9120
FAX: 304-347-0467
e-mail: erlcr@aeLorg
WWW: <http://www.ael.org/eric/>

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)