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ABSTRACT

Educational Needs Of Welfare Recipients

And The Role Of The Community College

As An Agent of Social Change

by

Carolyn Louise Browning

The purpose of this study was to investigate two underlying questions related to welfare reform and its impact on participants in the Cumberland Plateau Region: (1) What are the training and other noneducational needs of the participants in the VIEW program?, and (2) What is the projected success of the impact of the training on the lives of the participants? The research study included 47 interviews with four distinct groups of individuals--VIEW participants, case managers, administrators, and trainers. Three focus group interviews were conducted with individuals who were participants in the VIEW program or professionals actively involved in the administration and implementation of the program.

All the individuals interviewed in the study identified four difficulties to the successful implementation of the VIEW program: (1) the lack of economic development in the region, (2) the abbreviated time frame for the implementation of VIEW, (3) an excessive amount of paperwork, and (4) the lack of transportation. The participants cited the following difficulties: (1) child care, (2) inappropriate dress for interviews, (3) attitudes and busyness of case worker, (4) penalties associated with securing employment, and (5) limited opportunities for training. The training personnel identified three areas posing difficulties for participants: (1) motivation, (2) attitudes of the participants, and (3) leadership development.

In summarizing the responses of all the individuals interviewed in this study, the two viable remedies emerged as options available to assist participants: (1) seeking additional help from family members or friends, and (2) taking the initiative to investigate other avenues of assistance outside the scope of the Departments of Social Services.

The training component of the VIEW program was considered the most favorable among all the individuals interviewed in this study. The proposed outcome of the...
training received for all participants in the VIEW program was the attainment of full-time or part-time employment. All the interviewees felt to varying degrees that the VIEW program would assist participants in securing employment. The administrators and case managers ultimately viewed the employment as the measure of success of the training. However, most of the participants were very unsure if they would secure employment in the Cumberland Plateau Region.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Community education, which is considered the broadest of all community college functions, embraces adult education, adult basic education, continuing education, contract training, community services, and community based education. Brawer (1980a) has listed the terms most commonly used in defining community education:

(1) adult education - instruction designed for people who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance and who either have completed or interrupted their formal education; (2) continuing education - the learning effort undertaken by people whose principal occupations are no longer as students, and those who regard learning as a means of developing their potential or resolving their problems; (3) lifelong learning - intermittent education, whether or not undertaken in school settings; (4) community services (the broadest term) - whatever services an institution provides that are acceptable to the people in its service area; and (5) community-based education - programs designed by the people served and developed for the good of the community. (pp. 128-129)

The continuing education function of the community college arose early and the percentage of adults enrolled increased dramatically in the 1940s. The 1947 President's
Commission on Higher Education emphasized the importance of the continuing education function. Bogue (1950, p. 215) noted with approval a Texas college's slogan, "We will teach anyone, anywhere, anything, at anytime whenever there are enough people interested in the program to justify its offerings." Bogue also reported that "out of the 500,536 students reported in the 1949 (AACJC) Directory, nearly 185,000 are specials or adults" (p.35).

A nationwide survey of directors of continuing education defined it as "courses and activities for credit or noncredit, formal classroom or nontraditional programs, cultural, recreational offerings specifically designed to meet the needs of the surrounding community and using school, college, and other facilities" (Fletcher et al., 1977, p. 12). Found in the earliest community colleges, these varied and sundry activities were carried along for decades on the periphery of the career and collegiate functions. They expanded greatly in the 1970s, and slowed in the 1980s as college services came under closer scrutiny from external budget resource allocators (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

Contract training, a defined area within the continuing education function of the community college, is defined by Cohen and Brawer (1991) as "an arrangement in which a business, government agency, or a community association contracts directly with a college for the provision of instruction to its employees, clients, or members" (p. 266).
These contract training activities include apprenticeship training; contract services for industry; economic development services; Job Training Partnership Act Programs; and faculty "return to industry" programs, in which faculty spend time in industrial plants to gain information about contemporary technologies.

More recently, Ireland, Smydra, and Tucker (1988) defined community services and education as:

That community college function that goes beyond traditional transfer, vocational, and general education to effect lifelong learning of the general citizenry . . Community services and continuing education has as its major components civic literacy, work force training and retraining, cultural enrichment, and community resource development. All courses, programs, and activities provided to implement the various components have as their objective imparting knowledge, developing skills, or clarifying values. The approach or delivery mode is one that enables the citizenry to access quality programs and needed competencies any time, any place, and in a format that blends education with work and leisure time pursuits throughout life. Implementation is achieved through experimentation and community collaboration in the broadest sense of community, within and outside the institution (pp. 5 - 6).
Also in 1988, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges outlined academic goals for community colleges throughout the nation. One of these goals was that "community colleges should make available to adults a rich array of short term and continuing education courses to encourage lifelong learning and help students meet their social, civic, and career obligations" (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988, p. 15). In addition, the Commission stated that "every community college should work with employers to develop a program of recurrent education to keep the work force up-to-date and well-educated. Such a strategy should become an integral part of any regional economic development program" (p. 23).

Because the concept of community education describes an area of service that virtually sets no limits on age, prior educational attainment, interest or intent, the community college has been involved in a myriad of activities and initiatives for many years. The community services and continuing education professional of the community colleges have been involved in training, re-training, and upgrading the work force for many years and the two aforementioned documents help reinforce the idea that contract training is a legitimate community college function. One key area that has emerged over the past two decades is the community college's training role in activities focused around welfare reform.
While accomplishing the original depression era goals of helping the desperate, poor and downtrodden, many believe that welfare programs now have burgeoned into a complicated, multifaceted bureaucratic system of programs that are costly and seem to foster dependence rather than independence and self-sufficiency (Tanner and Leavitt, 1995). According to Gordon (1994, p. 1), states and the federal government have created a "welfare monster" that fosters a reliance on an antiquated, fragmented system.

The origins of the modern social welfare system can presumably be traced to the Social Security Act of 1935. This legislation, best known for establishing Social Security and unemployment insurance, also contained a number of means-tested joint federal-state programs to provide temporary assistance to certain categories of the poor (Rein, 1982). Such programs include Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to Dependent Children, the forerunner of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

These initiatives were intended to have very limited application. For example, Aid to Dependent Children was designed to assist a small number of widows and children whose fathers had died. Even those limited programs represented a significant change in social welfare policy. Previously, social welfare had not been considered a government responsibility; certainly not the federal government's, but rather the domain of families, churches, fraternal organizations, and other private organizations.
(Tanner & Leavitt, 1995). The Social Security Act, with all of its attendant programs, represented the first major step on the road to ultimately transferring responsibility for helping the poor from the private to the public sector.

By the mid 1950s, government social welfare programs began to expand inexorably. Many of those receiving welfare benefits were not even widows, and many had never been married. What began to emerge now was a new class of individuals dependent on government support. Criticism mounted, and Tanner & Leavitt (1995) noted that, by the early 1960s, The New York Times was editorializing that "the problem (of poverty) cannot be solved with a welfare check" (p. 2).

As a result, there began a shift in the emphasis of social welfare programs; from that of cash payments designed to support people to those programs designed to lift people out of poverty. An entire new group of training, education and other noncash payments were born. Yet, social welfare spending continued to explode, beginning with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. President Lyndon Johnson introduced still another new generation of public programs, including Medicaid and food stamps (Rein, 1982). By the end of the 1960s, virtually every low income American was eligible for some sort of publicly funded assistance.

Also during the 1960s, a subtle and progressive shift in the public perception of social welfare developed. Public aid began to be seen not as a form of tax supported
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charity, but as an "entitlement" (Tanner & Leavitt, 1995, p. 2). This trend eventually culminated with the 1970 United States Supreme Court decision in Kelly v. Goldberg, which held that welfare benefits were "an entitlement protected by the due process clause of the Constitution" (Tanner & Leavitt, 1995, p. 2).

Tanner and Leavitt (1995) noted there was little change in the growth of welfare until the Reagan Administration began to tighten eligibility requirements in the mid 1980s. President Reagan attempted, on a program-by-program basis, to restrict eligibility to the "truly needy" (p. 3). Gordon (1995) underscored the fact that states were required to set eligibility and income verification standards. Notwithstanding, total welfare spending continued to grow, and benefit levels remained relatively stable.

From across the political and ideological spectrum, there is a prevailing, generalized acknowledgment that the American welfare system has been a failure. Since the start of the War on Poverty in 1965, the United States has spent more than $5 trillion over the past thirty years trying to ease the plight of the poor (Sancton, 1992; Tanner & Leavitt, 1995). The net result of this corpulent investment has primarily been more reliance and dependence by recipients of the programs, and more poverty, both urban and rural.

When most Americans think of the poor in this country, such images as crowded cities and urban slums come to mind.
It is true that many inner cities contain distressingly high percentages of the poor. The highest concentration of American poverty exists not in the cities, but in rural areas, in four nonmetropolitan pockets: The Appalachian Mountain region (where most poor people are white); the old Southern cotton belt, stretching from the Carolinas to the Arkansas and Louisiana deltas (where most of the poor are black); the Rio Grande Valley/Texas Gulf Coast (where most poor people are Hispanic); and the Native American reservations of the Southwest (where poverty is nearly all Native American). Some 15 percent of all Americans live in poverty, but 20 percent of rural Americans, an estimated ten million people, are poor (Flynt, 1996).

The percentage of poor who receive welfare benefits in this country is greater in rural areas than in urban areas. This phenomenon is especially true in the Appalachian Mountain region. Over the last 30 years, more than $10 billion in federal aid has been trickling into the region assisting many poor families in providing the basics of food, shelter, and clothing; providing special schooling for slow learners; and paving roads to their homes (Flynt, 1996). Yet, the Appalachian region still lags dangerously behind after a high cost blitz of public assistance programs designed to wage a war on poverty.

Southwest Virginia, a defined area of the Appalachian region, which extends from Roanoke, VA, southwestward encompassing Giles, Montgomery, Pulaski, Bland, Wythe,
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Tazewell, Smyth, Washington, Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, Wise, Scott, and Lee counties, is an economically depressed area when compared to central, northern, and eastern parts of the state. The Cumberland Plateau region, consisting of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell and Tazewell counties, is an especially economically depressed area. Although the average unemployment rate in the state of Virginia from May 1995 to June 1996 was 4.4 percent, the average unemployment rate for the Cumberland Plateau region for the same time period was 11.6 percent. Poverty and unemployment are far more pronounced in the counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, and Tazewell counties, whose average unemployment rates for the period of May 1995 through June 1996 are 13.7 percent, 18.9 percent, 10.7 percent and 9.2 percent respectively (Virginia Employment Commission, 1996). Coupled with these significantly high unemployment figures that portion of the poor who are not actively seeking employment, but rather rely on and receive public assistance in the forms of AFDC, food stamps, and Medicaid. These specific areas of public assistance, especially the AFDC benefits, have become the primary targets of welfare reform.

Labor unions have supported community education programs by negotiating tuition aid packages with employers, serving on advisory committees for community colleges' occupational programs, and helping to establish cooperative apprenticeship training programs and programs to establish cooperative members in studying leadership roles and the
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liberal arts (Berger, 1988; Cohen & Brawer, 1991). Over the years, community colleges have taken advantage of various federal programs designed to retrain technologically displaced workers as well as other unemployed people. Such programs as the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, and the Job Training Partnership Act of 1983 have assisted community colleges in designing activities in accordance with local job needs and in cooperation with employers in their region (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). Specific programs include Food Stamp Employment Training (FSET), Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA), and custodial training. Community colleges have already designed and delivered training in these specific areas to help participants on public assistance to secure jobs.

The new campaign to strengthen families and encourage personal responsibility in achieving self-sufficiency, launched by the Commonwealth of Virginia, is the Virginia Independence Program. The primary welfare reform tool of this program is the Virginia Initiative for Employment, not Welfare (VIEW). This program targets statewide AFDC recipients requiring that these recipients to receive training and secure work in exchange for their benefits. VIEW participants are eligible for AFDC assistance for two years, one year of transitional benefits, followed by a two year period of ineligibility (Duty, 1996).
Individuals who are attempting to make the transition from public assistance to the work force will be targeted by the community college as potential clients. In order to respond to the needs of these clients effectively and efficiently, the community college must identify the educational as well as noneducational needs of these clients and design a training and/or retraining program congruent with the needs of the clients and other stakeholders (e.g. business industry, support groups, employers, counselors, administrators, teachers, etc.).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to: (1) identify the educational needs of welfare recipients in the counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, and Tazewell who are currently receiving AFDC benefits and are being required to receive training and secure jobs and (2) project the success of the impact of this training on the lives of the participants.

**Research Questions**

The literacy skills of the participants in this qualitative study will be determined by a standardized test administered by the Jobs Training Office. In addition to determining the literacy skills of the participants, several noneducational areas, which impact the overall success of the training initiative, will be investigated by the following research questions:
1. What are the skills levels of the participants in this study?
2. How were these skills levels determined?
3. In addition to the vocational and technical skills needed by these participants, what other types of training needs (noneducational) and support might these participants need while completing the training program?
4. What organization or agency will be the primary deliverer of the training? Why was this organization or agency chosen?
5. What are the opinions and factual knowledge of the participants about the VIEW program?
6. What are the perceived barriers (by participants as well as administrators, counselors, trainers) that may cause difficulties for the participants while in the training program?
7. What are some viable options and/or alternatives available to the participants to help them deal with these perceived barriers?
8. What are the proposed outcomes of the training program and what criteria will be used to measure the success of the participants of the program achieving the proposed outcomes?
9. What aspects of the training program do the participants and other stakeholders (e.g. administrators, counselors, teachers, etc.) like the most? the least? why?
What aspects of the training program do the participants and other stakeholders (e.g. administrators, counselors, teachers, etc.) need to be improved? Why?

**Significance of the Study**

All told, there are at least 75 separate federal programs operating to aid the needy. Three that particularly affect the United States and are critical to welfare reform initiatives are Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), food stamps and Medicaid (Gordon, 1994). Food stamps are subsidized by the federal government with administrative costs of the program being shared by the states. Medicaid and AFDC expenses are split between the states and the federal government.

AFDC recipients in the counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell and Tazewell counties who are currently participating in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program are receiving some literacy and occupational training. However, research documenting the success of such training programs strongly indicates that in addition to literacy, basic life and occupational skills training, other noneducational barriers to employability such as low self-esteem, internalized feelings of inadequacy, and motivation may also need to be addressed in the training process (Levitan & Gallo, 1993). Pursuing a holistic approach to the training of these individuals will instill and develop the psychological as well as vocational
constructs needed to enhance the successfulness of federally mandated programs of welfare reform.

Overview of the Study

This study will be organized into a series of five chapters. In the first chapter an introduction, statement of the purpose, and the significance of the study are presented.

A review of the literature concerning the beginnings of the welfare system, subsequent welfare reform initiatives and the role of the community college in training and retraining of the workforce is presented in Chapter 2. The research method and instrument(s) used to conduct this qualitative study are described in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 will include the data and the findings. The summary, conclusions, recommendations and implications for further study are given in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Public assistance programs, commonly called "welfare," provide cash or in-kind benefits for particular categories of poor persons. To be eligible for such programs, an individual must have income and other assets below a certain level (a means test) and often must meet other eligibility criteria. Public provision for the poor in the United States is still strongly influenced by the Poor Laws of England, which were punitive toward recipients of public charity. Generally, individuals who need public assistance are stigmatized and stereotyped, and their poverty-ridden circumstances are viewed as abnormal and temporary (Heidenheimer, 1981).

Welfare programs in the United States grew significantly after World War II, and these increases have raised questions about the extent and quality of public assistance. Recessions, unemployment, federal and state debts, rising taxes and shifts in federal funding expectations of the states, coupled with problematic state tax receipts, all create a context in which criticisms of public assistance programs become more accentuated.

Historical Background

Social welfare, in the form of public provision for needs of poor individuals, has existed since biblical and
classical times. For example, the Roman Republic provided doles and public works for unemployed proletarians. In more modern times, the first comprehensive public social welfare system—providing for the sick, the aged, widows, orphans and the unemployed—was the Poor Law system which was introduced in England under the Tudors and codified by the Poor Law of 1601. The Tudor Poor Law was designed to relieve the social distress caused by the enclosure village common land and to fill the vacuum in the provision of welfare left by Henry VIII’s abolition of the monasteries. Heidenheimer (1981) noted that the scope of the Poor Law, however, was severely limited by England’s low level of economic development and partly by the fact that, although the Poor Law was initiated by the government, it was administered by the local parish and financed only by a parish tax.

"Social welfare" in its contemporary sense is normally seen as a direct or indirect product of industrialization. It is associated with the advanced industrial economies that developed in Europe, North America, Australia, and parts of Asia beginning in the 18th century. The social welfare systems that began to develop in the 18th and 19th centuries varied enormously in their aims, their scope, and the political ideologies that undergirded them. Kahn and Kamermon (1976), Kohler and Zacher (1982), and Rodgers, Doron, and Jones (1979), all agree that some programs attempted to confine welfare to a small stigmatized minority
of the totally destitute; others tried to cover the entire
gamut of material needs for most people for a lifetime. In
all cases, however, three preconditions were crucially
necessary for the development of contemporary welfare
systems: economic growth, sophisticated government
institutions, and a reasonably stable population with a
well-balanced ratio of "dependents" to industrial producers.

The Nature of Social Problems

The social problems with which social welfare policies
in recent history have dealt can be classified into three
broad categories. First and most basic is the issue of
poverty, which can be divided into "primary" and "secondary"
poverty. Primary poverty means lack of goods that are
essential for healthy survival; whereas secondary, or
"relative," poverty means the lack of enough income to
provide oneself with what any given society views as a
"decent standard of life." The standard is termed
"relative" because what would be "poverty" in some societies
would be recognized as comfort elsewhere (Bell 1987; Kahn
and Kamermon, 1980; Rodgers, Doron, & Jones, 1979). For
example, the income of British paupers in the 19th century
was considerably higher than the average income of modern
Bangladesh.

Second, the aforementioned researchers state that there
are problems that are common to all societies, advanced and
traditional. These social problems include sickness,
accidents, mental and physical disabilities, widowhood and
old age. Societies view these problems as social and problematic; therefore, they should and must be addressed.

Third, Heidenheimer (1981), Kahn & Kamermon (1980), Rodgers, Doron, & Jones (1979) and Sainsbury (1977) discuss the point that these problems were acutely exacerbated by industrial growth itself. Of these problems, the most important are probably injuries at work, irregularity of employment, overcrowding and environmental squalor, more old-age dependency, individual alienation and the breakdown of traditional community cohesiveness.

In pre-industrial societies, the first two groups of problems (work injuries and interruptions of employment) were dealt with, if they were dealt with at all, by "natural" and voluntary institutions, such as family, the immediate community, and any charitable organizations. Over the past 200 years, however, in all advanced societies, the role of these three traditional bodies was increasingly supplemented, or superseded in some cases, by the state. Governments began to feel pressure to intervene in the field of social welfare. This pressure was partly political, partly ideological, but primarily functional (Wilensky, et al., 1985; Kohler & Zacher, 1982; Heidenheimer, 1981; Piven & Cloward, 1972).

McClements (1978) and Piven & Cloward (1972) noted at the functional level, traditional face-to-face institutions themselves were either destroyed or fundamentally changed by industrialization. Families and communities were broken up
by enforced migration and commercial development. Charitable organizations and institutions were not able to meet the mass of new problems introduced by the onslaught of industrialization. Consequently, governments were forced to intervene, partly to take over the welfare functions of traditional institutions and partly to protect the working population from the worst ravages of industrial change.

Such intervention was often humanitarian in its motives and served as well to help meet the need of new industries for a healthy, literate, and efficient working population. This kind of state intervention tended to become self-generating. Public agencies that were established and set up to remedy a particular social evil often discovered other social evils and therefore extended their welfare functions. It is mainly because of this self-generating tendency that government intervention in welfare is often associated with the growth of bureaucracy (McClements, 1978; Piven & Cloward, 1972).

Evidence suggests that voters' opinions are now influenced significantly by questions of social welfare. Political pressure is generally the reason for such expansion of social welfare programs and has usually come from two sources: government officials and organized interest groups. Bureaucrats already working in the field of welfare are often anxious to extend their functions and powers. Interest groups (e.g. labor unions, employers' federations, professional associations) are attempting to
The modern development of social welfare responsibilities as they relate to the development and evolution of welfare in the United States grew out of the establishment of the poor law in England in 1601. This Elizabethan statute, by taxing all householders of a parish for relief of the destitute among them, established the principle of secular public responsibility for the care of the poor (Leiby, 1978; Piven & Cloward, 1986; Trattner, 1974).

The role of the state and federal governments in social welfare became a significantly crucial and controversial issue in United States political and social policy. Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution conferred upon Congress the power "...To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense Welfare of the United States."

Whether this provision within the Constitution conferred on the Congress the power to enact social welfare legislation was a highly debatable question for many years (Leiby, 1978; Piven & Cloward, 1986; Trattner, 1974).

According to Leiby (1978), McClements (1978), and Trattner (1974), a historical decision took place in 1854, when President Franklin Pierce vetoed legislation that provided for federal aid to states in the form of land for...
construction of facilities for care and treatment of the insane. Pierce stated that such legislation would set a precedent in the care of the indigent that could lead to federal participation in measures for the care of other indigents and thus transfer to the federal government the responsibility of the poor in all the states. President Pierce reiterated that social welfare responsibility was exclusively a function belonging to state governments. Pierce's view was reinforced by subsequent presidents and congresses and by general acceptance until the massive upheavals resulting from the Great Depression of 1929 revealed the need to be greater than the resources of localities and the states.

Social welfare services thus remained largely a local responsibility until the 20th century. State responsibility for providing financial help to needy individuals and the gamut of activities which began to be termed social services grew very slowly, and it was not until the 1930's that all states had departments of social welfare with statewide responsibility for the operation of such programs (Axinn & Levin, 1992).

Despite a change in attitude toward the poor in the reform-oriented early 20th century, coupled with a slow but constant acceleration in welfare services, it was not until the wake of the Great Depression that the most significant step in the evolution of social welfare activities was taken in the United States--the enactment of the Social Security
Act of 1935. President Franklin D. Roosevelt viewed the new law as a cornerstone piece of legislation in a structure which was being built but is by no means complete. Since 1935, more rapid and far-reaching measures have occurred in social welfare. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the old age insurance program in the case of *Helvering vs. Davis* (1937) (Axinn & Levin, 1992; Bell, 1987; Trattner, 1974).

Social security is a primary and growing component of social welfare. Though the term "social security" originated in the United States, it has become generally accepted and applied to widely divergent programs in different countries. In the United States, it broadly refers to the whole range of programs under the Social Security Act. In a more limited sense, however, the term "social security" refers to the Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Program (OASDI) by employers, employees, and the self-employed who contribute to the program and receive benefits from it. The social security program in the United States, as it is embodied in the Social Security Act of 1935, its subsequent amendments, provides for six broad types of programs: social insurance, public assistance, social services, health insurance for the aged and disabled (Medicare), payment of medical costs for the needy (Medicaid), and health services for maternity and for crippled children (Axinn & Levin, 1992; Bell, 1987).
Axinn & Levin (1992), Bell (1987), and Kohler and Zacher (1982) stated that the social insurance program in the Social Security Act grew out of earlier experiences with the application of social insurance to industrial hazards. The very first program of social insurance in the United States was the state workmen's compensation laws, which began in 1910 and provided some cash payments and reimbursements for medical costs for disabilities or deaths arising during the course of employment. The workmen's compensation program established certain statutory rights superseding the common law rights of employees and defenses of the employer to protect families and society from the uncertainties of the law and judicial interpretations. The workmen's compensation system was the first income guarantee program established by legislation in the United States for any large group of employees outside of those for whom government had a special responsibility, such as war veterans. In 1908, the federal government established a similar program for federal employees, and a rather large number of states enacted such programs during the early part of the 20th century. However, it was not until 1948 that Mississippi, the last state, adopted a workmen's compensation program.

Bell (1987), Leiby (1978), and Piven & Cloward (1986) asserted that local and state programs of public assistance were unable to manage the vast and growing impact of unemployment and relief due to the Great Depression. There were a number of attempts made during the administration of
President Herbert Hoover to give financial assistance to states through loans and grants, but even this proved inadequate. With the election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and the establishment of his "New Deal" administration, a number of temporary relief work programs were established. The federal government became deeply involved in the financing and administration of social welfare.

The subsequent breakdown of state and local agencies in the social welfare field sharpened the enduring policy question: Who should have major responsibility for social welfare in the United States: the federal government or the states? President Roosevelt opted for a mixed program. The Social Security Act of 1935 established a federal old age benefits program; a federal-state program of public assistance for the aged, blind, and dependent children; and a federal-state program for unemployment compensation, maternity care, crippled children's services, child welfare services, public health services, and vocational rehabilitation services. Thus, the New Deal saved not only the economic system and the banks but also the states and the social welfare system from the possibility of complete and outright federalization. The nation had chosen a categorical, pluralistic, complex, and diverse social welfare system (Bell, 1987; Higgins, 1981; Piven & Cloward, 1986).
The historical development of health and medical services and education followed different courses. These programs, since the mid-20th century, have tended to have closer interrelationships with social security and other income maintenance programs. For example, since 1953, health, education, and welfare have been combined into a single cabinet department. Concerns for such issues as poverty, the disadvantaged, minority groups, and the development of career ladders for paraprofessional positions have tended to emphasize the need for coordinated planning among competing social welfare programs and policies (Axinn & Levin, 1992; Bell, 1987; McClements, 1978; Piven & Cloward, 1986).

**Current Major Cash Assistance Programs in the United States**

The major cash assistance programs in the United States welfare system are Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI). Two other programs are included when the term "welfare" is used: Emergency Assistance (EA) and General Assistance (GA). AFDC and EA are paid for by a combination of federal, state, and local funds. GA is funded by the states and localities alone. AFDC, EA, and GA are administered by states and localities, which establish their own "needs" standards, permissible income and resource limits and benefit levels—which vary widely. The federal government funds and administers SSI, for which all but nine states provide some
type of optional state supplement (Axinn & Levin, 1992; Piven & Cloward, 1986).

**Aid to Families with Dependent Children**

The largest and most costly of all the income welfare programs is Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). AFDC payments are intended to cover the minimum costs of providing care for poor children who have lost support of a parent because of death, prolonged absence, incapacity, or unemployment. Benefits are also given to the parents or guardians with whom the children live.

A provision of the AFDC program was first enacted in Illinois in 1911 as a part of the "mothers' aid" laws, which provided funds to enable widows and deserted women to care for their children, which spread rapidly to other states. Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) was included in the Social Security Act of 1935 to serve needy children without fathers as a joint federal/state assistance program.

The expectation that Social Security would reduce the need for public assistance for dependent children appeared to be fulfilled during the 1940s through the mid-1950s, a period when the average number of families receiving ADC fell. However, by the end of the 1950s, it was very apparent that the welfare problem was not disappearing. By 1991, the poverty rate for the entire United States was 14.2 percent and more than 35 percent of female householders with no husband present were poor. Also, during this same time, one in five children in the United States under 18 years of
age lived in poverty. During one recent recession, the AFDC rolls expanded to 24 percent.

The federal government provides matching grants to the states (50 to 80 percent for benefits, 54 percent on average, and 50 percent for administrative costs), and each state administers, with considerable discretion, its own program. To qualify for AFDC in any state, children must be less than 18 years of age—or, at state option, less than 19—and enrolled full-time in secondary or technical school.

**Supplemental Security Income (SSI)**

Federal-state programs were enacted for old-age assistance and aid to the blind as part of the Social Security Act of 1935. Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled was added in 1950. The means-tested, federally administered SSI replaced these state-administered programs in 1974 and provides minimum national monthly cash payments listed in the Consumer Price Index with uniform, nationwide eligibility requirements to needy, aged, blind, and disabled people. The disabled have become the primary recipients of SSI and are viewed as the "deserving poor," whereas the recipients of AFDC are more often viewed as the "undeserving poor."

**General Assistance**

General assistance is provided in 32 states by state and local governments without federal funds. Such aid may be furnished to needy or disabled persons who are ineligible for federal categorical programs. Eligibility criteria and
benefit levels for GA vary by state and often within states. Payments are at low levels and for short durations. Benefits range from cash payments to groceries and shelter.

**Emergency Assistance**

In 1991, 32 jurisdictions provided emergency assistance for specified emergencies to adults who were eligible for SSI and to destitute families with children under age 21. Eligible adults must experience sudden emergencies that deprive them of the means to stay alive and healthy. The benefits are paid in cash, in-kind, or in voucher form.

**Other Welfare Programs**

Other welfare programs include the food stamp program, public housing, nutrition programs, financial medical care, and the Earned Income Tax Credit. The food stamp program helps low-income households buy more and better food than they could otherwise afford. Each participating household receives a certain number of coupons called food stamps. The stamps are issued by the federal government. The number of stamps a household receives varies with the family’s size, income, and expenses. Cooperating grocery stores accept the stamps like money for food purchases.

Public housing provides low rental apartments in government-owned buildings. Other federal housing programs give cash allowances to assist low-income families rent privately owned housing. Energy assistance, which is federally funded and administered by the states, helps people pay fuel and energy costs.
The federal government also finances and administers nutrition programs for low-income families. These programs furnish free food supplements for poor mothers and young children, and free or low cost school lunches. Another federally funded program provides financial aid to college students from needy families and the federal government also offers financial medical care and other services to military veterans and their dependents.

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a federal program financed and administered by the Internal Revenue Service and provides a reduction in income tax to low-income individuals and low-income families with dependent children. Unlike other programs, these aid people who live above the poverty line (U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, 1992).

Growth and Costs of the Current Major Cash Assistance Programs

In 1970, 1.9 million families received AFDC assistance. In 1992, the growth and cost of the current major cash assistance programs increased substantially. The following tables summarize AFDC Assistance and SSI Benefits received by eligible individuals for 1992.
Table 1
AFDC ASSISTANCE - 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Disbursement</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of families enrolled</td>
<td>4.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children enrolled</td>
<td>9.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds expended</td>
<td>24.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total funds were federal</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly payment</td>
<td>390.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual payment</td>
<td>136.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* per month, per recipient
**per year, per recipient

Table 2
SSI BENEFITS - 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Disbursement</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of recipients</td>
<td>5.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent aged recipients</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent blind recipients</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds expended</td>
<td>20.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total funds were federal</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly federal benefit for individuals</td>
<td>422.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly federal benefit for couples</td>
<td>633.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* per month for individuals
**per year for couples
All but nine states supplement the regular federal SSI benefit. To qualify for SSI, criteria must be satisfied for age, blindness, or disability and the person must have limited income and resources. Also, a child under age 18 who has an impairment of comparable severity with that of an adult may be considered disabled. SSI recipients are entitled to Medicaid through several state options and food stamps, or in two states, these individuals may receive a cash equivalent (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1992).

About 20 million persons in the United States participated all 24 months of 1991 and 1992 in a major means-tested assistance program, conducted by the Commerce Department's Census Bureau (July 1995). This report indicated, "These long-term participants represented 8.3 percent of the population, a substantially higher proportion than the 7.6 percent (about 18 million) in the previous 2-year period, 1990 to 1991" (p. 1). The bureau counted persons as participants in a major means-tested assistance program if they lived in public housing or were beneficiaries of one of the following programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), General Assistance, Supplemental Security Income, Medicaid, food stamps, or federal or state rent assistance.

The report found that approximately 34 million people participated in a major means-tested public assistance program in an average month during 1992. The total number
of persons who ever participated in such programs during 1992 was 42.5 million.

The research found that the median duration for periods of participation in the assistance programs was 7.9 months during the 1991 to 1993 period, which was the same during the 1990 to 1992 period. This means that half of all the participation periods lasted less than 7.9 months and half lasted longer. The median benefit amount received in 1992 from one or more of the major means-tested assistance programs was $436 a month.

The report said, "There was a strong association between race and Hispanic origin and the likelihood of receiving means-tested assistance" (p. 2). Only 6 percent of Whites received long-term assistance, compared with 19 percent of Hispanic-origin persons and 24 percent of African Americans.

Even though the above was indicated in the report, most long-term participants in means-tested assistance programs were White—58 percent versus 36 percent who were African American and 21 percent who were Hispanic.

Children (under 18 years old) were more likely to be long-term participants in major assistance programs--13 percent--than elderly adults (65 and older)--11 percent--and non-elderly adults (18 to 64 years old)--6 percent.

Other findings of this research include the following:

Persons in female-householder families were 22 times as likely as persons in married-couple families to have
received AFDC or General Assistance on a long-term basis, and 13 times as likely to have received food stamps. Whites received AFDC/General Assistance, food stamps, and major combined benefits for shorter periods than African Americans. For instance, the median duration of AFDC/General Assistance participation for Whites was 6.6 months and for African Americans, 11.8 months. The median sum of means-tested benefits was higher for African American participants ($484 a month) in 1992 than for their White counterparts ($339). Persons of Hispanic origin had median benefits of $478, not significantly different from African Americans. (pp. 1-2)

Welfare and the Rural Poor

Rural poverty rates as a percentage of rural population are higher than urban poverty rates as a percentage of urban population. Many analyses of economic and social distress suggest that America is developing its own "third world." Although no sweeping characterization or prophecy fits them all, the label "rural", defined by the Census Bureau as an area/town of less than 2,500 population and in open country, has been applied to a variety of geographic and economic settings. For the most part the nation's rural areas are not only poorer but older and are getting more so than urbanized America (Flynt, 1996).

Rural poverty has been amazingly resistant to economic cycles and government programs. Of 3,000 counties in the
United States, 540 are non-metropolitan counties with at least 20 percent or more poor people in their population. This total of 540 counties has remained constant through every census since 1960. Consequently, it is not surprising to note that in 1992, states with substantial rural populations led the rankings of poverty: West Virginia, Texas, South Carolina, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, Georgia, Arkansas and Alabama (Flynt, 1996; Peake, 1996).

Rural poverty is not necessarily the result of laziness and personal failure, for half of the rural poor work and one quarter of rural poor families have two family members who work; yet, the families remain poor (Flynt, 1996). High-paying, high-skill jobs tend not to be found in rural areas where school systems are often bad and skills education levels are low. It is the low-wage, unskilled jobs that flow into such counties, therefore perpetuating indigence.

Migration has historically been the response of rural poor when faced with declining agriculture (which had once sustained them as tenant farmers or as farm labor) or with low-wage industrial jobs (typically in cotton mills, pulp wood, and timbering). Between 1940 and 1960 the population of southerners living outside the South doubled to ten million. By 1970, 3.9 million people of southern birth lived in the five Midwestern states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Another 2.5 million
lived in California and most of these Southern migrants were white, originated in rural areas, and were poor (Flynt, 1996; Gimlin, 1990).

The poor who have chosen to stay behind and live in rural areas do so for a variety of reasons: traditional ties to families, churches, and rural communities; fear that they do not possess the educational and job skills necessary to compete in a complex urban society because they viewed themselves as being too old or too young (rural migrants tend to be disproportionately between the ages of 17 and 45); and because they fear urban crime, drug use, and violence (Flynt, 1996; Gugliotta, 1994).

Welfare in Appalachia

The percentage of poor who receive welfare benefits in this country is greater in rural areas than in urban areas. This phenomenon is especially true in the Appalachian mountain region. Over the last 30 years, more than $10 billion in federal aid has been trickling into the region, a situation that has assisted the many poor families in providing the basics of food, shelter, clothing, special schooling for slow learners; and paved roads to their homes (Flynt, 1996). Still yet, the Appalachian region still lags dangerously behind after a high cost blitz of public assistance programs designed to wage a war on poverty.

Turmoil is nothing new to Appalachia, 195,000 square miles spanning 13 states from Mississippi to New York. The plentiful forests and steep mountains attracted such
adventurers as Daniel Boone and Kit Carson, free spirits like the feuding Hatfields and McCoys, and an array of other personalities and characters which captured the imaginations of the more prosperous, populated and proper industrial East Coast on one side, and the Midwest on the other (Tye, 1990).

Appalachia's role in this rapidly flourishing nation, however, was defined by what seemed to be its limitles reserves of deep black coal. Coal fueled the Industrial Revolution, made absentee mine owners into millionaires and provided jobs, housing and other benefits to the workers who, in turn, sacrificed their lungs--and often their lives--to scrape the "black gold" from cavernous underground shafts.

The nation's appetite for coal has been fickle. It rose in the 1920s only to fall during the Great Depression; rebounding in the 1940s, yet ebbing in the 1950s when a flood of cheap oil displaced coal as the fuel of choice (Gugliotta, 1994; Tye, 1990). These downturns were further exacerbated by physical isolation; narrow roads that snaked through the mountains limited access to education, health care and other vital services and discouraged the sort of diverse economy long enjoyed in the lowlands. By the early 1960s, Appalachia had become an embarrassing pocket of poverty in the richest country on Earth (Tye, 1990), with one in three families earning less than what the government said was required to meet basic needs.
Welfare and The Cumberland Plateau

Unemployment is a severe problem in the Cumberland Plateau region. Consisting of the counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, and Tazewell, average unemployment rates for the counties of the Cumberland Plateau region for the period of May 1995 through June 1996 were 13.7 percent, 18.9 percent, 10.7 percent and 9.2 percent respectively (Virginia Employment Commission, 1996). In addition to those who are considered unemployed, there are those who are among the poverty-stricken who are not considered unemployed, but rather are depending on various forms of public assistance programs for their support and livelihood.

For the purposes of this qualitative study, the average monthly counts of cases, recipients (the total number served) and actual dollar amounts for AFDC and food stamp programs (since food stamps is the additional public assistance program which most frequently accompanies AFDC) for the period of July 1995 through June 1996 for the Cumberland Plateau Region (Pasquantino, State Department of Social Services, 1996; 1996 Demographics USA-ZIP Code Edition, 1997) are as follows:
Table 3

AFDC ASSISTANCE FOR THE CUMBERLAND PLATEAU REGION

JULY 1995 - JUNE 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Total Payments</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>$127,656</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>$  74,450</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>$  92,553</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>$149,474</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

FOOD STAMP ASSISTANCE FOR THE CUMBERLAND PLATEAU REGION

JULY 1995 - JUNE 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Total Payments</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td>$322,725</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickenson</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>$233,666</td>
<td>30.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>$265,968</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>6,699</td>
<td>$419,149</td>
<td>18.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state of Virginia, under the auspices of Governor George Allen, has already implemented statewide AFDC requirements as of July 1, 1995. These requirements have become a focused part of Governor Allen's welfare reform tools and include: (1) diversionary assistance--one-time cash grant given for immediate hardship, and to avoid AFDC dependence; (2) paternity establishment--increased efforts.
to identify fathers and establish paternity for each AFDC child; (3) family cap--no increase in families AFDC benefits for additional children; (4) compulsory school attendance--school-age children must attend school to prevent future dependency; (5) minor parent restriction--minor parent must live with parent or guardian; (6) savings incentive--recipients can now save up to $5,000 for education, home ownership, or a business; and (7) immunization--all AFDC children must be immunized.

**Effects of Dependence on Welfare**

The effects of growing dependence on welfare programs are both social and economic. However, for the purposes of this qualitative study, the focus will be on the economic effects of the growing dependence on welfare programs.

The economic effects of increasing dependence on welfare programs can be focused around the question, "How much are we spending on antipoverty programs?", and the subsequent answers revealed by statistics. It is difficult to determine precisely how much is being spent on welfare and antipoverty programs. According to Goodman (March, 1996), by one estimate, $5 trillion has been spent on antipoverty programs in 1993 dollars since the War on Poverty began. Yet in 1993, the poverty rate was 15.1 percent higher than in the year the "war" began. Before the 1994 congressional elections, analyst Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation identified 79 interrelated and overlapping means-tested welfare programs, not including
Social Security and Medicare. In his speech, however, Goodman (1996) noted that after the election, Republicans in Congress discovered 338 means-tested programs buried in departmental budgets and not shown as antipoverty programs. At last count:

- There were 154 federal job training programs for low income people.
- There were 38 child welfare and child abuse programs and 45 programs for child care.
- There are eight means-tested programs for cash welfare, 33 for social services, ten for food and nutrition, 27 for housing and 23 for health.
- One in ten mothers receives a monthly check from AFDC, one in ten Americans receives food stamps, one in eight has Medicaid health insurance coverage, and more than 72 percent of all black children will spend some time on welfare before age 18 (pp.537-538).

In his speech, Goodman also noted total spending on federal means-tested programs was about $350 billion, or 5.3 percent of GDP, in fiscal year 1994. About $240 billion of that total was spent by the federal government and the remainder, under matching requirements, by the states. These totals, however, do not include welfare spending under nonfederal programs, including state-administered general assistance or relief programs, public housing and medical assistance.
To put the size of the "economics" of the welfare system in perspective, Eitzen (March, 1996, p. 534) and Goodman (April, 1996, p. 538) suggested the amount spent be considered in relation to the various measures of need:

- If all of the welfare dollars spent under federal programs were simply given to the people living below the official poverty level, each person would receive $8,906.

- This outright gift would equal $35,624 for a family of four--more than an average family income for the population as a whole.

- The difference between the nonwelfare cash income of the poor people and the official poverty level income (the "poverty gap") would equal about $94 billion.

- From this perspective, we theoretically eliminated poverty in the United States through outright gifts--for one-third the amount currently spent on welfare.

These examples seem to strongly suggest that there are inadequacies and inefficiencies in welfare spending in the United States. This evidence further indicates the general conclusion that the current welfare system is unfair to everyone: to taxpayers who must presently pick up the tab for failed programs; to society whose mediating institutions of community, church, and family are increasingly pushed aside; and perhaps most of all, to the poor themselves who
are trapped in a system that destroys opportunity for them and hope for their children. Welfare programs need to be brought under control.

Criticisms and Reform

The welfare issue often serves as a lightning rod for political and economic discontent. Some critics argue that welfare is bureaucratic and alienating; it encourages dependence, and stimulates resentment; costs are excessive and burdensome and fraud widespread; all of this ultimately undermines the work ethic and the traditional family. Still, others argue that there must be a safety net for families in economic trouble and poverty itself is the problem; consequently, benefit levels are said to be inadequate, the system too inequitable and inefficient, costs are run up by overzealous surveillance and the use of means test. While some view welfare recipients as exploiting the "system," others believe recipients are victims of social structural factors, including the lack of viable and feasible options in the job market, and yet others suggest welfare recipients as well as the system itself are scapegoats on which the nation's economic problems can be blamed. Some persons even believe that certain criticisms are disguised racial and class messages (Piven & Cloward, 1986).

Whether it is viewed as an unnecessary drain or an inefficient necessity, public assistance cannot be separated from its social context. According to Axinn & Levin (1992),
and Sancton (1992), the number of people on AFDC rolls has increased simply because of the nature and performance of the economy, population growth, family breakdown, periods of high unemployment, the shrinkage in the number of jobs for unskilled labor, discrimination, differential pay by gender, and trends in regard to marriage, divorce, out-of-wedlock births, as well as the increased number of female-headed, one-parent families.

The current welfare system contains major disincentives to work. For example, if a mother and child on AFDC have no income of their own, they may qualify for an average of $500 a month in cash benefits. If that mother takes on a part-time job at $300 a month, her family becomes "less needy" and her welfare check is reduced to offset the rest of her income. The higher the benefit reduction rate, the weaker the incentive to work. This incentive is even further weakened because other benefits (e.g. food stamps, housing assistance, and Medicaid) are also reduced as earnings increase (Lerman, 1996).

As an attempt to deal with this policy problem, the federal government began mandating states to provide some financial incentive for mothers to work in the late 1960s. There have been several earlier attempts at welfare reform. President Richard Nixon proposed in 1969 the Family Assistance Plan (FAP) to broaden the potential beneficiaries and to nationalize the AFDC program and General Assistance with standardization by family size and provision of a
minimum guaranteed income of $2,400 for a family of four. These provisions would be accompanied by increased federal funding and provision of job training, employment, and child care programs. The benefits designed to assist the working poor would then be reduced as earned income increased, or increased earnings fell. Some objected to the national standards minimum, some wanted stronger work requirements, and others objected to the requirement that jobs taken had to pay a minimum wage; while others wanted higher minimum, more public jobs, and greater relief for certain states (Moffitt & Wolfe, 1992).

During the 1970s, AFDC benefit reduction rates declined and some earnings that went to pay work expenses did not count against benefits. President Jimmy Carter envisioned merging AFDC, SSI, and Food Stamps into the Program for Better Jobs and Income (PBJI) with a single federal cash grant. In a means-tested program, unemployable people (e.g. elderly, chronically disabled, and women with children under seven) would be provided a national minimum income. A second group of employable but nonworking persons would be provided a public service job if private sector employment was not found. Under this plan, the working poor would receive assistance up to a ceiling of $8,400. Some critics of this welfare reform measure wanted all AFDC women to work; others wanted a higher income floors, and still others doubted whether a large number of public jobs could be created for relatively uneducated persons. Both Presidents
Nixon and Carter proposed broadening eligibility, higher investments in welfare, and a national minimum cash guarantee. Neither plan was adopted (Moffitt, 1993). In 1981, however, Congress again increased the work disincentives built into AFDC and limited any earnings exclusions to the first four months on welfare (Lerman, 1996; Moffitt & Wolfe, 1992).

Beginning in 1981, the administration of President Ronald Reagan pursued several welfare mess strategies while claiming preservation of a safety net for the truly needy and worthy poor. These strategies tightened eligibility requirements and tried to reduce and slow the growth of welfare programs and their associated costs. The Reagan administration emphasized a "new federalism," by which it hoped federal responsibility for most social programs would devolve to the states and the voluntary nonprofit sector. One suggestion under this "new federalism" was the exchange of federal and state roles in a welfare swap. The federal government would assume the expense of Medicaid, and the states would accept responsibility for AFDC and Food Stamps. The states, however, did not agree because they were unsure of the costs (Kaus, 1988; Moffitt & Wolfe, 1992).

The Clinton Administration philosophy of "make work pay" resulted in expanding nonwelfare benefits for recipients willing to work. In 1994, Congress passed an extremely large expansion of Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to improve the work incentives of all families with
children, including families on welfare. Also, expanding health insurance, child care, and child support are three other components of the strategy of making work pay outside the welfare system. At the same time some states are even experimenting with provisions that disregard increasing amounts of an AFDC recipient's earnings and thus lower the rate of benefit reduction within an AFDC program (Amott, 1993; Giannarelli & Steuerie, 1995; Lerman, 1996).

A second strategy to increase employment is to require AFDC recipients to work or register for work and training. In 1981, amendments to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act allowed states to use workfare. Workfare requires recipients to work in unpaid jobs in return for their welfare benefits. States responded to this reform initiative by expanding job-search and workfare activities and making such activities mandatory. A common program began by assisting recipients with job searches in the private sector, but requiring unpaid work in the public sector for those unable to find jobs (Friedlander & Burtless, 1995; Lerman, 1996; Moffitt, 1993).

The third primary strategy of welfare reform is programs allocating substantial funds to education, training, and support services. The last major legislative attempt in this area at welfare reform is the Family Support Act of 1988 (Lerman, 1996; Levitan & Gallo, 1993). The centerpiece of this effort is the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program which is a combination
of job training and job search initiatives. Under this reform activity, states are allowed to mandate that individuals receiving welfare benefits participate in job searches and could require some participants to perform community service work as a prerequisite for receiving benefits. Moreover, the JOBS program emphasizes education and occupational training for welfare recipients.

The most recent round of reform, according to Isabel V. Sawhill (1995), occurred in 1988, when Congress enacted the Family Support Act, a piece of legislation which provides opportunities for educators to form linkages with other agencies to strengthen families and help them towards self-sufficiency. This legislation combined an emphasis on moving people into jobs with increased funding for the education and training believed necessary to make this possible. The education and training were to be provided by the JOBS program, in which most welfare recipients would be required to participate. Many states are only now beginning to implement fully the philosophy and work-oriented programs contained in the Family Support Act. Currently nationwide, about 23 percent of able-bodied welfare recipients without a child under age 3 are now participating in JOBS.

As governor, President Clinton was a strong proponent of the Family Support Act, but he campaigned for the presidency on a pledge to "end welfare as we know it." Legislation embodying the details of his plan was introduced in 1994 as the Work and Responsibility Act. This piece of
legislation was built on the Family Support Act philosophy by investing still more in education and training but set a two-year limit, after which welfare recipients would either have to work or lose their benefits. With the appropriate assistance and the push of a time limit, it was hoped that most recipients would find jobs before their two years were up; but for those recipients who did not find work, subsidized work opportunities were to be made available. The two-year limit was to be phased out gradually, starting with those individuals born after 1971. This phase-out had three advantages: (1) it sent a message of personal responsibility to the younger generation; (2) it gave states time more time to expand their ability to provide the necessary training and work opportunities; and (3) it made the budgetary costs of the plan more manageable (Sawhill, 1995).

The Clinton plan was eclipsed twice; first by the focus on health care reform and later by the 1994 election which led Republicans in the House to propose a new plan, the Personal Responsibility Act (PRA), which differed significantly not only from Clinton's plan but also from their own proposals. The PRA, enacted by the House of representatives on March 24, 1995, goes far beyond simply reforming welfare and creates a number of new block grants focused on cash assistance, child nutrition, child protection, and child care. The PRA also contains fundamental reforms of the Food Stamp program, Supplemental
Security Income (SSI) for the low-income disabled, and the major means-tested programs serving illegal immigrants. Overall, The PRA saves almost $70 billion over the next five years. Its more narrowly defined "welfare" component not only turns the current Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and JOBS programs into a block grant with flat funding for the next five years, but also contains a number of prohibitions; notably, no federal funds are to be used to pay benefits to unwed minor mothers, to children born to mothers on welfare, or to those receiving welfare for more than five years (Sawhill, 1996).

Currently, there are 300-400 AFDC participants in the Cumberland Plateau region who have begun training under the current Virginia state version of the JOBS program called the Virginia Independence Program, whose primary goals are to strengthen families, encourage personal responsibility, and achieve self-sufficiency (Duty, 1996).

The most current Virginia state level equivalent to the federally mandated JOBS program is entitled the "VIEW" program--The Virginia Initiative for Employment, not Welfare. Elements of the Virginia plan have already begun implementation in various parts of the state such as the two northern sections of Virginia and central Virginia. For approximately six counties which comprise the southwestern part of the state, VIEW has begun the implementation process. But for the Cumberland Plateau region of southwest
Virginia, VIEW is not scheduled for phase-in implementation until October 1997 (Duty, 1996).

According to Duty (1996), the requirements for the VIEW program are being phased in quarterly throughout Virginia. There are primarily three requirements to the VIEW program: (1) Work requirement—All able-bodied AFDC recipients (VIEW participants) are now required to work in exchange for their benefits. Increased income of up to 100 percent of the poverty level is allowed while working towards self-sufficiency. Those unable to find jobs immediately will participate in intensive community work experience and job training programs; (2) Two-year time limit—VIEW participants are eligible for two years of AFDC assistance, one year of transitional benefits, followed by a two-year period of ineligibility; (3) Transitional Medicaid and child care—An additional 12 months of medical and child care assistance is available to VIEW participants, if needed, for transition from dependence to self-sufficiency.

The Role of the Community College

The provider for the training needs thus far for the Cumberland Plateau region welfare reform activities has been primarily the community college. As chapter one stated, the community college has positioned itself even further as a contract provider of training needs and services to various organizations (Kothenbeutel & Dejardin, 1994). The National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, in a policy statement, reaffirmed and even expanded the role
community colleges will play as it relates to contract training by stating "...Community services and continuing education has as its major components civic literacy, work force training and retraining..." (Ireland, Smydra, & Tucker, 1988). Also, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges outlined academic goals for community colleges throughout the nation by stating "...every community college should work with employers to develop a program of recurrent education to keep the work force up-to-date and well-educated. Such a strategy should become an integral part of any regional economic development program." (p. 23).

From its earliest conception, the community college has positioned itself as a provider of occupational and vocational training. A group of prominent citizens, called together by the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) in 1964 to serve as a National Advisory Committee on the Junior College concluded that "the two-year college offers unparalleled promise for expanding educational opportunity through the provision of comprehensive programs embracing job training as well as traditional liberal arts and general education" (AAJC, 1964, p. 14). Beginning in 1963 with the passage of the federal Vocational Education Act, a broadened criteria for federal aid to schools was established; and along with this new criteria, Congress appropriated funds generously ($43 million in 1968, $707 million in 1972, and $981 million in 1974), and these funds
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were augmented with additional monies for occupational programs for the disadvantaged and for handicap students. It was on this surge of monies that occupational education swept into the community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

The terminology for career or occupational, vocational training and education has never been exact. The terms terminal, vocational, technical, semiprofessional, occupational, and career have all been used interchangeably or in combination, as in vocational-technical (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). But nevertheless, over the years, community colleges have developed broad mission and purpose statements which have provided them with many options. For the Virginia Community College System, one such option is occupational technical education, broadly defined as meeting the needs for technicians, paraprofessionals, and skilled craftpersons for employment in industry, business, the professions, and government through curricula planned primarily to satisfy needs for and workers within its service region (VCCS, 1996-1997).

To strengthen even further and expand the role and purpose of the community college in providing occupational-technical training, a nationwide survey was conducted in 1989-1990 to assess the scope and nature of contract training and other economic development activities at community colleges and technical institutes. The survey was conducted by Lynch, Palmer, and Grubb (1989-1990) of the National Center for research and Vocational Education,
University of California, Berkeley, and published in the AACJC journal in 1991. The survey was sent to a random sample of 246 community colleges, requesting information on the college's work force and economic development activities in 1988-1989. Major findings, based on a 72 percent response rate, include the following: (1) The majority (94 percent) of the public community colleges in the sample offered at least one course on a contract basis to public or private employers; (2) most colleges had a relatively modest contract education programs, with 50 as the median number of courses offered, 919 as the median number of students enrolled, and 24 as the median number of employer clients served; (3) frequently offered contract courses dealt with job-specific skills, basic reading, writing, and mathematical skills, and miscellaneous courses; (4) on average, private firms comprised approximately 70 percent of the employer clients served by community college contract education programs; (5) on average, 61 percent of job-specific courses offered were developed jointly by the colleges and their clients; (6) employers provided the largest share of revenues needed to support contract education, followed by subsidies from state and local governments; and (7) approximately 80 percent of the public community, technical, and junior colleges received funds through the Vocational Education Act, approximately 50 percent received Job Training Partnership Act funds, and approximately 50 percent received funds from other state,
local, and federal agencies that support business assistance programs or vocational training.

The individuals that are making a transition from dependence upon public assistance to the work force comprise a potential target market to be served by the community college. Federal as well as other types of funds are currently being appropriated for the training and retraining of these individuals. To take advantage of this training opportunity, the community college must prepare itself as a provider of the occupational/vocational, and other noneducational training needs for this rich target market by assessing these needs and responding quickly with a quality, viable, and cost efficient training program.

Summary

Beginning with the Poor Law in England in 1601 to the Social Security Act of 1935 and the burgeoning historical development of health and medical services and educational programs for the poor and unemployed, the current welfare system still continues to become as a social and economic issue of significant concern to various stakeholders (e.g. politicians, legislators, taxpayers, recipients, and their families). Despite the War on Poverty programs, which account for an estimated $5 trillion as of 1993, the poverty rate is approximately 15.1 percent higher than in the year the "war" began.

There have been many attempts at welfare reform, which have tried to at least minimize the inadequacies and
inefficiencies in welfare spending in the United States. All of these have an element of education and training mandated by administering agencies. Recipients who receive benefits, especially AFDC benefits, are required to participate in educational and training programs.

The community college has emerged as the training mechanism of welfare reform activities not only across the nation, but significantly across the Cumberland Plateau region. Community colleges across the region have provided various occupational, technical, and skills training courses and programs for the past fifteen years. According to Duty (1996), the community college will continue to play a significant role in helping to provide the occupational, technical, and vocational skills training that will be required by workers entering or reentering the workforce.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter contains the description of the research, research participants, the procedures that were used in gathering data, the design of the research instrument, and an explanation of the techniques utilized in the analysis of the data.

Research Design

Qualitative research methods were used in this study to identify educational and training needs of recipients of AFDC benefits. Qualitative research is a method of inquiry encompassing a broad range of research strategies which allows the researcher to "view behavior in the larger context of cultural standards and patterns of behavior, goals of the participants, behavior settings, and social influences" (Hittleman & Simon, 1992, p. 32). According to Straus & Corbin (1990), qualitative research means "any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification" (p. 17); emphasizing participant observation and in-depth interviews that allow the researcher to learn first-hand about the social context in which these proposed findings are observed.

The purpose of this study was: (1) to identify the educational and training needs of recipients of AFDC benefits in the Cumberland Plateau region, and (2) to
project the success of the impact of this training on the participants. It was determined that a qualitative research design is best suited to accomplishing this purpose.

**Research Participants**

The research participants for this study included the recipients of AFDC benefits living in the Cumberland Plateau region who are currently participating or will soon be participating in the JOBS training program, as it is administered at the state and local levels of Virginia. For the state of Virginia, the reform mechanism that assists the recipients of AFDC benefits to achieve self-sufficiency will no longer be called the JOBS program, but VIEW (The Virginia Initiative for Employment, not Welfare). The requirements are being phased in quarterly throughout the state and it is projected that VIEW will be completely phased in throughout the state by October, 1997. Ms. Sarah Duty, Director of Jobs Training in Russell County, was coordinating the educational and training activities of the participants and was also be a participant in this study. Additional participants in this study included educators, trainers and others who are providing educational and training services for these individuals.

The participants in JOBS/VIEW program were assumed to be all women, who have a high school diploma or equivalent. The largest group of the participants were single parents, followed by displaced homemakers (older women who have to work). All the participants have been on public assistance
The Educational Needs (including AFDC) a minimum of five years, and less than 20 percent are minorities. For the Cumberland Plateau area, the average time most welfare recipients have been on public assistance programs is ten years or longer (Duty, 1996).

Since AFDC recipients are being required to participate in JOBS training activities, the researcher contended that it is their perceptions, interests, goals, motivations, capabilities, aptitudes, attitudes, and perceived barriers, limitations, and questions which must be understood, within the context of the goals and objectives reform activities are seeking to accomplish. How well do the training and educational needs, as perceived by the participants, match the training and educational needs of these participants as perceived by the administrators, coordinators, and providers of the training? What are the essential barriers (e.g. physical, economic, motivational, educational, cultural, attitudinal, logistical, etc.) faced by these participants? Generally, what are the attitudes, feelings, and perceptions of welfare reform by all participants in this study, and more specifically, the JOBS/VIEW program? These are the questions the researcher addressed in this study. The responses to these questions and issues by administrators, coordinators, and providers of training services were contrasted to the responses of the training participants of this study.

The individuals chosen to be participants in this study were more specifically determined by a qualitative sampling
technique known as purposive sampling. In utilizing purposive sampling, persons, sites, or documents were chosen that would maximize opportunities to elicit data regarding variations along dimensions of categories, and that demonstrated what happened when change occurs (Straus & Corbin, 1990). According to Patton (1990) perhaps nothing better captures the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research methods than the different logic that undergird sampling approaches. Patton (1990) also affirmed the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study. Information-rich cases are those cases from which one can learn a great deal about the issues of central importance to the purpose of research. The purpose of purposeful sampling is to select information-rich cases whose study will reveal and highlight the questions under study.

There are several sampling strategies to guide the qualitative researcher. Excellent summaries and explanations have been written by Borg & Gall (1989), Gay (1992), Patton (1990), and Straus & Corbin (1990). The sampling strategy used in this study was the typical case sampling technique. This sampling technique is primarily used when describing a program or its participants to individuals not familiar with the program. Typical case sampling can also be helpful in providing a qualitative profile of one or more "typical" cases (Patton, 1990). Since the participants in this study held several common
characteristics, this sampling strategy allowed for the development of an illustrative qualitative profile rather than a definitive one of more typical cases.

According to Patton, "the validity, meaningfulness, and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational (analytical) capabilities of the researcher than with sample size (p. 185).

There are approximately 300 to 400 participants affected by the implementation of the VIEW program. For the purposes of this study, it was estimated that approximately 30 to 75 cases would be selected for study. The participants were selected from a list in the case files of Sarah Duty of the JOBS Training office in Lebanon, Virginia.

**Data Collection**

Qualitative researchers have recommended several styles of interviewing. One very appropriate interviewing style for this study is the general interview style guide discussed by Patton (1990). The general interview guide began phase one of the data collection process. This approach to interviewing involved outlining a set of issues to be explored with each participant before the actual interviewing began. The issues in the outline were not in any particular order, it was presumed that there was common information that should be obtained from each person interviewed, and data was collected without determining exact wording or sequencing of interview questions.
To begin the development of the general interview guide and begin the process of purposeful sampling, the researcher interviewed five participants to elicit their feelings, perceptions, attitudes, motivations, abilities, interests, aptitudes, logistics, and barriers to successful completion of the goals and objectives of the JOBS/View reform initiative. This was phase two of the data collection process. By talking with these five participants, the researcher was able to obtain information needed to develop a general interview guide, by adapting both the wording and the sequence of questions to specific participants in the context of additional interviews (Patton, 1990). The following questions were used to interview the first five to ten participants. These questions served as pilot questions initiating the process: (1) How long have you been on public assistance? (2) Has being on public assistance programs helped you or harmed you in the long run? Explain in what ways you have either been helped and/or harmed by being a recipient of public assistance. (3) What skills or training do you feel you lack and need to equip you to enter the workforce? (4) What are the barriers which you might personally encounter that could prevent you or at least hinder you from entering the work force in the next few months to two years?

After the general interview guide was developed, phase three of the data collection process began. The researcher began collecting data through a process that Patton (1990)
terms standard open-ended interviewing. Lincoln and Guba (1985) referred to this process as the unstructured interview. The purpose for utilizing such an interview technique was to determine the conceptions, perceptions, and perspectives of the persons being interviewed. The basic purpose of the standard open-ended interview was to minimize interviewer effects by asking the same questions of each participant and, allowing the participants to supply their own words, thoughts, and insights in answering the questions. The precise wording of the questions was predetermined. The subject of this study appeared to be an excellent example for which open-ended interviewing is effective. For example, the adapting of the initial questions answered by the first five participants yielded such open-ended questions as: (1) Tell me, how do you feel about the JOBS/VIEW program? (2) Do you feel that the JOBS/VIEW program will help you acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities you need to enter the work force. Why or why not? (3) How confident are you that you will be able to seek any job, profession, or career after completing the JOBS/VIEW Program? Explain. (4) In your opinion, do you feel the JOBS/VIEW Program assisted you in overcoming any noneducational barriers that may prevent you from entering the work force?

Phase four of the data collection process involved refining the general interview guide and generating a potential listing of interviewees. Separate interviews were
held with each participant. After each interview, the researcher reviewed that interview to determine if any changes were required in the general interview guide prior to the next interview. It is estimated that three to five individual interviews can be conducted at pre-determined times. Following each group of interviews, further analysis was undertaken by the researcher to determine if further refinements to the general interview guide were needed, again, prior to the next group (series) of interviews. In accordance with the principles of open-ended interviewing, individual questions differed when necessary to accommodate the circumstances and the role of the participant being interviewed.

The final phase of the data collection process involved the continuation of phase four until no significant new information was obtained, thereby establishing the discovery of grounded theory. Through a qualitative research method using a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived research findings, such research findings constituted a theoretical formulation of the reality under investigation. The concepts of relationships which emerged from the systematic process were not only generated by the process, but were also provisionally tested. The ultimate purpose of the grounded theory method was to build theory that was trustworthy and highlight the area under study. It was the researcher's hope that grounded theories would ultimately be related and useful to
others within respective disciplines and that the theories implicated would have useful application.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed by using a procedure known as inductive analysis. Patton (1990) stated:

Inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis. The analyst looks for the natural deviation in the data. (Patton, 1990, p. 390)

Notes were taken by the researcher during and following interviews and recorded in a journal. All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Using transcriptions, the researcher began the subprocesses of analytical induction of the data called unitization and categorization. Lincoln & Guba (1985) described unitization as a process aimed at uncovering embedded information and making it explicit. Raw data were systematically transformed into units which permitted precise description of relevant content characteristics. Lincoln & Guba described units: as single pieces of information that stand by themselves, that is, that are interpretable in the absence of any additional information. A unit may be a simple sentence or an extended paragraph, but, in either case, the test of its unitary character is that if any portion of the unit were to be removed, the
remainder would be seriously compromised or rendered uninterpretable. (p. 203)

After the transcriptions were unitized, the next subprocess of categorization began. Patton (1990) and Lincoln & Guba (1985) described categorization as a process where previously unitized data are organized into categories that appear to have similar characteristics. These characteristics were initially implied or inferred. As these categories began to accumulate a significant number of units, the researcher began to write proportional statements (a "rule") that served as a basis for inclusion or exclusion in formulating grounded theory—the theory that follows from data rather than preceding them. The researcher sorted the data manually.

**Verification**

Qualitative research continues to gain credibility as a valid research design. This method, however, has forced researchers to search alternative methods to the conventional ideas and concepts of validity and reliability (Borg & Gall, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln & Guba (1985) have studied this need in great detail, and their work has emerged as the alternative methods to the conventional ideas of validity and reliability. In their treatment of this problem, Lincoln & Guba (1985) proposed that conventional formulations be replaced with four new terms that have a better fit with the qualitative epistemology. "Credibility" is the term that is substituted
for "internal validity", "transferability" for "external validity", "dependability" for "reliability", and confirmability" for "objectivity".

Lincoln & Guba (1985) also recommended certain operational techniques that the researcher used to establish credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. To facilitate transferability, a technique known as thick description was used.

The techniques of persistent observation, peer debriefing, and triangulation were used to establish credibility of the study. Persistent observation is a technique that identified those characteristics and elements in the study that were most relevant to the problem or issue being pursued and focused on them in detail (Krueger, 1988; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Stewart, 1990).

Peer debriefing "is a process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytical session for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308). Peer debriefing served multiple purposes such as helping the researcher identify any personal bias that may affect the analysis of the data collected, challenging the ideas and working hypotheses of the researcher, and serving as a counselor for the researcher to talk with comfortably.

The technique of triangulation as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) was a means by which to improve the
probability that the findings and interpretations of the qualitative study were be credible. A technique of interviewing known as focus groups was the technique used to substantiate the technique of triangulation. The focus groups for this study shared certain common demographic variables such as background, personal experiences, educational attainment, gender, ethnicity, and race. The researcher organized approximately three focus groups consisting of four to five members each to participate in the interviewing process. A moderator possessing exceptional active listening skills, interested in people, who wanted to hear what the participants have to say, who readily established a rapport and gained the confidence of the participants, and who made them feel relaxed and anxious to talk was selected to facilitate the focus group discussion. Tape recording equipment was set up before the meeting begins, and the participants were informed before the meeting began. In addition to this, notetaking was be done concurrently in such a manner that the notetaking did not interfere with the spontaneous nature of the group interview. The moderator was aware that he or she would only be able to capture brief comments by the participants.

Rev. Judy McKnight agreed to be the peer debriefer for this study. Rev. McKnight holds a Masters Degree in Education From Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Rev. McKnight and the researcher developed a
unique relationship and established a rapport which allowed for a most congenial, sincere and open exchange.

The concept of transferability is virtually impossible to establish a qualitative study. Lincoln & Guba (1985) said:

For a while the conventionalist expects (and is expected) to make relatively precise statements about external validity (expressed, for example, in the form of statistical confidence limits), the naturalist can only set out working hypotheses together with a description of the time and context in which they were found to hold. Whether they hold in some other context, or even in the same context at some other time, is an empirical issue, the resolution of which depends upon the degree of similarity between sending and receiving (or earlier and later) contexts. Thus the naturalist cannot specify the external validity of an inquiry; he or she can provide only the thick description necessary to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility.

(p. 316)

As required by the above, thick descriptions were provided as part of the analysis so readers could determine for themselves the possibilities of transferring the results of this study to other possible settings. The question of what constitutes "proper" thick descriptions was dealt with
by Lincoln & Guba (1985). They clearly stated that this stage in the development of naturalistic theory was still not completely resolved. Clearly, not just any descriptive data will suffice, but the criteria that separated relevant from irrelevant descriptors were still largely undefined. The qualitative researcher was responsible for providing the widest possible range of information for inclusion in the thick description.

In dealing with the concept of reliability, Lincoln & Guba (1985) used the preferred terms of dependability and confirmability. The technique used to establish the dependability and confirmability for this study was the inquiry audit. The purpose of the inquiry audit is to determine that the process used for collecting the data was acceptable to the auditor. If the process for collecting data was adequate, the investigation would be deemed dependable. The auditor also had the responsibility for ensuring that transcriptions were accurate as well as inspecting the data itself and all of the analyses derived from the data for accuracy.

Carol McKnight agreed to serve as the inquiry auditor for this study. Miss McKnight has had training in research design and techniques and also has studied the culture of Appalachia as it relates to welfare reform. Taped interviews and transcriptions, the researcher's journal and notes from the unitization and categorization process will be provided to Miss McKnight for her review.
Three separate focus group interviews and thirteen individual interviews with VIEW participants were conducted to ascertain data relevant to accomplishing the two-fold purpose of this study. The number of participants which comprised each focus group were five, four, and five respectively. In the focus group which had four members, all the participants were males. Females and males comprised each focus groups which had five participants.

One out of the thirty-one VIEW participants did not have a high school diploma or its equivalent. Eight out of the thirty-one VIEW participants had been on public assistance less than five years, while the others had been receiving public assistance for seven years or more. Individual interviews were conducted with administrators, case managers, and training personnel.

The VIEW participants were selected randomly, with the case manager making the initial contact with the participant. During the initial contact with the participant, the case manager explained the purpose of the interview and attempted to assure the participant the information requested would be kept in strict confidence. Once the participant agreed to be interviewed, a convenient time and place for the interview was scheduled.

Two of the focus group interviews were conducted at Southwest Virginia Community College, Richlands, Virginia in a conference room in Russell Hall. This was the most convenient place because the participants could get to the
campus without any problem. The participants seated themselves around the table, and the arrangement was such that the participants maintained eye contact with each other and the researcher.

One focus group interview was conducted at the Lebanon Training Center in Lebanon, Virginia. The Lebanon Training Center is an off-campus site of Southwest Virginia Community College. This interview was conducted in one of the classrooms at the center. This was the most convenient place for this group because they were participating in a 12-hour entrepreneurship class offered by Southwest Virginia Community College. Attending this class was part of the participants' meeting the "training" requirement of the VIEW program. The participants sat in desks in close proximity to each other so they could maintain eye contact with each other and the researcher.

Individual interviews with VIEW participants were either conducted in the office of the researcher or at the participants' residences. The researcher accommodated the place and time constraints experienced by the participants. In either interviewing environment, the participants were made to feel at ease and not threatened by the process or the researcher.

Interviews of administrators, case managers, and training personnel, except one, were conducted at their offices or off-campus sites. The researcher accommodated the time constraints experienced by these interviewees.
The interviewing style used for this study was the general interviewing style guide discussed by Patton (1990). The researcher interviewed eight participants to elicit their feelings, perceptions, attitudes, motivations, abilities, interests, aptitudes, logistics, and barriers to successful completion of the goals and objectives of the VIEW reform initiative (Appendix B). The initial interview guide that was developed through interviewing five participants in a pilot study, was adapted to yield open-ended questions to be used further in interviewing the participants. The general interview guide was also modified to include only applicable questions used to interview administrators, case managers, and training personnel.

All the interviews were taped, and a moderator was present to take notes and to facilitate the focus group discussions. All the participants were encouraged to answer each question honestly. A back-up tape recorder was available in case of technical difficulty, and the researcher made notes during individual interviews to corroborate the taped interviews.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS

This study closely examined two critical areas as they relate to welfare reform in the Cumberland Plateau Region: (a) the educational and training needs of those required to participate in the VIEW program in the counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, and Tazewell currently receiving AFDC benefits, and (b) the projected success of the impact education and training may have on the quality of life of the participants from the Cumberland Plateau Region.

Four distinct categories of individuals were interviewed: (a) AFDC recipients living in the Cumberland Plateau Region and currently participating in the VIEW program, (b) administrators of public assistance programs, (c) case managers of AFDC recipients, and (d) training personnel. A total of forty-seven people were interviewed for this study. None of the interviewees were referred to by their real names.

Chapter four presents results of the analysis of the data. This chapter also includes a description of all of the individuals interviewed in the study, data describing pertinent and relevant demographic and economic information of the Cumberland Plateau Region, the perceived educational training and other noneducational needs of the participants as they relate to the success of the VIEW Program and
welfare reform, and general observations of the researcher while gathering the data.

Description of VIEW Participants

Buchanan County

Ruth has been on public assistance for seven years. She holds a high school diploma and is a Certified Nursing Assistant. She is taking classes general courses required in the radiography program at Southwest Virginia Community College and is on the waiting list for acceptance into the radiography program. She is not currently working because she injured her back lifting a patient. She has a three year old son and is dependent upon AFDC for his total support.

Sarah has been on public assistance for two years. She holds a G.E.D. which she obtained one year ago. She is in pre-employment training classes at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is currently unemployed. She has a two year old child.

Judy has been on public assistance for three years. She holds a high school diploma and is currently enrolled in the Teleservices certificate program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She works ten hours a week as a college work study. She has a three year old son and a one year old daughter.

Tim has been on and off of public assistance for seven years. He had a heart attack more than a year ago. He has a high school diploma. He is enrolled in the pre-employment
training courses at Southwest Virginia Community College. He is currently unemployed. He has three children who are seven, four, and two years old.

Aileen has been on public assistance for four years. She has a high school diploma and is currently working part-time at a local convenient store. She is enrolled in the clerk typist certificate program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She has a four year old son and a one year old son.

Bill has been on public assistance for two years. He has a high school diploma and a mining certification and is working odd jobs. He is enrolled in the welding certificate program at Southwest Virginia Community College. He has two young children.

Tom has been on public assistance for three years since his nervous condition was diagnosed. He has a B.S. degree and is currently unemployed due to this condition. He is enrolled in the pre-employment training classes at Southwest Virginia Community College's off campus site at Garden High School. He has one son who is five years old.

Dickenson County

Trina is twenty-two years old and she and her family have been on public assistance all their lives. She has a G.E.D. She is currently enrolled in the pre-employment classes at Southwest Virginia Community College and has dropped out of these classes several times before. She is unemployed. She has two young daughters.
Lucille is twenty-nine years old and she and her family have been on public assistance all of their lives. She has a G.E.D. and a clerk typist certificate. She is currently enrolled in the Business Management Program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is unemployed. She has a six year old son.

Heather is twenty-one years old and she has been on public assistance for four years. She has a high school diploma and is currently enrolled in the Business Management Program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is employed part-time at a local restaurant. She has a four year old son.

Catrina is twenty-four years old and she has been on public assistance for six years. She received her G.E.D. a year ago and is enrolled in General Education courses at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is unemployed. She has a five year old son.

Carol is forty-two years old and has been on public assistance for eight months. She is a certified respiratory therapy technician and has been unemployed as a technician for eighteen months. She is enrolled in the Business Management degree program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She works doing clerical jobs primarily for family and friends. She has a seventeen year old son.

Dana has been on public assistance for ten years. She has a high school diploma and is enrolled in the Certified Nursing Assistant program at Southwest Virginia Community
College. She has worked on and off since she was sixteen at convenient stores. She is currently unemployed. She has one child.

Russell County

Sandra has been on public assistance for five or six years. She received her G.E.D. one year ago. She is enrolled in the Human Services certificate program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She works part-time at a nursing home as a receptionist. She has a six year old son.

Johnita is nineteen years old and she and her family have been on public assistance as long as she can remember. She has a high school diploma and is enrolled in Certified Nursing Assistance courses at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is currently unemployed. She has a four year old child.

Eva is twenty-one years old and has been on public assistance most of her life. She received her Certified Nursing Assistance license through Southwest Virginia Community College and also has her cosmetology license. She was enrolled in the Business Management program at Southwest Virginia College but had to drop-out because of problems with her thirteen year old son. She is currently unemployed. She also has a nine year old daughter.

Becky has had her G.E.D. for two years. She has been on public assistance for three years. She was taking pre-employment training courses at Southwest Virginia Community College.
College's Lebanon Center but had to drop classes due to having surgery on her knee. She is currently unemployed due to her knee problems and problems with depression. She has a seven year old daughter.

James is forty-five years old and has been on public assistance for two years since he had a heart attack. He has a high school diploma and completed the entrepreneurship class taught by Southwest Virginia Community College which was offered by the Russell County New Beginnings Program in Cleveland, Virginia. He has started a business in auto mechanic repair. He has a seventeen year son and a two year old son.

Larry just received a G.E.D. and has been on and off public assistance for seven years. He completed the entrepreneurship class taught by Southwest Virginia Community College which was offered by the Russell County New Beginnings Program in Cleveland, Virginia. He had to stop driving a truck for a living due to being diagnosed with irritable bowel syndrome. He worked as a security guard for two years and six months, but has been unemployed now for two years. He has three children.

Lional does not have a high school diploma or a G.E.D. and he has been on public assistance for the past ten years. He completed the entrepreneurship class taught by Southwest Virginia Community College which was offered by the Russell County New Beginnings Program. He has three children.
Curtis just received his G.E.D. and has been on public assistance all his life for thirty-two years. He completed the entrepreneurship class taught by Southwest Virginia Community College which was offered by the Russell County New Beginnings Program in Cleveland, Virginia. He has never held down a steady job and has worked odd jobs since he has been an adult. He has an eleven year old daughter.

Tazewell County

Mary has a high school diploma and has been on public assistance for seven years. She is currently enrolled in the Business Management degree program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She works a full-time job and also works as a work study at Southwest Virginia Community College.

Mia has a high school diploma and has been on public assistance for a year. She is currently enrolled in the Human Services certificate program at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is unemployed at this time but previously worked in North Carolina as a restaurant hostess. She has a one year old son.

Melissa has a high school diploma and had to drop out of the nursing program at Southwest Virginia Community College ten years ago. She has been on public assistance for ten years. She is currently taking General Studies courses at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is unemployed. She has a ten year old daughter.

Lydia is forty-nine years old and has a G.E.D. She has been on public assistance all her life. She is currently
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Michelle is twenty-nine years old and she has a high school diploma. She has been on public assistance all her life. She is currently taking Certified Nursing Assistant courses at Southwest Virginia Community College and is a participant in the work study program on campus. She has an eighteen month old child.

Lori is twenty-five years old and received her G.E.D. two years ago. She has been on public assistance all of her life. She is currently enrolled in General Studies at Southwest Virginia Community College. She is currently unemployed due to a foot injury. She has an eight year old daughter.

Peter is forty-two years old and has a high school diploma. He has been on public assistance for nine months. He is enrolled in General Studies at Southwest Virginia Community College. He is currently working part-time for Advance Auto and hopes the position will become full-time soon. He does not have any children.

Donna is thirty years old and has a high school diploma. She has been on public assistance four years. She is currently enrolled in general studies courses as Southwest Virginia Community College. She is unemployed. She has a four year old son.
Yvette is twenty-eight years old and has not received her G.E.D. She has been on public assistance all of her life. She is enrolled at Southwest Virginia Community College in the G.E.D. preparation program. She is unemployed. She has two children which were taken by social services due to the fact that she was declared an unfit mother. Both children have been adopted.

Jacenta is twenty-two years old and has a high school diploma. She has been on public assistance for three years. She is enrolled in the pre-employment courses at Southwest Virginia Community College. She works as a work study on Buchanan County campus. She has a three year old daughter.

**Description of Case Managers**

*Buchanan County*

Helen has been a case manager for Buchanan County Department of Social Services for about nineteen years. She is a native of Buchanan County and has lived in the Buchanan County area most of her life. She has close ties to the community and has known many of the participants all of their lives.

Dave has been a case manager for Buchanan County Department of Social Services for thirteen years. He is a native of Buchanan County and returned to this area thirteen years ago after being laid off from General Motors Automobile Plant in Michigan.
**Dickenson County**

Johnny has been a case manager for Dickenson County Department of Social Services for fifteen years and has worked with the social services department a total of twenty-six years. He is a native of Dickenson County but left the county from 1973 to 1983. His long tenure in social work has afforded him the opportunity to witness the gamut of welfare programs and welfare reform initiatives.

**Russell County**

Rick has been a case manager for Russell County Department of Social Services for nine years. He is originally from Blountville, Tennessee, but has lived in Russell County for the past twelve years. He has a B.S. degree in Human Services.

Wilma has been a case manager for Russell County Department of Social Services for fifteen years. She is a native of Smyth County, Virginia, but relocated to Russell County, Virginia, when she got a job with the Russell County Department of Social Services. She is working on an Associates Degree in Human Services at Southwest Virginia Community College.

**Tazewell County**

Hoyt has been a case manager for Tazewell County Department of Social Services for twenty years. He is a native of Tazewell County and except for the four years he served in the military, he has lived in the county all of his life.
Hope has been a case manager for Tazewell County Department of Social Services for sixteen years. She is originally from Monroe County, West Virginia, where she worked in social services before relocating to Tazewell County. She has resided in Tazewell County for the past twenty years.

**Description of Administrators**

**Buchanan County**

George has been director of the Jobs Training Services in Buchanan County for twenty years. He is a native of Buchanan County and has always lived in the county. He is very active in civic clubs and organization and knows the people of the county well. He works closely with the case managers in Buchanan County and the trainers at Southwest Virginia Community College.

**Dickenson County**

There were no administrators available for interview from Dickenson County.

**Russell County**

Christina has been the director of HUD housing in Russell County for six years. She is a native of Russell County and has lived in the county all of her live. She has a B.S. degree in Public Administration. She works closely with Russell County Department of Social Services case managers, Jobs Training Services, and Southwest Virginia Community College trainers.
Frank has been a member of the Russell County Board of Supervisors for three years. He has been director of Continuing Education at Southwest Virginia Community College for twenty seven years. He has a Masters Degree in education. He is a native of Russell County and has lived in the county all of his life. He works closely with civic groups in Russell County and is well known in the community.

Tazewell County

Bob has been a Jobs Training Program Developer for the Continuing Education Department at Southwest Virginia Community College for fifteen years. He has a Masters Degree in counseling. He is a native of West Virginia and still resides there. He works primarily with Tazewell County Jobs Training and Department of Social Services in Tazewell County.

Description of Trainers

Buchanan County

Elisha has been a trainer for Jobs Training Services in Buchanan County for two years. She is a native of Buchanan County and attended Buchanan County public schools. She graduated two years ago from Clinch Valley College with a B.A. in education. She is primarily responsible for pre-employment orientation and coordination of training schedules or recipients of Jobs Training Services in Buchanan County.
Dickenson County

Beverly has served as adjunct faculty for Southwest Virginia Community College for four years. She teaches courses in the Teleservices certificate program in Dickenson County. She has also taught some pre-employment training courses for Southwest Virginia Community College. She is a native of Dickenson County.

Russell County

Sheri has been a trainer for the Russell County Job Training Services for five years. Her primary responsibility includes providing pre-employment orientation and basic life skills training for recipients in the Jobs Training Program. She is a native of Russell County and has a B.A. degree in education. She has previously taught for the Russell County public school system for ten years.

Louise has been a trainer/program developer for Russell County Jobs Training Program for thirteen years. She is also an adjunct faculty member at Southwest Virginia Community College teaching Sociology and Psychology at the Lebanon Center. She worked for Russell County Department of Social Services for ten years. She has B.A. degree from Clinch Valley College.

Tazewell County

Junior has been a trainer/program developer for Tazewell County Jobs Training Program and basic life skills training to Jobs Training Program participants for fourteen
years. He worked in the family business two years before becoming a trainer in the Jobs Training Program.

A total of thirty one VIEW participants interviewed represented 65.9 percent of the total interviewing population. The seven case managers interviewed represented 14.9 percent of the total interviewing population. The four administrators interviewed represented 8.5 percent of the total interviewing population. The five trainers interviewed represented 10.7 percent of the total interviewing population. There were a total of sixteen male interviewees which represented 34 percent of the total interviewing population and thirty one female interviewees which represented 66 percent of the total interviewing population.

The collective responses of all individuals interviewed revealed several key areas related to the training needs of the VIEW participants and the expected impact of the training on the lives of the participants. How much education and or training did the VIEW participants already have? Were the participants administered any type of tests to measure specific skills levels? How and by whom were the participants informed concerning the VIEW program? What are the noneducational needs of the VIEW participants and how are they currently being addressed? Do the noneducational needs pose barriers for the VIEW participants? What are some viable options suggested by interviewees to assist the participants in dealing with any perceived barriers? What
are the opinions of the individuals of the VIEW program?
What are suggestions for improvements of the VIEW program?
The next section of the chapter will address these questions.

Findings
Skills Levels and Testing of the Participants

Most of the participants had a minimum education level of having obtained a high school diploma or a G.E.D. equivalent. Larry and Curtis were enrolled in the G.E.D. prep courses and Curtis recently received his G.E.D. Lional does not have a high school diploma or G.E.D. Yvette was enrolled in the G.E.D. prep courses at Southwest Virginia Community College.

Curtis was trying to make a career in woodworking. His case worker was assisting him with ideas on how to secure contracts for woodworking projects. Curtis explains, "My social worker is helping me try to get some woodworking jobs right now. My girl and wife are gonna help me with the business."

Some of the participants had a higher level of education attainment or special certification, and had worked in the areas of their professional fields for an average of more than ten years. Carol, who had a certificate in Respiratory Therapy, seemed uncomfortable as she stated that she had "sent over 400 applications to various places without any positive responses toward employment. I am learning that without proper education in
any field, it is virtually impossible to get a job." She was openly discouraged as she expressed:

that over the years while I was working, I attended various training programs to develop skills such as supervision, safety, quality assurance, infection control, benchmarking, and medical documentation. I feel that because I don't have a degree in any of the scope of practice that I just mentioned, I can't even get my foot in the door for an interview.

It was notable that Carol's discouragement was obviously due to her unemployment situation, while Thomas's frustration was because he was being forced to search for work that he felt he would not be able to do. Without hesitation, he said angrily:

I'm just playing by their rules. I can't work. I have been diagnosed with a nerve problem which causes me not be able to focus long enough to hold down a job. People hire you to think, and who's gonna hire somebody who can't think for very long? I've been on public assistance since my problem was diagnosed three years ago and I haven't been physically or emotionally able to hold down a job since.

Larry, Lional, and James were the only participants noted to have taken any type of skills test prior to being accepted into the VIEW program:
QUESTION: Did you have to undergo any type of test to assess what your skills level is right now as far as education is concerned?

LARRY: We were told we would be tested for vocabulary and what level we was on.

JAMES: I did fill out some papers come to think of it, before this class. I can't remember what they were. But a test of some type of attitude/aptitude test, but I can't remember what they were.

LIONAL: Yea, it was some type of aptitude test.

If participants were not in a certificate or a degree program at Southwest Virginia Community College, they were enrolled in the pre-employment courses. When asked to clarify what training was involved in the pre-employment courses Sherri and Louise explained:

SHERRI: They focus on instruction on how to write a resume, job interviewing skills, appropriate dress for interview, what questions to ask at an interview, potential employers.....what else, Louise?

LOUISE: Informing participants of the business and industry where most jobs can be found, how to develop a career goal, and assisting them in developing a path toward obtaining a job with activities such as hot leads to cool jobs.

Perceived Barriers and Difficulties of Participants

Uniformly, the participants were asked to identify barriers they were encountering or perceived difficulties
that may pose problems, while attempting to meet the obligations involved with participating the VIEW program. Ongoing problems with proper child care was the greatest barrier mentioned by the majority of the female participants. Donna was aggravated when she explained that her child was utilizing social service's child care program. When asked why the program through social services had been a "hassle" for her, she explained:

They'll only pay'em $12.00 for a six hours a day and if it costs any more I have to pay. Then if I need one in the evening to work I have a different one. When I worked I had to find a way to get my four year old son to Gratton, then find another ride back after work to pick him up. That's forty extra miles a day on me.

Eva seemed to be rather discouraged as she told of her situation concerning child care. She had been forced to drop out of the Business Management program at Southwest Virginia Community College due to problems with her thirteen year old son and an eleven year old daughter. Heather's problem was slightly different in that since her child is biracial she "had to depend on friends instead of my own family to help."

Transportation was also mentioned regularly throughout the course of the interviewing sessions as a hindrance for both male and female participants. Their complaints included not having the means to make the job contacts required due to not having a dependable method of transit.
Eva, Lional, and Peter stated "I don't have a car." Mary and Donna had been detained from commutes because of their vehicles "breaking down" so much. Donna had lost a job due to not being punctual from problems with her car.

There was a general lack of motivation among the participants who truly wanted to work. During the focus group interview with James, Larry, Lional, and Curtis, James and Larry strongly felt that their training was not properly assessed. James described the process as a "no win situation." Sherri, who is one of the trainers, expressed her concerns about the motivation of the participants this way:

"I feel that something ought to be done to at least try to motivate the participants. It is true that I have not had much success in getting them motivated due to either being on the system so long, or dealing with frustration because they were not properly assessed for their particular training need. Others feel that they were forced and not given an option of pre-employment training courses, certification programs, or degree programs.

Christina described the motivational barrier like this: "We have to find some way to stress the importance of putting forth initiative to get some training." Bob stated, "They just won't do it because of the mind set not to do it. There will be people who fall through the cracks."
Participants mentioned other problems or barriers. For example, Dana identified a conflict between school and job scheduling. She stated:

I'm probably not going to be able to keep up the training cause I can't find a baby sitter half the time and when I do work, sometimes my work schedule is during the time I'm suppose to be in school.

Melissa identified inappropriate or inadequate clothing as a problem. She stated, "I would like to have some better clothes to wear. Even after I get through the program, I don't have anything nice I could wear to work if I do get a job." Thomas complained about the "ridiculously overwhelming paperwork," and Rick acknowledged the problem of "hectic" case manager schedules.

One universal problem referred to by the participants, case managers, trainers, and administrators alike, was the dilemma concerning economic development in the Cumberland Plateau Region and the fact that they are obligated to find employment within two years, in many cases, forces them to leave the area, their homes, and their families. Bob, who is an administrator in Tazewell County discusses the job situation in the four county area:

Some progress is being made in Dickenson County because of the Red Onion Prison bringing jobs to the area. Russell County seems to have problems at times, because of layoffs at Reynolds, Teleflex, and Lear which are new industries in the region. There is unfortunately,
though no indication of new industry moving into Tazewell County or Buchanan County.

Louise, who is a trainer, indicates that she meets a lot of "depressed participants everyday, mainly because of lack of jobs in the area." Rick, who is a case manager, is sympathetic to the needs of the clients he works with. He especially feels that the lack of motivation is caused mainly because of "lack of jobs in our area." Some have ultimately decided to move out of the area.

**QUESTION:** Do you feel confident that you will be able to get a job after completing the program?

**MARY:** Yes, but I'll probably have to move back to Baltimore.

**MIA:** Well, it would be nice if after I completed the training, I wouldn't have to move back to North Carolina to get a job, but I don't see any other option. I have a job waiting on me in North Carolina. Isn't it a shame I'll have to raise my baby away from our family.

**HEATHER:** Yes, I intend to get a good job so that I can support my son and me without the help of anyone else. I would like to stay in this area and work, but I don't mind relocating if I have too.

**CAROL:** Not in two years. I will cooperate as instructed for as long as the program lasts for me; but as I continue to search for employment, I become more discouraged and frustrated with the employment
situation in this area. It is truly a shame that in order to be self-supporting, I may have to move away from my family to do it. I can't find a job in my field of experience due to companies and hospitals merging and downsizing. I hope it doesn't come down to me having to relocate. I don't think I could come out of the state of depression that I am already in if I have to move out of state away from my family. They have been such an emotional support for me.

Options/Alternatives Available to Assist Participants

The VIEW program itself did not provide any options or alternatives to assist participants in overcoming or managing their perceived barriers or difficulties other than the support services already in place. When asked if the program had any other types of assistance available, Donna replied, "They (meaning social services) continue to tell me that there are no other types of assistance available in child care or transportation." Melissa stated, "I could use some help in getting back and forth to school. I don't have a driver's license or a car, and so far my social worker has not told me of any way to even get either."

Any participant who had family members or friends who could help with child care, transportation, or providing appropriate clothing, called on these family members and friends for assistance in these areas. However, family members and friends could not always accommodate the
participants' needs during the times the assistance was needed:

**MELISSA:** My family would help me if they could, but they are no better off than I am.

**MARY:** They (meaning social services) did not provide any assistance with helping me find a sitter for my daughter or offer any money to help me fix my car when it broke down. All the expense came out of my pocket.

**PETER:** I could use a car. I'm riding a bicycle back and forth to work. Since they can't help me with any other means of transportation, I'll just have to do the best I can. I hitch a ride with a friend or my cousin or somebody whenever I can.

Administrators, case managers, and trainers did not perceive any viable or suitable alternatives to assist the participants except for them investigating on their own some possible avenues which social services may not have addressed to them. George, an administrator, felt:

Participants should fully utilize the services that social services does have in place and if this is not sufficient, call on family, friends, neighbors...to help with child care, transportation or what have you. They are going to have to bite the bullet and get creative and do whatever it takes to hold a job.

Frank reiterated:
Transportation is a problem that I am concerned about because the Departments of Social Services are limited
in what they can provide in this area of need. But they (participants) can ask relatives or friends who are not working to help with taking care of the children when they possibly can, and help them get to work or school. Carpooling may be an alternative they'll need to look into. If they lack proper clothes or need pointers on good hygiene, I know there is someone and some type of program assistance in social services that can temporarily help them address these needs.

Some case managers tried to assist participants in generating options to overcome their perceived barriers or problems. For example, Helen viewed a possible transportation option as this:

Transportation has been a big problem for a lot of my clients... I think the Board of Tazewell County and other county boards should try to make arrangements for more bus routing at least so the participants can get to class on a regular basis.

Hope encouraged her participants in this manner concerning child care and transportation problems, "I think, also, if more clients would become more actively involved with the training offered, SVCC might be able to hold some classes nearer to where they live."

Administrators and case managers recognized the real probability of participants having to relocate to secure jobs. Bob, an administrator felt this was very unfortunate
and commented on what the area (Cumberland Plateau Region) should be focusing on:

We should be spending a lot more time, energy, efforts, and money on creating feasible, lasting jobs for these participants rather than jobs that will not be there for them. For example, the lumber industry is shipping a lot of trees out of the area to be processed. Could we not process the lumber here instead of shipping it out of the area? Are we doing the right thing with the money we have access to?

Hoyt, a case manager for social services for twenty years acknowledged, "the economy is bad around here, but in order to survive, the client must realize that they may have to relocate." Hope, too, faced the probability that, "some clients may have to leave the area. I also encourage clients to push for the fathers of their children to pay child support."

When Dave, a case manager, was asked if he knew of any viable options that are available to help participants deal with any perceived barriers, he cynically responded, "Yes. An attitude adjustment for most of them would help them tremendously." In a more understanding tone, Johnny said:

In reality, there are good points and bad points. But good or bad, this is what we gotta live with. Some will go to North Carolina and they don't like it. You get into training, but you are going to have to work.

Training personnel also perceived no viable options or
alternatives to assist participants. Trainers thought some possible options for assistance in child care, transportation, suitable clothing for interviewing or work were to ask family and friends for any help they could provide until their circumstances improved. Alicia felt "until certain situations improved in the participants lives, family and friends who were able, were the only ones they could turn to for additional assistance." Beverly reiterated this but added, "perhaps churches, missions, the Salvation Army, or other civic and religious groups would be willing to assist in whatever way they could and this is a very feasible a and viable option which should be checked into." "If those in the community don't pitch in and help where they can," Junior declared, "it seems that those who truly want to be freed from the system may be doomed before they get started."

Opinions and Attitudes of the VIEW Program

One aspect of the VIEW program that virtually all the participants liked the "best" and the most was that of training. Whether in pre-employment training classes, a certificate or degree program, or G.E.D. preparatory courses, most seemed to enjoy the training component of VIEW. The question asked was, "What do you like most or the best about the VIEW program?" Following are some of the responses by participants:

**YVETTE:** I like G.E.D. classes!
MICHELLE: I like my classes.

JACENTA: ...I'm liking school.

JOHNITA: I think the training is good...

LUCILLE: Like I said, the training idea is good, but it just don't work for me.

Larry, James, Curtis, and Lional, appreciated and respected the concept of training, but were hesitant because they were not quite convinced that the training they had been enrolled in was adequate to meet their training needs. Larry, James, Curtis, and Lional were enrolled in the entrepreneurship class and this is what they had to say about the training:

LARRY: I didn't know what I was getting into in this class. I understood the class was supposed to learn about how to start my own business, the paperwork submitted for your business, and marketing your business. Technically I didn't know I'd have to come up with a business to get into this class.

JAMES: Basically I wanted to learn how to begin a business, get through the first couple of years. You know, I think that rather than a session as we have had here that virtually ensures failure, that we need something more like a mentor to help us during the first year or two.

LIONAL: I think we could benefit ourselves in what we want to pursue or add to our business by somebody letting us know what the opportunity doors are, what
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the market is in the area, and more up to date data
about the area (Russell County).

CURTIS: This class wouldn't really help me much at all
if I didn't already have a skill.

The training personnel especially like the training
component of the VIEW program. The trainers had the
following comments concerning the training component of the
VIEW program:

SHERRI: I also enjoy the training. I have enjoyed
working with the participants. Most of them have great
potential but I need more time than is allotted to work
with them.

JUNIOR: The pre-employment training courses can help
so many brush up on their interviewing skills and
resume writing skills. Things have changed so much as
far as what it takes to successfully interview for a
job. These skills are just as critical for the
participants as any other.

BEVERLY: This really puts "meat" into the Jobs
Training end of welfare reform. Coordinators and
training personnel can lay the necessary foundation for
helping to ensure that participants have a fighting
chance of getting a job, a real job.

Overall, case managers and administrators felt that the
VIEW program, even with its associated problems, was
basically a good reform initiative. Frank, an administrator
strongly asserted, "I think it's a logical, positive
approach in appearance and rationale. It is performance-based thereby placements must be made. This is positive for the participants." George, another administrator sighed relief as he said:

Finally, a formal, legislative mandate to begin to try to get the 'system' back under control. The system has been put of control too many years and welfare should have been addressed a long time ago. Now, we're in a crisis situation and it appears that it almost may be too late to get it back under control.

Hoyt, a case manager said, "I think it's (VIEW) a good idea. Something needs to be done in order to rule out..." Wilma is "positive about the program", Hope views the program as "having a degree more of success than the others." She had seen, and even though Helen and Dave have mixed emotions about VIEW, Helen did state that she felt "it was good in theory" and Dave felt the program would "encourage and even force some into employment."

Concurrently, the individuals interviewed in this study voiced several aspects they did not like about the VIEW program. Resoundingly, most the individuals interviewed for this study felt the two year time limit to fully implement view was unrealistic. The question was asked ' "What aspects about the VIEW program do you like the least?"', all of the participants responded in their own words. Jacenta said, "...I think I'm going to need more than two years to meet the requirements." Carol expressed that "the two year time
limit will definitely be a problem." Other comments by participants were, "I think they need to give us more than two years to do this thing" as stated by Lydia.

Emotions concerning the two year time limit were mixed among case managers. For example, Dave commented that the aspect about VIEW program he liked the most was, "the two year time limit." Hoyt said he "had heard a lot of complaints about the two year time limit, but I feel there has to be a time limit and why not two years?" Wilma felt "the time limit may be a little unrealistic", and Hope felt the two year time period "might push my clients towards it." The administrators agreed that the two year time limit posed at least a challenge in successfully implementing the VIEW program. Frank liked this aspect the least because he felt that:

Two years was too short in general and opens up opportunities for abuse to occur within the program. Those who may be truly serious about making the transition from welfare to work may be forced off public assistance and they may not be quite ready. Also, the time frame does not allow enough time for the 'hard core' recipients to get motivated to work.

George is concerned if "there will be a safety net in place for those who do not successfully make the transition from public assistance to work."
Trainers expressed their concerns about the two year time limit. Alicia was fearful that this constraint would dampen the spirits of the participants and perhaps 'set them up' to fail, the opposite of what VIEW is to accomplish." Sherri felt she "needed more time to work with them" and Junior stated the two year time constraint "placed trainers, participants, and case managers under a lot of pressure to meet it, with no one addressing the very real issue of 'what if some do not make it.'"

Some participants voiced their concerns over the attitudes of their case managers. Donna angrily stated that her case manager was "a son-of-a------." He's so hateful, I don't see how he keeps his job or his wife. He has ------- at me since I had to have help four years ago. Michelle said her case manager "rides me cause she got a report that I was an unfit mother....I had to take pictures and get doctor's reports and everything because of that." Lucille said about her case manager, "all she does is rage at me. She don't try to help me with what I need help with."

Carol felt that case managers "treat everyone in the system as though they all have the same needs and all problems can be solved in the same manner. This simply is not so." Judy felt like her case manager "has never liked her" and Sarah said, "they have such a piss poor attitude about everything. They don't care about us." Trina felt her case worker treated her rudely because of her "color."
Coupled with this general feeling about the attitudes of case managers, some participants as well as case managers felt their case loads were entirely too heavy. Lydia said she tried to "get up" with her case worker but "she always makes appointments while I have to come to school and she claims this is just about the only time she can meet with me." Mia felt, "It seems that the whole system is overwhelmed to the point until the workers in social services don't even know what's going on."

Hoyt acknowledged:

There's always improvements to be made. I know that the case managers are just loaded down with cases. You run into the problem of not having time to help everyone so, you help the ones who really want it and are really trying the most.

There was an opinion which emerged from the interviewing of the VIEW participants that the program penalized them for seeking gainful employment. Two expressed their disgust:

DONNA: It's all about following rules. They don't care about us getting jobs. They only want to stop our benefits. You know when I did work, they cut me one dollar in food stamps for every seven dollars I got.

LUCILLE: I can't take a chance of getting a part-time job and loosing my benefits right now...They don't need to cut benefits so quick.
**ALLEEN:** They just make it so hard to go by the rules. They expect us to get 40 job contacts a month...There ain't 40 different places to contact around here a month.

**MELISSA:** I just wish the Department of Social Services would use a little common sense when making up the rules. They make you have 40 job contacts a month. That's not even realistic in this area.

The responses of some of the individuals seem to indicate that communication needed to be improved between participants, case managers, administrators, and trainers. Rick, a case manager, felt this way about the overall level of communication, "Well, I feel that if we could sit down......I mean administrators, case managers, as well as participants, and talk about some of the problems we are having, we would know how to better help our clients."

**Attitudes of Outcomes**

This section presents the attitudes and feelings of the individuals interviewed as to the outcomes of the VIEW program. Will the VIEW program play a significant role in assisting welfare participants in making a smooth transition from welfare to gainful employment. Again, the emotions of the individuals interviewed were mixed. Basically, the participants felt that the training they received from the VIEW program might help them secure employment, but not necessary in the Cumberland Plateau Region. The participants were asked if they felt the training they were
receiving was going to assist them in getting a job. Several replied in this fashion:

TRINA: Not living here it won't. I have plans to move after my two years are up if something else don't happen, I'll have to move to find work.

LORI: I'll have to move away to get a good job I know I will.

JACENTA: I'm planning to move to North Carolina. I have family down there. There ain't no jobs up here and there will never be any good jobs up here.

Case managers differed as to their attitudes and opinions of the outcomes of the VIEW program. Hoyt felt, "Just like everything else, for some it will and for some not." Wilma stated, "I am positive about the program. I think that it can work for most participants if they are cooperative with the system."

Administrators were generally positive about the program. For example, Christina felt "that the majority of the participants have the potential to get benefits from the training but, most are not taking advantage of it." Bob expressed, "With strong initiatives and a good start it can be successful. It has proven to be successful in various areas. We will never eliminate poverty."

Beverly, a trainer, was confident that more participants would probably make a successful transition from welfare to work. "Our focus and concern as trainers is to deliver skills training that will prepare participants to
go and seek employment and be able to complete the employment process.

Summary

The analysis of the data revealed that most of the VIEW participants had attained a minimum educational level of a high school diploma or a G.E.D. equivalent. One participant was currently enrolled in G.E.D. preparatory classes at Southwest Virginia Community College and one participant was not actively pursuing a G.E.D. diploma. Several participants had attained higher than a high school diploma or G.E.D. equivalent and all but one, had worked in their respective fields. Only four of the participants were administered any aptitude test. No other skills test were administered to any of the participants before entering the VIEW program.

Barriers and difficulties encountered by the VIEW participants included transportation, child care, appropriate clothing for interviewing, lack of economic development in the Cumberland Plateau Region, the inordinate amount of redundant, mandatory paperwork and lack of motivation.

The VIEW program itself did not provide all the necessary and viable options or alternatives needed by the participants in assisting them to manage or overcome all perceived barriers and difficulties they encountered. Administrators, case managers, trainers, and participants arrived at the consensus that participants needed to seek
the help of family members, friends, or religious organizations in their communities for assistance in these areas.

The opinions which emerged from interviewing all of the individuals for this study were many and varied. Generally, most of the individuals interviewed talked favorably about the training component of the VIEW program. Several negative aspects, however, were identified: the unrealistic goal of being gainfully employed within two years; the requirement of securing forty job contacts per month; being penalized for securing employment by the reduction of benefits; the limited funds for child care expenses and the nonsensical criteria of having to engage more than one sitter if services were needed for more than six hours per day. Participants and case managers seemingly agreed that the work loads of the case managers were overwhelming. This could have lead to some of the negative attitudes and treatment received by the participants from their case managers. Administrators, case managers, and trainers also recognized that some of the participants lacked motivation and their attitudes were also negative. Another opinion of the VIEW program was that the communication process between all individuals needed to be improved.

The data supported two distinct patterns of attitudes concerning the outcomes of the VIEW program. Most of the participants felt that the training would help them secure employment, but not necessarily in Cumberland Plateau.
Administrators, case managers and trainers held to the attitude that in spite of the problems inherent in the VIEW program, more participants would be positively affected from the perspective that they would have a minimum skills level which would enhance their ability to secure employment.

General Observations

The researcher found passive and active resistance to interviewing by all participants involved. The participants, case managers, administrators, and training personnel were very concerned as to how the information obtained from interviewing was going to be used and what individuals might view it. Merely explaining the purpose of the study was not enough to secure the trust and cooperation of the interviewees. A waiver of confidentiality to interview with the researcher was drafted stating the purpose of the interview and assuring the interviewees that their names would not be revealed to any other party that may be associated with East Tennessee State University, Southwest Virginia Community College, or the researcher.

Initially, VIEW participants for this study were to be selected from a list in the case files of Ms. Sarah Duty, Director of the JOBS training office in Lebanon, Virginia. However, Ms. Duty secured another position in September, 1997 with another organization. Due to this change, the researcher had to contact case managers personally in order to obtain potential interviewees. The researcher
encountered difficulty in scheduling appointments with the case managers due to the nature of their job requiring them to be "in the field" at varying times. Even though the case managers were reluctantly cooperative, they did feel the interviewing constituted an undesirable constraint on their already hectic and chaotic schedules. Subsequently, it was difficult to make contact with the participants in the VIEW program because the case managers were the intermediaries through whom the scheduling of the interviews had to occur. To assure the case managers and the participants that no breach of confidentiality was occurring, the case managers made the initial contact with the participants for the interviewing process.

Overall, interpersonal communications between case managers and the participants were not amicable. The male participants interviewed considered their case managers as very uncooperative, unconcerned, and incompetent. The male interviewees were very vocal in describing their displeasure and malcontent not only with their case managers but with the VIEW program. The female participants generally regarded their case managers as too busy to assist them in fulfilling the criteria of the VIEW program.

Case managers and administrators generally felt that the majority of the participants in the VIEW program were "hard core" cases, meaning they had been on public assistance for more than two years and had no desire to get out of the system. Training personnel held a milder
attitude toward participants, meaning that the majority of the participants in the VIEW program, even though "hard core", could be positively motivated to get out of the system.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and Setting

Since 1601, with the passing of the Poor Law in England to the Social Security Act of 1935, the historical development of health and medical services, and educational programs for the poor and unemployed have grown and expanded rapidly into what is now known as the welfare system. The current welfare system has become a social and economic issue of significant cost and concern to various stakeholders. It has been estimated that $5 trillion had been spent on War on Poverty programs by 1993. However, the poverty rate is approximately 16 percent higher now than in the year Lyndon Johnson's social welfare began.

There have been numerous attempts and initiatives aimed at welfare reform over the past two decades. These attempts have tried to minimize inadequacies, inefficiencies, and inequities in welfare spending in the United States. The most current federally mandated welfare reform initiative in Virginia is entitled the VIEW program--The Virginia Initiative for Employment, not Welfare. VIEW was scheduled to begin implementation in October 1997 in the Cumberland Plateau Region.

The VIEW program has three primary requirements: (1) work requirement, (2) two-year time limit, and (3) transition of Medicaid and child care. Currently 300-400
AFDC participants in the Cumberland Plateau region have begun participation in the VIEW program under the current Virginia state version of the JOBS program called the Virginia Independence Program. The primary goals of the Virginia Independence Program are to strengthen families, encourage personal responsibilities, and achieve self-sufficiencies (Duty, 1996).

Over the years, community colleges have been actively involved in various federal programs designed to train or retrain displaced workers as well as other unemployed people. Programs such as the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, and The Job Training Partnership Act of 1983 have enabled community colleges to design activities in accordance with local job needs and in cooperation with employers in their region (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).

The role of the community college is to be the training mechanism of welfare reform activities not only across the nation but across the Cumberland Plateau Region, as well as the rest of the nation. The community college system has positioned itself as a contract provider of training needs and services to various organization (Kothenbeutel & Dejarbin, 1994). Ireland, Smydra, & Tucker (1988), in a policy statement of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, reaffirmed and expanded the role community colleges will play in contract training, especially for the Cumberland Plateau Region.
There are two underlying questions addressed in this study relating to welfare reform and its impact on participants in the region: (1) What are the training and other noneducational support needs of participants in the VIEW program? and (2) What is the projected success of the impact of training on the lives of the participants?

**Summary of Major Findings**

This research study included 47 individuals that were either participants in the VIEW program or professionals actively involved in the administration and implementation of the program. Three focus group interviews were conducted with participants, and individual interviews were conducted with participants and professionals of the VIEW program to gather data to answer the two primary questions underlying this study.

**Current Educational/Skills Levels of Participants**

All interviewees confirmed that all of the participants, except one, in the program had attained at least a high school diploma or its equivalent. A few of the participants had attained some post-secondary education. When any pre-training testing was performed, Southwest Virginia Community College administered an aptitude test.

The primary types of training and support of participants included pre-employment training, basic life skills training, and enrollment in a curriculum that would lead to full-time or part-time employment upon completion.
Barriers and Difficulties Encountered by Participants

Resoundingly, all the individuals interviewed in this study confirmed four barriers or difficulties: (1) the lack of economic development and limited supply of actual jobs, especially full-time jobs, in the area, (2) the abbreviated time frame for the implementation of the VIEW, (3) an excessive amount of paperwork, and (4) the lack of suitable transportation. The participants cited the following barriers: (1) child care, (2) inappropriate dress or clothing for interviews, (3) attitudes and busyness of case managers, (4) penalties associated with securing full-time or part-time employment, and (5) limited opportunities for job training. The training personnel mentioned three areas they viewed as posing barriers or difficulties for participants: (1) motivation, (2) attitudes of participants, and (3) leadership development.

Options/Alternatives Available to Assist Participants

In summarizing the responses of all the individuals interviewed in this study, two viable remedies emerged: (1) seeking assistance or help from family members or friends, and (2) taking the initiative to investigate other avenues of assistance such as grants or scholarships to help defray the costs of training and education.

Opinions of the VIEW Program

The training component of the VIEW program was considered the most favorable among all the individuals interviewed in this study. A common dislike of the program
found among all interviewees was the unrealistic goal of accomplishing the completed transition from welfare to work in two years. Participants, administrators, and case managers disliked the paperwork associated with the program.

The interviews of all individuals in this study confirmed that the professionals and the welfare-to-work program participants understood the primary objective of the VIEW program—to initiate and complete a transition of the participants from welfare to work. The participants and the professionals were somewhat at odds as far as their opinions of the success of the VIEW program. The participants felt the program hindered their successful transition from welfare to work; the professionals held the opinion that the program facilitated the participants' transition from welfare to work.

All interviewees agreed that the time table for the complete implementation of the program needed to be reassessed in light of the unusually high unemployment rates in the Cumberland Plateau Region, when compared to other areas of the state. Participants and case managers were of the opinion that the communication process needed to be improved.

Attitudes of Outcomes of the VIEW Program

The proposed outcome of training received for all participants in the VIEW program was attainment of full-time or part-time employment. The administrators and case managers ultimately viewed the attainment of employment as
the measure of success of the training and there would be more participants successfully making the transition than initially believed. Participants generally agreed, but were unsure as to how employment would be attained in the Cumberland Plateau Region if the perceived barriers and difficulties were not successfully addressed.

Most of the participants did regard VIEW as a viable program in helping them acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be competent to enter the work force. Administrators, case managers, and training personnel admitted that the program had problems but all felt that it had the potential of assisting some participants in their transition from welfare to work.

**Conclusions**

The VIEW initiative currently being administered as a welfare-to-work program has created varying opinions of participants, administrators, case managers, and training personnel. This study documented a complex relationship between participants and administrators and case managers. Generally speaking, the participants viewed administrators and case managers as individuals who may be trying to hinder them from making the transition from welfare to work or individuals who wanted to arbitrarily take their benefits away. Administrators and case managers held a general view that participants needed to strive to get out of the welfare system.
The training personnel were attempting to be mediators or arbitrators by recognizing and acknowledging the barriers, difficulties, and inequities that are seemingly inherent in the program, while trying to be objective in acknowledging at least the logical rationale behind the VIEW initiative. This particular position by training personnel places them in a somewhat awkward and precarious situation. They feel a need to be caring and nurturing of the participants, yet realistic and professional as their role as facilitators.

The VIEW initiative has as its foundation a logical premise, that being a jobs training program facilitating the transition from welfare to work. However, high unemployment rates and limited economic development within the Cumberland Plateau Region pose serious threats and grave challenges for the successful implementation of the program. Based on the proposed outcome of the VIEW initiative timetable, participants may have to seriously consider relocating out of the area in order to secure substantial employment. The migration of people out of the area will ultimately adversely affect the amount of monies flowing from the Virginia General Assembly to this area. Economic dirge could become a real possibility and probability for the Cumberland Plateau Region.

The economic conditions within the Cumberland Plateau Region are so critical that participants are blinded by the positive goals of the VIEW initiative. Administrators, case
managers, and training personnel operate within what appeared to be a no win situation. They have personal ties to the area and its people, yet they are strapped with the duty of administering a program according to parameters which are not appropriate for this region.

For decades, this region supplied the black diamond (coal) which was used to build the overall economic base of Virginia. This fact, alone should obligate the state to address the present adverse economic and social conditions now faced by the people in the region. The VIEW initiative has a solid, logical rationale behind it, but it cannot be successfully implemented without considering employment opportunities because the Cumberland Plateau Region is so different and unique from any other region of the state. Failure to recognize this factor is an insult and a direct disregard for the region's people.

The study readily presented suggestions for practice in the implementation of VIEW. Primary to an effective reform initiative is education of the people who will be influenced by the initiative. The continued education and staff development of case managers would play a critical role in assisting them with changing and/or modifying their attitudes and preconceived ideas about the program as well as the participants in the program.

The continued training and staff development of key persons such as case managers could be instrumental in establishing an "unofficial" support network for
participants making the transition from welfare to work. Case managers could contact other case managers and key personnel in other areas to share information as to the needs and challenges each are facing. Consequently, possible alternatives to address the needs and challenges could be generated and implemented that will help the VIEW participants make a more smooth and successful transition from welfare-to-work.

In Appalachia, there are strong, emotional ties to the region. This traditional characteristic of Appalachia has made many individuals reluctant to move out of the area to find employment. There is a need to educate the people and the children that it may be necessary to move out of the region and it may also be a part of life. Examples of other people in areas comparable to Appalachia and the Cumberland Plateau Region, who have had to relocate to secure employment could be used as a realistic teaching tool in trying to address this attitudinal change.

The children should not be forgotten in this entire process. Policymakers and policy administrators should take a critical look at allocating money for child support services which would begin educating the children to help break the generational welfare cycle.

Role models and mentors can help the implementation process of the VIEW program. Success stories should be publicized because it could assist others who are striving to make the transition from welfare to work. Also,
companies who have been a part of the process by hiring the participants could benefit by generating good will, partnering with agencies and organizations to improve the quality of life for communities, and promoting economic development for their areas.

Recommendations for Further Research

This qualitative study addressed two underlying questions regarding the success of welfare-to-work initiative in the Cumberland Plateau Region: (1) what are the training and noneducational support needs of the participants in the VIEW program? and (2) what is the projected success of the impact of training on the lives of the participants? Considering the uniqueness and complexity of the Cumberland Plateau Region, further investigation should be made regarding how the VIEW initiative is administered and implemented within the region. Additional research questions emerged from this study. What position did elected representatives from the area take when the VIEW initiative was being drafted at the state level? Are local governing boards or councils erecting barriers to the economic development efforts being attempted by the individual counties of the Cumberland Plateau region? Will there be a safety net provided by the VIEW initiative for those who do not successfully make the transition from welfare to work? If so, what limitations and restrictions will be a part of this provision? Are there any control procedures used to monitor how local departments and
agencies administer the provisions and benefits contained within VIEW initiative? If so, what are they, and what department at the state level is responsible for ensuring that the program is being administered honestly, equitably, and in compliance with Virginia law? What has happened to the unemployment rate in the Cumberland Plateau Region and how has the change been related to the VIEW program? What has happened to former VIEW participants? How many of the former VIEW participants have received local jobs and how many are still without jobs? How many of the former VIEW participants have moved to other areas in order to secure employment? Are there any other rural areas comparable to the Cumberland Plateau Region that have successfully implemented a welfare-to-work initiative? What is the economic and social prognosis for the Cumberland Plateau Region of Virginia after VIEW?
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APPENDIX A

Waiver of Confidentiality to Interview With Carolyn Browning

I, the undersigned, do hereby agree to discuss any and all information pertaining to my receiving welfare, AFDC, etc. with Carolyn L. Browning, for the purposes of:

1. Research for the Continuing Education department of Southwest Virginia Community College in an effort to assess training needs for welfare recipients.

2. Research for the dissertation of Carolyn L. Browning, who is now attempting to obtain her Doctorate degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University.

I also understand by signing this waiver that I cannot bring forth suit against Southwest Virginia Community College, East Tennessee State University, Carolyn L. Browning, or any other party(ies) designed by either of the above parties, for any information that may be published or printed in any document(s), including the dissertation of Carolyn L. Browning.

I also understand by signing this waiver that my name will not be revealed to any other party, including Southwest Virginia Community College, East Tennessee State University, the doctoral committee of Carolyn L. Browning, or any other party as associated with the above named parties, as named in laws for the United States of America and laws for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I, THEREFORE, DO HEREBY SIGN BELOW AS INDICATION THAT I WAIVE CONFIDENTIALITY TO PERTINENT INFORMATION FOR MY RECEIVING AFDC, WELFARE, ETC. TO DISCUSS THIS INFORMATION WITH CAROLYN L. BROWNING OR THE PURPOSES OF THE ABOVE NAMED RESEARCH PROJECTS.

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Welfare Recipient                    Date of Waiver

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Carolyn L. Browning                  Date of Waiver

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Witness to Waiver                    Date of Waiver

Copy Distribution: Original-Browning; Canary-Witness; Pink-Recipient
APPENDIX B

General Interview Guide

Name of Interviewee ________________________________

Location of Interview _______________________________

Date of Interview ________________________________

(1) How much education and/or training do you have?

(2) When you were placed in the VIEW program, did you take any type of skills level test?

(3) How were you informed as to what agency would be the primary deliverer of the training?

(4) Other than what you currently have, what other types of noneducational needs and/or support might you need while completing the training program?

(5) What, if any, are the barriers or difficulties you are having while you are in the program?

(6) Do you know of any viable options or alternatives that are available to assist you in dealing with any of the perceived barriers or difficulties.

(7) What is your opinion of the VIEW program? What do you like and dislike about it?

(8) What do you think needs to be improved about the program?

(9) Do you feel that the VIEW program will help you acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to enter the workforce after you have completed the program?
APPENDIX C
Inquiry Auditor's Memo

MEMORANDUM

TO:  Dr. Russ West, Chair
      Dissertation Committee

FROM:  Carol Sue McKnight
        Inquire Auditor

DATE:  October 12, 1998

SUBJECT:  EVALUATION OF QUALITATIVE STUDY

This memo serves as a verification for the qualitative study on welfare reform done by Carolyn L. Browning. In fulfilling my responsibilities for the study, I reviewed the recorded tapes and thoroughly reviewed the transcription of the tapes.

After going through this process several times I can confirm that there is direct correspondence between the noted tapes and the transcriptions. I also read the analysis of the data and can confirm that the results of the findings are justified according to the data.
VITA
Carolyn L. Browning

Personal Data:
Date of Birth: June 25, 1961
Place of Birth: Brooklyn, NY
Marital Status: Single

Education:
Public Schools, Tazewell, Virginia
Bluefield College, Bluefield, VA; B.S., 1983
East Tennessee State University,

Professional Experience:
Instructor, National Business College, 1986-1988
Associate Professor, Southwest Virginia Community College, 1988-1998
Management Trainer, Bluefield State College, 1998-Present

Publications:

Honors and Awards:
Who's Who in American Junior Colleges
Who's Who in American Colleges
Outstanding Faculty Member
NISOD Award of Excellence (1996 & 1998)
Phi Delta Kappa
Phi Eta Sigma
Outstanding Young American Woman (1997)
Delta Kappa Gamma