To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Charles Gleich entitled "An Analysis of the Interactions Between Selected Families and Various Organizations Within a Community Service Network." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

Robert G. Wahler

Robert G. Wahler, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
1976
G53
cop. 2

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SELECTED FAMILIES AND VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN A COMMUNITY SERVICE NETWORK

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Charles Gleich

June 1976

1286701

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the Chairman of his Dissertation Committee, Dr. Robert G. Wahler, and members Dr. W. S. Verplanck, Dr. Larry W. Hughes, and Dr. J. Albert Wiberley for their support and guidance throughout the course of the project. In addition, workers from the Child Behavior Institute and KCDC Social Services were instrumental in the design and implementation of this research. Two individuals were especially helpful in this regard; John Simpson contacted subjects for a pilot study and Nancy Pickens provided the necessary background information on the area in question. Most of all, appreciation is expressed for the individuals in families and agency workers who participated in this study for their openness and cooperation.

In a different vein, the author would like to mention that he never could have made it through these four years if it were not for Pat Mussey and Tom Robertson. The author and these friends have encouraged each other during the rough periods and have celebrated together the good times associated with their respective graduate careers. Last of all, the author feels very fortunate to have a family that always is in his corner no matter how well things are going at the time.

ABSTRACT

In this study, the interactions between individuals in selected families and various organizations are examined. An assessment is made of the type, amount, and quality of contact between the agencies working with these families. The results and methodology are discussed with respect to previous research concerning client and worker perceptions of social services and cooperation between agencies. The purpose of this study is to present a description of a community service network, including recommendations from subjects about ways services to consumers can be improved.

Questionnaires were administered personally to individuals in five families and twenty-two subjects in twelve agencies serving the Vestal community in Knoxville. All the participants from families were selected because they lived in the same area and because of their association with the Child Behavior Institute. The subjects in two black families and three white families are relatively uneducated and unskilled and depend upon the system for many supportive services. The agency workers are highly educated, have various service responsibilities, and have large caseloads.

There was a great deal of contact between individuals in these families and organizations. Subjects in families rated themselves as being more similar to workers in agencies than workers felt was true. In addition, workers rated their agencies as being more helpful than did subjects in families. When workers rated these questions according

to how they felt individuals in families would respond, the ratings were closer to actual ratings than their own.

Some individuals in families resented all the help certain residents on welfare were receiving. Others spoke about tensions between whites and blacks within the housing project when they described the important functions of agencies. The workers were less concrete in their language when they discussed services provided to multi-problem families. Subjects in families mentioned lack of equality among residents, supervision of children, long waits, and confidentiality when they were asked how services could be improved. Workers mainly discussed increasing community involvement, increasing community awareness, and expanding present services if money comes available. Responses from all those interviewed indicate how important was the personal nature of the interactions between workers and families.

As hypothesized, the considerable contact between workers in different organizations centers around a few major activities, depending on the size, location, and function of each agency. Many agencies are linked together in cases concerning child abuse, day care, and health related problems. Subjects in agencies often stated that the exchange of referrals and information characterized many of these interactions. Some recommendations called for regularly scheduled meetings, different administrative structures, more clearly differentiated service responsibilities, and improved communication between agencies. Overall, these subjects expressed a positive desire to work together to effectively serve the community. In general, workers felt it was more beneficial

Specific suggestions for improving the methodology are discussed with reference to evaluations of the questionnaires by subjects. The problems associated with the design did not seem to detract from the purpose of the research to obtain a description of the patterns of service within a particular community. When these results are compared to those reported in the literature, many similarities are noted with respect to perceptions of services and cooperation between agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Rationale	2
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
	Client and Worker Perceptions of Service	5
	Increasing Community Involvement	11
	Coordination Between Agencies	13
	Reorganization Strategies	16
	Illustrative Methods	20
	Summary	23
III.	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	25
	Methodology	25
	Procedure	26
	Subjects--Families	35
IV.	RESULTS	48
	Description of Contact	48
	Ratings on Similarity Between Families and Agency Workers	59
	Ratings on How Helpful the Services Are to Families	67
	Functions of Agencies Reported by Families	76
	Functions of Agencies Reported by Workers	82
	Recommendations by Families for Improving Services	90
	Recommendations by Workers for Improving Services	99
	Description of Contact	106
	Reasons for Contact	117
	Recommendations for Improving Interactions Between Agencies	127
	Questions About the Agencies	137
	Ratings on Working Closely with Other Organizations and on Similarity of Tasks and Services	139
	Evaluation of Questionnaire	145
	Observations About the Interview Process	148
V.	DISCUSSION	151
	Methodological Concerns	151
	Discussion of Results	158
VI.	SUMMARY	166
BIBLIOGRAPHY		171
APPENDICES		180
Appendix A		181
Appendix B		183
Appendix C		191
VITA		200

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Profile of Families	36
2.	Personal Data on Workers and Date of Interview	41
3.	Profile of Workers	42
4.	Contacts with Agencies Reported by Families	53
5.	Contacts with Families Reported by Agency Workers	58
6.	Similarity Between Workers and Families According to Families	64
7.	Similarity Between Workers and Families According to Workers	65
8.	Predicted Ratings on Similarity by Workers	66
9.	Family Ratings on Helpfulness of Agencies	72
10.	Worker Ratings on Helpfulness of Agencies	73
11.	Perceived Ratings of Helpfulness	74
12.	Areas of Improving Services to Consumers	91
13.	Contacts Between Agencies	107
14.	Ratings on Working in Close Collaboration with Other Agencies	141
15.	Perceived Similarity of Tasks and Services	143

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Effective delivery of social services requires the coordinated efforts of community agencies and organizations working in conjunction with families to plan and implement programs that are responsive to the needs of the individuals for whom they are designed. Priorities for the efficient allocation of available resources can best be established in a system where evaluation is an ongoing process. With these considerations in mind, the interactions between individuals in selected families and various service organizations will be examined in this study. An assessment will be made of the type, amount, and quality of contact between the agencies working with these families. The most important aim of this study will be to obtain a set of recommendations from the people interviewed about the ways in which community organizations can improve services to consumers.

It is hypothesized that there will be some differences between the reactions of clients and the reactions of workers to the delivery and receipt of services. Consumers will probably have different views about how similar they are to agency workers and how helpful the services are to their families than workers will have. It may be difficult for families to distinguish between all the individuals in the various agencies with whom they have considerable contact or to distinguish between all the services rendered by these agencies. It is assumed that there will be a lot of contact between the community

organizations working with the families in order to exchange information or referrals.

One of the most important objectives of this study is to present a methodology that may be useful in the investigation of overall service patterns within an area. This design is different from many others because it allows for direct comparisons between clients and workers by asking them many of the same questions. An interview format is employed with a limited number of subjects in selected families in order to trace their particular interactions with specific organizations. In addition, workers are asked to evaluate the services provided by their own agency as well as others with whom they are familiar. The interviews were conducted by an individual free of agency ties, who tried to make the experience as pleasant as possible for participants. A built-in evaluation of the instrument is included as well. Finally, the results in this study are compared to those obtained in previous research reported in the literature.

I. RATIONALE

This study is unique because the services provided by various community organizations are evaluated by individuals in families and by workers in other agencies dealing with the same client population as well as by workers in each organization. Evaluative efforts in the past have primarily focused upon the offerers of services. There has been little systematic research to determine how consumers feel about agencies and workers and how well informed consumers are about

service operations and worker roles. In addition, there have been very few studies prior to this one that have featured descriptions of multi-problem families, that have related worker attitudes and behavior to the use of services, or that have compared services to the past and to similar functions elsewhere. It is important to give consumers the opportunity to express themselves in order to improve services, phase out programs based on unrealistic goals, and better insure the success of educational and consultative efforts.

It is also believed that agencies serving the same population of clients should investigate ways to make program goals and jurisdictional responsibility as complementary as possible, in order to minimize duplication and overlap of services (Smith, et al., 1971). The structure and function of health and welfare systems should be re-examined within the context of the community being served and in relationship to particular clients (Whittman, 1963). It is felt that the amount of coordination that exists among agencies within a particular service network is directly related to the effectiveness of the social service organizations.

At this point in time, there are a great many assumptions taken for granted concerning the delivery and receipt of social services within communities. Many individuals are questioning the efficacy of providing so many support services to certain segments of the population. Therefore, it becomes increasingly important for administrators and workers to be able to explain more clearly what impact their activities have upon consumers. This research represents a new type of evaluation that gives consumers and workers the opportunity to

describe in their own terms what is happening within the particular community in which they live or work. In this way it is possible to understand service patterns from a broader perspective than is typically found in evaluative efforts.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is divided into three main areas, although there is considerable overlap among the areas. First, there is a discussion of client and worker reactions to the services provided by community social service agencies. Various studies are cited in the next section concerning the difficulties involved in trying to reach a desired end state, which would be characterized by community organizations working in cooperation with consumers and each other to develop effective programs for the community. Finally, some illustrative methods that helped influence the methodology used in this research will be examined.

I. CLIENT AND WORKER PERCEPTIONS OF SERVICE

Mayer and Timms (1970) have conducted extensive research on welfare clients' reactions to British social work. It seems that there was confusion about the activities of workers because clients expected concrete actions instead of a lot of talk. Workers related termination of services by clients to the anxiety caused by treatment, whereas many clients felt that workers were disinterested, misunderstood their problems, or lacked the authority to help them. Dissatisfied individuals did not understand why social workers focused so much on their personal lives; some were angered because they felt workers were using interviews to catch them in lies. Most clients expected a suppressive interpersonal approach by workers and expected material relief only.

Workers and clients both failed to recognize that they were using different systems of problem solving.

Social workers receiving favorable comments from clients would usually give material aid first and let the client shape the next interactions. Satisfied individuals received some relief and emotional support from workers, who appeared less hurried than other professionals. Their experience was less unpleasant than expected because workers showed an interest, trusted them, and helped loosen feelings of shame. Even though satisfied clients asked for material aid less often than dissatisfied clients, the main indicator of worker interest was seen as "activity" on the part of the worker.

Rees (1974) speaks about the mismatch between the perceptions of British social workers, who are preoccupied with assessment, and clients who want concrete identification of their problems. Clients were rarely aware that they could bargain with workers and share the agenda at meetings. They frequently felt helpless because they did not know what to do about their problems, which they often felt rested outside of themselves. A series of interactions with social workers characterized by limited intensity and intimacy, confusion of goals, and false assumptions taken for granted resulted in sustaining patterns instead of changing patterns, meeting official needs instead of client needs, and creating problems of frustration and fear instead of solving problems. Workers were often unaware of clients' feelings, partly because clients hardly ever disagreed with them forcefully. An approach using orderly office visits was seen as alien to the life style of individuals living in tenements.

Glasser and Navarre (1970) found that workers felt that the majority of welfare mothers were immature, pleasure-bent individuals, who showed no interest in their homes, their children, or in finding employment. They were supposedly poor at budgeting, poor at housekeeping, and careless in the physical care of their children. Women with low socioeconomic status are "acted upon by a seemingly unchangeable world" which fosters dependency and inhibits problem-solving ability. In another study, the apathetic attitude of the poor in response to planning activities because of their concern with personal problems was seen as an obstacle to involvement in the process (Smith, Spiesman, and Hutshoff, 1971). Mencher (1966) presents data to demonstrate how a lack of educational and vocational skills and experience results in the continuity of deprivation and dependency among certain segments of the population.

In two reported studies, females receiving AFDC (Aid to families with Dependent Children) stated that material aids such as money, food, and clothing were the most important priorities for their families (Glasser and Navarre, 1970; Jeffers, 1970). Welfare mothers in New York City had little knowledge of extra services other than medical; many would not ask for help even if they needed it (Pomeroy, Yahr, and Podell, 1966). Although they had a positive perception of most services, these mothers had a negative perception of services related to reducting welfare dependency such as job training. These overall impressions depended upon the client's perceptions of the capability of the system to provide relevant services. Despite the fact

that the expressed goals of social work are to return clients to self-support, many clients think this means when their children are old enough to work (Pomeroy, et al., 1966).

Black men and women saw financial aid as the most important service provided by the community (Pugh and Mudd, 1971). Many were obsessed by economic need and were experiencing communication problems with spouses. Few poeple would seek help unless things "really got rough." There were limited expectations for receiving help from agencies whose functions were not very well known to most individuals. In addition, Hopkins (1972) maintains that agencies overlook the role and responsibility of black men. People in school systems often assume that mothers are single and are shocked to meet black fathers. Business is usually conducted with middle class females, while men in power are hidden away in many of these agencies.

It is not surprising to note that the degree of congruence between clients and workers in the definition of the clients' attitudes is strongly associated with continuance in all studies (Briar, 1966). This is consistent with findings that relate lack of congruence between workers and clients with increases in social-class distance and increases in ethnic differences (Briar, 1966; Pomeroy, et al., 1966). It also has been reported that social class and race affect diagnosis, treatment, and attitude judgment of clinical social workers (Fanshel, 1958; Fischer, 1973). Ripple and Alexander (1956) link success with interpersonal casework relationships, stressing the importance of appropriate motivation combined with appropriate service applied in an adequate fashion.

Briar (1966) and Zalba and Stein (1969) have associated motivation and type of problem with the number of treatment contacts (success), as well.

As was previously noted for social work agencies, use of services is related to satisfaction at a neighborhood health center (Hillman and Charney, 1966). The small percentage of clients who received help found centers warm and welcoming (O'Donnell and Sullivan, 1974). There was, however, a great discrepancy between the intended advocacy role of public health assistants--who were supposed to help clients with bureaucratic problems of various agencies and help facilitate registration, orientation, and receipt of health services--and the sizable number of patients who were ignorant of such a person, even after considerable contact (Hillman and Charney, 1966). Complications may also arise because clients are rarely eager to deal with the outside agencies who have ignored them for years (O'Donnell and Sullivan, 1974).

There have been some data on the struggle between clients and staff in neighborhood health centers to define needs and interests (Schwartz, 1966; Suchman, 1967). Both favorable and unfavorable comments of clients revolved about convenience and quality of care (Bellin and Geiger, 1974). Many individuals appreciated the absence of fees, locations of centers, short waiting time, completeness of service, and personal care received. Some felt that there was insufficient staff and were dissatisfied with care facilities (Bellin and Geiger, 1974).

It also has been found in one study that low income people are relatively unaware of services provided by mental health centers, especially those involving emergency treatment (Heineman, et al., 1974). Previous research has indicated that attitudes toward mental health are shaped by age, social class, and education (Rabkin, 1972). Higher class individuals are less likely to view deviance as sin and are less likely to believe that it is harmful to associate with the mentally ill. Lower class individuals have a more narrow definition of mental health, have a less optimistic view about recovery, and have a less clear idea of the roles of mental health workers.

Overview

The studies that have been cited indicate that many consumers are aware of only a few of the services being provided within their community. They are primarily interested in receiving material aid or concrete action from agencies. A number of individuals are unclear about the roles of various workers. Despite limited expectations of receiving help prior to contact, many clients speak favorably of the services they have received from neighborhood health centers and welfare agencies. On the other hand, workers do not always understand the actions of their clients especially when there are large differences in ethnic background or social class. Some feel that the majority of their clients are either incapable of or disinterested in adequately caring for their home and children, seeking employment, and participating in planning activities. Satisfaction with service is, of course, directly related to the degree of congruence between the

attitudes of workers and consumers concerning the delivery of services.

II. INCREASING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Smith, et al. (1971), have studied the ability of clients to make their needs known to the establishment, and the ability of health and welfare agencies to explore new delivery systems. Community talents and concepts were rarely incorporated at the community level where resources were ignored, neglected, or used inefficiently. A lack of communication was evident, resulting in little public recognition of rehabilitation principles. In another extensive study of rehabilitation and welfare, it was noted that most agencies do not keep up with the changing community or with other agencies (National Study, 1971). There also is little indication that patients have to any great extent become integrally involved in the planning of services in neighborhood health centers.

At the same time, the majority of a caseworker's time is spent on investigating eligibility and completing paper work. Workers concentrate on income maintenance because there are limited personnel and resources to match rapidly expanding caseloads. They can refer clients, but there are few professional services available and there is a scarcity of housing. Even though they may view day care and maternal employment as priorities, board members of agencies, clergy officials, and other community sources have shown little support for these projects (Fanshel, 1966).

It is felt that more attention needs to be paid to community gatekeepers such as physicians, members of the clergy, social workers, nurses, and elected officials, all of whom sometimes leave the initiative for finding help with the families because of insufficient knowledge of available services as well as negative attitudes toward getting involved. Pomeroy, et al., (1966) report that individuals who play a role in social services have shown little effort to refer clients for particular needs. Organizations such as the League of Women Voters, fraternal orders, church groups, and schools should be used to inform potential consumers about services such as those relating to mental health (Heineman, et al., 1974). An intensive education effort among traditional and nontraditional gatekeepers, such as bartenders and beauticians, is also seen as important in the delivery of social services (Heineman, et al., 1974; Zolik and Boyd, 1972). It has been noted that services would be more relevant to the black community if natural helpers were more informed about services (Hopkins, 1974; Pugh and Mudd, 1971).

One project in the rehabilitation field aimed at increasing the ability of community leaders to understand the problems of dependency and the problems associated with trying to decrease service requests achieved limited success (Smith, et al., 1971). In another study in a small Canadian town, an intensive education program resulted in the acceptance of notions that the range of normal behavior is wider than most people think and that there is a specific cause for deviant behavior (Rabkin, 1972). People could not accept the notion that there is a

single continuum for normal and abnormal behavior. After a two year period in another community, overall attitudes improved toward doctors with reference to ease of communication, rapport, and feelings toward seeking help. Early detection increased dramatically, delay in seeking care for children decreased, and more health problems received attention at earlier stages (Bellin and Geiger, 1974). These studies demonstrate that it is possible, with effort, to change the attitudes of various individuals within communities towards the delivery and receipt of social services.

III. COORDINATION BETWEEN AGENCIES

Wittman (1972) maintains that social agencies and health agencies do not provide a satisfactory level of service in any community, even considering the uneven distribution of services in various regions. With the spread of neighborhood health centers and mental health centers overstepping the availability of qualified staff, the existing patchwork of services needs consolidation and reorganization. Health and welfare systems must be related to the needs of public school systems and the needs of business and industry. Switzer (1969) also recognizes the need for coordination at the federal and local levels because families can be affected positively through joint efforts by rehabilitation, welfare, and related agencies. Crisis intervention, comprehensive care, family planning, life education, anticipatory counseling, and retirement advice need to be related to each other in a well-articulated structure in which the role of welfare in maintaining

individual and family stability and financial adequacy is better understood by the public and all helping professions.

As might be expected, people with the same kinds of problems come to psychiatric clinics and family agencies (Coleman, Janowicz, Fleck, and Norton, 1957). There has been a tendency to limit functions according to professional interests instead of client requests for services. Most individuals ask for material aid irrespective of other problems and have contact with a number of agencies (Ebie, 1971). In neighborhood centers, the great demand for service in areas where service was previously unavailable cannot be met with the limited resources available (O'Donnell and Sullivan, 1974). Although centers have tried to be accessible (hours of service), acceptable (clean, comfortable and informal), prompt, comprehensive (include day care and transportation), intergrated, and responsive, most centers must choose between limiting recruitment or limiting services because cleints are usually oriented to a single service and because demand is so great.

Even though many sources stress the importance of coordinating the activities of human service organizations, there are many barriers to inter-agency planning. One must consider the range of different types of agencies at all levels of government with no clear hiearchial structure or single coordinating agency. Varying goals and objectives or varying priorities often result in domain conflicts that are characterized by agencies actively competing for clients and questioning

each other's right to exist. Different authority systems foster a lack of cooperation, even between the same kinds of professionals, because policies on clients and referrals do not coincide (Levine, 1974). Obstacles to change are also related to the difficulty involved in modifying agency structure that is based on goals established by needs of the past by individuals who are used to looking in first before restructuring activities (Wittman, 1963). Competition and cooperation are related to the degree of domain consensus that exists between organizations. For health agencies, this may be dependent upon the disease covered, the population served, and the type of service being rendered. Where consensus exists, each agency is likely to be provided with the resources necessary to achieve objectives, because the criteria for referring patients to each other is clear (Levine, 1974; Levine and White, 1973). Schoenfield, Lyerly, and Miller (1971) provide an example of a mental health agency among the Navajo Indians whose staff did not trust other agencies to do follow-ups and evaluations; they accepted referrals but did not refer back. In antoher instance, it was possible for workers to change interactions as a result of agency visitations, because they better understood each other's constraints and were more aware of each other's individuality after the visits (Oetting, Cole, and Hinkle, 1967). It has been found that there is less cooperation among organizations with non-complementary roles or where role ambiguity exists (Baker and O"Brien, 1973).

In a different vein, Harshbarger (1974) speaks about the consequences of interorgational involvement in turbulent atmospheres characterized by limited resources. What seems to emerge are value concerns and a strain towards irrelevance. Public school programs

and mental health programs are evaluated on the basis of orderliness, welfare programs are evaluated on the basis of case records, and health care programs are evaluated on the basis of how many beds are available. All of these evaluations are worthless to the consumer.

IV. REORGANIZATION STRATEGIES

Warren (1967) has some specific recommendations on how community organizations can improve their functioning with respect to problems of interdependence. He believes that it is necessary to have common data banks and systems for retrieval and analysis within the community. Prompt communication of proposed policy changes and specific procedures for reformulation of proposed changes are called for as well. There should be specific procedures to improve resource allocations and to broaden the scope of interactions between organizations. It is also suggested that overlapping boards and committee members would result in greater centralization of decision-making, which would facilitate conflict resolution. Finally, it is felt that procedures need to be established in order to achieve greater role clarity and greater cooperation (Warren, 1967; Baker and O'Brien, 1973).

In another survey, individuals in 43 agencies and various departments of the University of Tennessee identified the need for coordinated services, and envisioned an interdisciplinary diagnostic center oriented toward the training of parents of handicapped and emotionally disturbed children, toward rehabilitation, career guidance, physical therapy, and toward the implementation of demonstration projects for special

problems (Fine and Haythorn, 1965). The center would provide opportunities for research in child growth and development and for training professionals and indigenous non-professionals in the delivery of human care services. An interdisciplinary approach including specialists in pediatrics, psychology, social work, nursing, education, speech and audiology, nutrition, child development, and genetics would be employed. It was anticipated that this resource center would provide consultants to various persons and agencies responsible for school programs, special education, and physical care and health services. Unfortunately, although results of the survey indicated that there were inadequate psychological, educational, and medical services and that there was a need for coordinated services, the project did not come to fruition.

Reichler, Babigian, and Gardner (1966) have proposed a drastic reorganization of helping services, featuring a central board responsible for administrative level centralization to insure continuous responsibility for a number of clients. It was felt that agencies dealt with specific problems, whereas families had problems that were not as clearly definable. Previously, there had been an average of seven agencies and as many as fifteen agencies involved without much coordination and communication. There were as many as 25 home visits in one month by six or seven "vague figures" asking many of the same questions and referring individuals for more visits. In one instance, a woman with five pre-school and school-aged children living in substandard housing was being threatened by the Building Department and the Housing

Department, while a public nurse was chastising her at the same time for not giving better care to her children. Glasser and Navarre (1970) and Jeffers (1970) also describe similar welfare chains in which a multitude of physical and psychological problems are compounded by unresponsive agencies working in partial isolation from each other.

Some efforts in neighborhood psychiatry have been directed towards the use of multidisciplinary mental health teams to work with multi-problem families (Sharfstein, 1974). Psychiatrists would serve as mental health consultants to nurses, paraprofessionals, and social workers in order to help sort out psychological and social problems and to provide a clearer picture of needs and resources within a community. In another study, a school expressed a need for assistance and consultation for specific problems concerning children. Teachers felt that they lacked knowledge about emotional disturbances and they had had few face to face contacts with mental health professionals (Ryker and Vierhant, 1972). Bower (1972) states that educational institutions seldom explore emotional learning. In a joint effort between a mental health center and the schools, pre-school screening indicated that a significant number of children lacked adequate play experience. Volunteers and youth workers provided remedial play experiences for children through recreation agencies who were rarely involved with anything other than maintenance.

Selected referrals and consultation could be employed by professionals in child and family services and mental health centers to help juvenile clients in trouble with the law (Day and Faust, 1962).

Gardner (1973) feels that cooperation between community agencies and parole and probation officials is necessary to resocialize individuals at the community level. In the courst, the resocialization of parents and children is not always seriously considered (Rabinowitz and King, 1965). It seems that reorientation of the public is needed so that deviance can be seen as a community problem (Gardner, 1973).

It is hypothesized that social workers will in the future need a better knowledge of the law and rights of individuals (Brieland, 1974). Hopefully, education and training will emphasize the use of the consultative process and will include experience with direct cooperation between agencies (Wittman, 1963). A new system for training social workers and police together has been proposed, because it is felt that police could absorb sensitivity as well as specific skills from this contact (Trojanowicz, 1971). Even though police are often called in on problems concerning marriage, families, mental health, and personal assistance, little cooperation may exist between police and social workers (Michaels, and Treger, 1973). In the past, there has been a reluctance on the part of social workers to share confidential information with police whose role they did not understand. For these reasons, a demonstration project was conceived to provide on-the spot service to clients prior to prosecution and to improve communication between social agencies. Social work offices could refer clients to workers and exchange information directly. The process resulted in a more investment in a satisfactory outcome for all parties concerned.

Overview

Various studies have indicated how important it is to keep the public informed about social services available in their community so that consumers can be directed to the appropriate source at the most appropriate time. It is also important to coordinate the activities of different agencies within a community service network. These goals are difficult to achieve with the increasing demands for service that force organizations to choose between limiting services or limiting recruitment and allow insufficient time for coordination activities and educational efforts in communities.

A number of perople have suggested certain strategies for reorganizing organizations to serve communities more effectively. They emphasize the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to multi-problem families, featuring more centralized administrative authority and continuous responsibility for special clients. Mental health consultation is seen as an important process for professionals in health related fields, schools, child and family services, the courts, police departments and other social service agencies. It is also felt that the training of workers in the future include experiences with direct cooperation between agencies.

V. ILLUSTRATIVE METHODS

There have been a few organizational questionnaires and interview guides that have contributed to the formulation of the research methodology employed in this study. In the National Study of Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers 1971, individuals in agencies were asked

whether there were any community programs to integrate activities into an overall service system. An assessment was made to determine how extensively agencies participated in the coordination of services. Individuals were also asked whether their agency sponsored or conducted any studies on community needs or on the impact or effectiveness of services. In the final sections, agency personnel rated the degree to which agencies, clients, and various community sources shared information with each other.

In this same study, workers rated how important it was to provide equal service to all clients, to pay more attention to the interests and problems of clients than in their own, and to accept clients despite their own value judgments. In addition, workers were asked about their feelings of being able to make a difference in the community and being able to influence significant aspects of their clients' lives. It was determined how much influence workers felt that they had when it came to providing the type of services needed by the client or the community and when it came to determining the particular service for a client group.

Workers were also asked about the pressure of conflicting demands of supervisors, co-workers, and clients. They rated how desirable it was to protect the interests of clients and to have the rules and policies of an agency formulated to help clients. Staff were given the opportunity, as well, to state how much emphasis should be placed on using professional methods, as opposed to using any method available to accomplish the purpose of the agency. Individuals rated their performance in comparison to other agencies performing similar kinds of

functions. In addition, staff were asked to rate how much agreement they had with clients concerning attitudes towards services.

On Lounsbury's (1975) verbal questionnaire, workers were asked to describe the long and short term objectives of their organization and to describe the organizational approach used to achieve objectives. Individuals were asked whether rules were written or were generally understood by everyone, and how rules were enforced. The percent of effort devoted to clients, the total number of clients, the average time it takes to work with a client, and the frequency of referral sources were measured as well.

In the first organizational questionnaire, workers were asked to check how frequently they communicated with administrators, staff, and clients by memoes, letters, phone calls, informal gatherings, formal office meetings, and by other means. Staff were required to estimate how much involvement they had in decision-making within the organization, with respect to hiring, training, program development, and client issues. The general atmosphere of the interactions between staff and clients and between staff and administrators were also measured. In the second questionnaire, workers were asked to determine how frequently they communicated with other agencies according to various channels. In addition, they were asked to write down the names of people (or their positions) in their organization and other organizations who were actively involved in interagency communication. Ratings were used to evaluate the similarity of goals and tasks and services in their organizations who were actively involved in interagency communication. Ratings were used to evaluate the similarity of goals and tasks and

services in their organization as compared to other organizations. The final question required individuals to rate how beneficial it would be to work in close collaboration with various outside agencies.

In a personnel interview guide, workers were asked to evaluate their job with respect to what they were presently doing, what they would most likely do for a similar agency, and what they would do in an ideal situation. Staff were also asked to estimate the average time spent with people inside and outside the organization. In addition, they were asked their feelings concerning breaking the rules in order to help clients. The last question asked them to rate how good an overall job they did qualitative and quantitatively.

The methods that have been reviewed above were designed to measure community participation in agency planning, worker perceptions of clients and service, and interagency interactions. A variety of scaled and open-ended questions were employed to investigate many variables that affect the delivery of social services within community networks. The questions raised in these studies have contributed to the development of the family questionnaire and the organizational questionnaire used in the present research. In addition, there is a discussion in Appendix A of some interview techniques described by various researchers that have influenced the methodology in this study.

VI. SUMMARY

Even though research presented so far points out the potential benefits to be derived from cooperative efforts, the lack of available resources, lack of knowledge about service operations, lack of domain

consensus, and other constraints have resulted in less participation and cooperation than called for in the literature. Intensive education programs are needed to keep the public better informed about the policies and structures of various agencies. In order to plan and implement change in the future, it is suggested that workers make more use of multidisciplinary approaches that emphasize the consultative process. It is felt that the most effective approach to the study of community organizations will be one that focuses in on the interdependence between agencies and families within a particular social service network.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

I. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to present a description of a community service network by examining the interactions between selected families within a housing project and various organizations serving this area. In order to do this, family members and individuals within agencies were asked many of the same questions about the receipt and delivery of particular services. In addition, workers were asked a number of questions concerning their interactions with other organizations within the community. The questionnaires employed were administered personally to all subjects and contained both scaled questions and open-ended questions. It is felt that this approach will help clarify some of the issues raised in the literature concerning the difficulties involved in providing effective, coordinated services to multiproblem families. It is hoped that the positive recommendations generated by consumers and workers, concerning ways in which agencies can improve services to families, will influence planning efforts in the future.

In order to test the methodology and gain interview experience, a pilot study was performed in a different community. The three families spoken to each had a multiply-handicapped child enrolled in a school in Blount County, Tennessee. The seven workers interviewed included a psychological services worker, a social worker, two speech therapists, and three teachers. As a result of this study, changes were made in

procedures used to contact subjects and certain questions were reformulated.

II. PROCEDURE

Family Questionnaire

Initially, it was felt that the best way to obtain subjects would be through the graduate students working at the Child Behavior Institute of the University of Tennessee, who were familiar with a number of families in the Vestal area in Knoxville. Under the direction of Dr. Robert Wahler, these students had helped set up programs in Vestal Elementary School and in homes to teach parents and teachers behavior management skills. A number of undergraduate observers had been employed, as well, to collect data for research purposes and to provide participants with feedback on how well the children were improving specific behaviors. Because of time considerations, though, only one contact with a family was made directly through a student, during one of her home visits. Following a brief explanation of the purpose and nature of the project, a time was set for an interview with this mother a few days later. After three visits that scheduled day and five more visits on two separate occasions, it was decided to discard this subject. In all other instances, contact was made with individuals by knocking on their doors in the morning or afternoon.

In order to introduce the questionnaire to the families, it was explained in all but one case that the interviewer was a friend of the graduate student with whom they had the most favorable contact. In four instances, as well, it was explained that the interviewer was

familiar with their children as a result of his participation in a reading program sponsored by the Child Behavior Institute at the Vestal Boys and Girls Club that previous summer. The interviewer stressed the fact that he was working on a project for the University and that he was not connected with any of the agencies in the community. The families were told that they were selected along with others in the community because of their association with the Child Behavior Institute. They were also told that people in all of the listed organizations would be contacted after the interviews with the families were completed. In all cases, it was emphasized that their names would be held in confidence when the results were written up and that the most important aim of the project was to obtain recommendations on how services could be improved to families in the community. All interviews were conducted in the homes of the participants. The circumstances of the interviews may reveal something about the confidence that individuals in families had in the interviewer.[1]

---

[1]The first respondent enthusiastically invited in the interviewer, exclaiming that she would be happy to take a break from typing up her daughter's term paper. The next interview took place four days later. When the purpose of the visit was explained to the woman who answered the door, she went upstairs to tell another woman that someone was there to see her. Despite the fact that the second woman had just awakened, she agreed to be interviewed at this time. Right afterwards, the interviewer was directed across the way to the apartment of the first woman who had answered the door for him. In this instance, the mother was joined by her teen-aged son who was familiar with the interviewer from the past summer. Three days later, the interviewer contacted a couple in their car just as they were about to depart. Even though the husband grumbled that the interviewer was not interested in what he had to say, both agreed to meet with him later that afternoon. These people had recently married each other and the man had previously objected vociferously to interventions from the Child Behavior Institute. The

The interviewer started each session by asking the subjects to name all of the people in their family. The respondents were then asked about the following demographic variables for each family member: age, date of birth, place of birth, and last grade completed in school. In addition, the interviewer requested the following information: occupation of parents, number of rooms in the domicile, and number of years in the community. The interview schedule is given in Appendix B.

After the demographic information was recorded, the subjects were shown a list of major organizations in the community which included: KCDC (Knoxville Community Development Corporation) Social Services, KCDC Day Care Center, KCDC Recreation Center, Department of Human Services, Food Stamp Office, Health Clinic, University of Tennessee Hospital, local schools, Child Behavior Institute (CBI), Boys and Girls Club, Legal Aid, and Community Action Council (CAC). All of these agencies, with the exception of U. T. Hospital and Child Behavior Institute, are located in the community. All three KCDC organizations are located within the housing project. The Boys and Girls Club, Community Action Council, and Legal Aid are all centered in one building, as are Human Services and Food Stamps. The Health Clinic is in walking distance of the housing project. If someone was uncertain about an organization, the interviewer would provide the location and a little bit of information

---

last respondent was contacted that same day during an incident in which neighbors were upset about someone lurking around the project. Since she was on her way out, she agreed to be interviewed the following afternoon. In the last two interviews, the respondents were joined by the youngest son in the family. Both of these children were also familiar with the interviewer from the summer.

about the organization. The respondents were asked to indicate how many times in the past six or seven months (since September) they had had contact with these agencies according to three categories: office visits, home visits, and phone calls. They were encouraged to estimate the number of times or give a range of numbers when they were uncertain about the exact number of contacts. If the respondents indicated that they had been in contact with people in these agencies prior to September, the interviewer would probe in order to find out the extent of this previous contact.

It seems that the responses to many of the later questions was influenced by the nature and extent of the contact with individuals in these agencies. Because of this, the interviewer inquired about the number of different people these families were familiar with in these organizations; names and job titles were called for as well. Once again, estimates and ranges were accepted. The interviews continued with scaled questions pertaining to the degree of similarity between consumers and workers and the degree to which consumers felt they had been helped by these organizations. Next, there were two open-ended questions that required respondents to list the most important things their family and community derived from these services and to list some ways that these services could be improved. The interviews concluded by eliciting questions from the participants concerning these organizations and by having the participants evaluate the instrument.

Throughout the sessions, the interviewer tried to make the experience as pleasant as possible by taking an active interest in what was expressed by all participants. The respondents were encouraged to speak freely at all times and gently pressured to remain on task and to complete all appropriate questions. They were not required to answer

questions on agencies with whom they had no contact or about whom they had insufficient knowledge. The interviewer often interjected humor and revealed things about himself in order to make the process a personal one. Even though notes were being taken, eye contact was maintained as much as possible. After each session, the interviewer had the respondents sign a release form stating his intention to speak to individuals in various agencies about their contact with these families and to publish the results of the study under the guidelines of confidentiality. All participants were told how much their help was appreciated and were promised a one page summary of the results.

Organizational Questionnaire

Because of the preponderance of agencies serving the community in question, it was decided to limit the number of organizations studied to those situated directly within Vestal. One other, U. T. Hospital, was added because it is the only institution of its kind serving indigent clients. It seemed likely that the families interviewed would have knowledge of most of these agencies through direct contact or through conversations with others in the community. It was also felt that many of these organizations would be linked together because of the need to exchange information, referrals, materials, and skills.

One of the workers at KCDC Social Services played an instrumental part in this project by providing the necessary background information on agencies, including names of workers and locations of offices, prior to interviews. The director of KCDC Social Services was helpful in explaining the administrative structure, functions, and goals of the

organization. She was also gracious in giving sanction for the interviews and in introducing the interviewer to the head teacher at the KCDC Day Care Center. The director of the Child Behavior Institute and his staff were useful in the design and implementation of this project. They described their operations in the community, suggested ways of approaching different persons, and introduced the interviewer to key people in the local elementary school and at the Boys and Girls Club.

Before scheduling interviews, it was hoped that at least one person in each listed organization would be interviewed. It was anticipated that the people interviewed would represent many of those mentioned by the families. The interviewer contacted in person the appropriate individuals in most agencies in order to explain the project and get permission to talk to workers. If time was available, an interview would be conducted on the spot. Otherwise, a time would be set up not more than two weeks later to interview individuals. In many situations, the initial contact person would introduce the interviewer to workers they felt would be the most helpful in terms of their knowledge of the families or other community organizations.

Initial contact was made by phone only when the individuals in question had offices outside of the Vestal community. In one instance, when it was impossible to get an appointment with the superintendant of county schools, a copy of the two questionnaires was left in her office after a phone conversation. Subsequently, sanction was refused for the project on the grounds that a similar survey was being planned by the superintendant for the near future. This was unfortunate because Vestal School has been the site in which the Child Behavior Institute has been

working for the last few years and because a number of people there had expressed interest this past summer in participating in the study. In addition, the principal is well known in the community by families and workers because of his active interest in students and his participation in neighborhood activities. In another instance, a flat refusal was given over the phone by an intake worker at U. T. Hospital who said that she did not have the time to be interviewed. In every other instance, after a brief explanation of the project was given, the contacted person agreed to meet with the interviewer at a mutually convenient time.

Interestingly enough, only three individuals broke appointments with the interviewer after initial contact was made either in person or by phone. Interviews were rescheduled with two of these individuals after it was explained that car trouble prevented one arriving and that an unscheduled meeting detained the second individual. The third subject was discarded because three others had been interviewed in the organization in which he was employed.

Each interview started with a brief introduction, which was followed by a few questions concerning the worker's job and personal life. The following information was sought: number of years on the job, job title, amount of education, caseload, and previous work experience. When respondents were asked about their caseloads, they were urged to briefly describe their service responsibilities in addition to supplying a number. The participants were also asked about their marital status and the number of children they had. The interview schedule is shown in Appendix C.

After this information was recorded, the respondents were asked to write down the approximate number of times they had had contact with

the families interviewed in the six to seven month period (since September or October) prior to that date. As in interviewing the families, they were encouraged to give an estimate or range when it was difficult to supply the exact number. Respondents were then asked to rate the degree of similarity between themselves and the families in the sample with whom they were familiar and to rate the degree to which they felt their organizations helped these families. Workers were next asked how they thought the families would answer the same questions. In the situations in which workers had no contact or limited contact with the families in this study, they were asked to give ratings for families in general. The last two questions in the first part required the participants to state what were the most important things that their organization did for families and the community and to state ways in which services could be improved. It may be remembered that these are the same questions used to interview the families.

At this juncture, the interview shifted its focus from agency interactions with families to interorganizational relations. Respondents were asked to write down the number of times they had had contact with people in other community organizations over the same time period previously mentioned. The following four categories were listed: gone to their office, they've come to your office, phone calls, and other. The workers were then asked to write down how many people they had communicated with in these organizations as well as their names and job titles. In the next few open-ended questions, the participants were asked to characterize the interactions between agencies by stating what were the most important things that people in their agency did for other

organizations and what were the most important things that people in other agencies did for the participant's own organization. Respondents were also asked about ways in which the interactions between organizations could be improved. In addition, they were asked whether they had questions about any of the agencies in question or about any organizations in the community.

In the last two scaled questions, workers were given the opportunity to rate how beneficial it would be to work in close collaboration with other agencies in the community and to rate how similar the tasks and services in these organizations were to those in their own organization. The interview concluded with an evaluation of the instrument by the respondents. All of the participants were thanked for their cooperation with the interviewer and were promised a written summary of the results.

The same strategies previously described for making the family interviews as pleasant and personal as possible, were used in the administration of the organizational questionnaires. Many of the same questions were employed, as well, in order to permit direct comparisons between groups. In all cases, the instrument provided a structure that could be modified for each individual without distorting the entire process. When a question arose, participants were encouraged to describe more fully the issue at hand. In a sense, each interview was unique because of the interpersonal dynamics involved between the interviewer and each respondent.

III. SUBJECTS--FAMILIES

In the course of this study, five mothers were interviewed. In addition to these women, one teen-aged son and one husband directly participated in the process. All of the families had lived in the Montgomery Village Housing Project in the Vestal community of Knoxville for the last three years. They were selected because they lived in the same area and because of their association with the Child Behavior Institute. Such a small number of subjects was chosen because the interactions were traced between these families and thirteen different organizations in the community. The sample included two black families and three white families.

Must of the demographic information recorded during the family interviews is reported in Table 1. Family A consists of a mother, her two sons, and a man that she had married about six months prior to the interview. The man is a high school graduate who is a registered bonding agent in East Tennessee. The woman has an eighth grade education and is 14 years younger than her husband. One son is in the first grade and the other one is in the third grade. All the members of the family were born and raised in Knoxville. They live in an apartment with four rooms and a bath.

Family B includes one mother and her four sons, ranging in age from 8 to 14. The woman has a tenth grade education and is expecting her fifth child. Although she and her oldest two sons were born in Knoxville, her youngest sons were born in Los Angeles. They have been back in Knoxville for six years. The boys are in the fourth, fifth,

TABLE 1

PROFILE OF FAMILIES

Sex	Age	Date of Birth	Place of Birth	Last Grade Completed
			Family A	
M	41	6/21/34	Knoxville	High School
F	27	1/30/49	Knoxville	8th Grade
M	8	10/17/67	Knoxville	3rd Grade
M	6	7/14/69	Knoxville	1st Grade
			Family B	
F	30	1/21/46	Knoxville	10th Grade
M	14	12/28/61	Knoxville	10th Grade
M	12	12/18/63	Knoxville	7th Grade
M	11	5/20/65	Los Angeles	5th Grade
M	8	7/21/67	Los Angeles	4th Grade
			Family C	
F	35-40	--	Knoxville	10th Grade
M	18	7/16/57	Knoxville	10th Grade
M	17	7/29/58	Knoxville	11th Grade
M	16	10/28/59	Knoxville	10th Grade
F	15	10/20/60	Knoxville	10th Grade
F	14	10/15/61	Knoxville	8th Grade
M	12	6/27/63	Knoxville	7th Grade
F	10	12/05/65	Knoxville	4th Grade
M	7	2/03/69	Knoxville	1st Grade
			Family D	
F	36	6/12/39	Ohio	High School
F	15	4/02/61	Ohio	9th Grade
F	14	2/25/62	Ohio	8th Grade
M	13	2/20/63	Ohio	7th Grade
F	12	3/05/64	Ohio	6th Grade
M	10	5/27/65	Ohio	5th Grade
M	8	8/03/67	Ohio	3rd Grade

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Sex	Age	Date of Birth	Place of Birth	Last Grade Completed
			Family E	
M	49	4/07/27	Jefferson County	3rd Grade
F	31	1/05/45	Hancock County	8th Grade
M	13	10/03/62	Tazewell	6th Grade
M	12	12/01/63	Tazewell	5th Grade
F	9	6/12/66	Jefferson County	4th Grade
M	8	2/02/68	Jefferson County	2nd Grade

seventh, and tenth grades, respectively. Their apartment contains three bedrooms.

There are 10 people in Family C, including a mother and her five sons and three daughters, ranging in age from 7 to 18. In addition, the woman has two married sons. Everyone in the family was born and bred in Knoxville. At this time, the older children had dropped out of school before graduation, as was the case for their mother. Presently, there were five children attending three different schools in grades 1, 4, 8, and 10. The family lives in seven rooms.

In Family D, there is a woman and her three daughters and three sons. The mother is a high school graduate who has recently been divorced from her husband. The children, who ranged in age from 8 to 15, were in the third, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, respectively. They live in a seven room apartment, after having moved to the Project from Ohio three years ago.

In the last family, Family E, a woman who is a machine operator is married to a construction worker 18 years older than she. They live with their son and daughter and the mother's two sons from a previous marriage. The woman is a union steward, originally from Hancock County, where she received an eighth grade education. Her oldest sons were born in Tazewell; one is a 13-year-old sixth grader and the other one is a 12-year-old fifth grader. The man is from Jefferson County, where he completed three grades and where the other two children were born. The 9-year-old girl is in the fourth grade; her 8-year-old brother is in the second grade. The family has lived in Knoxville for the last six years and presently has an apartment with six rooms.

In summary, each of the five families has from two to eight children aged 6 to 18 living at home with parents. Three mothers were presently unmarried; two were remarried to men 14 or 18 years older than they. Most of the children were reportedly born within one or two years of the next oldest; the range is from 12 to 38 months. Only two of the children are living together with both original parents. In two families, all of the members were raised in Knoxville; in another family, two of the children were raised elsewhere (in Los Angeles). One family is from Ohio. The parents and children in the last family were from three different parts of Tennessee. In these families, two of the seven adults have graduated from high school. Three are presently employed. The adults range in age from 28 to 49; four of the mothers are in their thirties and both men are in their forties.

This sample represents an interesting cross-section of individuals. All of these families are presently living in public housing because of low income. In general, a lack of skills and lack of education limit job opportunities and make it difficult for these people to become financially independent. In addition, all of these individuals have had some trouble maintaining the ideal of a stable cohesive family unit. Despite some similarities, there are a great many differences between the families which will be exemplified by the diversity of responses noted in the Results section. Families B and C were black and the other families were white. Families A and E were not as dependent as the others on help from agencies because they had at least one working adult. Families B, C, and D were receiving child support payments from Human Services and many services from various community organizations.

Organizations

At least one person in each of the organizations listed on the questionnaire was interviewed. All of the interviews took place during the day within the periods from February 27 to March 4 and from March 15 to March 30. On two separate occasions, four different people were spoken to on the same day. On four separate occasions, two people were interviewed on the same date. The other six subjects were interviewed on separate days.

Of the 22 people interviewed, 8 were male and 14 were female; 19 were white and 3 were black. The personal data recorded on the subjects are presented in Tables 2 and 3. In this sample, 15 individuals were married, 3 were divorced, and 4 reported that they were single. Nine of the people, including two of three who were divorced, have children. Four of the married females have either two or three children and one has six. Each of the other four parents has one child.

With respect to education, 19 of those interviewed have Bachelor's degrees, one has two years of college, and two have high school diplomas. Nine of the subjects have graduate hours, including five with master's degrees, one with a law degree, and three presently working on their doctorates. Hence, it will be very enlightening to compare the views of these highly educated professionals with those of the individuals with much less formal education who were interviewed in selected families.

The subjects interviewed in these organizations have a variety of job responsibilities, partly based on their previous experience. The amount of time that these individuals had been working at their present jobs ranged from six months to nine years. A mean of 3.16 years

TABLE 2

PERSONAL DATA ON WORKERS AND DATE OF INTERVIEW

	Sex	Marital Status	Number of Children	Education	Date of Interview
1	F	M	3	B.A. + 2 yrs grad. school	Feb. 27
2	F	M	3	High School	Mar. 1
3	F	S	0	High School	Mar. 1
4	M	M	0	M.A., 4th yr. grad. school	Mar. 2
5	M	M	1	Masters + 60 hrs.	Mar. 2
6	M	M	0	4th yr. grad. school	Mar. 4
7	F	M	2	Masters	Mar. 4
8	F	M	0	B.A.	Mar. 4
9	M	D	1	B.A. + Some grad. hrs.	Mar. 4
10	F	D	0	2 yrs. college	Mar. 15
11	F	M	2	B.S.	Mar. 15
12	F	M	0	B.S.	Mar. 17
13	F	D	1	2 yrs. college	Mar. 22
14	M	S	0	Law degree + License	Mar. 22
15	M	S	0	B.S.	Mar. 23
16	F	M	0	Masters (M.S.)	Mar. 25
17	F	S	0	B.S., working on Master's	Mar. 25
18	F	M	0	B.S.	Mar. 25
19	M	M	1	B.A.	Mar. 25
20	F	M	6	Master's	Mar. 26
21	M	M	0	B.S.W.	Mar. 29
22	F	M	0	B.A.	Mar. 30

TABLE 3

PROFILE OF WORKERS

	Job Title	Years on Job	Caseload	Previous Experience
1	Graduate Research Assistant	3	5 classrooms--1 school	Day-care, nursery school, TA, Substitute teacher MR+Bl children
2	Assistant Recreation Leader	2	50 or more a day All age groups	5 years recreation for city, 9 years novelty stand
3	Assistant Recreation Leader	5	400 each month	None
4	Grad. Research Assistant	3 1/2	3-4 families, 7-8 undergraduates	Ran smoking clinic, 2 research projects for psychiatric clinics
5	Principal	4	800 students	Math teacher; ass't principal 10 yrs
6	Grad. Research Assistant	3 1/2	4 undergraduates--3 classes, 4 teachers, principal	None
7	Guidance Counselor	6	All children in school	Taught school 5 years
8	Social Worker II	4	148 families	None
9	Recreation Director	1	Whole community-- Indirectly 1000-2000 per month	15 years related fields
10	Intake Worker	9	200-300 calls per month; All the agencies	None

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	Job Title	Years on Job	Caseload	Previous Experience
11	Home Management Counselor	1	115 apartments	18 months teen-age program, Director YMCA
12	Field Supervisor II; Service Supervisor	4	350 open cases; 5 workers	15 years as an actress
13	Eligibility Sepcialist	2 1/2	320	None in social work
14	Staff Attorney	6 mo.	3 interviews per day	6 months in a legal clinic
15	Ass't Physical Director	3 out of last 4	Directly 15 children, oversees 150 at times	Hospital corpsman in Navy; orderly
16	Executive Director	15 mo.	18 staff-700 girls	Taught courses agricultural extension unit, planning + preparing 4-H
17	Program Director	16 mo.	Other instructors; 60 girls daily	None
18	Public Health Field Nurse	3	Team of 3 RN's + LPN's; Responsible all S. Knox.	None
19	Food Stamps Supervisor I	1 1/2	Oversee 4 people; Indiv. cases in emergency	7 years food stamps; 2 years public assist., 11 years missionary; Program director children's home

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	Job Title	Years on Job	Caseload	Previous Experience
20	Director of Social Services	4 1/2	900 per year/about 100 per month; 2 staff	3 years in family services
21	Home Management Counselor II	4	188	3 months field placement Dept. Public Welfare
22	Lead Teacher	2	35 children; 4 staff	Teacher and director day-care center 2 years

was calculated. Eleven people had at least three years experience at their present location. With respect to previous experience, seven listed none, four listed experience in teaching, three in recreation, and three in the social service field. Other occupations listed were actress, director of a smoking clinic, lawyer, instructor at an agricultural extension unit, and corpsman in the Navy. The man with the greatest amount of prior experience had worked 7 years in Food Stamps, 2 years in public assistance, and 11 years as a missionary. Five subjects had at least 15 years of previous working experience. One of these individuals ran a novelty stand for nine years.

The subjects in this study included three graduate students working for the Child Behavior Institute, two assistant leaders and the director of the KCDC Recreation Center, three home management counselors at KCDC Social Services, the lead teacher of the KCDC Day Care Center, the principal and one guidance counselor at Young High School, an eligibility specialist and supervisor at the Food Stamps Office, the director of social services at U. T. Hospital, a field supervisor in the Department of Human Services, a public health nurse, a staff attorney at the Legal Aid Clinic, an assistant unit director at the Boys Club, the program and executive directors of the Girls Club, and an intake worker at the Community Action Council. At least half of these workers were directly involved in supervising other staff and developing programs within their organizations. Caseloads were described in terms of service responsibilities.

The graduate students interviewed worked either in three to five classrooms or in three to four homes. Two reported supervising

from seven to nine undergraduates each. The principal and guidance counselor at the high school stated that they were responsible for all 800 students. At the day care center, the lead teacher worked with 4 staff members and 35 children.

At the recreation center, the director felt that he was indirectly responsible for the whole community. One of the assistant leaders stated that she worked with 50 children each day and the other one stated that the center served approximately 1400 people per month across all age groups. The executive director of the Girls Club explained that she oversees 18 staff members and 700 girls. Her program director supervises the other instructors and 60 girls daily. The physical director at the Boys Club is directly in charge of 15 boys, but oversees 150 at times.

At KCDC Social Services, the workers reported respective caseloads of 115 apartments, 148 families, and 188 families. The eligibility worker at Food Stamps has a caseload of 320, while her supervisor oversees nine employees and works with individual cases in emergency situations. The field supervisor at the welfare office stated that she was responsible for 5 workers and 350 open cases.

The director of social services at U. T. Hospital works with 2 staff members to serve about 100 individuals per month and 900 per year. A team of three registered nurses, including one subject in the study and one public nurse are responsible for health needs in South Knoxville. The intake worker at CAC has from 200 to 300 phone calls each month from people in all agencies in the community. At the legal clinic, the lawyer stated that he interviewed three people each day.

In this study, these 22 subjects fall mainly into three categories: education and psychology, social work, and recreation. A lawyer and a public health nurse were also included in the sample. The group consisted of workers with varying degrees of supervisory responsibility and varying degrees of direct contact with consumers. All but three have a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or graduate hours. There also was great diversity in previous job experiences reported by these individuals. In addition, the caseloads described by many of the subjects were sufficiently large to impair delivery of optimal services to all consumers.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two main areas. First, subjects' responses to questions concerning the amount and type of contact between agency personnel and these families, the perceived similarity between workers and families, and the perceived helpfulness of services provided by agencies are reviewed in the first part of this section. In addition, the subjects'descriptions of each agency's most important functions and recommendations for improving services will be included in this section. In each case, the workers' views are compared directly to those obtained from family members. Second, the workers' responses to questions concerning the interactions between agencies and recommendations for improving these interactions are summarized. A number of tables and a few statistical analyses are provided where appropriate to more clearly present the data. Finally and in addition to these two main areas, the subjects'evaluations of the interview instrument and some observations on the interview process are discussed.

I. DESCRIPTION OF CONTACT

Contact Reported by Families

Contact between families and agency personnel will be described from the perspective of each of the families. The number of direct communications with specific workers in 12 community organizations are reported in three categories: visits to agencies, home visits, and phone calls. Data on the number of people in agencies identified by

subjects in five families will also be included in this section. In order to present an accurate picture of what was recorded, individual examples will be integrated along with group data on the families.

KCDC organizations. The subjects in three families reported having no contact with social service workers from KCDC, although all were familiar with the names of one or two of the workers from prior contact. Another subject who paid monthly visits to the office was also visited at home twice by a worker concerning a special grant. The last subject reported one home visit and three to four calls to complain about maintenance. Apparently, the KCDC office is a place to pay rent and to contact people about getting something fixed around the apartment. None of the families had used the KCDC day care center in the last six months, although Family A had one son enrolled there two years ago. The black subjects stated that children in their families went to the recreation center every day. All of the names of the workers were supplied by a young boy in Family C, who mentioned that one was about to be fired because of recent budget cuts in the city. A woman in Family E stated that she had met the director of the center the one time she was there during a Halloween party.

Food Stamps and Human Services. Three of the five families made monthly visits to the Food Stamps office to pick up stamps or to be recertified. One of the women in these families had talked to workers over the phone a couple of times about changes in the cost of stamps and had been in touch with the director and one or two caseworkers. Another woman stated that she had gone to the office about a year and a

half ago to see if her family was eligible for stamps and that she had been called a few times to verify information for neighbors. Even though four subjects had spoken to from one to three different individuals, only one identified a worker by name. Two of the women had made one or a few trips to the Department of Human Services, and four women in these families were visited at home from one to four times since September. One was recertified that week and another stated that a worker came about every six months. Two women had spoken to individuals a couple of times on the phone and could identify workers by name. One woman in Family D identified five to six people, including the director, while the other three mentioned they had seen one caseworker.

Legal Aid, Community Action Council, and Boys and Girls Club. One of the mothers had seen a lawyer in September and another one went to Legal Aid two years ago, before a local office opened in South Knoxville. Only one of the subjects had been to the Community Action Council; she stated that her girlfriend was a supervisor there. On the other hand, all of the families had used the services of the Boys and Girls Clubs. Three of the women went there to pick up their children and could identify (one time with the help of a son) at least two persons by name. The subject in Family D identified six people by name; she stated that workers visited her at home a couple of times and called her about special meetings. The children in two families used the facilities only during the summers, while the children in another two families were on day care at the clubs. One woman in Family E said that she visited the club every evening for a while and would call periodically to see if her

sons had stayed there that day. She identified one person by his first name. Three of the women identified a worker in the Boys Club who is also a subject in this study.

Health Clinic and U. T. Hospital. Four of the five mothers had taken their children to the Health Clinic to get screened or to get immunization shots. None could identify any of the nurses by name. Again, the woman in Family D had called them a few times and mentioned the fact that the nurses refer you downtown. Three of the women in the families had been to U. T. Hospital two or three times in the last six months to use the emergency room facilities. In Family D, the mother identified the doctor and intake worker by name and mentioned the fact that her children were enrolled in the family physician program at the hospital. One woman in Family C who underwent surgery in October identified one doctor by name and told the interviewer that she had been seen by a number of surgeons and interns at that time. She also identified one of the doctors as "cabbagehead."

Schools. All the mothers had been to the local schools at least two or three times in the last six months prior to the interviews. Three had been to three different schools in the area and one had been to two different elementary schools. The contact people in the various schools were the principals, reading teachers, resource teachers, and regular classroom teachers. Three of the mothers had also spoken to people at the school a couple of times over the phone. Most of the staff members were identified by name by the respondents. Much of the contact revolved around getting the children certified for special education classes.

Child Behavior Institute. Three of the families had been visited at least a few times by staff from the Child Behavior Institute. In one case the mother stated that workers had visited her about two times a week for a while and had contacted her by phone several times. Each of the respondents mentioned by name one to four people with whom they were familiar, including the director and two subjects in this study. There was a lot more contact that past summer when the children were involved in the reading program at the Boys Club, and other times prior to September when observers were frequently in and out of these families' homes. In addition, one mother received calls a number of times from one of the graduate students whom she considered a good friend, and another mother mentioned meeting people at a picnic during the summer.

Data on the contact with agencies reported by subjects in the families are recorded in Table 4. Each of the families reported having communicated in the past with workers from 4 to 11 of the 12 agencies listed on the questionnaire. Three families had been involved with workers in at least 8 of the agencies within the six-month period prior to the interview. As might be expected, most contacts involved visits to an agency. Phone calls were reported much less frequently, as two of the families did not report any. It is uncertain whether or not these two families owned a phone at the time. These contacts refer only to ways of communicating with agencies and not to the frequency of communications. Even though a subject might have used the phone three times to call Food Stamps, and her children may have attended the recreation center every day, each of these is recorded as one contact. Of the 55 individual contacts, 26 were visits to agencies, 14 were home

visits, and 12 were phone calls. The respondents identified by name or by job title from 11 to 32 people with whom they were familiar in these agencies. These are minimum estimates because it was difficult to calculate such things as the number of personnel involved in the emergency room of a hospital or number of nurses involved at the Health Clinic. These counts were not included in the totals. In addition, the subjects were not encouraged in all cases to list all of the workers in these agencies with whom they had made contact. Interestingly enough, subjects in each family identified from three to seven people included in the worker sample. Most of these individuals were from KCDC Social Services, KCDC Recreation Center, the Child Behavior Institute, the Boys and Girls Club, or from the local schools.

TABLE 4

CONTACTS WITH AGENCIES REPORTED BY FAMILIES

Family	Different Agencies	Visits to Agency	Home Visits	Phone Calls	Different Ways	People Contacted	People Surveyed
A	4	2	2	3	7	11	3
B	11	8	4	0	12	17	4
C	10	6	1	0	7	18	7
D	8	5	5	6	17	32	4
E	8	5	1	3	9	22	4
	$\bar{X}$=8.2	26	13	12	52	$\bar{X}$=20	$\bar{X}$=4.4

Contact Reported by Workers

Family A. Contact between the families and agencies will be discussed from the point of view of each of the workers interviewed. Twelve subjects in six agencies reported having communicated directly with individuals in Family A in the past. All three people from the Child Behavior Institute were familiar with family members through the summer reading program or through home visits. One of the graduate students reported visiting them four or five times since September, speaking two times on the phone with the mother, and seeing the mother two or three times at parent group meetings. Another worker who had made one home visit stated that he knew the children very well.

A social worker at KCDC reported six phone calls, six home visits, and three visits by the mother to the office. One of her counterparts worked with the family a few years ago. At the recreation center, the director mentioned that he had met the mother a few times since September. One worker reported four to five phone calls and three visits to the agency. The other worker stated that she had had many contacts with the mother earlier in the year when she attended the center one or two times a week. She also reported one home visit and a few phone calls in the last six or seven months. In addition, the teacher at the day care center had made a home visit a few years ago when the youngest son was enrolled in the program.

An eligibility specialist at Food Stamps indicated that the mother had visited the office two times and that they had twice spoken to each other over the phone. The supervisor at the welfare office felt that she had been involved in a case conference with a staff member working with

the family and had spoken to the mother over the phone. It will be noted at this point that no contacts with Food Stamps or the Recreation Center were reported by Family A in the six month period prior to the interview.

Family B. Nine different workers in six agencies reported previous contact with members of Family B. Once again, two of the Child Behavior Institute workers were familiar with the children from working with them at Vestal School and the Boys Club. Each had visited the home two or three times since September. One had seen the mother twice a week during the summer and had taken one of the boys home with her a few times. Two workers at the recreation center also stated that they knew the children very well. The physical director of the Boys Club had daily contact with the children who were on day care and had visited the home three or four times. At the high school, the principal reported having previously met the mother four or five times. The guidance counselor and he were involved in a conference which resulted in special education placement for one of the boys. A KCDC social service worker had visited the woman three times and reported two phone calls. In addition, the teacher of the day care center had made a home visit a few years ago when the mother had been in custody of a niece and nephew enrolled in the program.

Family C. Twelve workers representing six community organizations reported having direct contact with members of Family C. One graduate student from Child Behavior Institute had seen her about two times a week at the housing project during the summer and was familiar with the

children. Two assistant leaders at the recreation center had daily contact with the children. Only the director, however, reported having met the woman personally. At the Boys Club, a worker stated that the children used to come every day before being dropped off day care. The program director also had daily contact with one of the girls during the summer. At the high school, the principal stated that he had spoken to the mother a number of times over the years, including two or three times over the phone in the last six months. The guidance counselor had met with the mother a few times this year at the school. A woman at the Community Action Council said that the mother used to come into the office when she was getting food stamps in the past. The eligibility specialist at Food Stamps reported three agency visits by the mother and three phone conversations since September. In addition, one of the home management counselors mentioned that he had seen the woman once in the office and had spoken to her one time over the phone. Lastly, a supervisor at Human Services stated that she had perhaps participated in a staff conference on the family.

Family D. Fifteen workers in seven agencies stated that they had previous contact with individuals in Family D. Two of the workers from Child Behavior Institute had spoken to the mother once or twice over the phone and one of them had made a home visit as well. The director of the recreation center and one of his leaders had both met the mother before. One woman at the center said that the mother had been there two times and that she had seen her quite a bit at Girl Scout programs. A KCDC worker reported one agency visit, three home visits, and six phone

calls, while a fellow worker mentioned that this family was one of his at one time.

The principal at the high school stated that the father called two or three times a week and came in person the same number of times. Daily personal contact and phone contact was reported by the guidance counselor who said there was nothing to keep them occupied. A worker at the Boys Club saw the mother every day when she picked up the children and mentioned that they had taken a few of the children on a special trip to Florida. The executive director of the Girls Club reported 9 to 11 visits from the mother, 2 home visits, and about 6 phone calls since September. She stated that one of the daughters was named Girl of the Year at the club. The program director listed three agency visits to the club, two home visits, and one phone call. She also stated that the husband picked up the girls three times a week. At Food Stamps, a worker said that she had spoken to the mother three times. Once again, the supervisor at Welfare participated in a staff conference concerning this family.

Family E. Six workers in three agencies were familiar with individuals in the last family, Family E. One worker from the Child Behavior Institute had communicated with the mother two times a week by phone, at the Boys Club, and at home during the summer. Another had made one home visit since September and saw the children at school. A third staff member also made one home visit, called the home one time, and saw the mother at a parent group meeting. At the Boys and Girls Clubs, workers had seen the mother at least two times a week when she picked up the children. They mentioned that the children had not been there in the last

few weeks. In addition, a KCDC worker had worked with this family in the past. The present worker on the case had not met with the mother in person despite several attempts.

Data obtained from workers concerning contact with families is summarized in Table 5. It can be seen that at least 6 subjects and as many as 15 of the 22 subjects have had direct contact with each of these families. These individuals represent 9 of the 12 organizations listed on the questionnaire. The lawyer, the public health nurse, and the social service director at U. T. Hospital were not familiar with any of the families in this study. In each case, workers from three to seven different agencies reported having communicated with individuals in the families at least one time since September. Of the 62 individual contacts

TABLE 5

CONTACTS WITH FAMILIES REPORTED BY AGENCY WORKERS

Family	Different Agencies	Visits to Agency	Home Visits	Phone Calls	Different Ways	Different Workers
A	6	4	4	6	14	12
B	6	6	4	1	11	9
C	6	6	0	3	9	12
D	7	7	5	8	20	15
E	3	3	3	2	8	6
	$\bar{X}$=5.6	26	16	20	62	$\bar{X}$= 10.8

reported, 26 were agency visits, 16 were home visits, and 20 were phone calls. Once again, the greatest number of contacts were made in person at the various agencies.

II. RATINGS ON SIMILARITY BETWEEN FAMILIES AND AGENCY WORKERS

Ratings by Families

The ratings by subjects with respect to similarity between family members and agency workers was an important aspect of the study. Most individuals in the sample took the longest time with this question and many remarked how difficult it was to provide such a rating. A number of people asked the interviewer to further clarify the question before proceeding. In one instance, the husband in Family A stated that it was impossible to say whether workers were similar or different because such a question could only be answered after years of contact. The woman went along with her husband's refusal and the interviewer tentatively went on to the next question.

The mother in Family B rated all the agencies except the day care center and the recreation center. She felt that people in 8 of the 10 agencies were very different from her. A graduate student was seen as a little bit like her and the workers at Community Action Council were seen as very much like the woman. In Family C, the same graduate student was seen as very much like the mother. This woman also felt that the people in the schools were like her and the people at the KCDC office were a little bit like her. Workers in four other organizations were seen as different or very different.

In Family D, the mother thought that workers at the recreation center and at Human Services were very different from her. Staff at U. T. Hospital were seen as being a little bit different. She felt that workers at the health clinic and at the Food Stamps were like her. In addition, the director of Human Services and people from the day care center, Vestal school, Child Behavior Institute, and the Boys and Girls Club were viewed as being very much like the woman. The mother in Family E gave the workers at Food Stamps, U. T. Hospital, and KCDC these respective ratings: very different, different, and a little bit different. She felt that the people at Moreland Heights School and the Boys and Girls Club were a little bit like her and that the people at the recreation center were like her. She also rated the workers at Vestal School and at the Health Clinic and one of the graduate students from the Child Behavior Institute as being very much like her.

Ratings by Workers

When the workers from the agencies answered the same question, a very different picture emerges. It must be noted that these workers were rating how similar they were to families on the basis of contact with the mothers or the children, whereas the families were rating workers on the basis of contact with many different people from an organization. The subjects took the longest amount of time to respond to this question, asked for clarification numerous times, and expressed doubts about their answers more times than for any of the other questions. The director for Food Stamps, a Child Behavior Institute worker, and a

day care teacher see Family A as being different from them. Another Child Behavior Institute worker and a KCDC worker see the family as being a little bit different. One of the women at the recreation center feels that she is a little bit like Family A, while her counterpart and a KCDC worker see the family as being like them. The workers believed that the mother in the family would probably rate the question the same way in six out of eight cases.

The teacher and a caseworker both felt that Family B was different from them. Two workers from Child Behavior Institute, one from the Boys Club, and one from the recreation center felt that the family was different. The guidance counselor rated them as being a little bit different and the principal rated them as being a little bit like him. A KCDC worker, an intake worker at the Community Action Center and an eligibility specialist at Food Stamps considered Family C to be very different from them. Workers from the recreation center and Child Behavior Institute, the director of Food Stamps, and the principal of the high school all rated the family as being different. The guidance counselor, the Executive Director of the Girls Club, and the physical director of the Boys Club thought they were a little bit different. Four of 10 workers for Family C and 4 of 8 workers for Family B thought the mothers would give identical ratings when asked the same question.

A subject at the Girls Club felt that Family D was very different from her, as did the principal. Workers from the Child Behavior Institute, KCDC, and the recreation center and the director of Food Stamps rated this family as being different. Another KCDC worker, a guidance

counselor, and the program director of the Girls Club thought they were a little bit different. A worker from both the recreation center and the Boys Club each rated Family D as being like them. In this case, 4 of 11 workers were confident that their ratings would be the same as those reported by the family.

One graduate student from the Child Behavior Institute felt that Family E was different from him, while two others felt they were a little bit different. Workers from KCDC and the Girls Club rated this family as being a little bit like them. Two of six subjects thought that the mother would probably rate them the same way.

In addition to these findings, 13 workers rated families in general along these same dimensions. When this was done, the range became very narrow and all but one score fell either in the "different" or "little bit different" slots. Two workers from the recreation center, a graduate student from the Child Behavior Institute, a KCDC home management counselor, a public health nurse, and the director of social services at U. T. Hospital all felt that most families they come in contact with were different from them. Four felt individuals in families would say the same thing. An intake worker at the Community Action Council, an eligibility specialist at Food Stamps, a lawyer, the program director of the Girls Club, and the director of the recreation center all rated themselves as being a little bit different. Four of the five were confident about these ratings for families as well. The Supervisor at Human Services thought that families were a little bit different to very different from her. The teacher at the day care center considered the families to be very different from her. The last two subjects both

felt the families would say they were a little bit different or different from them.

Comparison of Ratings

It can be seen by examining the data in Tables 6, 7, and 8 that the subject ratings in the families differed greatly from those received from workers. Of the 38 ratings given by families, 18 were in one of the three "different" categories and 20 were in the "like" categories. This may be contrasted with ratings by workers which indicate 29 out of 35 times that they feel they are different from families. They were correct in their assumptions that family subjects would perceive themselves as being more similar to them than they felt was true. The 29 became 19 when subjects rated what they thought families would say. Inspection of the data showed that subjects in families more frequently used both ends of the scale than did workers. The comparisons were 13-7 for "very different" and 10-0 for "very much like you."

The group frequencies in each category of ratings for subjects in families were compared with those obtained from workers. A chi-square test comparing worker ratings on four families to the actual ratings received from these families was significant at the .001 level ($x^2 = 24.3$; d.f. = 5). When worker ratings on how they felt subjects in families would answer the same question were compared with actual ratings, results were significant at the .005 level ($x^2 = 17.0$; d.f. = 5). When data were pooled into just two categories, "same" and "different," a chi-square test was again significant at the .005 level ($x^2 = 10.1$; d.f. = 1). The results indicate that differences between

TABLE 6

SIMILARITY BETWEEN WORKERS AND FAMILIES ACCORDING TO FAMILIES

	Very Different	Different	Little Bit Different	Little Bit Like You	Like You	Very Much Like You	Total Agencies
B	8	0	0	1	0	1	10
C	2	2	0	1	1	1	7
D	2	0	1	1	2	5	10
E	1	1	1	2	1	3	8
Total	13	3	2	6	4	10	$\bar{X}$=8:75

TABLE 7

SIMILARITY BETWEEN WORKERS AND FAMILIES ACCORDING TO WORKERS

	Very Different	Different	Little Bit Different	Little Bit Like You	Like You	Very Much Like You	Number of Ratings	r_o
A	0	3	2	1	2	0	8	.94
B	2	4	1	1	0	0	8	.79
C	3	4	3	0	0	0	10	,93
D	2	4	3	0	2	0	11	.85
E	0	1	2	2	1	0	6	.62
B,C,D,E,sub	7	13	9	3	3	0	35	.--
A,B,C,D,E sub	7	16	11	4	5	0	43	.88
Total	8	22	16	4	5	0	56	.95

TABLE 8

PREDICTED RATINGS ON SIMILARITY BY WORKERS

	Very Different	Different	Little Bit Different	Little Bit Like You	Like You	Very Much Like You	Number of Ratings
A	0	2	2	1	3	0	8
B	2	2	1	1	2	0	8
C	3	3	1	1	2	0	10
D	0	4	1	2	3	1	11
E	0	2	0	3	1	0	6
General	0	7	5	1	0	0	13
B,C,D,E sub	5	11	3	7	8	1	35
A,B,C,D,E sub	5	13	5	8	11	1	43
Total	5	20	10	9	11	1	56

the frequencies obtained from subjects in agencies and subjects in families did not occur by chance.

In addition, rank-order correlations were performed to see how well the first rating given by a worker would correlate with the second one. The correlation coefficients obtained ranged from .62 for Family E to .94 for Family A. In addition, a coefficient of .88 was calculated for the total group of 22 subjects and one of .88 for subjects who rated specific families. These results indicate that workers were often confident that subjects in the families would rate them in the same way that they rated family members. This is an interesting finding because of the large differences already noted in the ratings received from individuals in families and agencies. Of course, these results also may just as well be a function of lack of effort or a lack of critical thinking, or some other variable relating to the task at hand.

III. RATINGS ON HOW HELPFUL THE SERVICES ARE TO FAMILIES

Ratings by Families

Ratings by subjects concerning how helpful to families and the community were the services provided by the agencies represented in this study will now be presented. In Family A the mother rated six agencies and her husband rated two of these same ones. The mother felt that the Child Behavior Institute, the schools, and the day care center were somewhat helpful to her family. She stated that workers from the Child Behavior Institute did some things "right" and some things "wrong." Human Services was viewed as being very helpful. Her husband thought

the Child Behavior Institute did more harm than good and that the schools were not very helpful. KCDC Social Services was also viewed as an agency that did more harm than good.

The woman in Family B felt that 5 of the 12 agencies, including the day care center, Food Stamps, U. T. Hospital, Child Behavior Institute (referring to one graduate student in particular), and Legal Aid were very helpful. Human Services, the recreation center, the Boys and Girls Clubs, and the Health Clinic were viewed as being somewhat helpful. On the other hand, she felt that KCDC Social Services was no help at all to her family.

Four agencies, including Human Services, Food Stamps, Legal Aid and the Child Behavior Institute (referring to the graduate student above) were viewed by the Family C mother as being very helpful. In addition, KCDC Social Services ("when you pay them"), the Health Clinic, and the schools were seen as being helpful. This woman felt that U. T. Hospital and the Boys and Girls Club were no help at all to her family. These last two subjects exemplify how the ratings and comments on KCDC Social Services were strongly influenced by the subjects' feelings about management and maintenance of the apartments.

In Family D, the mother considered the Child Behavior Institute and the Boys and Girls Club as two agencies helpful to her family. She also felt the services provided by the schools, Human Services, Food Stamps, and Health Clinic were helpful. KCDC Social Services was seen as being not very helpful. In addition, she felt that the recreation center was responsible for more harm than good and that U. T. Hospital was no help at all.

The woman in Family E viewed Human Services, Food Stamps, the schools, and the Child Behavior Institute as being very helpful. She remarked that the schools were doing the best job they could and that the rest was up to the children. She also considered the Health Clinic and the Boys and Girls Club to be helpful. U. T. Hospital was seen as being somewhat helpful, while the recreation center was seen as being somewhat helpful to children and not very helpful to families. The day care center was thought to be not very helpful as well.

Ratings by Workers

Once again, a different pattern of responding is noted when ratings by workers are compared to ratings obtained from subjects in the families. One worker believed that the recreation center was very helpful. Two KCDC workers rated their agency as being helpful or somewhat helpful. A graduate student from the Child Behavior Institute, a Food Stamps director, and a day care center teacher also felt their organizations were somewhat helpful. Another subject felt that the Child Behavior Institute was not very helpful to the family. In addition, a supervisor from Human Services thought that her agency was somewhat helpful to very helpful. Five of eight subjects suspected that the woman in Family A would respond the say way to the question. Both Child Behavior Institute workers were correct in their assumptions that the husband would consider their organization to be doing more harm than good.

The physical director of the Boys Club, the program director of the Girls Club, the teacher from the day care center, and the guidance counselor all felt that their organizations were very helpful to Family B. Workers from the Child Behavior Institute and KCDC considered their agencies

to be helpful. Another KCDC worker, a recreation worker, and the principal thought theirs were somewhat helpful. Five of eight individuals believed that the mother of this family would rate their agencies in the same fashion.

Workers from the Boys Club, KCDC, and Food Stamps, and the guidance counselor rated their organizations as being very helpful to Family C. An intake worker at the Community Action Council and the program director at the Girls Club felt theirs were helpful. In addition, the director of Food Stamps, a Child Behavior Institute worker, the principal, and a recreation center worker believed that their agencies were somewhat helpful. The supervisor considered Human Services to be somewhat helpful to their family. Of these eleven subjects, five thought the mother in Family C would give the same rating.

The guidance counselor and workers from the Child Behavior Institute and the Boys Club considered their agencies to be very helpful to Family D. Workers from KCDC and the recreation center, the executive director of the Girls Club, and the principal felt theirs' were helpful. An eligibility specialist and other workers from the Child Behavior Institute and KCDC rated their organizations as being somewhat helpful. Some other individuals felt the Child Behavior Institute, the recreation center and the Girls Club were not very helpful to Family D. Six of thirteen subjects expected identical ratings from the mother.

Ratings of perceived helpfulness to Family E were restricted to two categories. Individuals from the Child Behavior Institute, KCDC, the Community Action Council, and the Girls Club rated their agencies as being helpful. The director of the recreation center gave this same

rating to all families, although he only gave a second rating for Family E. Two workers believed that the Child Behavior Institute was somewhat helpful to the family. Four of seven subjects thought the mother would respond as they did.

When workers rated how helpful their agencies were to families in general, only two categories were used. Subjects from the recreation center and Food Stamps felt that their organizations were very helpful to families. A home management counselor believed that this was true only for families who used their services, but felt others would consider KCDC to be no help at all. The social services director at U. T. Hospital, the executive director of the Girls Club, the public health nurse, and the lawyer considered their agencies to be helpful to families.

Comparison of Ratings

The data presented in Tables 9, 10, and 11 again show some differences in the ratings provided by subjects in families and those in agencies. Only four individuals rated their agencies as being not very helpful, while 49 rated their organizations in the three "helpful" categories. This may be contrasted with the 37 ratings by families in the first three categories and the 12 ratings in the other three. Agency personnel were correct in believing that subjects in families would give fewer positive responses on this question.

Chi-square tests were used to analyze the relationships between the frequencies obtained for both groups of subjects. When ratings by families were compared to ratings by workers, the results were significant

TABLE 9

FAMILY RATINGS ON HELPFULNESS OF AGENCIES

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	No Help At All	More Harm Than Good	Number of Ratings	Number of Agencies
A	1	0	3	1	0	3	8	6
B	5	2	4	0	1	0	12	12
C	4	3	0	0	2	0	9	9
D	2	5	0	1	1	1	10	10
E	3	2	3	2	0	0	10	9
Total	15	12	10	4	4	4	49	$\bar{X}$=9.2

TABLE 10

WORKER RATINGS ON HELPFULNESS OF AGENCIES

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	No Help At All	More Harm Than Good	Number of Ratings	Number of Agencies	r_o
A	1	4	4	1	0	0	10	7	.89
B	4	2	3	0	0	6	9	6	.93
C	4	4	4	0	0	0	12	8	.95
D	3	6	3	3	0	0	15	8	.98
E	0	5	2	0	0	0	7	5	.95
General	3	4	0	0	0	0	7	7	.79
A,B,C,D,E sub	12	21	16	4	0	0	53	$\bar{X}$=6.8	.95
Total Subjects	15	25	16	4	0	0	60	$\bar{X}$=6.8	.97

TABLE 11

PERCEIVED RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	No Help At All	More Harm Than Good	Number of Ratings	Number of Agencies
A	0	3	5	1	0	2	11	7
B	2	2	3	1	0	0	8	6
C	3	2	4	2	0	0	11	8
D	3	4	2	4	1	0	14	8
E	1	2	4	0	0	0	7	5
General	3	3	2	0	1	0	9	7
A,B,C,D,E Subtotal	9	13	18	8	1	2	51	$\bar{X}$=6.8
Total	12	10	20	8	2	2	60	$\bar{X}$=6.8

at the .1 level (x^2 = 9.5; d.f = 5). Results were significant at the .25 level (x^2 = 7.8; d.f. = 5) when ratings by families were compared to the workers' ratings on how they felt subjects in the families would answer the same question. The significance level rose to .025 when data was pooled into two categories (x^2 = 5.6; d.f. = 1).

Rank-order correlations were used to see how well the workers' first ratings matched up with their second ratings. The correlation coefficients ranged from .89 for Family A to .98 for Family D. For families in general, the coefficient was .79. Respective coefficients of .95 and .97 were also obtained for raters of families as well as for all 22 subjects. Once again, these correlations may be viewed as confidence ratings or as artifacts relating to the task required.

For both questions, the rank-order correlations were generally above .90. Even though the ratings appeared somewhat closer for the last questions, there are other factors to consider. It is difficult to say how much the differences were due to the phrasing of the two questions or the scales employed for each. It would be safe, though, to expect real differences in ratings from such hetergeneous groups. It seems evident that workers are aware of some of these differences because their estimations of responses from family subjects came much closer to actual ratings than did their own. When the frequencies in each categroy were compared for the two questions, a chi-square was significant at the .1 level (x^2 - 10.4; d.f. = 5). A chi-square was significant at the .025 level when the frequencies were compared for families that rated both questions. Almost all the variance results from

the difference between the 13 ratings of "very different" and the one rating of "more harm than good." These differences are no longer significant when these categories are dropped. A very similar pattern can be noted for the first five categories of both questions. A rank-order correlation of .9 for these five categories indicates a strong relationship between the way subjects rated these questions. These results can be attributed mainly to the scales or to the fact that people in this study associate "helpfulness" with "similarity." On the other hand, a rank-order correlation of .8 was obtained fro the four families when the two questions were compared by assigning values of -3 to +3 to the various categories. This suggests that the more helpful an agency is to families, the less similar to them are the workers in that agency. Perhaps, individuals reflect their negative feeling towards the notion of receiving help in these ratings. It may also be that this correlation is surprisingly high because of the small number of subjects being compared.

IV. FUNCTIONS OF AGENCIES REPORTED BY FAMILIES

KCDC Social Services

At this point, a description of the agencies' most important functions will be given from the perspective of subjects in the families. Whenever possible, the results will be discussed by keeping intact the language of the subjects in the families. Three of the five mothers spoke about the KCDC minibus that is used to take people to such places as U. T. Hospital and the McNabb center. One stated that the bus was

good for the old and handicapped when it was reliable. A few subjects mentioned the fact that a particular KCDC worker tries to get jobs for people and tries to help anybody who needs it. Another mother told the interviewer that a KCDC worker with whom she is familiar, once in a while takes food to neighbors. The KCDC organization was seen as a source of money for certain people who could not pay taxes or pay for food stamps. Two people thought KCDC had done nothing for them in the past. One felt the only beneficial service they provided was keeping an eye on people released from Eastern State Psychiatric Hospital. Other comments dealt with checking and putting up screens as well as providing housing.

Day Care Center

The day care center was seen as a place that helped welfare mothers' children so they could go out and loaf or shoplift. One subject felt that it was a babysitting place that did not "learn 'em" or discipline them. It was believed that the center was too choosy and asked too much money of some people, while others went out and had a big time. It was also mentioned that the people did not visit much. One person said that they will not keep children unless you are on welfare and working, and that they get you jobs.

Recreation Center

A mother told the interviewer that the recreation center helped keep children out of trouble by giving the children something to do. Another woman talked about the fact that the gym was open to children, that the center threw Halloween and Christmas parties, and that they

provided snack lunches in the summer. The young boy spoke about the gym, gangs, shooting pool, and playing ping pong. A woman also mentioned that you could play Bingo there. It was felt that if you were black you could get anything you wanted there and that there were too many children cussing and threatening to get their big brothers.

Human Services

When it came to Human Services, one mother spoke about how they stayed on people's backs to make sure the women did not have boy friends. She related a story about one neighbor who they stayed on all the time, with KCDC and the welfare people both chewing her out. It was felt, though, at the same time that they are not as strict as they could be. Another subject thought they helped some too much, since people used the money from all these checks they drew to get drunk. One woman believed that they were just a little help and when questioned said they did nothing. Still again, one other woman felt the check was important because it kept something coming in. The last subject explained that they help you fill out legal papers, give you information on legal matters, and tell you who to get in touch with.

Food Stamps

The Food Stamps program was viewed very favorably by all subjects, except one who felt they were not as strict as they should be in order to put a stop to people who sell stamps for money while children are hungry. One woman stated that they helped a lot, and that her family could not make it without them. Another mentioned that you just drop

the stamps down when you have a bill. In addition, one mother simply spoke about the fact that they provide an allowance each month for people.

Health Clinic

Subjects reported that children were screened by nurses at the Health Clinic for problems with hearing, vision, and teeth. One woman explained that this was a place to get birth control pills and advice. If there is a special problem, they refer you to a doctor or send you downtown to get an x-ray. Another subject felt that they were too free with birth control pills with teenagers. It was felt that 13 and 14 year old children were examined without parental consent. In addition, it was stated that they give pap smears and test blood pressure.

U. T. Hospital

When U. T. Hospital was mentioned, one woman said, "Don't ask, they're not together." Another mother explained that those they don't kill they help to get better. She went on to say that they have you wishing you would die when you are there. One woman stated that although they did nothing for families, they did have a community clinic where people could go to accept care and pay only half price for medicine. In addition, U. T. Hospital has helped in the past when someone was sick; they treated you while others like Baptist Hospital turned you down.

Schools

When these subjects were asked about the schools, three women spoke about how much the special education classes had helped their children. One woman talked about how helpful it was for the children who needed it to be in small groups for reading and math instead of the

usual 35. In one family, the mother talked about free lunches and breakfasts in addition to many programs to explore the children's talents. In another family, it was felt that the schools were doing a better job because the teachers seemed more interested this year than they had been in the past.

Boys and Girls Club

The Boys and Girls Club was seen as important because they picked up some of the children after school and gave them a place to go. One mother mentioned the fact that it got the children out of Montgomery Village and gave them things to do, like sewing, painting, and meeting new people. They also provide snacks and lunches in the summer. In addition, one woman explained that the club kept children out of trouble all day, gave out certain awards, and took children on camping trips.

Legal Aid and Community Action Council

Two subjects thought that Legal Aid helped out people who could not otherwise afford services in cases concerning child custody, divorces, and wills. Another woman remarked how the lawyer was more nervous than she was when they went to court. This same woman felt that the Community Action Council (particularly the one on Magnolia Avenue) helps train you for jobs, gets employment for children in the summer, and helps black people and senior citizens. Another subject thought that six or eight people could easily con the people there into signing a petition.

Child Behavior Institute

It was felt that the Child Behavior Institute kept the children out of trouble in the summer in addition to taking them on picnics and trips. One worker had recently helped get one of the boys into a special reading program. One mother spoke about another worker who was "just real nice" and who was willing to do anything she could. She had taken one of the boys out to her own place a number of times and would call and come pick up the mother. Another woman who mentioned that hers was one of the first regular families, spoke about how she would talk to workers about how to communicate with the children and how to handle certain situations with them. In the summer reading program, workers supervised and cared for children and took them on trips to show them a taste of the world. The last mother stated how much she liked to shoot the bull with one of the workers whom she and the children enjoyed a whole lot. She also stated how much she enjoyed the whole bunch and how much fun she got out of this graduate student. In addition, she mentioned that she felt that some of the people she met at parent meetings were more misbehaved than the children in the long run. Workers were very helpful to her because she had previously achieved little success in raising her children in the same strict way she had been raised.

The interview process was so enjoyable because of the fact that the subjects, especially those in families, were very candid about their feelings about organizations within the community. They spoke freely and often had a genuine sense of humor about answering some of the

questions. Their responses demonstrate the dichotomy between the subjects who are very dependent on the system for many services and those who are less dependent and are resentful of all the help people were receiving. One client seemed to be very professional in her approach to getting as much for her family as it was possible to obtain from agencies. There also seems to be a split between black and white families in their reactions to certain agencies, especially the recreation center and the day care center. In addition, white subjects were more verbal with the interviewer (who was white) and showed greater knowledge of services in their responses. All subjects gave very concrete answers when asked about the important functions of the organizations, although many did diverge quite a bit in order to more fully explain likes and dislikes.

V. FUNCTIONS OF AGENCIES REPORTED BY WORKERS

Child Behavior Institute

When the workers' responses to the same question are explored, it must be remembered that these subjects were speaking about their own organizations, while individuals in families were speaking about all agencies about whom they knew something. One graduate student explained that the Child Behavior Institute provided help in working with children with behavior problems by keeping them occupied and off the streets in the summer and by teaching parents how to set up rule systems and how to give positive rewards. Although another student felt they were not doing much at the time, he thought they could make inroads by trying to make the Child Behavior Institute a community organization that could function on

its own. This could be done by training parents and workers to train others. He thought that it was very important to build up a sense of community as well as to help families with child problems and other problems. In the past, workers had helped one family bring a problem down from the crisis level. It was also mentioned that the Child Behavior Institute was available on a consulting basis. In general, though, the performance of the organization was viewed as being inconsistent and having little impact on the community as a whole. The last subject believed one of the most important things they did was to put a lot more into contacts in order to build relationships with families, to garner a support system, and to provide some change strategies. He felt that the Child Behavior Institute was good for the community because workers provided teachers with some skills that enabled them to structure classroom atmospheres that are more conducive to learning and because they helped change teachers' perceptions towards the children.

KCDC Social Services

At KCDC, one of the workers believed that their ultimate goal was to help people eventually be self-supporting financially and psychologically so they could leave the development. For those who could not get out, it was important to learn how to maintain households on their own with little or no help. Another worker mentioned that the most important thing KCDC does as an organization is to provide people with suitable housing. In addition, residents are offered various programs to better themselves, transportation, a vast information retrieval source including educational and medical services, free utilities, and recreation

facilities. The last worker mentioned the fact that home management counselors helped cut out a lot of red tape to make it easier for people to receive available services. Social workers were seen as advocates for residents, speaking in their behalf to various agencies and finding resources such as food and money in emergency situations. In addition, they serve as referral agents to get employment, education (including the Village School), medical services, dental appointments, and SDT screenings for residents.

Human Services

The subject from Human Services felt that their most important function, other than providing the checks, was to lend an ear to clients. Workers were involved in counseling individuals and families to help them clearly see what action to take. For instance, they might speak to teen-age mothers-to-be about available options and then refer them to appropriate sources. In addition, some workers are responsible for finding emergency shelter for individuals and some are working as child protective agents. Lastly, there are homemakers who help older people by doing light housework and by preparing a meal, or who help families to budget their money. In addition, they may work with retarded clients or teach a young girl how to prepare meals in the case of illness in the family.

U. T. Hospital Social Services

Social service workers at U. T. Hospital are involved in a mixed bag of activities, especially those relating to exchanging

information and making referrals. In addition, they provide supportive counseling and serve as advocates with doctors and nurses in the hospital and with workers in the community. They try to cut red tape in order to get housing, food stamps, or other services to clients. They also are responsible for discharge planning and obtaining facilitative services such as transportation, wheel chairs, and nursing homes.

Community Action Council

An intake worker explained that the Community Action Council would help people by getting them garden seeds, coal, insulation for homes, plastic for windows, clothing, furniture, or food. Workers would refer clients to Food Stamps and help them fill out applications. They also help residents pay light bills or make house payments at times. In addition, there is a Senior Nutrition Program in which meals are delivered to older people. A podiatrist and a public health nurse are each available one day a month. The subject mentioned that one of the KCDC workers always calls when there is a problem. A lawyer in the same building stated that the main purpose of legal aid is to provide representation for clients who cannot afford to go elsewhere. Staff lawyers also help make individuals aware of other agencies and help in the referral process.

Food Stamps

The workers at Food Stamps feel that they were beneficial to clients because the stamps allowed them to buy nutritious meals at low cost. The eligibility specialist believed that it was important to

impress upon the public the value of shopping for proper foods and that it was important to keep them informed about eligibility requirements. Her supervisor mentioned that they refer people upstairs to Human Services, since they do not provide special services.

Health Clinic

A public health nurse mentioned preventive health care, including immunications, birth control, blood pressure screenings, and medical screenings for children. In chronic cases and in acute cases such as burn victims, the nurses provide intensive care in the home. They also assess needs, deal with social and emotional needs, and refer clients to social workers. In addition to this, the clinic has a nurse Monday thru Friday to provide advice and help with family planning and birth control. This subject felt that much of what she did was actually social work.

Day Care Center

The day care center was seen as a place that gives parents an opportunity to go to school or work knowing that they have a place for their children. It was felt that a main goal was to promote individual self-worth or make children feel good about themselves. In addition, the teachers would direct many families to health specialists such as ear doctors and try to educate parents on the use of the Medicaid card with doctors and dentists.

High School

At the high school, the principal believed they did very little for Montgomery Village children who did not have the middle class values that the school is built around. He stated that there were special classes for EMR level students and a tutorial program funded by Title I. The tutors who were assigned to the schools work strictly in math and reading and are not allowed to work with students in special education. They are mainly concerned with children who are able to learn but are not getting it because of cultural deprivation. He said that the children in one of the families did not have much academic chance since they were deprived at home. The guidance counselor believed that the school does great things such as looking after them, trying to keep them in school, following up on them in different schools, and showing tremendous concern. She went through some of the history involved in getting the community around the school to accept the housing project. In addition, she felt the resource teachers, the "wonderful" psychological service workers, and the tutors helped immensely, even though they represented only a smattering of what is needed.

Recreation Center

Workers believed that the most important function of the recreation center was to provide a different atmosphere outside the home. Children are provided with recreation facilities that give them an outlet for their emotions and allow them to get rid of frustrations. Some have gotten the chance to go to the circus for free and see the expressway for the first time. Adults also can use the place to get away from home, even just to talk. The center helps by sanctioning Thanksgiving dinners

and brunches for residents, some of whom have never seen a fully cooked turkey on the table. Bingo and the luncheons are the biggest attractions for the adults during the day. The director had a great deal to say about how the center provides rules and organization for individuals who often live in chaos and have little regard for feelings or property. He feels that the "non-slap judgment discipline" administered and the emphasis on teaching respect and courtesy makes an impact on the community. Of course, athletics is seen as an important activity for these children whose parents do not always have much time for them. In addition, a monthly newspaper is published featuring articles on such things as the meaning of behavior or on knowing your child and featuring announcements about birthdays, the mother's patrol, pre-school enrollment, and other community activities. For most mothers, the recreation center acts as a babysitter from 2:30 to night for them to go shopping or do other things.

Boys and Girls Club

A subject at the Boys Club believed that one of their most important functions is to provide day care for welfare families. He felt that the Club gets children off the streets and gives them a place to play as well as a chance to get involved in organized sports like baseball and basketball. The children are also given the opportunity to go on field trips and overnight trips to places like Disneyworld and Nashville. At the Girls Club, a worker mentioned that they do not emphasize physical recreation as much as the Boys Club. They provide supervision for children after school and in the summer and teach them

such skills as cooking, sewing, plant care, and brushing their teeth. According to one worker, they try to show girls that they can be better than what their neighbors encourage them to be by giving them individual attention and motivation to succeed. It seems that these girls are taken from homes where there are not always many material possessions or emotional support. The Girls Club tries to make these girls aware of the consequences of their behavior and provides them with an atmosphere conducive to building up their self-esteem.

In general, many of the workers in this sample view their organizations as being oases in the midst of an area characterized by chaos, violence, poverty, and deprivation. In addition to some of the concrete functions previously mentioned by some subjects in the families, some subjects speak about concepts such as self-support, sense of community, support systems, self-esteem, and cultural deprivation. These expressions are in sharp contrast to the concreteness of the language used by subjects in the families who more often talk about getting a check, finding a job, and shooting the bull. Many of the workers seem to take on functions related to social work and psychology in the course of their jobs in various settings. There are some workers who strongly emphasize the advocacy role of their organizations. Almost all of the workers are actively involved in the exchange of information and referrals with other agencies. Like the subjects in the families, these workers were aware of how important was the personal nature of the interactions. Although they were somewhat more guarded as a rule than the people in the family, the answers were again free-flowing.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS BY FAMILIES FOR IMPROVING SERVICES

When subjects were asked about ways of improving services, most were pretty vocal about expressing their feelings toward certain individuals and organizations. Subjects were also quick to tell the interviewer that they felt an agency was doing all right or that they knew too little to make an intelligent judgment. The recommendations from the families are primarily based on direct contact with agencies as well as reports from neighbors and friends. The results are reported in Table 12.

KCDC Social Services

Confidentiality is one of the big issues for families who evaluated KCDC Social Services. In one family, it was stated as "what is said here should remain here." One woman felt that her privacy was invaded when workers gave out information such as telephone numbers and addresses. She said that she does not like to go there because they tell other people about it. Another woman believed that there was favoritism shown to blacks. She cited an incident when she was threatened by a black family and one of the workers did not take action. She gave another example in which one of the workers who apparently had no time to get the minibus for a white family was seen later that day transporting a black person. This woman stated that you should do the same for all that you do for one. She also thought workers should do more about unfed and neglected children.

In a different vein, one of the subjects wanted to have a direct phone line to the office instead of having to go through a central

TABLE 12

AREAS OF IMPROVING SERVICES TO CONSUMERS

Families	Workers
Confidentiality	Increasing size of staff
Equal treatment for blacks and whites	Refining and standardizing procedures
Direct phone line to KCDC	Better follow-up on cases
Maintenance of homes	Communication between workers and consumers
Unreasonable yard fees	Communication between workers in different agencies
Notification when managers are changed at KCDC	Money for expanding services--improving facilities, more trips for children, transportation, etc.
Better understanding of function of KCDC Social Services	Increasing community involvement and community awareness of services
Better supervision of children	Bureaucratic hassles--lines of authority and rules to work around
Separating teenagers from younger children at recreation center and Boys Club	Greater accessibility to public--hours
Income requirements at day care center	More general assessments of community needs
Long waits	Expanded day care functions
Keeping appointments	Liaison social workers in schools and community centers
Combining cases so just one worker and one file	Improving attendance by parents at school conferences
More thorough investigative work by social workers--eligibility and child abuse	Better intergration at the recreation center
Behavior of workers while consumers are waiting	More adult programs at community centers
Personal manner of physicians and all workers	
More money for special classes and teacher aides in the schools	

TABLE 12 (Continued)

Families	Workers
Equivalent rules for Boys and Girls Club	Volunteer programs--especially tutoring
	Holding meetings within a parent's neighborhood
	More consistent programming and discipline between Boys and Girls Clubs

switchboard. This woman also felt that KCDC should do a better job of maintaining buildings to insure safety for residents. In addition, she mentioned that residents should be notified when managers are changed and that something should be done about managers who have no feelings or sympathy when they collect rent. Two of the women were indignant about the fact that KCDC charged for picking up a few papers or strings in their yards. Lastly, it was stated by a few people that they did not know exactly what Social Services was about or what they did in addition to Human Services.

Day Care Center

Two people remarked that they did not know what to say when it came to the KCDC day care center and one said that they were all right. The other two people were upset about what seemed to be deferential treatment to undeserving welfare mothers. One person stated that they should not have an income requirement because each child has equal rights. It was felt that some people who do not work get services for free while other who go to school have to pay. There was another woman who spoke about the income requirements as well.

Recreation Center

The race issue was brought up again by a family in talking about the KCDC recreation center. Once again, it was emphasized that each one should be treated equal. An incident was mentioned concerning some broken windows in cars to illustrate the point that the help go along with the blacks because of fear. Another subject thought they should

take more responsibility with the children, especially by not letting the teenagers in with the small children. In the past, some white children had come home with bloody lips or a bloody nose because things were not kept under control. This parent felt it is everyone's responsibility whether black or white to teach children to play and live together within the neighborhood. The boy in one family spoke about the upcoming dismissal of an employee in light of budget cuts. He also talked about one of the staff members who he felt acted like a big shot and remarked that workers should wait their turn to play pool. In addition, he believed there should be longer hours and more dances.

Human Services and Food Stamps

One of the subjects decided not to comment on Human Services, implying that it would be better to leave it than get into some negative feelings about welfare. A few subjects spoke about having to wait a long time in the few hard bottom chairs available. One felt that they should give clients more money and they should do a better job of keeping appointments. She also believed that many agencies treated you just like a number. Another woman stated that she and her neighbors wanted direct answers from caseworkers. She believed that cases should be combined so there would be just one worker and one file. A lot of unnecessary red tape would be cut in this way and consumers could get everything done in one day. She thought these recommendations held true for the Food Stamps program as well. The last woman felt that Human Services should send workers out more often to check whether or not children are being "took" care of or if the money is being used for

other purposes. She believed that Food Stamps workers should crack down a lot harder on people because some who do not need them tell yarns in order to receive stamps. Another subject also felt that they should screen clients better, although they did okay in general. Lastly, long waiting times experienced at Food Stamps were mentioned once again by one of the subjects.

Health Clinic

Comments about the Health Clinic were generally very favorable. One woman who believed they were doing a fantastic job, stated that nurses were sent out to expectant mothers on welfare and to individuals with epilepsy. Another woman mentioned that they treat you okay when they screen children. Seemingly, they are nice to talk to and they keep appointments better than the others. It was felt by one woman that adults should be compelled to receive a physical as well as children. She also thought that the place should be made less dreary by cleaning it, painting the walls, and providing more comfortable seats as well as more space. The interviewer was uncertain whether or not the woman was referring to the neighborhood clinic or the one in Knoxville.

U. T. Hospital

When it came to U. T. Hospital, every one of the subjects talked about the long waits encountered there. Although one subject believed they were doing a pretty good job, she told the interviewer that you had to sit all day from 7:00 A.M. Two women were upset about nurses and doctors drinking coffee, laughing, talking, and gossiping while people

were waiting to be treated. The general consensus seems to be that the hospital should not give out so many appointments so that people would not have to wait so long. One woman described an incident in the emergency room in which a suspicious staff member was being snappy when asking for an ID card while her child lay on the floor because he was hurt so badly. She remarked that she did not care to go there. Another subject stated that patients should have qualified physicians, citing an incident when a doctor there did not diagnose a broken arm correctly. One subject made an insightful comment about the problem when she expressed her feelings that one of the interns was going to make a fantastic surgeon because he understood her aches and pains. On the other hand, she disliked the intern she called "cabbagehead" and did not appreciate the fact that a few interns were brought into her room to see how big a cut was made after gallbladder surgery.

Schools

In talking about the schools, one subject thought they were doing a great job, citing the special classes as evidence. One woman felt they were doing the best job they could and that the rest was up to the children. She believed teachers and schools should receive more money so there could be more special classes that might open up greater opportunities for children. Another mother was in favor of spending federal money to get a new school building so children would not come home so muddy. She also advocated having a teacher's aide in every room and improving janitoral services at Vestal School. A subject in one family felt very strongly that teachers should discipline children better instead

of letting them get by and letting them play. Although one of the teachers had apparently called up twice expressing interest in one of the boys, it was uncertain what more could be done at home to help the child.

Child Behavior Institute

There is a wide spectrum of opinion about how the Child Behavior Institute could improve services. One vocal critic thought they should come in the afternoon instead of the evening time when the children were ready to go to sleep. When he stated that workers would leave at 8:30 or 9:00 o'clock at night, his wife gently asserted the fact that they did not usually come at inconvenient times. The man felt that the youngest boy became a problem only after his brother began earning stars and getting toys. It was also felt that Child Behavior Institute workers should do a better job of keeping track of the children during the summer. It seems that a few children were found lining the railroad tracks with coke cans when they were supposed to have been brought home by workers. In a different vein, one subject hypothesized that people would not have their guard up if workers kept in closer touch by visiting more often. Another woman simply stated that she liked the program and one of the workers. The last subject believed that they did a fantastic job and could not improve anything. She explained how she tried to act normal in the beginning when the workers were there for three or four hours, three or four days a week. She added how helpful she thought it was to have someone in the house to talk to then.

Legal Aid and Community Action Council

Few subjects had much to say about the last two agencies to be discussed in this section. One woman believed that Legal Aid was a good information center for people calling up and that there was a friendly staff at the office to help calm you down. Another woman stated that they did okay for her. With respect to the Community Action Council, one person felt strongly that the people there grouped together to help just a few of their own whom they liked. Once again, it was stated that everyone would be better off if things were equalized. Another woman said that people over there were all right.

A number of interesting themes were developed by subjects in these families in response to the question of improving the services provided by agencies in the community. There was some feeling among the families who had working adults that too many people were getting a free ride while they struggled to make ends meet. A few subjects believed that black families received deferential treatment within the housing project. Similar feelings were expressed in reverse by black subjects who felt their children were perhaps treated less well by workers in an agency outside of the project. All of the families were concerned to some extent what sort of supervision their children were receiving at various agencies.

Although subjects often routinely mentioned the long waits encountered in many agencies, they expressed anger when these waits were associated with emergency situations and discourteousness on the part of workers. There was also some concern shown about apparent breaches

of confidentiality among workers within the project. It seems throughout that the most crucial variable in determining how well an agency is viewed by the public is the personal interaction between workers and families.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS BY WORKERS FOR IMPROVING SERVICES

When subjects in agencies were asked to describe some ways in which their organizations could improve services to families, many of the recommendations dealt with things outside of their control, such as the bureaucratic structure, staffing, and expenditure of money. Some workers, though, gave some concrete suggestions that could be put into operation if they were priorities for administrators and other staff members. In this section, the subjects' responses will be compared to those recorded for workers in their own agency as well as the entire sample. Where appropriate, responses will also be compared to those discussed concerning the reactions of subjects in the families. Results are summarized in Table 12, page 91.

Child Behavior Institute

One worker felt that the Child Behavior Institute was doing what they could do, but would like a larger staff to do more of the same thing. This person also wanted to change some of the institutions like the schools and welfare agencies to make them more human. Two workers from the Child Behavior Institute spoke about refining and standardizing procedures for intake and treatment within the organization. One thought that the research model should be molded more by developing more consistent

measures. It was stated that a tiny caseload and fewer staff hours would allow workers to go through more research stages in order to come up with new parameters. A worker in the school program also believed that the staff was spread too thin and that the sample size should be held steady. He remarked how important it was to keep an open mind about the data by using the feedback provided by different people. This subject pointed out the need for awareness of the personalities and sensitivities of teachers and parents. In addition, it was mentioned that the whole staff could probably do a better job of following through on promises. Some individuals were occasionally guilty of "talking through their hats" or forgetting to follow up requests for suggestions. The last recommendation given was that the masters program needed firming up.

KCDC Social Services

Two workers from KCDC mentioned that the agency could expand services related to transportation, health care (especially dental), community organization, employment, and emergency relief (e.g. clothing and furniture) if more money were made available to them. One subject could not see how services could be better because she felt that clients were getting the best there was to offer. Another believed that some public relations efforts, perhaps in the form of a booklet, were needed to improve the attitudes of residents and to make families more aware of services and their responsibilities. It was believed from past experience, that it was difficult to organize individuals within the community.

Human Services

One subject from the Department of Human Services remarked that there was a tremendous amount that cannot be done because of the bureaucracy. Ostensibly, it takes a great deal of time to process cases involving such services as providing extra money, because there are sometimes five supervisors to get through and various rules to work around. At the present time, it seems that the staff is discussing the possibility of having different hours, longer hours, and night hours to be as available as possible. This subject believed that helping people to become self-supporting was what Human Services was all about. It was also mentioned that the workers in child and foster care do a good job of forming relationships with clients, especially disturbed children.

U. T. Hospital

At U. T. Hospital, the social worker believed that a greater effort would be given if there were enough staff to reduce the caseload to about 35 each month, and to meet the crises that come up so fast. If more time was available to workers, they could be more empathetic, go into greater depth with each case, and do more extensive follow-ups. At this time, the staff is not as committed to total care of patients as this subject would like.

Community Action Council and Food Stamps

The subject from the Community Action Council believed that her organization has improved year to year by adding services related to

helping drop-outs, finding employment for low-income families, and getting people off of welfare and food stamps. She stated that a lot of people would rather be working if jobs were available. At Food Stamps, the eligibility specialist stressed improving the outreach program. She felt that more could be done to inform clients about services, like speaking before groups such as PTA's. The supervisor mentioned once again that their main purpose was to provide stamps. In order to give more people the opportunity to be seen, they have gone on caseloads, extended sign-up periods, and opened up six offices and three or four satellite centers in Knoxville.

Legal Aid and Health Clinic

Although the lawyer thought it was a good idea to make the community more aware of the existence of Legal Aid in that area, he felt that it was not appropriate to advertise. He believed that more needed to be done in the area of community education to inform consumers about criminal rights as well as basic information on legal recourse if they are denied AFDC benefits or food stamps. In addition, he called for a larger staff to serve the community. Interestingly enough, the public health nurse also felt that more general assessments of community needs should be done; in this case it was in order to see what diseases were showing up in the area. She was not sure that health specialists were necessarily fitting the individual needs of each community at the present time. For her own sake, she would like less paper work and more field time. She also believed that the public should be made more aware of family planning and birth control.

Day Care Center

At the day care center, the teacher stated how important it was for the residents to know how to use the services available to them and that she was doing as much as she could in this area. She believed that agencies should have a mandatory education period before providing services in order to inform clients about such things as what to do with a Medicaid card and what good nutrition is in general. It was also suggested that there be more day care functions after school for children up to age 10 because they should not be left alone.

High School

Once again, it was stated that the biggest problem at the high school is that parents are not educated and do not get involved. The guidance counselor believed that parents in the project should be more aware of the importance of special education and vocational training. She was annoyed at the fact that a good percentage of individuals would not come to scheduled conferences or call up to say they were not coming. In general, though, she felt they were doing a pretty good job and could only go so far. The principal talked about the many services performed on a group basis such as free lunches and shoe tickets. He thought it would be useful to have a liaison social worker in the school who could contact families in the homes where a lot of heartbreaking conditions apparently exist.

Recreation Center

A subject from the recreation center thought it was important to provide extra curricula such as trips outside the center, but that this was contingent upon the availability of bus transportation. She felt that the center should be more integrated because at night it is mostly black and during the day a lot more whites come in for the luncheons and bingo. It was stated that the center needed to maintain two women in the day time despite budget cuts. Another worker believed they should work more closely with social service people in order to get consumers to become personally familiar with them so that reluctance to use services would be decreased. According to this woman, it was necessary to have more adult programs because it was not known how well they were now reaching adults. The director of the recreation center was unhappy about recent cuts in funding, since he dreams of a game room, improved gym facilities, and a teen room complete with a decorated soda fountain and a juke box. In addition, he would like to see overnight trips planned for adults and staff to get individuals in the open where they could learn how to take care of themselves instead of depending on others. Lastly, it was mentioned that he would like to get more people involved as volunteers, perhaps even on a paid basis.

Boys and Girls Club

A worker at the Boys Club felt that a good volunteer tutoring program could help children identified by the schools get extra academic help. He would also like to get a bus to pick up the forty to fifty children at the Village who cannot come because of lack of transportation.

At the Girls Club, one worker thought they might start a juvenile delinquency program and a career development program and try to set up a better counseling situation for the girls. Both subjects from the Girls Club wanted to get parents more involved. One suggested offering workshops on topics such as behavior modification, nutrition, and talking to your daughter about sex. Since it appeared to be so difficult to get mothers to the Club, this woman believed it might be better to hold meetings at an outreach center in the parents' neighborhood. Unfortunately, the only source of funding, other than United Way, is day care.

Most of the subjects from the agencies spoke about increasing community involvement and community awareness. An equal number spoke about how they could expand services or lighten caseloads if more funding were available to them. Very rarely did workers touch on the areas of concern mentioned by subjects in families although both parties craved more resources. In one case, though, the race issue with respect to the recreation center was discussed by a worker there. Although few people in these agencies were as critical of services as were the consumers, a few good suggestions were made. These include scheduling better hours for consumers, providing for social work functions in the schools and the recreation center, and setting up tutoring programs and adult programs at the Boys and Girls Club.

In the second part of the results section, the workers' responses to questions relating to the interactions between agencies within the community is examined. For each organization, the type and amount of

contact reported by subjects and the specific recommendations for improving interactions will be described. The subjects' general recommendations and questions about each agency will be discussed as well. In addition, the responses to scaled questions concerning how similar were tasks and services and how beneficial it would be to work in close collaboration with other organizations will be analyzed at this time.

VIII. DESCRIPTION OF CONTACT

The workers' responses concerning how much contact they each have had with other agencies according to four different ways of communicating is summarized in Table 13. In addition to reciprocal office visits and phone calls, a category is included to record other ways of communicating. The number of subjects reporting contact and the different agencies they represent are recorded as well. There are also categories that list the approximate number of different names of workers given by subjects and the number of workers named who are in this sample. This table is very similar to the ones used to describe the contact between selected families and various organizations.

KCDC Social Services

All nineteen subjects not working for KCDC Social Services reported having had contact with workers in this organization in the six or seven months prior to the interviews. Eleven individuals in seven agencies stated that they had been to the KCDC office at least one time in the past. Four workers from the day care center and the recreation

TABLE 13

CONTACTS BETWEEN AGENCIES

	Number of Workers	Number of Agencies	Gone to Their Office	They've Come to Your Office	Phone Calls	Other	Number of Different Ways	Number of Different People	Number of People Surveyed
KCDC Soc. Ser.	19	11	12	11	15	2	40	9	3
Day Care	9	5	4	6	7	1	18	4	1
Recreation Ctr.	6	4	5	5	0	16	4	3	
Human Services	14	9	10	9	12	0	31	11	1
UT Hospital	12	8	6	2	10	0	18	8	1
Food Stamps	9	7	5	2	7	0	14	7	2
Health Clinic	9	8	5	4	9	0	18	5	1
Schools	15	7	11	7	13	2	33	10	1
Ch. Behav. Inst.	5	3	0	2	3	1	6	4	2
Boys-Girls Club	17	9	8	7	12	4	31	8	3
Legal Aid	8	7	0	1	5	2	8	3	1
C.A.C.	16	9	9	7	11	1	28	7	1
	$\bar{X}$=11.6	$\bar{X}$=7.25	75	63	110	13	261	$\bar{X}$=6.7	$\bar{X}$=1.7

center were there at least two times a month. The public health nurse had been there at least two or three times a month during this period. The rest listed from one to four visits. Eleven people in seven organizations remarked that KCDC workers had been to their agency at least once and as often as three times a month. As might be expected, the most agency visitations were listed for the recreation center and the day care center both adjacent to the KCDC office. Fifteen subjects from every agency besides the Girls Club reported having had spoken to workers from KCDC at least a few times over the phone in six months. Three had daily contact and four had at least weekly contact.

The director of the recreation center reported almost daily contact according to the three channels of communication. A woman at the Girls Club mentioned that she saw some of the other workers at Title XX meetings. Of all the subjects, only four did not name a worker from KCDC. Names of the directors, the caseworkers, and the secretaries were given repeatedly to the interviewer. The workers in this sample from KCDC were respectively known by thireteen, eight and five other subjects. Although there was little contact reported by individuals from the Boys and Girls Club, Legal Aid, and the Child Behavior Institute, almost all could identify by name at least one worker there.

Day Care Center

Nine subjects in five different agencies had communicated with people from the day care center. As noted previously, a great deal of contact was reported for workers from the other two KCDC organizations.

Four individuals had been to the center at least one time. A KCDC worker had been there about 15 times, the recreation director about two times a week, and the nurse about seven times. A Child Behavior Institute worker mentioned that he had been there four or five times three years ago. On the other hand, five individuals reported having been visited by workers from the day care center from one to ten times; the recreation center director reported weekly contact. All but two of the respondents listed at least a few phone calls. The three KCDC workers said they had talked to staff all the time, weekly, or about 20 times. Only one subject did not give the name of the head teacher; five individuals were named in all.

Recreation Center

There were six subjects in four different agencies who reported contact with workers from the recreation center. Four workers stated that they had been there from one to five times. Recreation center workers had apparently been to agencies from one to six times. All reported having spoken over the phone from a few times to a dozen times. The three social workers from KCDC, a man from the Boys Club, the principal, and the day care teacher had contact with recreation workers. One person reported weekly or monthly visits and calls. Of the four workers named by subjects, three are in the sample.

Human Services

Fourteen subjects in nine agencies stated that they had communicated with staff members at Human Services. Six individuals

including the nurse, the guidance counselor, a KCDC worker, two directors from the Girls Club, and the lawyer had been there from one to ten times. The other two KCDC workers reported weekly visits, while the Food Stamps people in the same building had daily personal contact. Workers from the welfare department were also seen as frequent visitors to KCDC, Food Stamps, and the Girls Club. In all, nine subjects reported visits from child protective workers and other service workers. On the other hand, twelve workers stated that there had been from two to two hundred phone conversations with people at Human Services. Four listed at least daily contact by phone and five listed at least weekly contact. Eleven different workers were named by subjects, including one in this study. In addition, each of twelve workers remarked that they had been in contact with from 3 to 15 different Human Services workers.

U. T. Hospital

For U.T. Hospital, twelve workers in eight agencies reported having had some contact since September. Three workers from KCDC had from 10 to 25 visits to the hospital, while the nurse had approximately 48. The director from the Boys Club was there five times and a subject from the Girls Club was there one time. In addition, a worker from the Child Behavior Institute had been there four times during the summer. The woman from the Community Action Council mentioned that 50 people had been to her office once during this time frame. Ten workers had from 1 to 20 calls with hospital personnel. A Community Action Council worker, a KCDC worker, and a guidance counselor respectively reported 115-120 calls, monthly calls, and weekly calls. Another KCDC worker said she spoke to

people at U. T. Hospital all the time. There were nine people identified by name, including the social service director, an intake worker, and various doctors. It was not feasible to ascertain how many different people were contacted because this often included the entire emergency room staff or in general, a great many doctors and nurses.

Food Stamps

Nine subjects in seven different organizations reported interacting with workers from the Food Stamps Office. Three KCDC workers had both been there from 5 to 10 times, while the lawyer had been there once. The supervisor from Human Services, of course, had daily contact. One subject stated that Food Stamps workers had been to the KCDC office at least once each month. Most of the contact, though, was made by workers via the phone. Social workers from KCDC and U.T. Hospital all reported having almost weekly calls and the Community Action Council worker reported about 200 calls. The nurse and the day care teacher each had three to four conversations with Food Stamps workers. Seven staff members were mentioned by name, including one participant in this study. Four subjects reported having had contact with six to eight different individuals at the agency.

Health Clinic

There were nine people from eight agencies who had been in contact with staff from the Health Clinic. A caseworker from KCDC and a supervisor from welfare reported one to three visits. Another KCDC worker and the teacher said they had been there one or two times a

month since September. Apparently, nurses from the Health Clinic had also visited KCDC weekly and had been to the recreation center and to the Community Action Council a few times each. All subjects listed at least three phone conversations. Workers from KCDC and the Community Action Council had at least weekly contact by phone and the guidance counselor reported daily contact. There was also some contact listed by the recreation center director, the day care teacher, and a worker from the Girls Club. In addition, the nurse said she had been at the Clinic about 20 times in the last six months and had called about 30 times. She was identified by three subjects, whereas only one other nurse and three doctors were mentioned by name in addition to the subject. Most subjects reported contact with at least three public health nurses and family planning nurses.

Schools

Fifteen subjects from seven organizations reported having had contact with local schools. Two of the Child Behavior Institute graduate students worked in the schools three to four times each week and one had been to schools about seven times. When requested, the workers from KCDC pick up children who become ill; one had been there about 10 times and the other about two times. The subject from the Boys Club had been there 10 to 12 times and the nurse 18 times. In addition, another worker from the Girls Club had been to each school in the community one time and the day care teacher had a lot of previous contact. Seven subjects from the Child Behavior Institute, the recreation center, and the Boys Club stated that people from the schools visited

their respective agencies from one to eight times. Again, the most prevalent means of contact was the telephone. Almost all of the subjects had either weekly or monthly contact with people in various schools. Ten staff members were mentioned by name, including one in this study. Most of the subjects had reported contact with a building principal in at least one of the five area schools. The principal of Vestal was named by ten different individuals. Workers had contact with as many as 12 staff members in the schools including teachers, guidance counselors, and superintendants.

Child Behavior Institute

None of the five people from KCDC, Human Services, and the Girls Club who reported having had contact with Child Behavior Institute workers had been to their office on the U. T. campus. One subject from KCDC and one from the Girls Club stated that Child Behavior Institute workers had visited their agencies one or two times. Another worker from the Girls Club had daily contact with the Child Behavior Institute staff during the summer. Three subjects listed one or two phone conversations as well. Four individuals were identified by name, including the director and three graduate students. Two of these graduate students are subjects in this study.

Boys and Girls Club

Seventeen individuals from nine different agencies stated they had communicated with workers from the Boys and Girls Club. Of course, staff members from both clubs interacted with each other every day even though they were under different auspices. The woman from the Community

Action Council saw them in the halls every day and a subject from the Child Behavior Institute had each been to one or the other club a few times. The principal had been there a couple of times and said that workers had been to the high school three or four times. A worker reported weekly contact at the KCDC office while other workers at the Child Behavior Institute and KCDC mentioned that they had also met with workers in their offices. In addition, two people from KCDC and one from the recreation center reported from one to five phone conversations. Subjects from the high school and U. T. Hospital reported at least monthly contact by phone. Weekly or daily contact with each other was also reported by workers from the Boys and Girls Club. A KCDC worker said that she spoke to people there about once a day. Some contact at Title XX meetings and CDC meetings were reported, as well, by the director of the recreation center and the executive director of the Girls Club. Eight different workers and supervisors were identified by name, including all three in this study.

Legal Aid

The fewest number of direct interactions were noted for subjects talking about Legal Aid. People from the Girls Club and the recreation center met staff at management level meetings. A subject from Human Services had been there one time. Subjects from the Child Behavior Institute, the high school, Human Services, and KCDC reported from two to six phone conversations. One woman from KCDC said she had weekly phone contact with workers there. In addition, the woman from the Community Action Council shared the same office with the personnel from Legal Aid. Three

lawyers were listed by name including the subject in this study.

Community Action Council

In talking about the Community Action Council, 16 workers from nine different agencies reported having had communicated with staff there. One Child Behavior Institute worker had spoken to people at the Community Action Center 36 times, while a co-worker reported daily contact during the summer. A subject from KCDC stated she had been there on a weekly basis and another KCDC worker listed five visits. The subject from the Boys Club reported daily contact, while two workers from the Girls Club respectively listed 2 and 15 visits to the Community Action Council office. The director of the recreation center and the principal of the high school had met with Community Action Council workers several times in the past. In addition, a subject from Legal Aid and one from Food Stamps had been there one or two times since September. It was stated that one worker from the Community Action Council had been to the Child Behavior Institute three times. The eligibility specialist mentioned that Community Action Council workers had been to the Food Stamps office about eight times. Daily and weekly contact at their office was specified by workers from the Boys Club and KCDC. In addition, a subject from the Girls Club stated that she had met with Community Action Council workers 15 times in her office. Three subjects listed from three to five phone calls. There were also five individuals who reported having communicated with Community Action Council workers at least once a month over the phone and three who reported having at least weekly contact. Seven different people were identified by name,

including the intake worker in the sample who was mentioned seven times. The director was listed seven times in relation to his role at the Community Action Council and two times with respect to his connections with the Boys and Girls Club.

It can be seen that considerable contact occurs between the various organizations represented in this study who serve the Vestal community. The mean number of subjects reporting contact with an agency is 11.6; the range is from 5 to 19. At least 12 workers stated that they had interacted with staff from KCDC, Human Services, U. T. Hospital, Community Action Council, the Boys and Girls Club, and the school. These individuals represent an average of 7.25 agencies. Contact was reported by subjects in at least seven agencies for all organizations except the Child Behavior Institute, the recreation center, and the day care center. For every organization, the phone was used to communicate with more times than any other means. For only three agencies (Child Behavior Institute, Legal Aid, and the day care center) the totals in the category "gone to their office" was less than the totals obtained in the category "they've come to your office." In all cases but a few, the totals were very close in these two categories, with the biggest difference being four in the case of the schools and U. T. Hospital. In other words, workers seem to interact regularly in their own settings and often visit other agencies as well. In addition, at least three people and as many as 11 people were identified by name in every organization in this study. A mean of 6.6 was obtained. A great many more workers were listed by occupation. Included in both these counts were many of the subjects who participated in this project.

IX. REASONS FOR CONTACT

On the basis of the results reported by subjects concerning the interactions between agencies, it would seem that the amount and type of contact is directly related to the function and location of each organization. There will be greater opportunity to exchange information, materials, services, or referrals if agencies are located in the same building or in close proximity to each other. In addition, agencies outside of a community may depend upon other organizations to perform certain activities because they are situated much closer to where clients live. An organization which provides needed services on a regular basis to a great many consumers will have more interacting with other agencies than will an organization that provides a particular service to a selected population. In this section, the nature of the interactions between agencies will be discussed from the point of view of the subjects in this study, who were asked to describe the most important things that workers from various organizations did for each other.

KCDC Social Services

Ten subjects in five agencies specifically mentioned referrals when they discussed reasons for interactions with workers from KCDC Social Services. Workers from the day care center, Food Stamps, the Child Behavior Institute, and the recreation center spoke about the exchange of referrals, and workers from Human Services and the Girls Club spoke about receiving referrals. Subjects in about eight agencies stated that KCDC Social Services was a good source of information concerning clients. Workers would contact KCDC for addresses, for verification

of information on Food Stamps applications, and for other specific information on families within the Village. At U. T. Hospital, the social worker may delay discharge or alter some action because of information received on patients. A supervisor stated that workers would pass things to people at Human Services because KCDC is not mandated by contract to do work in the legal and protective service areas. Subjects from the day care center, the high school, and the Boys Club have used KCDC workers to contact families directly when a phone was unavailable or in emergency situations. KCDC workers have received requests to promote programs, to take children from school, to transport individuals to the hospital, and to help recover stolen property. They have engaged in conferences with the public health nurse, the day care teacher, workers at the Girls Club, and other individuals to discuss common problems and to get to know each other.

In addition, workers from the Child Behavior Institute mentioned that the KCDC organization allowed them to use empty buildings for parent meetings and training observers. One subject felt that they helped out by employing a few residents and by working with cases that KCDC was not equipped to handle. The director of the recreation center works together with people at KCDC to get some insight on the behavior of certain children in order to help him make decisions on suspensions and treatment strategies. The woman from the Community Action Council helps workers get food, housing, and transportation in certain situations. Lastly, it was mentioned that the KCDC staff works with the welfare department on vendor payments for children on day care.

Day Care Center

Workers from KCDC mentioned that they refer clients to the day care center and make arrangements for SDT screenings. The teachers there keep them informed about how well a child is doing and whether there are any medical problems or child abuse noted. Recreation center workers stated that they provide facilities for recreation, especially useful when the weather is bad. In the past, there were weekly movies shown based on Sesame Street and other topics. One subject said that they help promote the day care program by passing out flyers to mothers. In addition, the director felt that they did an excellent job at the day care center and wished more parents were involved in it. In addition, the public health nurse spoke about referrals for screening and the fact that workers helped by teaching the children skills and getting them out of the home.

Recreation Center

Once again, KCDC workers refer clients to the recreation center and help them carry out their program by printing their newspaper, publicizing dinners, and making calls to try to get things donated there. Workers sometimes check with each other about children and exchange information on families. The day care teacher said that the children used the facilities over there to play and in the past went over there for movies. A year ago, they borrowed some chairs for parents attending a fashion show at the day care center. The principal stated that workers notify the schools if children are playing hooky there. The physical director of the Boys Club also mentioned that he tried to set up a basketball game with them.

Child Behavior Institute

Apparently, workers from the Child Behavior Institute contacted the staff at KCDC for information and have inquired whether they knew of children to refer to them. One of the KCDC workers mentioned that she helped them set up their program in the beginning by referring people to them, providing them with space, and introducing them to people. In the last year, though, it has been difficult to get information about what workers were doing with clients. Staff at the Girls Club requested help from Child Behavior Institute workers on the basic principles of behavior modification and asked them about their program in the Village. In addition, the supervisor from Human Services was contacted when workers were about to expand the school program.

Human Services

An interesting situation exists between Human Services and Legal Aid because they are involved in a custody suit in which the welfare agency has agreed on advice from counsel to be the defendant in the case. Workers from Food Stamps, KCDC, Community Action Council, and the Girls Club and the public health nurse all mentioned referrals when discussing interagency exchange. Workers from KCDC, the Girls Club and Human Services work together to get children on day care through vendor payments. The woman from the Community Action Council said that workers called up when they needed help in locating sources of transportation, food, or coal. In the local high school, the principal is contacted to verify school attendance and in turn requests information on families from workers. The public health nurse and workers from

KCDC and Food Stamps also exchange information on clients with workers.

There is a lot of interagency work on cases concerning public assistance, medical care, and child abuse as well. The social worker at U. T. Hospital helps by speaking directly to doctors and by assisting clients in filling out forms. On the other hand, Human Services provides the funding for social workers at the hospital. It was felt that KCDC workers helped lighten the load for welfare workers by providing certain services right in the community. One subject mentioned that they discuss service plans so that their activities will not be overlapping and so they can help people become self-supporting. A worker from Food Stamps mentioned that many clients were sent there first because they saved other agencies like Human Services time and money. In addition, caseworkers send Medicaid clients to the Health Clinic for screenings and receive information from nurses on home problems during regular conferences.

Food Stamps

Workers from KCDC and Food Stamps help each other out when problems arise with particular clients. KCDC workers explain the programs to clients, make appointments, fill out applications, and help verify information for eligibility purposes. The woman from the Community Action Council also explains eligibility requirements to clients and helps them fill out applications. It was also stated that subjects from Legal Aid, the Health Clinic, and Human Services refer people to Food Stamps and serve as advocates for consumers at times.

U. T. Hospital

One worker from the Child Behavior Institute spoke at a luncheon at U. T. Hospital in order to help set up a referral system. At various times, workers from KCDC, the Boys Club, and the day care center have taken clients to the clinic or emergency room. Workers from the Community Action Council and KCDC help people get clinic cards, make appointments, and advocate for them. U. T. Hospital provides school personnel with medical information to help verify a condition so a child can get into a homebound program when necessary. There is occasional contact as well with Human Services. In addition, the public health nurse provides home care for patients being discharged from the hospital, for patients who are pregnant, and for patients who need acute or chronic care.

Health Clinic

The guidance counselor mentioned that she refers children with health problems to the clinic and makes dental appointments as well. If children have real badtoothaches, the Health Clinic schedules emergency appointments for them. Workers from KCDC and Human Services provide transportation, encourage people to get shots, and explain the services to clients. The teacher from the day care center helps make sure parents take children at the appropriate times. In addition, the woman from the Community Action Council worked with people who had V.D. or who need immunizations. Nurses at the Health Clinic do SDT screenings, supply advice and information on family planning, and work at preventive care. In a different vein, the staff of the Girls Club was sent to the Health Clinic to get health cards.

Child Behavior Institute

The staff from the Child Behavior Institute help teachers with discipline problems, and teach them how to quantify rules, reward children, and break up work into units. Workers feel that it is a symbiotic relationship because the teachers are often the data collectors and change agents in the classroom. In addition to receiving help with classroom managements skills, teachers receive masters credit for their participation in the research project. The staff at Vestal School have helped formulate and revise the program, have supplied referrals to the Child Behavior Institute, and have shown support for the program by tolerating the observers and cooperating with the Child Behavior Institute staff.

Schools

Staff at local schools call up KCDC Social Services when children are sick, have problems with truancy, school work, or behavior, and when there is suspected child abuse. Workers from KCDC pick up children when necessary, get in touch with parents on these matters, and inform them about conferences at the schools. KCDC also provides facilities for parent conferences in the Village, and workers encourage staff to come out there. Human Services is also involved in certain cases concerning child abuse or emotionally disturbed children.

It was mentioned that children from the day care center are taken on a tour of the local school to familiarize them with the surroundings before enrollment. Occasionally, someone from the school will come to the center to see if a child is ready for school and determine

the appropriate placement there. The principal at Vestal School is very active in community affairs, attending functions at the recreation center and serving on the Board of Directors at the Boys Club. Personnel from the schools and the Girls Club have worked together on a project to improve Mary Vestal Park with community development funds. A worker from the Girls Club has spoken to all the principals so they will know her when she calls the schools about the buses or about getting girls out early. Once again, the schools and the Boys and Girls Club have arrangements concerning day care pick up. It was stated, as well, that the school nurse is involved in the round up of five and six year old children for check-ups and shots before they are enrolled. Nurses also check with the staff in certain crisis situations to see if it is helping the child to be at school at that time.

Boys and Girls Club

It is felt by some workers that the Boys and Girls Club helps keep children off the street by providing recreation, social stimulation, and a place to stay away from the Village while mothers work. The recreation center director spoke about the facilities for arts and crafts, woodworking, and assorted activities. Space has been loaned to the Child Behavior Institute during the summer and children in the program can share the pool and the gym. Workers in both organizations have also discussed the possibility of training workers at the Club in behavior management skills. As mentioned previously, workers in Human Services, KCDC, and the Boys and Girls Club contact each other conerning day care, child abuse, health related problems, transportation, and

referral. In addition, the Boys and Girls Clubs employ children recommended by the schools through the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

The Boys Club and the Girls Club are two separate organizations although they have been considered as one throughout much of this paper. They occupy the same building, share facilities, and work together on such things as day care pick-up. Workers from the Girls Club have helped the staff at the Boys Club with their Title XX proposal. Lots of information is exchanged between the Clubs who also work together on the Community Development Fund project. At various times, workers at each Club will get advice from each other and will invite all the children to special programs.

Legal Aid

Only a few people commented on their interactions with Legal Aid because of the limited contact described earlier. Workers from the Child Behavior Institute and KCDC refer clients there when help is needed with legal matters. Occasionally, the schools will provide workers with information on a child's reputation and attendance before a case comes to trial. Also, as mentioned previously, lawyers are suing Human Services for custody of a child as agreed by both parties. Finally, staff from Legal Aid have worked with the executive director of the Girls Club on a needs assessment project in conjunction with Title XX funding.

Community Action Council

The last organization to be considered is the Community Action Council, an agency that helps locate resources such as money, food, coal,

transportation, furniture, jobs, clothing, etc. They provide the space for the Boys and Girls Club and the summer program sponsored by the Child Behavior Institute. There is also a Senior Citizens nutrition program and a Golden Age Club sponsored by the Community Action Council. Almost all the agencies in the community exchange information and referrals with workers at the Community Action Council. They also bring applications for food stamps or clients themselves to the office. In addition, workers from the Community Action Council have been included on evaluations at the Girls Club because of their knowledge of certain case histories.

The director or manager of the Community Action Council has been directly responsible for many of the services provided by his agency according to subjects in this study. He has helped promote the Child Behavior Institute summer program by setting up field trips, getting bus transportation, and by getting free lunches for the children. As director, he coordinates use of the facilities for the Boys and Girls Club, the Child Behavior Institute, the recreation center, and other community groups. He has also taken a course at the Child Behavior Institute and has received graduate credit for his endeavors on their behalf.

As hypothesized, the interactions between workers in different community organizations centered around a few major activities depending on the size, location, and function of each agency. Although many subjects mentioned the exchange of information and referrals, it seems that certain agencies are used primarily as sources of information and referrals while others tend to be the recipient more often. A number of agencies are linked together on cases concerning child abuse, day care, and health

related problems. In addition, many workers felt they were responsible for informing their clients about services provided by other agencies in the area. Of course, it must be remembered that the subjects in this sample represent a small percentage of workers and agencies that have input into the Vestal Community.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING INTERACTIONS BETWEEN AGENCIES

Many of the recommendations for improving interactions between agencies in the community stress the importance of maintaining regular and open communication between workers. Breakdowns in the system seem to occur when time constraints caused by hugh caseloads prevent workers from following through on cases or from adequately explaining service operations to consumers and other workers. On the other hand, when workers understand the tasks and services in other organizations, there is greater likelihood that they can work effectively together. It is almost inevitable, though, that there will still be problems related to the bureaucratic structure and interpersonal differences between individuals. These results are illustrated in Figure 1.

KCDC Social Services

Two workers from the recreation center both suggested having monthly bull sessions or meetings with staff from KCDC to provide feedback to each other. The eligibility specialist suggested swapping information on clients on a more regular basis as well. Her supervisor thought things were pretty good between the agencies, but felt that KCDC workers should not develop hard feelings when they cannot process

Regularly scheduled meetings

Exchanging information on a regular basis

Improved understanding of functions of other agencies

Defensiveness about worker's own agency

Greater clarification of roles and responsibilities of various social workers

Better intergration at community centers

Two-way communication between agency workers

Monthly list of case numbers

Bureaucratic problems--information forms, channels to go through, worker awareness, filling out papers, etc.

Clearer definitions of specific service responsibilities and domains

Better coordination of Medicaid screenings

Confidentiality especially in cases of child abuse

More coordination between large multi-service agencies

More respect and concern for consumers

Preventive health care

Liaison with juvenile courts to provide preventive care

Day long seminars or problem solving meetings

Specific contact person within an agency, especially in the schools

Liaison social workers in community centers

Coordinating worker visits in different agencies

Freer rein for schools, especially in cases involving child custody

Visitations to other agencies

Community information bank for families in need

Investigating untapped resources within the community

FIGURE 1

IMPROVING INTERACTIONS BETWEEN AGENCIES

a client for Food Stamps more quickly. At U. T. Hospital, the social service director believed staff in both agencies could work better together if they were less defensive about their own particular bailiwicks. A teacher at the day care center also mentioned trying to get a better understanding of each others functions by regularly attending staff meetings. In addition, a worker from the Girls Club expressed the need for social workers who both have charge of social services to get together to decide who will do what.

Another worker from the Girls Club stated that she did not know what workers did at KCDC. A Child Behavior Institute worker did not know whether it was necessary for her in the schools to interact with KCDC staff, but felt it was imperative for workers in the families to use the agencies to help find out where children live. It was also believed that the school should get together more with KCDC, especially by using the visitation apartment provided in the Village. Although another Child Behavior Institute worker thought the interaction was satisfactory for what was needed, he expressed a great deal of resentment about the way he felt residents were treated at the housing project. He believed it was very important to consider the clients' feelings and treat them with equal respect.

Day Care Center and Recreation Center

The only recommendation concerning the day care center was that they need to use the recreation center more often. Workers from KCDC thought the interagency relations were real good. It was felt by one of these subjects, though, that workers from the recreation center should

sit in on staff meetings now and then. The teacher wanted to have the weekly films reinstated. One of the workers thought it would be a good idea to work with the recreation center to downplay their differences because the Boys Club had a reputation as a white club.

Child Behavior Institute

Two subjects from KCDC expressed the desire to know what Child Behavior Institute workers were doing and which children they were working with. They stated that Child Behavior Institute staff members did not communicate back to them and that workers had not been to the office for a long time. A worker at the Girls Club was dismayed at the "little wild Indians" seemingly forced to be in the summer program. Her counterpart believed it would be desirable to have periodic sessions with the Child Behavior Institute staff to get advice on special problems or to refer children to them.

Human Services

When it came to Human Services, it was felt by one KCDC worker that it would be nice to get a monthly list of case numbers because they receive payments on the basis of that figure. Two of the workers spoke about the delay in receiving forms and getting information, partly because it was necessary to go through so many channels. Workers from Food Stamps also spoke about receiving interoffice forms more regularly, despite good relations. A subject from the Girls Club believed they should be more organized in this respect as well, citing an incident in which 15 or 20 contracts that were supposed to be picked up a certain day.

Although she believed more needed to be done about health problems, speech problems, emotional problems, and about replacing broken glasses, she was leary about stepping on toes. The nurse mentioned that programs such as Medicaid screening were not very well coordinated. Seemingly, there was confusing information being passed on, partly because there were joint meetings for supervisors but not for those giving the care. It was felt by an intake worker at the Community Action Council that although they worked very well together with Human Services, the workers there should visit homes more frequently. Finally, one subject spoke about the need for confidentiality in child protective cases while describing an incident where this was breached.

U. T. Hospital

The social worker at U. T. Hospital called for more mutual understanding of the orientation and roles of her staff and medical staff. She believed that hospital personnel were dedicated, but sometimes exhibited poor attitudes because they were so overworked and under such stress. Although she was aware of the long waits, she mentioned that the emergency room was understaffed; sometimes, as well, it was a question of ordering priorities differently. One of the Child Behavior Institute workers thought they should treat the patients with more humanity and improve the line of communication, especially with respect to the psychiatric ward. Another subject believed they should take appointments at the clinic so that 50-75 people would not have to sit there all day. Based on reports from clients, it was felt by one worker that doctors are not as thorough with Medicaid patients because they do

not care about patients or because there are so many cases. The nurse stated that it would be very helpful if interns or residents knew more about public health so they would make more referrals. She thought one of the primary problems was that there was no medical facilities for the unemployed unless you considered the emergency room. In the long run, it will probably cost the taxpayer more if problems like heart disease and diabetes are ignored at early stages. It is also felt by the supervisor at Human Services that more coordination was needed in large multi-service agencies of this sort and that rules on eligibility should be spelled out to welfare workers. A last subject from the Child Behavior Institute was interested in getting some referrals from U. T.. Hospital if possible.

Health Clinic and Legal Aid

Once again, there were few comments concerning the Health Clinic and Legal Aid. One subject stated that if the Clinic could transport their own people, it would take a load off the Community Action Council. The teacher thought they were doing a good job, particularly the nurse in this study, but felt they should take more time with mothers to fill out papers for day care instead of expecting them to do it. Social workers mentioned that Legal Aid was in South Knoxville a short time. A supervisor mentioned that they have not received referrals from Human Services because they have just become aware of their existence there. One of the workers from the Child Behavior Institute theorized about setting up a liaison with the juvenile courts through Legal Aid in order to set up a referral system and to provide more preventive care before the children get older and more delinquent.

Food Stamps

One of the subjects from KCDC desired a closer relationship with the supervisor of Food Stamps. Another worker also thought there was a lack of communication because the only time they seemed to call was when they were cutting off someone's food stamps. It was also felt they should expedite things over there so they would not have to seek other resources for food. In addition, this worker believed they should have better appointments for people so that people would not have to sit all day. A subject also mentioned that if Food Stamps workers would organize things differently, aides from the Community Action Council would not have to keep running around in order to recertify clients who are unable to go there.

Schools

One of the Child Behavior Institute workers suggested having a day long seminar, a full day problem solving meeting at Gatlinburg, or anything to break the isolation between teachers, parents, and Child Behavior Institute staff. Another worker believed that the Child Behavior Institute should be more organized, make stronger attempts at unobtrusiveness, and do a better job of following up on promises. Workers from KCDC and Human Services thought that the interactions with the schools were good. It was felt by the day care teacher, though, that she would like to have a better understanding of what was going on there by being informed through the mail about the pre-school round-up and preliminary registration. A worker from KCDC stated that it would help if there was one person with a sympathetic ear to contact in each school. It was also

believed that even though Knox County was unique in that the nurses had more time to spend in the schools there, Vestal School could use someone full time. They are in the process of hiring a liaison caseworker at the Boys Club to improve interactions with other agencies like the schools. One of the workers thinks they should work more closely with the schools to help children with academic and behavior problems. This is happening to a certain extent at the Girls Club where workers are going to the schools to find out how staff at the Club can help children with problems. Unfortunately, it seems that contact with teachers and the superintendent of schools has been very negative concerning attempts to get a tutoring program started. Apparently, they are very defensive about them providing extra reading help for the Girls at the Club because they can see no reason for Girls Club staff to get involved in their job.

Community Action Council

Many of the subjects thought their relationship with workers from the Community Action Council was either adequate or good. One woman spoke about how cooperative and helpful they are, again mentioning transportation and the Senior Citizen program. A worker from the recreation center thought communication could be improved. Workers at the Boys and Girls Club believed workers should have more access to people in the health department and should possibly coordinate visits with staff at the Club. It was also felt that Community Action Council workers should make sure that the information on applications to Food Stamps is accurate so that only the people who need the stamps will get them.

Boys and Girls Club

Workers from the Child Behavior Institute felt that the manager of the building and staff members from the Boys and Girls Club had been very helpful without receiving much in return. A few of these workers were interested in providing much in return. A few of these workers were interested in providing consultation services to help staff there reorganize certain things and learn the use of behavior management skills. On the other hand, workers from the recreation center felt that they wanted more personal contact with people at the Clubs because the only time there seems to be interchange is when someone needs something. A worker from Child Behavior Institute believes that there is too much red tape to go through since there has been a change of directors. It was also felt by one of the workers at the Girls Club that the two Clubs should be more consistent with programming and discipline instead of having two different sets of standards.

General Recommendations

In addition to the specific recommendations listed for each organization, many subjects spoke about some more general recommendations for improving interactions between agencies. The guidance counselor stated that less friction would develop if each worker were more familiar with the overall program at different agencies. In certain situations, workers at an agency believed certain things should be done or services be provided when they were actually outside the domain of the other organization. Although the principal thought all the agencies were very cooperative, he felt that the biggest problem was tied up in legalities.

He wanted a freer rein in certain cases involving pregnant students and child custody where school officials seemingly had a better knowledge of the home situation than the judge. When disasterous results occurred because of such things as improper placements, he could not help but feel defeated. The principal went on to say that he would like the staff in the school to be involved more often in a position of influence instead of coming up against the wall so often.

The director of the recreation center believed that agencies need to get involved with what was going on in the community by visitations to find out what was needed and what could be done to help. In this way, people could learn that services can be relied on. He suggested there be something like a community bank where individuals could call in certain situations. For instance, the Food Stamps card might be ready, but the client may have no money, no friends, and no way to get there. In addition, he suggested that there be a monthly bull session of organizations to discuss problems in different areas. He stated that some problems might be solved if staff from different recreation centers in the area exchanged some ideas.

One of the Child Behavior Institute workers thought it was important to keep in closer touch with social service agencies in the community. He felt that the Child Behavior Institute could not continue to operate autonomously if they were to bring about long term changes. It was believed as well that there were untapped sources like the Mayor's Office and the Lions Club that could provide money for trips or glasses for children if they were contacted. According to one subject from

KCDC, it was a question of personalities. She mentioned that some people in certain agencies cannot or do not want to deal with KCDC or communicate back. The supervisor from Human Services stated that it might be better if all agencies were under the same umbrella.

As suggested previously, many of the recommendations called for more frequent contact between agencies so that workers could better understand the organizations each represent. Some called for regularly scheduled meetings, different administrative structures, and more clearly differentiated service responsibilities. A few spoke of defensiveness and other personal qualities that interfered with the communication process in certain cases. Overall, the subjects expressed a very positive desire to work together in order to most effectively serve the people in the community.

XI. QUESTIONS ABOUT THE AGENCIES

Most of the individuals spoke about getting better knowledge or understanding of particular agencies when they were asked whether they had any questions about other organizations in the community. This question gave subjects the opportunity to come up with more recommendations on improving services and to further express their opinions on these other agencies. Some of the subjects mentioned certain organizations that were not included in this study.

A worker from the Child Behavior Institute said she would like to know more about what workers at KCDC Social Services do because some of the parents do not have a positive view of them. She suggested inviting

them over for a seminar. A fellow worker thought it was important to know more about Human Services since they have the most comprehensive view of the community. It was felt that this could be another source of referrals for the Child Behavior Institute. Once again it was felt by this worker and one from the Girls Club that KCDC did not have local support. A third Child Behavior Institute subject and one of the directors from the Girls Club were unclear about the various roles of workers at social service agencies and especially where each organization begins and where each leaves off.

The principal at the high school remarked that he would like to understand the overall program with respect to social services. For instance, he would like to know who has the authority when a child is sick and needs to go home, but the parents are unavailable. In addition, he would like to know in specific cases whether to contact the health nurse or the Lions Club for glasses for a child. One of the subjects from the recreation center wanted to know more about the Health Clinic, especially their hours, so workers could provide them with more feedback.

Subjects from the recreation center, KCDC, U. T. Hospital, the high school, and the Health Clinic all wanted to know more about the Child Behavior Institute. The social worker at U. T. said she would welcome the opportunity to talk to them. A teacher from the day care center stated that she would like to have a flyer or brochure to pass out to parents and to teach her about services offered by Legal Aid. The intake worker at Community Action Council wanted to know why eligibility requirements for Food Stamps were changed so often and why they do not screen

clients better at Human Services and Food Stamps. Finally, the director from the recreation center mentioned that he would like to see a Golden Age Club in the area.

Workers from KCDC, Human Services, and Food Stamps mentioned that in general it would be helpful to know about all the agencies in the community. The worker from KCDC spoke particularly about agencies like Birth Defects that worked with children who had abnormalities or handicaps. There were also some individuals who felt they had sufficient knowledge of services offered by organizations in the community. This was a difficult question for many subjects, including those in the families who in every case but one stated that they did not have any questions. It seems that it puts people on the spot when you ask them directly whether they have any questions.

XII. RATINGS ON WORKING CLOSELY WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND ON SIMILARITY OF TASKS AND SERVICES

Working Closely with other Agencies

When subjects were asked to rate how beneficial they thought it would be to work in close collaboration with other organizations, it was a welcome relief at the end of the interview session. Most individuals worked quickly on this question and the next one concerning the similarity of tasks and services. A number of subjects made comments while they were working to explain their ratings.

The lawyer felt that this question was inappropriate because it depends on each case whether or not he is an adversary or ally of an

organization. Four subjects from the recreation center, KCDC, U. T. Hospital, and Human Services felt it was very beneficial to work closely with all these agencies. An intake worker from the Community Action Council felt it was never detrimental, although she mentioned the problem of infringing on domains. One worker suggested the words "mutually beneficial" should replace "close collaboration" to improve the question.

All subjects with the exception of the lawyer, rated at least three agencies and as many as twelve. Nine subjects rated all the agencies; the number was twelve at times because workers at the Girls Club rated the Boys Club and the social worker at U. T. Hospital rated that organization. There were only nine ratings out of 207 that suggested it would be somewhat detrimental or detrimental to work in close collaboration with agenceis. It was explained in one case that this rating was given because of the way this particular agency was viewed by the public. Only the Child Behavior Institute and the Health Clinic received less than seventeen ratings; they respectively got thirteen and eleven ratings. The results are summarized in Table 14.

All in all, the respective totals were 45, 63, and 90 for the three categories "somewhat beneficial," "beneficial," and "very beneficial." In order to rank the agencies, each one of the categories was given a numerical value from -2 to +3. That was multiplied by the total number of ratings. The scores obtained ranged from 1.26 to 2.62. Human Services, the local schools, and the Health Clinic received almost identically high ratings. Only five agencies received ratings lower than two. The recreation center and Food Stamps received the lowest ratings in this group. It must be remembered that these two agencies

TABLE 14

RATINGS ON WORKING IN CLOSE COLLABORATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

	Detrimental	Somewhat Detrimental	Somewhat Beneficial	Beneficial	Very Beneficial	Total	Rating	Rank
KCDC Social Ser.	2	0	1	6	8	17	1.94	8.5
Day Care	0	1	6	2	8	17	1.94	8.5
Recreation Center	2	1	6	7	3	19	1.26	12
Human Services	0	0	1	7	11	19	2.53	3
Food Stamps	1	2	5	6	6	10	1.55	11
Health Clinic	0	0	2	1	10	13	2.62	1
UT Hospital	0	0	5	7	7	19	2.11	6
Schools	0	0	2	3	13	18	2.61	2
C.B.I.	0	0	4	1	6	11	2.18	5
Boys-Girls Club	0	0	2	9	8	19	2.32	4
Legal Aid	0	0	6	7	4	17	1.88	10
C.A.C.	0	0	5	7	6	18	2.06	7
Total	5	4	45	63	90	207	$\overline{X}$=2.06	

serve particular functions that do not necessitate considerable contact with other agencies in the community.

Similarity of Tasks and Services

A few subjects mentioned how difficult it was to describe in ratings how much they thought the tasks and services in the listed organizations were similar to those in their own agencies. One individual stated that the agencies were different in their day to day operation, but very similar in the sense that they were helping people. Some differentiated the agencies according to health functions versus social service functions. In all, there were 124 ratings recorded by the 21 subjects in 11 organizations. Subjects only rated agencies when they felt they had sufficient knowledge of the service operations.

All subjects in the study, except the lawyer, rated at least seven agencies and as many as twelve agencies. There were different totals listed on this question because some individuals would rate an agency like Legal Aid even if they had little personal contact. On the other hand, subjects on the last question who categorically stated that it would be beneficial to work with all agencies, could not very well rate an organization like the Child Behavior Institute, whose functions were unknown in some cases. In fact, the Child Behavior Institute was the only agency to receive less than 16 ratings. The results are summarized in Table 15.

Of the 214 ratings obtained, 124 suggested that subjects felt other agencies were different from theirs. The following frequencies were obtained for the six categories from "very different" to "very

TABLE 15

PERCEIVED SIMILARITY OF TASKS AND SERVICES

	Very Different	Different	Somewhat Different	Somewhat Similar	Similar	Very Similar	Total	Rating	Rank
KCDC Social Ser.	1	4	4	4	3	3	19	.21	5
Day Care	1	5	2	2	4	2	16	.06	7
Recreation Center	1	6	6	1	2	0	16	-1.00	9
Human Services	1	4	1	4	5	3	18	.61	1
Food Stamps	8	4	2	2	0	0	16	-2.00	12
Health Clinic	7	4	3	2	3	1	20	-1.05	8
UT Hospital	9	3	2	4	3	0	21	-1.10	10
Schools	0	6	0	8	3	3	20	.55	3
C.B.I.	0	5	0	3	1	0	9	.56	2
Boys-Girls Club	3	3	5	2	2	6	21	.19	6
Legal Aid	9	5	1	4	0	0	19	1.79	11
C.A.C.	0	5	4	4	3	3	19	.26	4
Total	40	54	30	40	20	21	214	$\bar{X}$=.45	

similar": 40, 54, 30, 40, 29, and 21. At least five categories were used by subjects to describe all agencies but three; for these agencies three or four categories were used. A chi-square test was significant at the .005 level, (x^2 = 18.6; d.f. = 5) indicating that the differences between frequencies did not occur by chance. Once again, rankings for the agencies were obtained by giving each of the categories listed a numerical value from -3 to +3. The scores ranged from -2.00 to +.61. Food Stamps and Legal Aid were considered to be the agencies most different than the others according to subjects. Negative ratings were also given to the recreation center, the Health Clinic, and U. T. Hospital. On the other hand, the highest positive ratings were obtained by Human Services, the local schools, and the Child Behavior Institute.

When the ranks were compared for the two questions, the biggest difference was seven for the Health Clinic; there was a difference of four for U. T. Hospital. A rank-order correlation resulted in a coefficient of .59, indicating that the desire to work in close collaboration with another agency is related to the perceived similarity of tasks and services. It is considered more beneficial in most instances to work closely with organizations with similar functions. Two noticeable exceptions were the organizations in health related fields. When these two agencies are not included, the correlation coefficient of .82 indicates an even stronger relationship between the two ratings for ten agencies.

It is interesting to note that two agencies which provide limited services and offer fewer opportunities for contact than multi-service organizations, received the lowest ratings on the two questions. The

agencies which received the highest ratings are perhaps the two most complex organizations in the group who probably come in touch with the greatest percentage of families as well. In other words, subjects in this study felt it was more beneficial to work closely with agencies that have the most service responsibilities.

XIII. EVALUATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

When individuals in the families were asked to evaluate the questionnaire, only a few had much to say. Three subjects thought the questions were all right and a fourth remarked that the interviewer covered it pretty close. One person repeated his criticism of the question on perceived similarity, stating that it was tough unless you knew the people well.

One woman, though, told the interviewer that he should have asked people whether they think landladies and managers are doing their job, are prompt, or are prone to give faulty excuses. About this same time, she again asked why the various agencies cannot work together instead of in different directions and expressed discontent over the number of calls and referrals back and forth that were made. Another subject commented on the failure of the project designed to give residents more security. One woman also spoke about her experiences with the McNabb Center when her son was seeing a psychologist there. Finally, two individuals specifically asked for a copy of the results at the end of the interview session.

As might be expected, the workers in the agencies had a lot to say when they evaluated the questionnaire. Like the subjects in the

families, they used this opportunity to mention certain organizations that were not included in this study or to emphasize certain points once again. Nine or ten subjects had no comments or thought the interviewer covered it pretty well.

A worker from Child Behavior Institute thought it would be helpful to ask people more about their roles, what they do, and how they go about providing services to places. It was felt that perhaps there should also be some questions concerning whether organizations and the Child Behavior Institute see each other as being helpful or intrusive. This subject also mentioned that it was difficult to rate social agencies because he had little awareness of their roles other than general impressions.

The recreation director thought the questions were quite adequate, but again expressed his desire to find a way to get more finances to increase materials and broaden activities. Another worker there remarked that some families may not know the meanings of some of the words on the questionnaire. She went on to say how things had improved in the last six months because of the leadership provided by the director. The last worker mentioned that the people in families do not know her background and would probably have different answers because they do not know she was raised like them. The principal suggested giving the questionnaire to agencies in different areas. Although he said that he knew what the interviewer was driving at, he felt that the most difficult questions were those on how he viewed the families and vice versa. He believed that it was almost impossible to answer these questions and that he was the most uncertain about his responses to these questions.

One of the KCDC workers felt there should be more structure on the question on what they did for families. She was uncertain about what was wanted because much of the contact is related to services they cannot get for clients. It was felt that the questions could be posed as what did agencies do for clients and how can they help clients get services. In addition, she thought the question on perceived similarity was strange. A fellow worker also believed that this question was hard to answer and that a few questions were repetitious. She stated that the following organizations should have been included on the list: Social Security, the churches, the Veteran's Administration, FISH, and Ladies of Charity. A third worker from KCDC mentioned that the Helen Ross McNabb Center should be on the list since so many residents are outpatients there.

The teacher from the day care center thought the interviewer did a good job of covering the agencies in Vestal as well as targetting in on Montgomery Village. An eligibility specialist believed that the interviewer picked a very poor sample of South Knoxville because there would be much different opinions expressed anywhere else in the area. A social worker from Human Services mentioned a few more vital agencies, including Child and Family Services, the Dameron Consumer Credit Council, Birth Defects, the Salvation Army, and churches like Vestal Methodist and New Prospect. The last church sponsored a shelter home for families and maintained a day care center. This subject also spoke about problems in the area including emergency housing, care for the elderly, care for the retarded, and services for adolescent offenders. She went on to explain many of the other services provided by workers at Human Services.

In addition, the lawyer repeated that the best way to address questions to the staff at Legal Aid would be on a case by case basis. A worker at the Boys Club mentioned their involvement with the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and work-study programs with U. T. and Knoxville Business College. Lastly, one of the directors of the Girls Club thought it would be helpful to do a questionnaire of this sort in the whole community using different agencies like Girl Scouts, "Y's," the United Way, and other civic organizations.

Subjects in this study provided the interviewer with a list of from 10 to 15 agencies active in the community that were not included in the questionnaire. A few people suggested that the questionnaire be administered to a larger sample representing more organizations within the area. Although few criticisms of the instrument were aired, several individuals remarked how difficult it was to answer questions on perceived similarity and to guess how the subjects would respond to the same question. It was also interesting to see how many subjects diverged from the task at hand to speak further about issues that were important to them.

XIV. OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

Before proceding to the discussion section, it might be useful to describe some results that are more related to the personal nature of the interview process than the content. First off, it was fascinating to see how open the individuals in the families were when they were approached about doing the interviews. Despite the fact that none of

the people had met the interviewer before, all agreed to participate in the project with little introduction or explanation. Even though the sessions lasted approximately one hour, none of the subjects became overly impatient or annoyed when questions were tedious or demanding in some other way. They had no qualms about expressing their opinions to the interviewer with little or no censorship of what they said. The people were all friendly even when they had strong negative feelings about the Child Behavior Institute, which served as a link for the interviewer. In this one situation where two adults were present, there was some tension because of the overbearing manner of the husband. It would most certainly have been a different interview if the woman was there alone. The other sessions were generally filled with a lot more humor and verbal exchange. Two of the women really seemed to enjoy talking to the interviewer, who often had to get them back on the track to complete the task at hand. In addition, most of the subjects told the interviewer to come by when he is in the neighborhood and to say hello to the people at the Child Behavior Institute. It is uncertain how much of the smoothness of the interactions can be attributed to the personality of the interviewer or to the openness of the subjects.

Although the subjects in the agencies were somewhat more guarded about what they said than were individuals in the family, they too were surprisingly open about doing the interviews. In some cases, the interviewer had a head start because he knew some of the subjects from previous contact in the design stages of the project. One of the workers from KCDC and all the workers from the Child Behavior Institute were familiar with the interviewer because of their associations with the

University of Tennessee. Individuals were just as quick to agree to do the interviews when they had no previous contact with the interviewer. Even though more explanation was given to workers concerning the nature of the project, it still is surprisingly how little effort it took to convince them to sit down with the interviewer for 45 minutes to an hour. Part of the reason for this seems to be that the interview session was often viewed as a welcome relief from the busy daily routine. In addition, many of the workers appeared to be challenged by some of the questions and thankful for the opportunity to express their opinions on the issues discussed. Of course, some of the interviews took more or less time according to the rapport built up, the garrulousness of the subjects, and the amount of contact subjects had with families and other agencies. Many of the subjects spoke to the interviewer for at least 10 or 15 minutes after the pen and paper were laid to rest. All of the interviews evolved differently according to the nature of the personal interaction between the interviewer and each subject.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this section, the methodology and results will be discussed with respect to some of the issues raised in the review of the literature and possible implications for future research. An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses associated with the type of design employed in this study will be included in this discussion. Sepcific suggestions for refining this particular methodology will be presented as well. In addition, the subjects' responses to questions concerning their perceptions of services will be compared to those reported in the research cited earlier in this paper.

I. METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

To begin with, although the procedure for obtaining subjects was effective, it was very much dependent upon the openness of the system and the personality of the interviewer who is trained as a psychologist and who has experience working with families and in the schools. It would be interesting to see how successful another researcher would be in obtaining subjects by knocking on doors in this community or others. There is also some uncertainty as to what would have happened if people higher up the administrative ladder were contacted prior to interviews instead of appropriate individuals further down the line. Certainly, there is little doubt in the case of Vestal School that the principal and staff there were more than willing to participate in the project. In a different way, the fact that the interviewer was familiar with the

system as a result of earlier probes and participation in a summer project, helped him gain smooth entry into the system.

There is also some question as to the representativeness of the sample because of the way in which the choices of subjects and agencies were made. Because a primary purpose of the project was to present a description of a community service network by interviewing selected individuals within the system, it was decided to use only those individuals residing in Montgomery Village who had some connection with the Child Behavior Institute and mainly those agencies situated directly in the Vestal community. Even though at least one person was interviewed in each of the organizations and the sample contained individuals from many different strata within the organization, subject selection was based to a certain extent on accessibility to the system. There were a few organizations like the McNabb Center and local churches that could have been included just as easily if more interviewers were employed or if more time were available to this researcher. It would be interesting to see how well the responses obtained from subjects in these families reflect the general sentiments of others in the housing project, in the Vestal area, and in other communities. When a pilot study was performed with middle class subjects in Blount County, the results were quite different. Despite these considerations, there was a good cross section of subjects interviewed in this study who aired views that assuredly are common themes for those who are involved in the receipt and delivery of social services.

As previously noted, the interview process was affected by the personal nature of the interactions with each of the subjects. Although rapport was generally good in all of the sessions, there were certain

individuals who hit it off especially well with the interviewer. In these cases, there was less emphasis on task oriented behavior than in other situations when the interviewer or the subject was rushed for time or when the interviewer or the subject was rushed for time or when the interviewer was less enthused about the individual. There was some effort on the part of the interviewer to be as consistent as possible with subjects, but many extraneous variables (such as mood or time of day) undoubtedly affected the process with different individuals. In addition, certain people required more explanation of the nature of the project, took more time to respond to questions, or felt it was necessary to explain responses and fill the interviewer in on other important aspects of service operations. The interviewer tried to get the subjects to respond as well as they could to the questions without turning them off to the entire process. Therefore, there were many judgments made as when to interject humor, when to prod individuals, when to move on quickly to another question, and when to reinforce subjects for what they were saying. Some of these differences are inherent in the interview process itself. It would take a highly sensitive person to replicate this process which is based on building relationships with subjects over a short period of time. There is a great deal of skill involved in making the individuals comfortable with the interviewer whom they have just met. To get into the home and then carry on an interview for approximately an hour requires patience, experience, and warmth. This type of approach can only be successive when individuals believe that the interviewer cares about what they are saying.

Another important aspect of the process related to the fact that all the interviews took place in each subject's own natural environment. Subjects in agencies were interviewed where they worked and families were interviewed in their homes. It seems as though the interviews might have been different if the locations were changed to a more neutral or more or less relaxed environments. For instance, one can speculate whether workers would have been less guarded if they were spoken to in their homes or in a local restaurant. Again, since a great deal of openness was exhibited by all subjects, the results may only have been affected if individuals were met in places more threatening than their homes and offices. The results may have also been adversely affected if the interviewer was seen as an agent of the system with power to change policy or influence decisions within the organization. In addition, some small differences may have been noted if the interviewer had used a tape recorder instead of trying to write down what was being said during the interview. It must be repeated that all these aspects that are unique to this process did not detract from the purpose at hand which was to gain a description of the community.

At this point, it may be instructive to move on to a discussion of the particular interview instrument used in this project. Most of the subjects thought that the questions asked by the interviewer were straightforward, although there were some problems noted for some of the questions that involved ratings. One question in particular, concerning perceived similarity between workers and individuals, was difficult for many subjects to answer because of the wording as well as

the task at hand. There are so many dimensions of similarity that the definition provided by the interviewer still left doubt as to what was expected. In addition, there are some strong emotional overtones attached to the question that were not anticipated by the researcher. There was also quite a bit of discrepancy between how familiar subjects were with the individuals whom they rated. In certain situations, individuals were rating agencies on the basis of personal contact with a number of workers who represented all extremes on the scales. Also, in actuality, workers were mainly responding to how similar they felt they were to the mother in each family. There was quite a bit of difference, though, when subjects rated families in general pointing out the efficacy of trying to be as specific as possible. Finally, it is a difficult chore for anybody to respond to how they think another individual will answer a particular question.

Interestingly enough, it was much easier for subjects to rate similarity of tasks and services than to rate similarity between individuals. There was also some problem with the question of how beneficial it was to work in close collaboration with other agencies. The words "close collaboration" threw one subject off. In addition, this question was somewhat inappropriate for agencies like Legal Aid, where lawyers are advocates or adversaries depending upon the case. A few individuals gave categorical ratings instead of trying to meet the intention of the question which was to differentiate between agencies. Lastly, some of the ratings provided by families on perceived helpfulness of agencies were so tied to their personal contacts with one or a few workers that they

reflected little about the overall agency's effectiveness.

Some of the criticisms mentioned concerning these questions reflect the problems with ratings in general. It is difficult to come up with appropriate categories for some of the questions at hand. Although the data is meaningful from the standpoint that all subjects are under the same constraints, it is difficult to generalize too much about the results. It is fascinating, as well, to observe how different people try to interpret the ratings to satisfy their needs to be clearly understood. Most people seemed to enjoy the questions and worked quickly; only a few pondered laboriously over the ratings.

On some other questions which required subjects to indicate how much contact they had with each other or various agencies, it was hoped that a more complete picture of the interactions would be obtained if contact was broken up into a few categories. Although the results were interesting, the process for subjects was often tedious as they tried to recall how many phone calls they might have had with various agencies. It was especially important to give subjects support on this question by encouraging them to just do the best they could. Because of these considerations, there was a great deal of variance in the way subjects responded to this question. Some workers were extremely efficient and quick; they seemed very confident in their assessments. Other workers and subjects in the families hemmed and hawed, thought out loud, and occasionally forgot to include a certain category. The totals obtained reflect the subjects best "guesstimates" of amount of contact.

Once again, it was difficult to obtain an accurate count of how many people subjects came into contact within the various organizations

in the community. In some cases, there were so many over the six month period that it was not easy to remember who they were. In such places as U. T. Hospital where so many doctors and nurses are present, it is hard to say exactly how many people were contacted. It was informative, though, to see how many times certain names were given because they perhaps represent key contact people in the community. The responses to these last few questions were helpful in understanding the overall picture of the service network.

There were also some problems associated with open-ended questions that were designed to learn about the important reasons for contact between agencies. Subjects believed it was somewhat repetitious to ask what workers in each agency did for each other because they often adequately explained the nature of the contact in their first response. There was some awkwardness involved in cases when the interactions were one sided. It is felt that more responses might have been given on another question if the wording was changed from "Do you have. . ." to "What are some questions you have about agencies in the community?" Maybe the fact that subjects are put on the spot in either case, will limit the possibility of getting many responses. In general, open-ended questions provide a great deal of information to researchers on the topic at hand. Unfortunately, the unique interpretations given to even very structured questions as well as the wealth of data recorded make the data analysis a time-consuming chore. The mix of objective questions and open-ended questions seems to help keep the interest up among subjects and to provide a fuller picture of the phenomena.

Finally, it must be stated that there was confusion among subjects about which agencies were being specified. A few people responded inappropriately by referring to an agency with a similar function or title not included on the list, even after an explanation by the interviewer. There was confusion as well because the Boys Club and Girls Club were considered as one agency, although in fact they are separate organizations occupying the same building as Legal Aid and the Community Action Council. In addition, it was difficult for some individuals to differentiate KCDC Social Services from maintenance and managerial functions of the agency. In a similar way, it was hard for subjects to evaluate the overall effectiveness of an agency like Human Services, which provides wo many different types of services to families. All of these difficulties encountered point out the importance of being knowledgeable about the organizations in question before interviewing subjects about them.

II. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

At this juncture, there will be a departure from the methodological issues in order to discuss some of the results obtained from the interviews. To begin with, three of these families who are completely dependent on the system resemble the classic examples of multi-problem families described in the literature. All of these families have had personal contact with a number of different workers in most of the organizations listed on the questionnaire, which represent only a small number of agencies serving the community. Their children are often in special education classes, attend day care, receive special services

through the Child Behavior Institute during the summer, get screened through the Health Clinic, and in a few cases use U. T. Hospital like another family might use a family physician. In the past, they have received welfare checks and food stamps and have dealt with more than a few social workers in at least three agencies. The other two families, who at the present time are depending upon few support services despite the fact that they live in public housing, are resentful of all the help some of the residents on welfare receive.

According to group ratings, workers were correct in their predictions that subjects in the families would rate themselves as more similar to workers than was true for subjects in agencies who rated. Despite the fact that the pattern of ratings was significantly different when group frequencies were compared, many workers were confident that subjects in families would provide the same rating or similar ratings in most instances. Once again, the workers were correct in assuming that subjects in the families would give more negative ratings than the subject in agencies when they were asked how helpful various agencies had been. They also felt that subjects in families would provide much more similar ratings than actually was the case. It is difficult to tell how much the differences are due to the fact that the subjects in the families tend to use the extremes of the scales more often than the workers. On the other hand, it is certainly expected that agency personnel would rate their own organization more favorably than the consumers receiving services.

Subjects in the families were much more concrete than workers in their language describing the important functions of each of the organizations. They spoke mainly about specific services, but also described some incidents to illustrate the points they were making. Although most were not very aware of all the day to day operations, they were trusting of people who they believed were helping them. One woman stood out from all the rest because of her extensive knowledge of these agencies. All the subjects emphasized how important the personal touch was when it came to interactions with each other. As was the case in the literature, many more workers talk about returning families to self-support and teaching them self-esteem, while individuals in the families express the desire to get more money, to get medical care, and to have some concerned individual around with whom to converse. Although it seems like the subjects in the different groups come closer to understanding each other than those described in the literature, they still often have frames of reference that are quite different.

Workers and consumers again differed in their responses when they were asked to come up with recommendations for improving services. Subjects in families spoke about intolerable waits, confidentiality, supervision of children, and racial discrimination. Workers spoke about increasing the awareness of consumers and getting more money to expand services. The fact that so many individuals described things outside of their direct control is very consistent with results in the literature that indicate social service agencies need to be more in tune with the clients by developing or adapting evaluation techniques appropriate for

their organization. So much written in the literature has also emphasized how important it is to increase community involvement. It is apparent that staff in agencies, despite constraints caused by enormous caseloads and unrealistic service responsibilities, will have to look more closely into their own organizations in the future in order to improve services. To their credit, many of the workers seemed very sincere about helping consumers as much as possible. Unfortunately, too much of this sentiment seems to be expressed in terms of getting people out of their misery instead of in terms of working together with consumers to find the best possible situation irrespective of conditions.

In a different vein, it can be seen that considerable contact exists between the various agencies in the Vestal community. There is active communication between many organizations on a regular basis according to all various channels. Workers from the Child Behavior Institute and the recreation center have the fewest number of interactions with other organizations. Many of the subjects in this study are well known to other workers throughout the system. Most of the agencies interact with each other in order to exchange referrals and information. One organization in particular is counted on as a direct link to the residents because it is in the housing project. Another agency is often contacted when certain resources such as food, money, and clothing are needed. Three or four agencies are involved in some way in the day care program for children whose families are on welfare. The amount and type of contact reported for each organization is very much related to the function, location, size, and client population.

Despite the fact that there was much more coordination of services apparent between these organizations than was reported for agencies studied in the literature, many of the recommendations for improving services spoke to the issue of having regularly scheduled meetings to provide feedback to each other. A number of workers mentioned breakdowns in the communication process that sometimes interfered with the delivery of services. Other subjects discussed the notion that certain individuals were difficult to deal with because of their personal styles. In addition, many individuals stated that they were unsure about certain service responsibilities for similar agencies and were concerned about not stepping on any toes. Most subjects also spoke about getting better knowledge or understanding of agencies within the community.

When subjects were asked to rate how beneficial it would be to work in close collaboration with other agencies, the overwhelming majority thought it would be at least somewhat beneficial to work with any organization providing services in the community. A very few people thought it would be somewhat detrimental or detrimental to work with a couple of agencies because of the negative way the public apparently viewed an organization or because the services provided were limited enough not to warrant much contact. There appears to be a connection between the way workers rated agencies on this question and the way they responded to the question of similarity of tasks and functions between agencies. It seems that people see proposed contact as being more beneficial when an organization is viewed as similar. Most of the ratings recorded, though, indicate that workers generally feel most other organizations have different functions and responsibilities. Despite this, it

is interesting to see how many of the activities described by agencies are becoming increasingly more involved in social work, psychological, and educational functions. For instance, there are liaison social workers at U. T. Hospital and the Boys and Girls Club at the present time. Workers often talk about teaching values, changing attitudes and behavior, counseling children, and setting up tutoring programs in agencies that were at one time thought of as exclusively oriented to recreation. In addition, certain workers expressed openness about multidisciplinary approaches and were interested in learning more about behavior management skills through consultation with staff from the Child Behavior Institute.

In this study, there was at times a lack of cooperation between social workers in the various agencies because of defensiveness concerning their own bailiwicks. Many of the professionals interviewed had some difficulty describing the functions of their organization and evaluating their own programs. It was useful to view each organization in the context of the whole community since it helped put into perspective some of the comments made by individuals during the interviews. For instance, a few residents were upset about what they considered to be breaches of confidentiality on the part of a social service agency. The way many residents felt about this organization, partly because of this issue, affected the perceptions of certain individuals working with families. Later on, it became obvious that a major purpose of this agency is to supply addresses and other information about clients to workers in other agencies. Some of this information is supplied in

cases concerning child abuse, child custody, eligibility for food stamps, and attendance in school. When the overall picture is understood, the situation can be viewed quite differently.

In addition, because this organization controls the sources of needed information and feedback it exerts a great deal of influence within the community. All other agencies outside the area must contact this one organization in many different situations to get in touch with clients or to find out anything about them. If this agency were to alter its policy on giving out information, other agencies would be greatly affected.

There were certain tensions because some individuals did not know how to differentiate between the domains of different social service workers; they did not know where one agency either started or left off. Some subjects questioned the need for two or more organizations whose workers apparently performed similar functions. People were at a loss about what to do in given situations which were considered out of their own domain. In other instances, communication was only in one direction.

Problems also developed because of the scarcity of resources available to agencies. One supervisor provided the example of how social workers in a certain agency grow impatient when they believe a case is being processed too slowly despite the fact that a family is in dire need. There is some resentment between workers because they do not understand the constraints under which others are working.

Many of the recommendations echoed by workers in this study related to improving interactions between agencies. A few people mentioned more efficient information retrieval and common data banks. Others spoke about

wanting to be informed about policy changes, including the reasons behind these changes. In addition, there were subjects who called for regular meetings to broaden the scope of interactions between agencies. Finally, some individuals also spoke about more centralized administrative structures, greater role clarity, and greater cooperation.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

In this study, the interactions between individuals in selected families and various service organizations are examined. An assessment is made of the type, amount, and quality of contact between the agencies working with these families. The results and methodology are discussed with respect to previous research concerning client and worker perceptions of social services, cooperation between different agencies within a community, and interorganizational relations within a system. The purpose of this study is to present a description of a community service network, including recommendations from the people interviewed about ways in which the delivery of services to consumers can be improved.

In the past, there has been little evaluative research to guide the development and implementation of new programs. It is felt that there is a need to investigate ways in which agencies can work more effectively together to provide coordinated services to communities. Few researchers have systematically explored overall service patterns within an area by asking both workers and clients to respond to questions concerning agency operations. An interview format is employed in this study to trace the particular interactions of a limited number of subjects in families with specific organizations. Workers are also asked to evaluate services provided by these organizations as well as their own agencies and to answer many of the same questions subjects in families are asked. In addition, these interviews are conducted by an individual

free of agency ties who became familiar with the community during the preliminary stages of research.

When the literature is reviewed, many studies indicate that consumers are usually aware of only a few services provided in a community. Workers and clients often have misconceptions about each other, especially when there are large differences in ethnic background and social class. Satisfaction with the services is directly related to the degree of congruence between the attitudes of workers and consumers concerning the services. It is also noted by a number of sources that it is important to keep the public informed about available services so that consumers can be referred to the appropriate agency as quickly as possible. In addition, the importance of coordinating the activities of various agencies within a community service network is stressed. Unfortunately, the increasing demands for services allow a limited amount of time for coordinating activities and educating potential consumers.

A number of individuals have suggested using a multidisciplinary approach to multi-problem families, featuring more centralized administrative authority and continuous responsibility for specific clients. Mental health consultation is seen as an important process for professionals in health related fields, schools, child and family services, the courts, police departments, and other social service agencies. It is felt that the training of workers in the future should include experience with direct cooperation between agencies.

Some techniques of interviewing and examples of questionnaires previously used are cited as well because they helped influence the

present research design. The questionnaires employed in this study were administered personally to individuals in five families and 22 subjects in 12 agencies serving the Vestal community in Knoxville, Tennessee. The interviewer contacted subjects in the families by knocking on their doors in the housing project where they lived, introducing himself as a friend of workers from the Child Behavior Institute, and explaining the nature of the project and requirements for participation. Although some of the workers were previously known to the interviewer, most of the subjects in the agencies were initially contacted by the interviewer in person or by phone. Throughout the sessions, the interviewer tried to make the experience as pleasant as possible by encouraging subjects to speak freely, interjecting humor, and maintaining eye contact while taking notes. All participants were promised a summary of results when the research was completed.

All the participants from the families were selected because they lived in the same area and because of their association with the Child Behavior Institute. Subjects in the two black families and three white families are similar to those described in the literature, in the sense that their relative lack of education and skills prevent them from becoming financially independent with the large families they are supporting. On the other hand, the workers interviewed are highly educated, have varying degrees of supervisory responsibilities and direct contact with consumers, and have huge caseloads.

As was anticipated, there was a great deal of personal contact between individuals in these families and workers (including many in

sample) in various organizations listed on the questionnaires. According to ratings, workers were perceived by subjects in families as being more similar to them than they felt was true. In addition, workers rated their agencies as being more helpful to families than was the case for subjects in families. In both cases, workers' predictions of responses from family members were much closer to actual ratings than their own.

Some individuals in the housing project expressed resentment over all the help certain residents on welfare were receiving. When they were asked to describe the important functions of agencies, some alluded to tensions between blacks and whites in the community. The workers were less concrete in their language when they told the interviewer about the services they provide to multi-problem families living in a community characterized by deprivation.

Subjects in families spoke about lack of equality among residents, supervision of children, long waits, and confidentiality when they were asked how services could be improved. Workers mainly discussed increasing community involvement, increasing community awareness, and expanding present services if money comes available. Responses from all subjects throughout the interviews indicated how important was the personal nature of the interaction between workers and families.

As hypothesized, the considerable contact that exists between workers in different community organizations centers around a few major activities depending upon the size, location and function of each agency. Many agencies are linked together in cases concerning child abuse, day care and health related problems. Subjects often mentioned

the exchange of information and referrals that also characterizes these interactions. Some recommendations called for regularly scheduled meetings, different administrative structures, more clearly differentiated service responsibilities, and improving the communication process. Overall, subjects expressed a positive desire to work together to effectively serve the community. In general, they felt it was more beneficial to work closely with agencies that are similar to them and have the most service responsibilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, M. and J. Hage. Organizational interdependence and intraorganizational structure. Sociological Review, 1968, 33(6), 912-930.

Aldrich, H. Organizational boundaries and interorganizational conflict. In F. Baker (Ed.), Organizational Systems: General Systems Approaches to Complex Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1973.

Baker, F., Ed. Organizational Systems: General Systems Approaches to Complex Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1973.

Baker, F. Introduction: organizations as open systems. In F. Baker (Ed.), Organizational Systems: General Systems Approaches to Complex Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1973.

Baker, F. The living human service organization: application of general systems theory and research. In H. W. Demone, Jr. and D. Harshbarger (Eds.), A Handbook of Human Service Organizations. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Baker, F. and G. O'Brien. Intersystems relations and coordination of human service organizations. In F. Baker (Ed.), Organizational Systems: General Systems Approaches to Complex Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1973

Ballard, R. G. and E. H. Mudd. Some sources of difference between client and agency evaluation of effectiveness of counseling. Social Casework, 1958, 39(1), 30-35.

Bard, R. Program and Staff Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Education, Training, and Research Sciences Corp., 1971.

Bellin, S. S. and H. J. Geiger. Actual public acceptance of the neighborhood health center by the poor. In R. M. Hollister, B. M. Kramer, and S. S. Bellin (Eds.), Neighborhood Health Centers. U.S.A.: D.C. Heath, 1974.

Bellin, S. S. and H. J. Geiger. The impact of a neighborhood health center on patients' behavior and attitudes relating to health care: a study of a low income housing project. In R. M. Hollister, B. M. Kramer, and S. S. Bellin (Eds.), Neighborhood Health Centers. U.S.A. D.C. Heath, 1974.

Borgatta, E. F., D. Fanshel, and H. J. Meyer. Social Workers' Perceptions of Clients. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960.

Bower, E. M. Education as a humanizing process and its relationship to other humanizing processes. In S. E. Golan and C. Eisdorfer (Eds.), Handbook of Community Mental Health. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Briar, S. Family services. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Brieland, D. Children and families. Social Work, 1974, 19(5), 589-579.

Cannell, C. F. and R. L. Kahn Interviewing. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology (Second Edition). U.S.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Carson, G. L. The self-concept of welfare recipients. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 5, 424-428.

Cochran, W. C. Methodological problems in the study of human populations. Annals of the N.Y. Academy of Science, 1963, 107(2), 476-489.

Cole, Dr. W. E. Priority Study: A Survey of Community Services in Knox County. United Community Services of Greater Knoxville, 1971.

Coleman, J. V., R. Janovicz, S. Fleck, and N. Norton. A comparative study of a psychiatric clinic and a family agency: part II. Social Casework, 1957, 38(2), 74-80.

Conway, J. A., R. E. Jennings, and M. M. Milstein. Understanding Communities. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Day, R. J. and I. C. Faust. A Study of Requests for Service from Family and Children's Services, Nashville, Tennessee. in Cases Concerned with Parent-Child Relationships Involving Adolescents. Master Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1962.

Demone, H. W. and R. Harshbarger (Eds.). A Handbook of Human Service Organizations. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Dotson, F. Intensive interviewing in community research. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1954, 27(5), 225-230.

Ebie, J. C. Features of psychiatric relevance at an experimental multi-disciplinary social casework center in Edinburgh. Social Psychiatry, 1971, 6(3), 122-128.

Eddy, W. B., S. M. Paap, and D. D. Glad. Solving problems in living: the citizen's viewpoint. Mental Hygiene, 1970, 54(1), 64-72.

Ellwood, C. A. A study of social attitudes. In P. V. Young (Ed.), Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Fanshel, D. A study of caseworkers' perceptions of their clients. Social Casework, 1958, 39(10), 543-551.

Fanshel, D. Child welfare. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Fine, H. and B. Haythorn. Report of a Committee on a Comprehensive Child Development Center. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1965.

Fischer, J. and H. Miller. The effect of client race and social class on clinical judgments. Clinical Social Work Journal, 1973, 1(2), 100-109.

Gardner, E. J. Tools for a correctional agent. Crime and Delinquency, 1973, 19(1), 54-60.

Geisman, L. L. and M. A. LaSorte. Research interviewing with low-income families. Social Work, 1963, 8(2), 10-14.

Glasser, P. H. and L. N. Glasser (Eds.). Families in Crisis. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Glasser, P. H. and E. L. Navarre. The problems of families in the AFDC program. In P. H. Glasser and L. N. Glasser (Eds.), Families in Crisis. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Glock, C. Y. (Ed.). Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Golan, S. E. and C. Eisdorfer (Eds.). Handbook of Community Mental Health. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Gorden, R. L. Interviewing Strategy, Techniques, and Tactics. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1972.

Greenwood, E. and F. Massarik. Some methodological problems in social work research. American Sociological Review, 1950, 15(4), 546-550.

Harshbarger, D. Turbulence and resources: the basis for a predictive model of interorganizational communication in the human services. In H. W. Demone and D. Harshbarger (Eds.), A Handbook of Human Service Organizations. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Heineman, S. H., F. Perlmutter, and L. W. Yudin. The community mental health center and community awareness. Community Mental Health Journal, 1974, 10(2), 221-227.

Hillman, B. and E. Charnet. A neighborhood health center: what patients know and think of its operations. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Hollister, R. M., B. M. Kramer, and S. S. Bellin (Eds.). Neighborhood Health Centers. U.S.A.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1974.

Hopkins, T. J. The role of community agencies as viewed by black fathers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1972, 42(3), 508-516.

Hyman, H. H. Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Jackson, D. G. (Ed.). Research 1970--An Annotated List of Research and Demonstration Grants, 1955-1969. U.S. Department of HEW Social and Rehabilitative Service, Office of Research Demonstration and Training, 1970.

Jeffers, C. A participant observer study of priorities and choices. In P. H. Glasser and L. N. Glasser (Eds.), Families in Crisis. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Katz, D. The practice and potential of survey methods in psychological research. In C. Y. Glock (Ed.), Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Klyman, F. I. and J. Kruckenberg. A methodology for assessing citizen perceptions of police. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1974, 2(3), 219-233.

Levine, R. A. Participation in planning and evaluation of mental health services. Social Work, 1970, 15(2), 41-46.

Levine, S. Professional barriers to interagency planning. In H. W. Demone and D. Harshbarger (Eds.), A Handbook of Human Service Organizations, New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Levine, S. and P. C. White. Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. In F. Baker (Ed.), Organizational Systems: General Systems Approaches to Complex Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1973.

Litwak, E. and L. F. Hylton. Interorganizational analysis: a hypothesis on co-ordinating agencies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, 6(4), 395-420.

Lounsbury, John. Organizational Questionnaire A and B and Verbal Questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tennessee, 1975.

Maas, H. S. (Ed.). Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Maas, H. S. and N. A. Polansky. Collecting original data. In N. A. Polansky (Ed.), Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Massarik, F. The survey method in social work: past, present, and potential. In C. Y. Glock (Ed.), Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Mayer, J. E. and N. Timms. The Client Speaks: Working Class Impressions of Casework. New York: Atherton Press, 1970.

McWilliams, S. A. and L. A. Morris. Community attitudes about mental health services. Community Mental Health Journal, 1974, 10(2), 236-242.

Mencher, S. Public Welfare. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Merton, R. K., M. Fiske, and P. L. Kendall. The Focused Interview. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

Michaels, R. A. and H. Treger. Social Work in police departments. Social Work, 1973, 18(5), 67-75.

Morris, R. Social planning. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Mueller, J., K. Cameron, and D. Joransen. Community care-takers as mental health case finders. Mental Hygiene, 1971, 55(2), 214-218.

National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers, Work and Organizational Contexts. Research Report No. 2, Effects of Agency Work Contexts: An Intensive Field Study (Volumes I and II), 1971.

O'Donnell, E. J. and M. M. Sullivan. Service delivery and social action through the neighborhood center: a review of research. In H. W. Demone and D. Harshbarger (Eds.), A Handbook of Human Service Organizations. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Oetting, E. R., C. W. Cole, and J. E. Hinkle. A case study in community agency visitation. Community Mental Health Journal, 1967, 3, 45-48.

Park, R. E. A study of community life in rural natural areas. In P. V. Young (Ed.), Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Perrow, C. A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 194-208.

Polansky, N. A. (Ed.). Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Pomeroy, R., H. Yahr, and L. Podell. Studies in Public Welfare: Reactions of Welfare Clients to Social Service. The Center for the Study of Urban Problems, Graduate Division, Bernard M. Baruch College, CUNY, 1966.

Pugh, T. J. and E. H. Mudd. Attitudes of black women and men toward using community services. Journal of Religion and Health, 1971, 10(3), 256-277.

Rabinowitz, C. and C. H. King. The impact of public welfare practice on family attitudes with reference to delinquent children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35(3), 609-613.

Rabkin, J. G. Opinions about mental illness: a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 77(3), 153-171.

Rees, S. No more than contact: an outcome of social work. British Journal of Social Work, 1974, 4(3), 255-279.

Reichler, R. J., H. M. Babigian, and E. A. Gardner. The mental health team: a model for a combined community approach to the problems of the poor. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36(2), 434-443.

Ripple, L. and E. Alexander. Motivation, capacity, and opportunity as related to the use of case work service: nature of client's problem. Social Services Review, 1956, 3(1), 38-54.

Ritson, E. B. and G. O'Brien. The influence of social and geographic distance on the perception of community problems. Social Psychiatry, 1969, 4(2), 59-62.

Ryker, M. and A. Vierhant. Community mental health and the schools. Community Mental Health Journal, 1974, 10(1), 77-83.

Schoenfield, L. S., R. J. Lyerly, and S. I. Miller. We like us: the attitudes of the mental health staff toward other agencies on the Navajo Reservation. Mental Hygiene, 1971, 55(2), 171-173.

Schorr, A. L. Family policy in the United States. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14(3), 452-467.

Schwartz, W. Neighborhood centers. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Five Fields of Social Service: Reviews of Research. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1966.

Sears, R. R., E. E. Maccoby, and H. Levin. Patterns of Child Rearing. White Plains, N.Y.: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957.

Sharfstein, S. S. Neighborhood psychiatry: a new community approach. Community Mental Health Journal, 1974, 10(1), 77-83.

Shyne, A. W. Evaluation of results in social work. Social Work, 1963, 8(4), 26-33.

Smith, D. W., G. D. Spiesman, and G. D. Hutshoff. Community Specialists in Rehabilitation and Community Services--Planning for the Reduction of Dependency. Rehabilitation Center, College of Education, University of Arizona, 1971.

Sub-Committee on Agency Research, FSAA Committee on Statistics and Studies. Guides to Agency Research. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950.

Suchman, E. A. The survey method applied to public health and medicine. In C. Y. Glock (Ed.), Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Switzer, M. E. Coordination: a problem and a promise. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1961, 35(2), 27-29.

Task Force on the Organizations of Social Services--Services for People. Preliminary Recommendations. Welfare in Review, 1969, 7(1), 10-13.

Thomas, E. J. and C. L. Walter. Guidelines for behavioral practice in the open community agency: procedure and evaluation. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11(2), 193-205.

Troganowicz, R. C. The policeman's occupational personality. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1971, 62(4), 551-559.

Trow, M. Survey research and education. In C. Y. Block (Ed.), Survey Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Wagenfield, M. O., S. S. Robin, and J. D. Jones. Structural and professional correlates of ideologies of community mental health workers. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1974, 15(3), 199-210.

Warren, R. L. Studying Your Community. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955.

Warren, R. L. The interorganizational field as a focus for investigation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1967, 12(3), 396-419.

Wittman, M. Some problems in the development of cooperation between mental health and community welfare programs. Mental Hygiene, 1963, 47(4), 641-648.

Wittman, M. The social welfare system: its relation to community mental health. In S. C. Golan and C. Eisdorfer (Eds.), Handbook of Community Mental Health. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Wolins, M. Measuring the effect of social work intervention. In N. A. Polansky (Ed.), Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Young, P. V. (Ed.). Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Zalba, S. R. and H. D. Stein. Assessing Organizational Effectiveness: A Draft Report. School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, 1969.

Zolik, E. S. and R. J. Boyd. Attitudes toward patients and service delivery. Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1972, 7(2), 797-798.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

In an extensive article on interviewing, Cannell and Kahn (1968) emphasized the importance of explaining what demands will be placed on the respondent. Best results were achieved when the interviewer and the respondent had the same frame of reference and when the language used approximated the level of the respondent. Since an interviewer often is initiating and carrying out a fairly intimate relationship across sex, age and class barriers (without much recognized authority), it is a good idea to give a brief intelligible explanation of the purpose of the interview in order to legitimize the situation (Cannell and Kahn, 1968; Conway, Jennings, and Milstein, 1974; Dotson, 1954; Polansky, 1960).

To increase the effectiveness of the instrument, the interviewer usually begins with questions of a demographic nature that are least likely to evoke anxiety on the part of the respondent (Polansky, 1960; Conway et al., 1974; Cannell and Kahn, 1968; Warren, 1955). The introduction sets the tone for the interview and helps build rapport (Conway et al., 1974). In the central section, there should be factual and opinion questions carefully designed to promote a logical thought sequence that will make the interview a meaningful experience (Cannell and Kahn, 1968). In the closing portion of an interview, the interviewer typically tries to leave as gradefully as possible by tying up any loose ends and by thanking the respondents for their cooperation (Cannell and Kahn, 1968; Polansky, 1960).

To make sure that the instructions are clear, that there are adequate transitions between sections, and that the length of time

is appropriate, it makes sense to pre-test the instrument (Cannell and Kahn, 1968; Conway et al., 1974; Cochran, 1963; Sub-Committee, 1950; Wolins, 1960). In this way, the interviewer can learn what the respondents thought the purpose of the interview was and how each person felt about the interview (Conway, et al., 1974). Items which are poorly worded or poorly constructed may convey more than one idea. For some items, many respondents may not have access to the information required or may not remember well enough to answer the questions (Cannell and Kahn, 1968). If a carefully designed pilot study is performed, there is a greater likelihood that the final product will include only necessary and relevant items.

In summary, it is important to clearly articulate the purpose of the interview to the respondent in order to achieve satisfactory results. The effectiveness of the instrument is dependent upon careful sequencing and the use of a pilot study. Careful attention needs to be paid to the selection of the proper number of objective and open-ended questions used to obtain the type of information required within the allotted time period.

APPENDIX B

RELEASE FORM

_____
Date

My name is Charlie Gleich. I am doing a project for the University of Tennessee to find out what people think about various agencies and organizations that they have had contact with in their communities. A number of people will be asked their opinions on how much the services they are getting help their families. The most important thing we are trying to find out is how you think these services could be improved to help your family and this community as much as possible. I will be talking to people in this community like social workers, teachers, and public health workers to find out how much they think the services you are getting are helping your family and how they can improve services to your family. The results will be printed up without the names of any of the people talked to. I will be glad to answer any questions you have about the project at any time.

I understand the above, and agree to take part in this project.

_____
Signature

_____
Address

FAMILY QUESTIONNAIRE

I'd like to begin by asking you a few questions about your family. First off, what's everybody's name? How old are your children? When are their birthdays? When are your birthdays? (If necessary, use the following ranges: under 25, 25-34, 35-49, 50 or over.) Was everybody in the family born in this area? If not, where were they born? How far did you get in school? (What was the last grade you completed?) How about your children? What do you do for a living? (If necessary) How many years has your family lived in this community?

1. Family

Family Member	Age	Date of Birth	Place of Birth	Last Grade Completed	Occupation

2. Housing

Area family lives in _____ Type of home_____

Number of years in community_____ Number of rooms_____

3. Now, I'd like to find out what kind of contact your family has had with a number of community agencies and organizations. On the left, there is a list of organizations. I'd like you to tell me how many times in the last 6 months (since _____) you have talked to people with the agencies listed below. How many times have you spoken to people at _____? Have they ever been to your home? How many times? Any phone calls?

Organization or Agency — Type of Contact

	Visits to Agency	Home Visits	Phone Calls	Total

4. On this page, I'd like you to tell me the number of different people you have spoken to in these organizations. How many people have you spoken to at _____? What are their names? What are their jobs?

Organizations	Number of People	Names and Jobs

5. On this page, I'd like you to put a check mark in each box that describes how much the people in these organizations are like you in the way they look, in the way they talk, and in their general background.

Organization	Very Different	Different	A Little Bit Different	A Little Bit Like You	Like You	Very Much Like You

6. Some people think that certain organizations help their families quite a bit. Other people may think that these organizations do more harm than good. I'd like you to put a check mark in each box that describes how much these various organizations help your family.

Organizations	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	No Help At All	More Harm Than Good

7. What are the most important things that people from these agencies do for your family and this community?

8. What are some ways that these various organizations can improve their services to your family and this community? (How can these organizations help you and your family more than they are at the present time?)

9. Do you have any questions about any of the organizations that we have talked about?

10. Is there any way I can improve this questionnaire? Were there any questions that didn't make much sense? Which ones? Are there any questions you would have liked me to ask that I didn't? Do you have any questions? Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX C

ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is Charlie Gleich. I am a fourth year doctoral student in School Psychology at the University of Tennessee. At the present time, I am doing a project for my dissertation to find out what people think about the social services in their community. I have spoken to a few families that have had contact with this organization and will be speaking to a number of people in various organizations who have direct contact with families. The most important thing we are trying to do is to obtain some recommendations from you on improving services to families. I will be glad to answer any questions you have about this project at any time.

1. First of all, I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself and your job. How many years have you been working in this organization? What is your position here? How much education or training have you received in your field? Did you have any previous work experience before taking this job? Are you married at the present time? Do you have any children? What is your present caseload? (How many people are you serving?)

Agency Demography

Years on job_____ Job title_____

Marital status_____ Number of children_____

Education_____ Caseload_____

Previous experience_____

2. Now, I'd like to find out how much contact you have had with the following families. On the left is a list of families. On the right is a list of ways you could have contact with these families. Write down the number of times you have had contact with these families in the six month period (since_____) prior to this interview.

Families	Ways of Communicating			
	Visits to Agency	Home Visits	Phone Calls	Total

3. On this question, I'd like you to do two things. First, put a check mark in the box that best describes how much these families are similar to you in the way they look, in the way they speak, and in their general background. Next, put two check marks in the box that describes how you think these families would answer the same question.

Families	Very Different	Different	A Little Bit Different	A Little Bit Like You	Like You	Very Much Like You

4. On this question, I'd like you to put a check mark in the box that describes how much you think this organization helps these families. Put two check marks in the box that describes how you think these families would answer the same question.

Families	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	No Help At All	More Harm Than Good

5. What are the most important things that this organization does for families and this community?

6. What are some ways that your organization can improve services to families and this community?

7. On this question, I'd like you to write down how many times in the course of your job you have had contact with people in the organizations listed below in the last six months (since_____).

Organization	Ways of Communicating				
	Gone to Their Office	They've Come to Your Office	Phone Calls	Other	Total

8. On this question, I'd like you to write down the number of different people you have communicated with in these organizations. On the right side, write down the names of the people and their job titles (e.g. social worker, teacher, nurse, etc.). If you don't know their names, just write down what their jobs are.

Organization	No. of People	Names and Job Titles

9. What are the most important things that you and the people in the agency you work with do for the organizations you have contact with?

10. What are the most important things that people in these other organizations do for you and other workers in <u>your</u> organization/

11. What are some ways in which the interactions with your organization and other organizations could be improved? (How could you work more effectively with these other agencies?

12. Do you have any questions about any of the organizations we have spoken about? Would you like to know anything more about any agencies in the community?

13. Some people think it would be very beneficial for their organization to work in close collaboration with other organizations. Other people think this would be more detrimental than beneficial. Put a check mark in the box that describes how beneficial you think it would be to work in close collaboration with the following organizations.

Organi-zation	Very Detrimental	Detrimental	Somewhat Detrimental	Somewhat Beneficial	Beneficial	Very Beneficial

14. Now, put a check mark in the box that describes how much the tasks and services in these organizations are similar to those in your organization.

Organization	Very Different	Different	Slightly Different	Slightly Similar	Similar	Very Similar

15. Is there any way I can improve this questionnaire? Were there any questions that didn't make much sense? Which ones? Are there any questions you would have liked me to ask that I didn't? Do you have any questions? Thank you for your cooperation!

VITA

Charles Gleich was born in Brooklyn, New York, on January 23, 1950. He attended Public School 238 and graduated from Lafayette High School in 1967. In February, 1972, he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Education and Psychology from Brooklyn College. He is licensed to teach elementary school in the City and State of New York. He has been employed as an elementary school teacher at Public School 93 in Brooklyn.

He entered the Graduate School at the University of Tennessee in September, 1972, and received the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in Psychology in June, 1976. During these years, he has served as a research and teaching assistant and has taught introductory psychology at the University. He also has been employed by Riverbend School at Eastern State Psychiatric Hospital where he was an observer and consultant to the program for autistic children. In addition, he has been a Psychological Services Worker in the Blount County Schools for the Little Tennessee Valley Educational Cooperative. He is a member of the National Association of School Psychologists.