

to take care of adults. (An adult dental clinic proposal was submitted, but turned down.)

Cancellation of the program would be a severe blow to the poor people of Clermont County. If this should happen, the County itself might try to cover part of the expense. The private social welfare agencies might want to pick up the project—but it is hard to see how they could manage it: it is very difficult to raise money in Clermont County.

As for other Federal help—HEW might take the clinics over. "At least it would be worth a try."

(The Clermont Clinics draw critical comments from an elected official among the Cincinnati respondents. He questions the need for the clinics on the grounds that there are already four hospitals—outside the County—serving Clermont residents.)

Other programs

A few programs draw only unfavorable comment. *Talbert House*, a program for paroled prisoners, is criticized as too special in nature and too far removed from the main antipoverty effort to be appropriate to the Community Action program.

The Small Business Development program is described by several respondents as ineffectual. Some believe that its weakness is due to an inability to get loan applications approved further up the line. A social worker declares flatly that SBD suffered from "poor leadership and inadequate professional staffing," and adds: "Also, the financial community has not been sufficiently involved in its activities."

Some programs were not discussed, in most cases because they are too specialized in nature to be of general interest. In this group are the Dental Services Program, Family Planning Service, Therapeutic Recreation Program in Institutions for the Aged, the Lincoln Heights School Social Work Project, the Preschool Program in Lincoln Heights, and the Salvation Army Case Work Program in Clermont County.

This study did not involve community leaders in the three Kentucky counties. However, the major programs in these areas parallel the most widely discussed programs in Cincinnati, Neighborhood Facilities and Head-Start.

AWARENESS, PARTICIPATION, AND BENEFITS TO FAMILIES

1. In Cincinnati 4 out of 10 respondents, living in poverty areas contiguous to the Neighborhood Centers, report that they are aware of the programs and activities sponsored by the "War on Poverty." This incidence of awareness is lower than the average reported for the nine communities studied (6 out of 10).

	Total contacts	Total contacts, Cincinnati
Number in group.....	5,720	602
Unaware of program (percent).....	38	60
Aware of program (percent).....	62	40

2. Among the households contacted in Cincinnati, participation in OEO "War on Poverty" programs by one or more family members is reported by 3 out of 10 respondents—slightly higher than the participation level (1 in 4) noted for the nine communities, on the average. Taken as a function of awareness, the incidence of participation in Cincinnati is at a much higher level (almost 8 out of 10) than is reported among the nine communities studied (4 out of 10).

3. Those who participated in the CAA programs in Cincinnati (the "affected poor"¹ interviewed) have, by and large, similar characteristics to the "affected poor" interviewed in the nine areas.

A high proportion are under 35 (about 4 out of 10).

The average household size is about the same (5.8).

Unemployment is as prevalent—3 out of 10 reporting no family member employed.

¹ Those respondents reporting participation by a family member in one or more programs are identified as the "affected poor."