A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RATINGS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS: REGIONAL AND COOPERATING CENTER DIRECTORS: AND PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MINNESOTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
MICHAEL HARLAN KAPLAN
1974

THESIS

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RATINGS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS: REGIONAL AND COOPERATING CENTER DIRECTORS; AND PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MINNESOTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
presented by

Michael Harlan Kaplan

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

~~Ph.D~~ degree in Educ. Administration

Howard Wilcox
Major professor

Date August 5, 1974

O-7639

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RATINGS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS: REGIONAL AND COOPERATING CENTER DIRECTORS; AND PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MINNESOTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Michael Harlan Kaplan

Community education has grown from a modest experiment in the public schools during the 1930's to a concept that is currently in operation in over 400 school systems and 3000 school buildings all over the United States. The rapid growth and adoption of community education have resulted in a need for a solid body of research, particularly on community education goals.

The purpose of this study was to compare the community education goal ratings of a group of directors of regional and cooperating centers for community education development with the ratings of groups of principals, superintendents and community education directors from selected Minnesota school districts that were operating community education programs as of September, 1973. The purpose included determining whether or not there were significant differences between these groups on the ratings of eleven categories of community education goals represented in the

Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI-4), the survey instrument utilized in this investigation.

The design of this study was descriptive and comparative and sought to determine a measure that would indicate whether or not there was significant agreement or convergence on the rating of eleven categories of community education goals between principals, superintendents, community education directors and center directors.

The total study sample for all respondents was N = 280. Individual group samples included: principals, n = 130; superintendents, n = 61; community education directors, n = 58; center directors, n = 31. The respondents were mailed a questionnaire which required rating fifty-three community education goals according to an intensity-of-importance scale from very low to very high.

The data gathered on 280 respondents were coded and then punched on data-processing cards. The data were statistically analyzed by multivariate and univeriate analyses of variance techniques suggested by the Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University. Computational analyses were performed on the CDC 6500 Computer System at Michigan State University.

The major findings of the study included:

Hypothesis 1: Significant differences were observed between center directors and all other administrators as one group (principals, superintendents and community

education directors) on the ratings of six of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 1A: Significant differences were observed between center directors and principals on the ratings of three of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 1B: Significant differences were observed between center directors and superintendents on the ratings of five of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 1C: Significant differences were observed between center directors and community education directors on the ratings of two of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 2: Significant differences were observed between principals, superintendents and community education directors on the ratings of three of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 3: No significant differences were observed between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors) on the ratings of any one or all of the eleven categories of community education goals.

Hypothesis 4: No significant area by position interaction effects were observed on the ratings of any one or all

of the eleven categories of community education goals.

The general conclusions reached in this study were that: 1) the respondent's position had the greatest effect on rating community education goals, and 2) neither area by itself nor area by position had a significant effect on a respondent's goal ratings.

Even though narrow in scope, the findings of this study have important implications, not only for the groups sampled in the study, but also for other school district administrators, teachers, community residents, and community agency directors. If community education goals are recognized as important and worth pursuing, then a coordinated effort should continue to be undertaken to overcome the problem of a significant lack of convergence between the professionals charged with implementing and operating community education programs.

Although this study stressed the importance of convergence to the extent that significant convergence encourages a better understanding of community education goals, and consequently, makes implementation of the community education concept in American communities easier, there is a danger in total and unanimous convergence. Differences revealed because of position are not necessarily a detriment. Changes made in schools and communities should reflect the differences of those who work in the schools and live in the community.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RATINGS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS: REGIONAL AND COOPERATING CENTER DIRECTORS; AND PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MINNESOTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Michael Harlan Kaplan

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It was my good fortune to have Dr. Howard W. Hickey serve as my graduate committee chairman. His friendship, advice and assistance made my doctoral pursuit a very meaningful experience.

Help came from other quarters as well. Dr. Keith Anderson, Dr. James McKee and Dr. Archibald Shaw also served as committee members. Their suggestions were most valuable.

Dr. Kowit Pravalpruk offered generous assistance in the areas of research design and data analysis. Dr. Maryellen McSweeney shared her enormous knowledge of survey research, particularly with respect to sampling problems. I salute and thank both of these experts.

Special appreciation is extended to the Mott Foundation for their support of community education study. My experience as a C.S. Mott Fellow at the National Center for Community Education, Flint, Michigan, provided me with the opportunity to participate in several internships which contributed significantly to my overall Fellowship program.

Mr. Lawrence Erie of the Minnesota State Department of Education provided current information on the names of principals, superintendents and community education directors in that state. His cooperation facilitated the identification of eligible survey recipients in Minnesota.

I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. Paul F. DeLargy for generously sharing his previous research. Hopefully, my investigation has added a significant dimension to the research he began on community education goals.

I would be remiss if I were not to mention a personal debt to my good friend and colleague, Dr. Larry E. Decker, of the University of Virginia. He first introduced me to community education and has continued to monitor my personal and professional growth. His generosity, concern and support have had a profoundly positive impact upon me.

Finally, my wife Julie continued to remain my most unwavering supporter and most valuable critic. Her editorial skills helped clarify several problem passages. Her companionship and love provided much meaning during this entire effort. It is my wish that this work be dedicated to her.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Innovations and changes are constantly occurring in the dynamic arena of American public education. The impact and significance of educational change is a topic that elicits great debate among school critics. Charles Silberman analyzed numerous attempts at "educational reform" and concluded that despite millions of dollars in financial aid to schools for innovative programming, very little reform actually has occurred. He further argued that some professional educators fear change because they are unwilling or unable to cope with it. Silberman strongly advocated an "open" educational concept that encourages greater community involvement in educational planning and more interaction by students with their community.[1]

Ronald Roel has suggested that the "educational system" itself (school boards, teachers and administrators) appears to collectively perpetuate resistance to change by creating an environment that "disenchants" students, parents and community residents. This resistance is being challenged by what Roel described as a "third force....citizens, parents,

---

[1]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, New York: Random House, 1970.

students and employers...becoming more active, more vocal, more informed, and more demonstrative on community and national issues."[2]

Continued resistance to change by public schools becomes a more acute problem because of the increasing rate at which societal change occurs. Change is swift, constant and forces corresponding pressure upon all institutions in our society.[3] In a recent interview, Alvin Toffler further discussed the importance of change and the future.

> All of us in the high-technology nations are caught up in one of the great revolutions in human history. We are in the process of creating a new civilization which will demand new ways of life, attitudes, values, and institutions....people in our schools today are going to live in a world radically different from the one we know--and a world that will be undergoing continual and in all likelihood, accelerating change.[4]

He further indicated that there may be "...no more important role for education than to serve as one of the great adaptive mechanisms both for the social system as a whole and for the individual within it."[5]

---

[2]Ronald Roel, ed., "Searching for a 'Third Force': Can We Put the Public Back into Public Education?" The Journal of the Institute for Responsive Education, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Winter 1974), pp. 1 and 10.

[3]Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, Chapter 18 (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 353-378.

[4]June Grant Shane and Harold G. Shane, "The Role of the Future in Education," an interview with Alvin Toffler, Today's Education, Vol. 63, No. 1 (January-February 1974), p. 72.

[5]Ibid., pp. 72-73. Also see Benjamin D. Singer, "The Future-Focused Role Image," Learning for Tomorrow, Alvin Toffler, ed. (New York: Random House, 1974), pp. 19-32.

If education is to become an adaptive mechanism in our society, future citizens must be equipped to deal with the ever-increasing complexity of bureaucracies. Kenneth Benne stated,

> Bureaucratic organizations are...primary factors in contemporary man's employment as a worker. Increasingly, he must reckon also with bureaucracies in his nonworker roles--as citizen, as student, and as client in quest of [educational], health, recreational and welfare services as well.[5]

The failure of numerous education programs and the inadequacy of the school as a bureaucratic institution was described by Kerensky and Melby.

> Among [the] shortcomings there are two basic characteristics of schoolhouse education that contribute to its inadequacy. First, in the work of the school, the child is daily confronted with demands he cannot meet, demands which the teacher and administrator know he cannot meet. Since many children are seldom asked to do anything they are currently able to do, they are perforce educated in failure.
>
> The second characteristic of schoolhouse education which renders it ineffective in our current society is its failure to educate all the people of the community....In many instances it is a studied effort to avoid dealing with parents and adults generally.[6]

Meeting the needs of individuals is a problem that ought to be shared by schools and communities alike. The extent to which they are successful in meeting needs is contingent upon identifying the needs and implementing programs

---

[5]Kenneth D. Benne, Education for Tragedy (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967), p. 107.

[6]V.M. Kerensky and Ernest O. Melby, Education II - The Social Imperative (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 28-29.

that satisfy these needs. In servicing needs, priorities must be determined. One way of determining priorities is to establish an agreed upon set of goals and proceed to accomplish these goals. The present era is characterized by a drive for accountability, particularly in education. Sophisticated systems utilizing goals and objectives are becoming more widely adopted in the United States. Unfortunately, however, many accountability models are on shaky ground because "...they are extremely rationalistic, mechanistic, and far removed from the actual workings of social systems."[7] An additional weakness in educational accountability is that it "...becomes a strongly hierarchical matter. Teachers formulate goals for students; administrators for teachers; school boards for administrators."[8]

According to Parsons et. al., if a social system is to survive, it must meet and satisfy certain functional problems. These problems include goal attainment, or as they described it, the gratification of the units in a social system.[9] Our society continues to become more complex. Increased societal complexity results in increased difficulty in formulating and attaining goals.

---

[7]Ernest R. House, "The Price of Productivity: Who Pays?" Today's Education, Vol. 62, No. 6 (September-October 1973), p. 67.

[8]Ibid., p. 66.

[9]Talcott Parsons, Robert F. Bales and Edward A. Shils, Working Papers in the Theory of Action, Chapter 5 (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953).

Many communities are adopting a new approach to problem solving and goal attainment. Roel's "third force" or the citizenry in a community is not only becoming more active on school issues and policy but on problems that affect the well-being of their community as well. Community education provides an opportunity to include a wide variety of goal options in an attempt to satisfy the multiplicity of interests within the population of any particular community. The sharing in the decision-making and goal-setting processes of a community by its residents is philosophically in concert with democratic principles.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine the extent of agreement on the importance of community education goals as perceived by groups of regional and cooperating center directors, superintendents, principals and community education directors.

Need for the Study

Since 1936, when community education began as an experiment in the public schools of Flint, Michigan, it has grown steadily in America and now reaches over 400 school systems, 3000 school buildings and serves nine million people. Much of this growth has occurred during the recent decade and it is projected that the services of 8000 new community school directors will be needed over the next ten

year period.[10]

The rapid adoption of community education has been sided significantly by the establishment of the Mott Foundation Projects Division of Training and Dissemination. Fifteen regional and thirty-one cooperating centers for community education development are in operation throughout the country in colleges, universities and state departments of education. These centers now perform many of the tasks that the Mott Projects Division was established to perform. The original tasks of the Mott Projects Division were to,

> ...develop programs to train Community School Directors and school administrators imbued with the philosophy of Community Education and the Community School...and...help outstanding colleges and universities, located near concentrations of school populations, develop programs of training in Community Education.[11]

As community education has spread around the country, its methods of adoption and implementation have become increasingly complex and varied. The continued growth of community education is contingent upon good planning and the well-coordinated efforts of community educators at all levels of involvement. These efforts should include the endorsing of a widely accepted group of community education goals which can be easily and continually modified as societal change

---

[10]William F. Grimshaw, ed., "Mott Foundation Announces Creation of Community Education Board of Advisors," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 2 (March-April 1974), p. 32.

[11]Dissemination Program Manual, Division of Training and Dissemination, Mott Foundation Projects Office (Flint, Michigan: Flint Board of Education, 1968), p. 4.

occurs. The need for clearly defined and agreed upon goals is obvious.

Equally necessary is a solid body of respectable community education research, and specifically, research on community education goals. Meeting in 1971, community education leaders from around the country identified over 200 potential research topics. Located near the top of the list of research needs was the question, "What are the goals of community education?"[12] In 1972, during a nation-wide tour, Donald Weaver, then President of the National Community Education Association, interviewed 245 community educators and reported, "Even a casual look at the Social Setting reveals widespread community disorganization and the absence of a viable means for defining common goals and attacking common problems."[13] Also in 1972, Phi Delta Kappa published a special issue of its journal entitled, "Community Education: A Special Issue," in which Curtis Van Voorhees discussed research in community education.

> There is currently little research that either supports or denies the effectiveness of community education....Several decades after its birth as an educational movement, community education is still supported not by facts but by the logic of

---

[12]Curtis Van Voorhees, ed., Needed Research in Community Education, Compiled results of a Research Symposium in Community Education held at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, April 13-14, 1971, p. 3.

[13]Donald C. Weaver, The Emerging Community Education Model (unpublished report available from the National Community Education Association, Flint, Michigan, 1972), p. 10.

> the process....Potentially, the doctoral dissertation is the single greatest contributor to community education research.[14]

Research continues to be of great importance to many in the field of community education. In October, 1973, a second National Community Education Symposium was conducted in Flint, Michigan, and attended by over 100 persons. In an interview at that time, Ralph Tyler suggested that it would be extremely valuable to determine the validity and acceptability of a national set of agreed upon goals in smaller locales such as individual states. He emphasized the desirability of consensus and widespread participation of educators and community members in determining these goals.[15]

The most extensive and recent research on community education goals was undertaken and completed by Paul DeLargy in 1973.[16] DeLargy employed the Delphi Technique to obtain a convergence of opinion on the important goals of community

---

[14]Curtis Van Voorhees, "Community Education Needs Research for Survival," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 3 (November 1972), pp. 203-204.

[15]Ralph W. Tyler, Director Emeritus, Science Research Associates, is well-known in education research circles and was asked to give the keynote address at the Flint Symposium. He remained to critique Symposium results and offer advice to individuals interested in conducting community education research projects (Flint, Michigan, October 30, 1974).

[16]Paul F. DeLargy, "Identification of Community Education Goals By Use of the Delphi Technique" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973).

education.[17] In addition, distinctions between categories of goals were identified.

Each small step taken toward increasing research brings much needed respectability and credence to community education. The concept is a new and potentially potent force in the United States. Many communities are attempting to design and implement community education programs compatible with their local needs. These attempts are greatly aided by the national network of regional and cooperating centers for community education development that are currently operating at many colleges and universities around the country. Center directors or members of their staffs assist school districts and communities by making presentations to groups or by talking with individuals interested in community education. Groups typically addressed include boards of education, school administrators, city counsels and other elected public officials, as well as community residents. The objective of such presentations is to disseminate information about the concept of community education and to incourage these various groups to coordinate their efforts toward the development of broad-based community support. In effect, a partnership can be forged

---

[17] Ibid. See pp. 58-67 for a more detailed description of the Delphi technique and its various modified versions used to achieve consensus.

between school and community.[18]

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the community education goal ratings of a group of directors of regional and cooperating centers for community education development with the ratings by a group of administrators from selected school districts which currently operate community education programs. The goal ratings were obtained from a modified version of the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI).[19] Selected from each district were the superintendent, a principal and the director of community education. The study attempted to assess and document the extent to which there was convergence on the importance of the eleven categories of community education goals listed in Appendix A. Other important research questions considered included the following:

1. To what extent is there agreement between center directors on the community education goals listed in the CEGI?

---

[18]Interview with Patrick B. Mullarney, Director, Northeast Community Education Development Center, University of Connecticut, December 11, 1973, provided clarification of the roles of regional and cooperating centers and the responsibilities of their directors.

[19]The term Community Education Goals Inventory refers to the 75 goal items developed by Paul F. DeLargy using the Delphi Technique. For a complete listing of these goals, see DeLargy, op. cit., Appendix H. An explanation of the modifications in the CEGI can be found in Chapter III of this study, and the new instrument itself appears as the CEGI-4 in Appendix C.

2. Which groups will the center directors identify as most likely and least likely to rate the goals like center directors; principals, superintendents or community education directors?

3. Which categories of goals will center directors rate different from principals, superintendents and community education directors?

4. Which of the fifty-three goals in the CEGI will have the highest and lowest mean ratings?

5. With no distinction as to urban, suburban or rural, how will groups of principals, superintendents and community education directors rate the goal categories in the CEGI?

6. Are the differences between urban, suburban and rural areas such that principals, superintendents and community education directors reflect these differences in their goal ratings in the CEGI?

This documentation should assist in the implementation of community education in American communities. The findings should also be of help in planning pre-service and in-service training for community educators, interested administrators, school staffs and community members.

Of particular importance is information on any differences that might exist within a region or even a state. Center directors should be aware of these differences in order to provide the best possible consultant services in all phases of community education; "...no two centers are exactly alike, each has its own territory to supervise, each has its own unique problems and characteristics...."[20] Even

---

[20] Richard C. Pendell, "University Centers Key to Community Education Expansion," Community Education Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3 (May 1973), pp. 4-5.

though there are regional variations throughout America, communities face many similar problems that must be dealt with. Community education offers a universally viable means of dealing with community problems.

Conceptual Framework

As a concept, community education is described as a process by which an entire community can be served by providing for all the educational needs of its residents. This process assembles and utilizes the human, physical and financial resources of a community in an attempt to most effectively serve the needs of everyone in that community. An overall objective of community education is to help develop a positive sense of community, to improve community living and to enhance community potentiality.

The basic principles of community education are shared by many educators and were expressed by Jack Minzey.

1. The public school has a capacity for far greater impact on its community than it is currently making in educational services, leadership and facilities and has an obligation to explore these responsibilities.

2. Education should be made relevant to the community.

3. Each child is a gestalt requiring consideration of his total environment in his education rather than just his formal schooling.

4. Education is a lifetime process and the goals of education should be open to all members of the community.

5. Education is not just a dissemination of

information or mastery of a subject, but it is as John Dewey says, "...a reconstruction or reorganization of experiences... which increase [the] ability to direct the course of subsequent experience."

6. Community is a feeling, not a physical boundary.

7. Problems of our time are solvable.

8. The common good of the community is the goal of all.

9. Ordinary people can influence solutions to problems and are willing to commit themselves to such solutions.[21]

According to Larry Decker, the broad consequences of adopting community education are assumed to be:

1. Community education encourages more cooperation and communication between school and community agencies and between school and businesses in the area.

2. The curriculum of the community school makes greater use of the existing community resources. There are more community resources brought to the school and more school programs taken into the community.

3. Community education provides more diverse opportunities to be of service to all ages.

4. School facilities are available for use by all community groups for all hours of the day, week and year.

5. The people in the community served are involved in the decision-making process on the types of programs and activities offered.

6. The community school is the catalyst in bringing about effective citizen participation and provides the leadership and staff

---

[21] Jack Minzey, "A Report to the Fifteenth Annual State Community Education Workshop" (Flint, Michigan, October 28-30, 1970).

for developing and coordinating processes for community involvement and improvement.[22]

Hypotheses of the Study

To accomplish the purposes of this study the following hypotheses were examined:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between regional and cooperating center directors and all other administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors).

Hypothesis 1A:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and principals.

Hypothesis 1B:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and superintendents.

Hypothesis 1C:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and community education directors.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between principals, superintendents and community education directors.

---

[22] Larry E. Decker, "An Administrative Assessment of the Consequences of Adopting Community Education in Selected Public School Districts" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971).

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no interaction between groups of urban, suburban and rural principals, superintendents and community education directors on the ratings of the eleven categories of goals.

Design of the Study

This study was designed to analyze the convergence in rating community education goals by regional and cooperating center directors, principals, superintendents and community education directors.

Population

The population in this study consisted of the directors of all the regional and cooperating centers for community education development throughout the United States, as of May, 1974, and the principals, superintendents and community education directors who represented the sixty-six Minnesota school districts that were operating community education programs as of September, 1973.

Sample

The study sample included thirty-one full-time center directors employed at colleges or universities. They constituted a complete geographical representation, nation-wide.

The sample of superintendents and community education directors was formed by using the entire population, while

the sample of principals included a probability sample from the available population.[23]

Procedure

The study was designed and organized to be a descriptive and comparative one. An appropriate questionnaire was developed based on the earlier work of DeLargy. Because modifications were made, all changes were reviewed and approved by DeLargy. In addition, technical assistance was provided by the Research Consultation Office and academic advisers at Michigan State University.

The new questionnaire, the CEGI-4, was designed to assess an intensity-of-importance rating for each of fifty-three community education goal statements. It was administered to all participants through the mail.

A supplement, consisting of two questions, was added to the questionnaire mailed to the center directors. These questions were designed to determine whether or not there was congruence among center directors with respect to their perceptions of which groups would rate the items in the CEGI most similarly or least similarly to themselves; principals, superintendents or community education directors.

After the names and addresses of the respondents were obtained, the questionnaires were mailed. Provisions

---

[23]The sampling procedures employed in this study were suggested by Maryellen McSweeney of Michigan State University and supported by the Research Consultation Office of the College of Education.

for a mail follow-up were also planned.

With assistance from the Research Consultation Office, appropriate computer programs were utilized that allowed for a reliability check on the newly modified CEGI-4, an analysis of variance by item, univariate and multivariate analyses of variance techniques to determine if significant differences existed in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals and a correlation matrix between variables.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in this study:

community education: the philosophical concept of a process which serves the entire community by providing for all the educational needs and wants of all community members. It uses the local schools or some other agency to act as a catalyst in bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop a positive sense of community, improve community living and develop the community process towards the end of self-actualization. It is a process that involves people in the marshalling of human and physical resources to create an environment conducive to improvement in the quality of life of all citizens.[24]

community school: the usual vehicle for implementation of community education. The community school provides a facility for many of the programs of community education.[25]

regional or cooperating center: "college or university charged with [the] responsibility for promoting Community Education and training personnel for service in Community Education."[26]

---

[24]Decker, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[25]Ibid., p. 12.

[26]Arnold Munoz, "The University Center for Community Education Development Director: Analysis of Role Conflict and Expectations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), p. 7.

community education goals: broad statements of direction, general purpose or intent. They are general, and not wholly concerned "with a particular achievement within a specified time period."[27]

goal categories: arbitrary classifications in which similar community education goals are arranged for treatment and analysis in this study (see Appendix A).

Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI-4): an instrument developed to yield an intensity-of-importance score on fifty-three community education goals from which differences between groups of individuals rating the goals can be measured. In this study the terms CEGI-4 and CEGI were used interchangeably.

community education director: the individual who has responsibility for the administration of a community education program for an entire school district.

convergence: the movement toward uniformity with respect to an opinion, issue or goal.[28]

Limitations of the Study

DeLargy's research has resulted in the identification of a set of community education goals, developed through consensus, by community educators from all parts of the country. The present study was limited to the State of Minnesota in order to determine the importance of community education goals within a small section of the country.

Another limitation of the study was the effect of the non-respondents upon data analysis and the final conclusions. Those who responded to the questionnaire and returned it, did so voluntarily. According to McSweeney, ethical principles in survey research should be adhered to.

---

[27] DeLargy, op. cit., p. 26.

[28] A working definition developed by the researcher specifically for use in this study.

> From the beginning of each research investigation, there should be a clear and fair agreement between the investigator and the research participant....The investigator should respect the individual's freedom to choose to participate in research or not....[29]

The response rates for all groups sampled in this study were high (see Chapter III), and therefore, it was concluded that the non-respondents would not have differed significantly on the variables of interest from those who did respond.[30]

An additional limitation of the study was that the recipients of community education services were not involved in rating the goals in the CEGI. Local community school directors should attempt to have community residents who participate in community education programs rate the goals in the CEGI and compare their ratings with those of the experts. In issuing a critique of community education, Samuel A. Moore suggested, "The very simple proposition here is that as we improve the quality of life for someone else as he sees it we at the same time enhance the likelihood that

---

[29]These statements appeared in the May, 1972, draft of the American Psychological Association's "Ethical Standards for Research with Human Subjects," and were quoted in Maryellen McSweeney's Advanced Research Methods in Education, course handbook, Michigan State University, 1974, p. 81. Also see Arthur R. Miller, The Assault on Privacy (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1971).

[30]Maryellen McSweeney, lecture on "Response and Non-Response Patterns in Survey Research," Michigan State University, May 21, 1974.

these people will choose to perpetuate our activity."[31]

A final limitation was that the biases of the respondents must be considered. Subsequently, the biases of the researcher must be considered as well.

Organization of the Thesis

This study on community education goals will be presented in five chapters.

Chapter I: The Problem

Chapter II: Review of the Related Literature - contained a review of literature pertinent to the concepts of community, the community and the school, and community education.

Chapter III: Design of the Study - described the procedures used in selecting the samples, developing the questionnaire and the way the data were collected and organized for analysis.

Chapter IV: Analysis of the Data - contained a discussion of the descriptive data, results of the Hypotheses tests and a discussion of the research questions investigated in the study.

Chapter V: Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

---

[31]Samuel A. Moore, II, "Community Education: Package Plan vs. A Quest For Quality," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January-February 1974), p. 56.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The intent of this review of the related literature was to offer a conceptual and philosophical background for this study and to provide a framework within which the data were examined. The review was restricted to the examination of materials relevant to the purpose of this investigation which included the concept of community, the community and the school, and community education.

One view of the community allows a focus on what the relationships are between the formal and informal associations of a community. The proponents of community education recognize that American society undergoes continuous change, and that the community can assist individuals in adjusting to change by providing opportunities to participate in the decision-making and problem-solving processes in their communities.

The roots of community education are deep in the interactional processes of a community. Through association and collaboration, societal units perform services and effect change. Cooperation, coordination and a unified community effort are key ingredients to the health and perpetuation of American communities.

The Community

Theoretical and Fundamental Aspects of the Community

Our present times are characterized by an abundant and continually increasing concern for "the development and preservation of the community as a social unit."[1] Harold Kaufman suggested that citizens and leaders, alike, face a struggle to save the community which must be,

> ...seen against the background of forces hastening its decline, namely, centralization, specialization, and the increase of impersonal relationships. Centralization is seen both in the massing of population and the pyramiding of power and leadership, culminating in the growth of the monolithic state.[2]

The quest to save the community is not a phenomenon that is peculiar to any one particular way of life. Those who endorse either rural, suburban or urban life styles share a concern for community preservation. William Whyte, after extensive research, discovered that urban dwellers, especially concerned about individual neighborhoods, were threatened by the runaway growth and the "anti-city" direction that characterized metropolitan development.[3]

An examination of definitions of community, by

---

[1]Harold F. Kaufman, "Toward an Interactional Conception of Community," Social Forces, Vol. 38, No. 1 (October 1959), p. 8.

[2]Ibid.

[3]William H. Whyte, Jr., et. al., The Exploding Metropolis, Chapter 1 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958).

George Hillery, illustrated that most students were "...in basic agreement that community consists of persons in social interaction within a geographic area and having one or more additional common ties."[4] There is agreement among writers with respect to three essential components necessary in the definition of community:

1. Community is a social unit of which space is an integral part; community is a place, a relatively small one.

2. Community indicates a configuration as to way of life, both as to how people do things and what they want--their institutions and collective goals.

3. Collective Action - persons in a community should not only be able to, but frequently do act together in the common concerns of life.[5]

Kaufman pointed to key problems inherent in any attempt to state a "precise" definition of community.

> ...there is not only the question differentiating localities as to their size and complexity, but within any locality there is the problem of distinguishing community phenomena from those which might be considered noncommunity. Specifically, does the community include the totality of the social life in an area--all family living and voluntary association, political and economic organization? Most common usage at least leaves that inference. Community, from this point of view, is the

---

[4]George A. Hillery, Jr., "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology, Vol. 20 (June 1955), p. 111.

[5]Dwight Sanderson and Robert A. Polson, Rural Community Organization (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1939), pp. 49-50.

local society in all its inclusiveness.[6]

According to Hans Bahrdt, Max Weber's sociological concept of the city, one kind of community, emphasized the city as having a market which is significantly affected by the day to day economic interaction of the city's residents and what Weber calls the market. Bahrdt took issue with Weber insisting that many rural communities and other "settlements" with occasional or annual markets were excluded from the classification of city.[7] Weber's analysis of the city was grounded in a combined sociological-historical approach; he did not deal at all with the social and psychological consequences of human interaction with the market. Bahrdt wrote,

> In the formation of a city in the sense of that described by Max Weber, where the daily economic life stands in constant relationship to the market, participation in public life is not just a festive exception but rather a daily form of social behavior for the mass of the inhabitants. This makes it possible and to a certain extent probable that other forms of public activity will develop, for example, public political activity.[8]

Bahrdt identified an additional criterion of the city by contrasting the "total life" and the "daily life" of a city. He called these phenomena the "public and

---

[6]Kaufman, op. cit., p. 9.

[7]Hans P. Bahrdt, "Public Activity and Private Activity as Basic Forms of City Association," Perspectives on the American Community, ed. by Roland L. Warren (2nd ed.; New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), p. 12.

[8]Ibid., p. 14.

private spheres of activity," and further suggested that these two spheres form a polarity, even though they stand "in a close reciprocal relationship."[9]

> ...The more clearly the polarity and the reciprocal relationship between public and private spheres are defined, the more "city-like," sociologically speaking, is the life of a settlement. The less this is the case, the less strongly developed is the city character of a settlement.[10]

Because the market in a city is large, it typically does not support a closed, tightly-knit social system where all inhabitants are totally integrated. People enjoy varying degrees of involvement with the market; their temporary interaction with the market is greatly influenced by the additional social relationships of which they are a part, and to which they must eventually return. Bahrdt described the "incomplete integration" of the members of a social system in the following way:

> ...the order of the market guarantees a certain voluntariness of contact-making of each with the other; or more exactly, of each individual with each other individual. A characteristic of the market is thus an incomplete integration, a freedom of social purpose for the individuals, who can choose with whom, in what manner, and for how long they keep up the contact....[11]

Many individuals researching communities have discovered the necessity for analyzing community dynamics or

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., p. 15.

interaction. For the most part, sociologists have been interested in,

> ...the community structures which result from interaction rather than the interaction processes themselves....It would seem...that the time may be ripe for a greater emphasis on dynamic interaction in community studies and also, perhaps, for greater recognition of the community aspect of all interaction studies....[12]

Kaufman suggested that one area of study that dealt with the idea of field or arena has contributed to the development of what he called an interactional concept of community.

> The community field is not a Mother Hubbard which contains a number of other fields, but rather is to be seen as only one of the several interactional units in a local society.... The relation of the community field to other fields such as the economic, the religious, the political, is a highly important concern.[13]

In an attempt to further clarify field or arena, Kaufman presented this analogy.

> ...One may visualize the community field as a stage with the particular ethos of the local society determining the players and the plays. If the orientation is democratic and primary social contacts are dominant, many engage in script writing and acting and there are relatively few spectators. On the other hand, in situations where the population is relatively large, only a small proportion can occupy the stage at any one time. The same persons are likely to appear again and again, while the others either sit passively as spectators, or are carrying on their limited-interest shows

---

[12] Jessie Bernard, "Some Social-Psychological Aspects of Community Study: Some Areas Comparatively Neglected by American Sociologists," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March 1951), pp. 17-18.

[13] Kaufman, op. cit., p. 10.

> on other stages, unmindful of the community drama.[14]

He further stated that,

> The community arena is by definition an integral part of the local society, or perhaps better stated, the locality agglomerate. The latter term is preferred because it has less implication with respect to the social organization and integration of the local area. Two highly significant types of relationships in studying the community field are the interplay of community actions and interactions (1) with the demographic, ecological, and physical setting and (2) with other interactional fields both in the given locality agglomerate and in the mass society.[15]

Another researcher who looked at interaction was Albert Reiss. Much of his work and findings were in concert with Kaufman, particularly on the topic of field or arena. Reiss believed that the community field is essentially a collectivity of numerous actions performed or undertaken by individuals who operate or assist through an affiliation with some organized group or association. This collectivity of actions takes place in the center of the community arena and differs substantially from other fields of action in the same community because of its own particular identifying characteristics and parameters.[16]

Another theoretical aspect for consideration is what

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., p. 11.

[16] Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "The Sociological Study of Communities," Rural Sociology, Vol. 24 (1959), pp. 118-130.

sociologists have referred to as community groups. The community itself is often described as a social group. The most useful and clear definition of a social group was given by E.T. Hiller and clarified by Henry Zentner, who wrote,

> The communal group may be regarded as that group which remains after all other types of groups and associations have been factored out of the total system of social organization constructed by the inhabitants of the locality.[17]

There is no limit to the number of social groups that can be found in a community at any given point in time. Many groups are of the institutional type and are characterized by stability and an ability to self-perpetuate over time. Other social groups become operational in response to a particular social development and may remain active only until a solution to the problem has been worked out. The social group as an entity within the community has important implications for consideration by individuals engaged in the planning and implementation of community education programs. Involvement in the community decision-making process was earlier identified in this study as a consequence of adopting community education. Becoming involved in community decision-making requires either individual or collective action. Kaufman concurred,

A great variety of groups may at one time or

---

[17]Henry Zentner, "Logical Difficulties in Relating the Concepts Community, Society and Institutions," Alpha Kappa Deltan, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Winter 1958), p. 115.

> another be involved in community action. They range from the coffee-break clique through the civic clubs to the more institutionalized groups such as the board of alderman....Only a few organizations, such as perhaps a community improvement association, are engaged entirely in community activity....[18]

A final theoretical consideration associated with the present study is the work of Roland Warren relating to the vertical and horizontal patterns of communities.[19] In order to comprehend and analyze the various units within a community, it is necessary to observe two key groups of relationships. The first group refers to the external connections and commitments that societal units such as businesses, governmental agencies, churches and voluntary associations have with organizations that are located away from the community. Very often these ties are carefully articulated and firm, even though there may be a great geographical separation between the societal unit in the community and the external organization. For example, the crucial decision-making regarding a military base to be located in a California community undoubtedly takes place in Washington, D.C., far from the community affected. In addition, the activities of that base may be of no real importance to the community itself. Nevertheless, the base is located in that particular community, and consequently, a set of

---

[18] Kaufman, op. cit., p. 12.

[19] Roland L. Warren, The Community in America, Chapters 8 and 9 (2nd ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1972).

relationships does develop. Some units may not have the external dependence to the extent that a military base does. However, regardless of the extent to which societal units are dependent upon external organizations, these external relationships are described as the vertical pattern of the community.[20]

The second set of relationships is characterized by the kinds of internal ties that exist between societal units such as schools, churches, businesses and governmental agencies within a community. These internal relationships are called horizontal patterns and become crucial aspects of the community, particularly when the community is contrasted with additional "social groupings" such as small groups or formal organizations.[21]

The concepts of vertical and horizontal patterns have important implications for the future of communities, as well as for community education. One of the key trends in the Twentieth Century has been the continued growth of the vertical pattern in many American communities. At stake is the issue of whether or not the local community can survive the increasing barrage of external dependencies. As societal units continue to develop and strengthen outside ties, their individuality and independence decrease correspondingly.

---

[20] Ibid., Chapter 8.

[21] Ibid., Chapter 9.

Urban, Suburban and Rural Communities

In our society, regardless of whether or not a settlement is urban, suburban or rural, it is common to find many groups and associations participating in community activity or action. It was fundamental to this study to explore and describe the distinguishing aspects of urban, suburban and rural social systems. Numerical size alone, a criterion emphasized by the United States Census Bureau, was not a sufficient descriptor of community typology. "...What matters is not the number of people living together, but the particular manner in which they relate to one another socially."[22] However, currently there are problems in attempting to precisely delineate these three types of communities. Warren described an important problem facing researchers of today.

> In recent decades, changes in the structure and function of American communities have been characterized in large measure by a rapid growth of communities surrounding the central cities. Associated with these and other factors have been a number of different kinds of change which have tended to blur the contrast between the metropolis and the village or small city.[23]

In order to establish working definitions of urban, suburban and rural appropriate to this study, it was necessary to explore and analyze community settlement patterns

---

[22]Bahrdt, op. cit., p. 15.

[23]Roland L. Warren, ed., Perspectives on the American Community (2nd ed.; New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), p. 102.

in America. Daniel Elazar attempted to deal with the question of whether or not America is a nation of cities.[24] He argued that it is inaccurate to assume that the living conditions of most Americans can be described as characteristic of a city. City life in America is simply not like that of cities in Western Europe or Asia, for example. Wealth, the availability of land, and a relatively low population had a cultural impact upon American settlement patterns unlike many other nations.

Elazar further pointed to the "central myth" or the "fact" that over seventy per cent of our population resides in urban places; the danger inherent in this "fact" is that "urban place" must be viewed as any settlement of 2,500 persons or more, which is part of the United States Census Bureau definition of "urban place." One sensible approach to cities is to examine them by "classes," according to population. Only approximately ten per cent of our population lives in cities of over one million. Since 1920, the class of cities with 10-50,000 has experienced the greatest increase. "Most Americans would agree that cities of that size hardly deserve to be considered cities at all, in common sense usage."[25] But these communities are cities that share differing life styles according to their geographical

---

[24]Daniel J. Elazar, "Are We A Nation of Cities?" The Public Interest, No. 4 (Summer 1966), pp. 42-58.

[25]Ibid., p. 43.

location and population. In this study, city and urban were used interchangeably with the emphasis on the presence of a relatively large, active market as defined by Weber and expanded upon by Bahrdt. A secondary emphasis focused on population, and urban areas were described as communities of over 10,000 persons.

American urbanization has been a unique process. There have been three influences upon the development and growth of the American urban place.[26] First, from its beginning, our country has been primarily agrarian-oriented. "Agrarian virtue" has been consistently pursued while "urban corruption" has been piously attacked. It is significant to note that many Americans fled to the city, even though most of America remained peacefully rural. Americans sought the city for its economic and social advantages, yet they refused to accept the models for urban living that dominated Western Europe.

> ...Accepting the necessity and even the value of urbanization for certain purposes, in particular, economic ones, Americans have characteristically tried to have their cake and eat it, too, by bringing the old agrarian ideals into the urban setting and by reinterpreting them through the establishment of a modified pattern of "rural"-style living within an urban context. The result has been the conversion of urban settlements into metropolitan ones, whose very expansiveness provides the physical means for combining something like rural and urban life-styles into a new pattern which better suits the American taste. It was hoped that this pattern would combine the

---

[26] Ibid., pp. 46-47.

> advantages of an urban environment with the maintenance of the essence of the traditional American "agrarian" virtues and pleasures, to preserve as much as possible of what is conceived to be the traditional "American way of life."[27]

The second influence was metropolitanism that began with the first American cities which were not conceived as self-contained, closed entities, but served rather as service and trade centers for surrounding areas. American cities have grown and flourished because they have served their hinterlands to a much greater extent than the urban centers of Europe where self-centered communities, with less outreach, tended to perpetuate less metropolitan-like communities.[28]

The last characteristic of American urbanization has been "...the penchant toward nomadism which has always characterized Americans."[29] Geographic mobility historically has been a common practice that reached across the social and economic strata of American society. This fact is in direct contrast with the cities of the Old World which retained stability in population and were, therefore, self-perpetuating.

A definition of suburban, appropriate to this study, was given in the 1970 Census Bureau Report which stated that a suburb is an urbanized, residential community outside the

---

[27] Ibid., p. 48.

[28] Ibid., pp. 51-52.

[29] Ibid., p. 52.

corporated limits of a large central city, but which is culturally and economically dependent upon the central city.[30] Sociologists have debated the "myth" about suburbia as homogeneous, middle-class communities where behavior patterns display enormous conformity. This myth has been exploded by Bennett Berger whose research uncovered many suburbs that were populated by significant numbers of poor and lower-middle-class individuals. Berger insisted that the myth about suburbia has been perpetuated by studies that were conducted in nonrepresentative suburbs.

> I do...question the right of others to generalize about "suburbia" on the basis of a few studies of selected suburbs whose representative character has yet to be demonstrated.... References to "suburbia" more often than not cite the examples of Park Forest and Levittown --as if these two communities could represent a nationwide phenomenon that has occurred at all but the very lowest income levels and among most occupational classifications. If "suburbia" is anything at all unique, we'll never know it until we have a lot more information about a lot more suburbs than we now, unfortunately, have.[31]

Any attempt to settle the problems associated with the myth of suburbia was beyond the scope of this explanatory section on suburban communities. It appeared more pertinent to emphasize the geographical approximation of

---

[30]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, United States Summary - Section 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

[31]Bennett M. Berger, "The Myth of Suburbia," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1961), p. 49.

suburbs to cities without stressing any particular system of social stratification.

Dwight Sanderson provided a useful description of rural communities. He discussed the "real community" by describing it as a "form of association" and stated,

> ...it is necessary to recognize that, because farm people have to have certain services which can be obtained only at centers where there is a sufficient patronage to support them, they inevitably associate themselves more or less definitely with one or more village centers. The area within which this association occurs between farms and villages forms the geographical basis of the rural community.[32]

He continued, and gave the following definition of a rural community.

> Thus, while recognizing the psychological and sociological aspects of the rural community, for practical purposes one wishes to locate the areas within which these common associations exist. One may, then, define the geographical basis of the rural community, as a rural area within which the people have a common center of interest, usually a village, and within which they have a sense of common obligations and responsibilities. The rural community is the smallest geographical unit of organized association of the chief human activities.[33]

The preceding descriptions of urban, suburban and rural communities were developed specifically to facilitate the identification and categorization of sixty-six communities in the State of Minnesota. This categorization was

---

[32] Dwight Sanderson, Locating the Rural Community, Cornell Extension Bulletin 413 (Ithaca: New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, 1939), p. 6.

[33] Ibid.

undertaken in order to determine whether or not responses to the CEGI were affected by an individual's area or geographical orientation.

Social Change and the Community

One of the most curious aspects of American social behavior is the way individuals organize to effect changes in a community. Warren wrote,

> ...Many changes occur within communities on the basis of unplanned modifications in the structure of the population, the gradual growth or decline of industries, the constant competition for land use, the gradual development or infusion of new ideas or usages and discarding of old ones. But some kinds of change are deliberately brought about. The development of a new pattern of health services or of a program of low-cost housing, the adoption of a new plan of land use, the mounting of a campaign for industrial expansion, a concerted attempt to reduce juvenile delinquency or poverty--all are examples.[34]

Nelson, et. al., focused on the description and definition of social change.

> Most of the problems of man involve social change in one way or another....Almost any kind of change produces problems if for no other reason than it represents a deviation from that to which one is accustomed....The nature of social structure is such that a change in one dimension or element is likely to produce change in another....[35]

Martindale and Monachesi identified an additional

---

[34]Warren, op. cit., Perspectives on the American Community, p. 246.

[35]Lowry Nelson, Charles E. Ramsey and Coolie Varner, Community Structure and Change (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960), p. 391.

relationship between social change and social problems, one that is reflected by the fact that when individuals are confronted with problems, they adjust their societal relations in an attempt to alleviate the problems. This adjustment process actually amounts to social change.[36]

Communities are stages upon which the great dramas of social change are produced and directed. Community education can play an important role because its aim is to help communities organize and attempt to cope with problems and change. In this respect, community education is consistent with the sociological term community development.[37] There are additional similarities between community education and community development. Both are methods for helping to effect social change, and both stress the notion that the community, as a social group, and its residents share common interests and problems and often suffer from poor or no communication. Both a community development worker and a community educator would encourage a community to begin the communication process, pursue common interests, develop goals and a process by which they can be met, implement a program of action, and continue to evaluate their entire effort. The greatest difference between these two approaches is that the community educator organizes his

---

[36]Don Martindale and Elio D. Monachesi, Elements of Sociology, Part 4 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).

[37]Nelson, et. al., op. cit., p. 392.

efforts through the local school system; that, in effect, becomes his base of operations.

Community and Citizen Action and Participation

Participating in a wide variety of community activities has long been a part of an American's way of life. Typically, participation manifests itself as a voluntary action rather than as a professional career. There is a great proliferation of participatory organizations in American communities: clubs, churches, associations, voluntary agencies, and various social action groups.[38] Another type of group participation is provided by the local community council whose members reside in the surrounding neighborhood of the local community school. Indeed, one of the goals of community education is to establish representative community councils that provide local residents with an opportunity to participate in community and school activities.

The American's fascination with voluntary participation groups is not a recently developed phenomenon. The well-traveled Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited America in the early decades of the Nineteenth Century and remarked favorably about the abundance of "public associations."

> ...Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations.

---

[38] Warren, op. cit., Perspectives on the American Community, p. 342.

> They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons and schools....[39]

People often get involved in participatory associations because they seek others who share a particular point of view and a desire to help initiate some change. Christopher Sower, et. al., stated,

> It is through a convergence of interest arising out of values, beliefs, and relationships of the larger community that a group is formed which is concerned with the initiation of a specific action. Until such a formation takes place, action exists only in the minds of individuals. The establishment of such an initiating set leads to the development of a common frame of reference from which concrete action flows.[40]

Among those working at organizing communities for action, there are two dominant but opposing strategies. One strategy emphasizes the unique environment of economically depressed neighborhoods and concentrates its efforts in those areas. The most well-known advocate of this strategy is Saul David Alinsky who once stated that he "appeals to the self-interest of local residents and to their

---

[39]Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Vol-II, trans. by Phillips Bradley (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1945), p. 106.

[40]Christopher Sower, John Holland, Kenneth Tiedke and Walter Freeman, Community Involvement (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 68.

resentment and distrust of the outside world."[41] Alinsky motivates people toward unified action by fanning the fires of personal fear. The result is that an organization is formed which becomes a pressure agent that forces other agencies and organizations to negotiate with it. Neighborhood groups, motivated by fear, are not usually rational bargaining agents. Their demands are often unreasonable and removed from the framework of renewal planned by local governmental and social agencies or industrial organizations. They are, however, unusually successful in gaining "special concessions from city hall to remedy specific neighborhood problems."[42]

Most community planners and organizations do not share Alinsky's approach to action. His strategy has ripped communities apart, alienating a given area from the rest of the community. The second action-strategy stresses cooperation and collaboration in organizing for change. These tactics are in spirit with community education in that they encourage the development of "neighborhood organizations which will define positive goals for their areas in collaboration with the relevant city agencies...."[43]

---

[41]Saul David Alinsky, "Citizen Participation and Community Organization in Planning and Urban Renewal," Speech to the Chicago Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, January 29, 1962.

[42]James Q. Wilson, "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 29, No. 4 (November 1963), p. 246.

[43]Ibid.

The Community and the School

The relationship between school and community, in America, has always been an important one. Perhaps the most interesting dimension of this relationship has been the fluctuating and diverse roles played by community residents in their concern for a sound educational program. These roles may range from one with little interest or input to one emphasizing complete control. In an analysis of the role and function of the local board of education, James B. Conant stated,

> ...in the United States, many decisions which in Germany, for example, would be made by the Ministry of Education are made by the local board. Important educational matters are settled by a school board responding in part to the views of parents, in part to the pressure exerted by taxpayers who are not parents, in part to representations made by the teachers, and often to the advice of the superintendent and his staff....The differences from school to school, however, are highly significant and often represent the differences between a satisfactory and an unsatisfactory school. Such differences are an inevitable consequence of the high degree of independence of the local school board and, to an extent, reflect the diversity of the parental interest between one type of community and another.[44]

In order to more fully understand the goals of community education, and to realize its increasing potential for the future, the following assessment of several key factors was undertaken. The school and the community are inextricably bound together; their closeness was described by Conant.

---

[44]James B. Conant, The Child, The Parent and The State (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 16.

> The nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore, to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreak havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable.[45]

School Problems

The barrage of problems facing schools today signifies the need for institutional transformation. It is becoming increasingly difficult to leave the entire functioning of a school to only the board of education and the professionals under its direction. In fact, this practice has become obsolete in many communities. For too long schools remained aloof from the community, operating according to guidelines developed by professionals but seldom explained to community members, parents or students. Faced with declining enrollments, higher operating costs, decreasing funding, and increasing public criticism, schools must seek to become a more vitally active unit in today's society. Sumption and Engstrom concurred when they wrote,

> The role of the school in the American community is vital and challenging. If it is to exercise ...leadership, if it is to recognize and provide for educational needs, it must develop and maintain a close relationship with the community. This relationship must not be a superficial one, but rather a deep and meaningful one. It must not be occasional or temporary, but continuous

---

[45]Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966). This statement by Conant appears in the epigraph.

and lasting.[46]

They went on to discuss some principles essential for developing and sustaining an effective partnership between school and community. The fundamental principle was the need for "recognition of the school as a public enterprise." After all, schools are owned by the community residents and supported by their tax dollars. Increased societal change produces a concomitant change in educational needs. Schools must meet the challenge of providing for these needs by responding "actively, boldly and courageously [with] the spirit of adventure, ambition and achievement...."[47] An additional principle isolated the importance of "a structured, systematic, and active participation on the part of the people of the community in the educational planning, policy making, problem solving, and evaluation of the school."[48] The participation principle advocated by Sumption and Engstrom goes beyond the traditional function of most boards of education by encouraging "the knowledgeable participation of hundreds of people...if the school is to make adequate use of the talents and abilities of those it serves...."[49] The final principle addressed the necessity and purpose of an open system of communication.

---

[46] Ibid., p. x.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., p. xi.

[49] Ibid.

> ...There must be a clear and effective two-way system of communication between school and community. Communication which limits itself to telling the people about the school is doing only one-half the job. Equally important is telling the school about the people who support it and are served by it. It is important that the community knows what the school is doing, but it is equally important that the school knows what the people are doing. In brief, the community should know its school, and the school should know its community.[50]

The importance of on-going communication cannot be overemphasized and is succinctly summarized by Harold Leavitt. "People begin, modify, and end relationships by communicating with one another. Communication is their channel of influence, their mechanism of change."[51]

In addition to the problems of declining enrollment and decreasing finances facing schools today, there have been multiplying demands that schools be more accountable for their educational programs and the professionals who develop, implement, operate and administer those programs. With ever-increasing consistency, American communities are rejecting bond issues for new buildings and equipment. Schools apparently will have to get along with less and account more for how they do it. Those professional and lay persons who have criticized the schools have demonstrated their concern. Although their attacks in many cases have

---

[50] Ibid.

[51] Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology (3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 114.

been severe, the net results could be positive. According to Robert Hutchins,

> The critics of the schools have performed a public service in calling attention to shortcomings that can be repaired by keeping them in mind and working on them.[52]

If the "antischool" movement continues to gain supporters and momentum, the school as a primary social institution faces possible destruction. "...If it [the anti-school movement] succeeds, we shall be deprived of the one institution that could most effectively assist in drawing out our common humanity."[53]

The greatest challenge facing education could very well be its ability to keep pace with today's world of change. Toffler discussed the problem of time-bias that tried to force American education to change its "focus" from the past to the present.

> The historic struggle waged by John Dewey and his followers to introduce "progressive" measures into American education was, in part, a desperate effort to alter the old time-bias. Dewey battled against the past-orientation of traditional education, trying to refocus education on the here and now.[54]

There is considerable disagreement among experts over the extent to which this transformation has occurred. Toffler

---

[52]Robert Maynard Hutchins, "The Role of Public Education," Today's Education, Vol. 63, No. 7 (November-December, 1973), p. 81.

[53]Ibid., p. 80.

[54]Toffler, op. cit., Future Shock, p. 401.

further argued,

> ...And just as the progressives of yesterday were accused of "presentism," it is likely that the education reformers of tomorrow will be accused of "futurism"....
>
> Finally, unless we capture control of the accelerative thrust--and there are few signs yet that we will--tomorrow's individual will have to cope with even more hectic change than we do today. For education the lesson is clear: its prime objective must be to increase the individual's "cope-ability"--the speed and economy with which he can adapt to continual change. And the faster the rate of change, the more attention must be devoted to discerning the pattern of future events.[55]

The problems outlined in this section were not meant to be representative of the entire range of problems encountered by schools. The objective was to concentrate on school problems which are more greatly affected by the interaction between the community and its public educational institutions. Although apparently subtle in the past, the impact of politics and its role in education has become increasingly visible during the last ten years. The influence of politics and power upon the decision-making process in education is inescapable. Because of its consequence, school politics was analyzed as an individual topic, even though it belongs beneath the umbrella of "school problems."

School Politics

Thomas Eliot discussed the notion that "...schools are objects of local control..." and are, therefore, subject

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 402-403.

to the intricacies of political and governmental entanglement.

> Surely it is high time to stop being frightened by a word. Politics includes the making of governmental decisions, and the effort or struggle to gain or keep the power to make those decisions. Public schools are part of government. They are political entities....[56]

Wirt and Kirst concurred with Eliot and contended that over the years there has been an attempt to keep politics somehow separated from schools or to think "...that schools had somehow been sanitized against politics...."[57] They attacked the "myth of apolitical education."

> By a mutual but unspoken and long-standing agreement, American citizens and scholars have contended for many years that the world of education is and should be kept separate from the world of politics. Although elections and referenda concerning other policies were viewed as "political," these words did not connote "politics" when used for educational policy. Two reasons for attempting to preserve the folklore that"politics and education do not mix" were the risk to the schoolmen who were overt players of politics and the relative benefits to schoolmen who preserved the image of the public schools as a unique, nonpolitical function of government.[58]

The unwillingness of schoolmen to openly explain political

---

[56]Thomas H. Eliot, "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," American Political Science Review, Vol. 53 (December 1959), p. 1035.

[57]Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, The Political Web of American Schools (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1972), p. x.

[58]Ibid., p. 5.

ties was understandable because of community concern about the nebulous and mysterious ways of politics. Eliot elaborated,

> But are we permitted to speak of the "politics of education? To many...the word seems abhorrent....Again, this is understandable. Whole school systems have been blighted by the intrusion of certain aspects of politics, especially the use of patronage in appointments and contracts...."[59]

Politics was not only distasteful to community members but also to many professional educators charged with the responsibility of keeping schools functioning. Eventually, ties that are as heavily knotted and that represent a horizontal pattern as fundamental as the relationship between the school and governmental agencies had to undergo public scrutiny. In addition, many American schools continued to witness vertical pattern growth largely due to the increasing amount of federal government funding for programs of all sorts.

> ...Because school districts are governmental units and the voters have ultimate responsibility, school board members and school superintendents are engaged in political activity whether they like it or not. The standard professional terminology for this--a semantic triumph--is "community relations"....[60]

The political factor has become a topic of major interest to researchers, as well as to educators. A few

---

[59]Eliot, op. cit., p. 1035.

[60]Ibid.

years ago Neal Gross conducted a study on problems that faced American superintendents. His research question, "Who runs our schools?" actually became the title of a book. Gross was particularly interested in the assortment of community pressures that formed the bases of problems faced by school superintendents.

To begin with, any individual residing in a community can express his opinion about an issue relating to the public schools. In order for a superintendent or a school board to be cognizant of community concerns, direct communication of these concerns must take place. An individual has some avenues open to him if he feels dissatisfied with attempts to handle his concern. He may vote in the school board election or run as a candidate himself, if he is so inclined. Another common pressure is that which is exerted publicly by a community member or a group. The advantage of this tactic is that it can be employed any time.

The superintendent may also become the target of directly applied pressure from a community member, as well as from a board member. One additional pressure tactic results when an individual board member is "leaned on" and encouraged to do what he can for a community member making a request or demand. The unifying element in all these pressures was their political overtone. Powerful or influential people in the community applied pressure in order to benefit somehow, whether it was in receiving a

maintenance contract, getting someone hired or fired or simply obtaining a favor. All these pressures, if applied successfully, can erode most institutions; schools are particularly vulnerable. Gross wrote,

> Few people would be so blunt or crass in their attempts to influence board members or superintendents. But how often does a request or the expression of an opinion carry with it an implied threat, even an unintended threat? This is what we mean by a pressure: a request, demand, or expressed opinion behind which lies a threat for failure to conform to the request, demand, or opinion, whether this threat is intended or unintended, implicit or explicit. We are not objecting to citizens expressing opinions about their schools. We live in a democracy and everyone has a right to his own opinion, a right to express that opinion, and a right to ask for anything he wants that is not expressly illegal.[61]

The political pressures of ordinary individuals and groups applied to the school have the potential for far greater success. Although breakthroughs and improvements have occurred as a result of citizen and group action, the real clout has been carried by informal groups. The magnitude and consistency with which informal power groups affect educational decision-making is alarming. Ralph Kimbrough commented,

> Generally speaking, educational leaders have failed to recognize the tremendous influence exercised covertly by informal groups in basic educational projects, policies, and issues. There is a reluctance on the part of some educators to recognize that much goes on in addition to the activity readily observed in the

---

[61]Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), pp. 45-60.

> formal meetings of organizations, school boards, and school facilities....[62]

In order to appreciate the complexity, strength and extent to which informal groups can apply political strangleholds to a community, Kimbrough listed the following series of statements which "are supported by research and relevant to an informal conceptualization of power and educational policy decision-making."

1. Citizens vary greatly in the degree of influence they exercise over educational policy decisions.

2. The variation in power among persons and groups in the local school district is associated with the difference in control over, and the effective use of, power resources. Informal groups are often able to use their collective resources more effectively than formal organizations.

3. The status of public officials is often associated with the disproportionate amount of resources controlled by the private institutions in meeting the felt needs of people. This often results in relatively low power among the members of the board of education and other governmental officials.

4. Decisive power is exercised in most local school districts by relatively few persons who hold top positions of influence in the informal power structure of the school district. The success of significant educational projects and proposals is often heavily dependent upon the support or lack of support of these men of power.

5. Businessmen constitute the largest single occupational representation at the decision-making level of the informal power structures of many local school districts. As a consequence of their superior status, businessmen exercise the

---

[62] Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964), p. 194.

greatest effect upon, and often dominate, educational policies in the nation.

6. Decisive influence with decisions is often exercised through the informal group activity of a few leaders preceding formal action by those officials legally clothed with authority to make the decisions.

7. An established informal power group is usually an important element in the informal power arrangement in the political unit. It is characterized by hierarchical levels of control functions.

8. Organized interest groups and temporary informal groups assume important functions in the informal power structure of the school district.

9. The direction in which an informal power group moves is consistent with the pattern of operational beliefs held by the leaders of greatest power in the group. Men of influence tend to move along an individualistic-interdependent power continuum which vitally affects their behavior on basic educational policy.

10. The influence of each important informal power group is extended through an informal network of interaction and close ties with persons located in each local community or political subdivision of the local school district and with persons holding important power positions at the state and federal levels.

11. Educational policies result from different levels of politics. School politics cannot be isolated from the politics of other public and private agencies operating within the local school district.[63]

Informal power groups are forces to be reckoned with in all American communities; urban, suburban or rural.

One additional example illuminated the school's susceptibility to special-interest pressure. Raymond

---

[63] Ibid., pp. 195-218.

Callahan conducted a study in order to explore "how the educational policy forced upon the schools has been dominated by business." He observed,

> ...I was not really surprised to find business ideas and practices being used in education.
>
> What was unexpected was the extent, not only of the power of the business-industrial groups, but of the strength of the business ideology in the American culture on the one hand and the extreme weakness and vulnerability of schoolmen, especially school administrators, on the other. I had expected more professional autonomy and I was completely unprepared for the extent and degree of capitulation by administrators to whatever demands were made upon them....[64]

Callahan's argument does not have a blanket applicability to all school districts. Nevertheless, it served to illustrate that many schools are confronted with decisions that must be made by carefully considering the demands and interests of informal power groups.

Any consideration of a topic such as "school politics" would be incomplete if the role and place of government were not examined. During the past decade, the relationships between the local, state and federal governments have changed drastically. These changes were summarized by James Koerner.

> In a series of actions over the last dozen years the federal government in all three branches has made clear its conviction that lower levels of government are unable, for whatever reasons, to cope with the civil rights movement and a number

---

[64] Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), preface.

> of other urgent problems. Most of these federal actions involve American education in one way or another. The central government has apparently decided that formal education is to be one of the chief instruments for solving all sorts of social and economic problems--poverty, hate, discrimination, unemployment, maladjustment, inequality. It has also decided that the states and local communities will have to be led, or if necessary coerced, by higher authority until they are willing and able to tackle these problems themselves.[65]

Throughout American history, Congress has passed a great deal of educational legislation. However, until the 1960's only five "fundamental actions" were taken.

1. The Land Ordinance of 1785
2. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862
3. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917
4. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944
5. The National Defense Education Act of 1958

The federal role expanded greatly in the 1960's, as Koerner pointed out.

> ...Between 1962 and 1967 alone, Congress passed perhaps thirty pieces of legislation which pumped a vast amount of federal money into the education and the occupational training of Americans. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; the Higher Education Act of 1965; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; plus the renewals, extensions, and expansions of these acts in 1966 and 1967: all this legislation comes to many billions of dollars and creates new relationships between the federal government and the states and between both of them

---

[65] James D. Koerner, Who Controls American Education? (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 3.

and the local education authorities.[66]

The avalanche of federal funds dispensed by the giant Congressional cash register has encouraged schools to get more seriously involved in politics than ever before. Writing for federal grants has become common practice for administrators and teachers. As this practice continues, the external dependency on outside organizations increases and a community becomes increasingly vertical and decreasingly horizontal. In a sense, the community loses a bit more of its ability to control its own educational destiny.

The analysis of school politics drew attention to what can be identified as professional school politics. Despite the multitude of outside pressures, somehow many professionals managed to retain a significant influence on how educational policy is made.

> While the board is the ultimate local authority in school politics, professional educators have their resources, too. They define alternatives, produce research, provide specific policy recommendations, and recommend the formal agenda. In these and many other ways, professionals generate subsystem pressures and information that shape the board's deliberations and policy decisions.[67]

Reduced to the most basic issue, school politics points to a contradiction in values.

> ...This emphasis upon professionals as policy makers reflects an interesting tension in our schools that arises from conflicting values.

---

[66] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[67] Wirt and Kirst, op. cit., p. 85.

> On the one hand, Americans talk much about democratic controls on education, and the school's closeness to community opinion is much stressed ....On the other hand, "We want the best for our children" is an also-stressed popular value, one which requires surrender to the expertise of professional educators.[68]

In an attempt to resolve the value conflict and to encourage a useful dialog, many communities have initiated procedures to secure community input regarding school problems.

Citizen Advisory Groups and Community Councils

Communities are complex settings with a high degree of institutional and human interaction. Tension can be high and conflict is not uncommon. Because community education advocates the establishment of neighborhood community councils, it was helpful to examine various attempts at community council and advisory group formation in communities that had not embraced the community education concept, as well as in some that had done so.

David Easton coined the term "withinputs" which refers to "the effect that events and conditions both within and without a system may have upon its persistence...to find the major influences that may lead to stress."[69] Communities demand a variety of things from schools and school boards. The quality and amount of citizen input has a

---

[68] Ibid., p. 95.

[69] David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 114.

direct correlation with the stress level in a school system. There were studies indicating that many citizens really do not know much about the functioning of the educational process or the complexity of making school policy.[70] What concerned the public were issues that were rather marginal, such as dress codes or the athletic program. This lack of interest was found to exist in community leaders as well. Roscoe Martin sampled mayors, officials of local Leagues of Women Voters and other prominent officials, and found that they revealed no

> ...particular interest in curriculum, textbooks, subversive activities, personalities, athletics, race relations....This suggests that these areas provide a reservoir for what we have called episodic issues--issues which emerge under unusual or special conditions and shortly subside. Thus, it is not textbooks which cause concern, but a particular textbook under a special set of circumstances.[71]

The role and effectiveness of community advisory councils was found to vary greatly depending on such factors as community interest and willingness to participate, school district support and the quality of the council leadership.[72] Additional factors were identified in an

---

[70]Richard F. Carter, Voters and Their Schools, (Stanford, California: Institute for Communication Research, 1960), pp. 73-76.

[71]Roscoe Martin, Government and the Suburban School, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962), p. 55.

[72]"School-Community Advisory Councils," A National Community Education Workshop, hosted by the Flint Board of Education, March 5-7, 1974, Flint, Michigan.

evaluation recently conducted in Los Angeles which had three purposes:

> 1) to describe the structure and operation of the advisory councils, 2) to pinpoint discrepancies between how the councils should work and how they actually do work, and 3) to identify what factors are related to council effectiveness....[73]

The factors associated with the effectively functioning councils were:

1. Fair representation of sex and race
2. Extensive nonmember input and participation
3. Cooperative school administrations
4. Planned goals and agendas[74]

The establishment of neighborhood community councils is a goal of most community education programs. However, many school districts that have not operated "official" community education programs have initiated community advisory councils or citizens committees.

According to Herbert Hamlin, a renewed interest in public participation in school affairs developed in post World War II America. Earlier in our history, schools were often constructed by community folk who also frequently provided lodging for the teachers. Local school boards supervised teachers and town folk regularly attended meetings

---

[73]"An Evaluation: School-Community Advisory Councils," Unified School District, Office of Education and Management Assessment, Los Angeles, California, 1972.

[74]Ibid.

where educational funding was discussed and voted on. Hamlin noted that, increasingly, community interest waned and schools became part of the emerging bureaucracy which included state departments of education and myriad professionals.

> Thus we developed many school systems which were largely managed by professional administrators and teachers. Boards of education in these systems became necessary evils, useful primarily in helping to get from the public the funds required to carry out the ideas of state and local professional workers. Laymen became almost unnecessary to the schools, except to furnish the students, elect a board of education, and pass on occasional bond issues....[75]

Hamlin continued his historical analysis and discussed the reasons why the public became "interested" once again in school affairs during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

> ...Groups who once accepted schools that did not serve them well now demand appropriate services. Strong minority pressure groups harass boards of education, administrators, and teachers....
>
> The schools have been changing and education has been becoming more and more complicated....Many laymen feel that they are "left out," that they have no way of influencing effectively the program of the schools....[76]

The citizens advisory committees, sometimes identified as councils or commissions, have proven to be of value in many American communities. However, in some communities they have created problems. It must be pointed out that these committees do not have legal authority and their

---

[75]Herbert Hamlin, Citizens Committees in the Public Schools, (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printing Co., 1952), p. 3.

[76]Ibid., p. 5.

members receive no financial incentives to serve. The overall objective of citizen committees is to advise the board of education and other school officials on educational policy and school problems.[77]

Two general types of committees were identified. First, the independent committee which is typically composed of local community members that form a protest or pressure group. With sound leadership, an independent committee can achieve "constructive" results by being,

1. Representative of the people of the community rather than a segment of the population.
2. Willing to study a problem or issue rather than take a position in advance.
3. Receptive to professional counsel and advice.
4. Organized in such a way as to involve many people of varied opinions yet maintain a relatively small executive or action group.[78]

Damage to school and community can be done by a "destructive" committee which "is frequently unrepresentative, unwilling to study, without professional counsel, and willing to take into its ranks only those who are in full accord with its avowed aim."[79] Examples of destructive committees were found in several communities, particularly in New York City, where citizen advisory groups pushed for what became known as complete community control of the schools. The

---

[77]Sumption and Engstrom, op. cit., pp. 75-100.

[78]Ibid., p. 79.

[79]Ibid., pp. 79-80.

failure of community control was due in large measure to an overinvolvement in political tactics and concerns rather than to unsound or unreasonable educational plans. Diane Ravitch indicated that according to proponents, the decentralization of the New York school system, including turning over more responsibility to parents and administrators, would result in an improved educational program for ghetto youth. She asserted that one of the ironies of community control was that

> ...though community control has been advanced by educational radicals as a means of freeing the schools from bureaucratic conservatism and conventional thinking, in fact, elected parent-community boards tend to be more conservative, more middle class, and more bound to traditional approaches than most educators. Real community pressure, especially in poor and working-class areas, is in the direction of making sure that children are being equipped for entry into the middle class....The Ocean Hill-Brownsville governing board may have appeared radical and innovative to the outside world, but in fact it was desperately trying any and all means to achieve the traditional goals of higher reading scores and discipline in the halls. The community wanted educational results.[80]

In an attempt to operate effectively, advisory committees must perform several functions:

1. To aid in developing educational policy.
2. To aid in developing long range plans.
3. To help in solving school-community problems.

---

[80]Diane Ravitch, "Community Control Revisited," Commentary, Vol. 53, No. 2 (February 1972), pp. 69-74.

4. To assist in evaluating the work of the school.

5. To aid in maintaining two-way communication between community and school.[81]

The following guidelines for operation were suggested:

1. A regular schedule of meetings should be established as early as possible. Interim meetings may be held if the work requires them. No less than one meeting should be held each month of the school year.

2. The board should provide a regular meeting place for the committee, preferably at a centrally located school.

3. If possible some secretarial, clerical, and duplicating service should be provided for the committee.

4. A citizens committee should be primarily a study group making recommendations and only secondarily a promotional group.

5. A good way to orient the citizens committee with the program of the school system is to start with a tour of the schools.

6. While a citizens committee should not be limited as to the scope of problems it may study, it should undertake only one or two problems at any one time.

7. A citizens committee should, when possible, select for its first problem for study one which it is possible to solve in a relatively short time.

8. A citizens committee, when it is starting, should avoid issues which are likely to split the community and should attack this type of problem only after it has become well established.

9. A consultant should assume the responsibility for seeing that the advisory committee maintains its proper relationship to the school

---

[81]Sumption and Engstrom, op. cit., pp. 84-86.

board, the school staff, and the people of the community.

10. Resource persons, those who have a special competence in one or more areas, should be called on for help as needed. The superintendent of schools is one of the most valuable resource persons available to the committee.

11. The citizens committee should fully utilize the services of the teaching staff as resource persons.

12. There should be close communication between the citizens committee and the board of education at all times. A member of the board of education should often be invited to sit with the committee as a resource person, and one annual joint meeting between the board of education and the citizens committee should be held.

13. While working cooperatively with the board of education, the citizens committee should arrive at its own decisions and never be a rubber stamp for the board.

14. The committee should enlist the aid of citizens of the community by establishing temporary subcommittees as needed to work on specific phases of a problem.

15. All meetings of the citizens committee should be open to the public.

16. The committee should report its recommendations and suggestions to the board, never to the public directly.

17. When the board appoints a citizens committee, it assumes an obligation to consider the opinions of the committee carefully, and while the board is not obligated to act favorably on all committee recommendations, it should be prepared to state specific reasons when it does not act favorably.[82]

In districts with community education programs,

---

[82] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

community councils have operated quite similarly to citizen advisory committees. The two share a similarity in composition, organization and purpose. Because community councils are a vital component of many community education programs, it was beneficial to illustrate their importance and relationship to the school and community. Eleanor Blumenberg concisely captured much of the spirit of community councils.

> Basically, the school-community advisory idea is a valid and valuable one. It suggests that one can make use of previously untapped forces of strength around the schoolhouse, in order to improve the educative process. It considers improved community relations as a means, not an end. Implicit in this idea is a more basic one: That there is indeed strength and wisdom "out there" regardless of socio-economic and subcultural differences....Involvement, communication, and accountability become two-way interactions; council members are partners in the process, not clients or even visiting experts. Creative and responsible actions can be expected from community participants and students as well as from school personnel.[83]

She further addressed the problem of getting a community council started.

> The trick is to involve the non-involved, hearten the dubious, and hear from the inarticulate or the alienated....Use a broad definition of the community, draw from it representatively, but make sure it is your community, not a mythical random sample taken from a sociological text. A good local council is one-of-a-kind. By definition it must be different from its neighbors in composition, priorities, and in operation....

---

[83]Eleanor Blumenberg, "The School-Community Advisory Council: For Better or For Worse?" Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 46, No. 2 (February 1971), p. 60.

> Early in the game councils must work at establishing shared perspectives, shared priorities, and above all, shared ground rules. Establishment of these is in itself a process of education for all. Therefore, this process must be ongoing and subject to revision as needs change and as insights grow....The more vital a council becomes, the more accurate and challenging its perceptions....[84]

Once the council is functioning, a process ought to be employed to evaluate its effectiveness. Patrick Mullarney presented a comprehensive evaluation process based on Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model which "is based on the continual analysis of the discrepancies between the standard of the desired performance and the actual performance."[85] He concluded,

> Evaluating the effectiveness of community councils is a most difficult task. The problem of identifying the purpose and role of the council not only deals with the evidence supplied by various programs and research, but also the values which are an integral part of the community and themselves. The council must know the purpose of the evaluation and select an approach to it....Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model...provides continuous feedback in the early and last stages of a program's development and provides relevant information to the council for making decisions. By comparing the data obtained from this procedure to the original design of the community council, its effectiveness can be ascertained.[86]

---

[84] Ibid., pp. 61-62.

[85] Patrick B. Mullarney, "Evaluating Community Council Effectiveness Using Provus' Discrepancy Model," Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 3 (May-June 1974), pp. 54-57.

[86] Ibid., p. 57.

Both citizen advisory committees and community councils can be useful utensils in the construction of positive school-community relations.

> In New York and San Francisco an experiment in parent-student-faculty advisory groups was most effective. Problems were solved that included a series of "student demands" and an overcrowded junior high school. One unanticipated problem encountered by the advisory groups was unsuccessful attempts to communicate their accomplishments to students and community members. The various factions were rather suprised at the extent to which they were able to work out differences.[87]

Blumenberg pointed out that the community council cannot do it all for a community.

> ...The local school-community advisory council, obviously, is not the miracle cure-all some of its uncritical proponents suggest. It cannot be substituted for overdue system-wide improvements in educational programs and organization. ...However,...the council can be a valuable tool for better diagnosis, relevant prescription, and realistic preventive actions where local school practices are concerned.[88]

The material presented in the first two sections of this chapter, The Community, and The Community and the School, formed the basis for the following discussion of community education. The rationale and purpose of community education are deeply grounded in the sociological concepts of community; in addition, the importance of school to our society has provided community educators with a recognized and acceptable framework within which the goals of

---

[87]"New Voices Gain Stature in Old Power Structure," Nation's Schools, Vol. 84, No. 3 (September 1969), p. 42.

[88]Blumenberg, op. cit., p. 62.

community education can be pursued.

Community Education

Introduction

The increased shifting from horizontal to vertical societal patterns has been traced. It was also suggested that this trend will continue in the future. This trend has the advantage of providing a community with new funding sources, but concurrently removes part of the ability of that community to rely on its own internal dependency mechanisms. Many communities have sought a

> ...means [of] reducing the extent of external control to assure that the community's goals are given the highest priority. The greater the extent of local autonomy, the greater the control exercised within the community, the more opportunity for it to survive, to develop, and to grow in its own fashion. Only this process will permit increased investment in the community's future, and the corresponding increase of personal commitment on the part of its citizens.[89]

One such process, described above by Barry Stein, has come to be known as community education. The process aspect of community education places great emphasis on community involvement "which results in self-actualization."

> The term community self-actualization is...used to mean the ability of a community to become the best that it is capable of becoming. In essence,

---

[89]Barry A. Stein, "A Step Toward Community Autonomy," The Community Context of Economic Conversion, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Community Economic Development, 1971), p. 40.

> community self-actualization is aimed at community development to the point that community members are involved in identifying problems and working through a process which enables them to plan courses of action and carry through on possible solutions.[90]

There were four basic assumptions related to community education.

1. Communities are capable of positive change.
2. Social problems have solutions.
3. One of the strongest forces for making change is community power.
4. Community members are desirous of improving their communities and are willing to contribute their energies toward such ends.[91]

Many community educators have accepted these assumptions and have worked to design and implement community education programs that reflect the needs of a particular community. The importance of professionals working with community members toward the solution of problems was emphasized earlier in the discussion of community advisory councils.

This study concerned itself with the importance and convergence of community education goals. The utilization of goals for educational planning has become acceptable practice. In America, the establishment of such groups as The National Goals Research Staff and The Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation reflected the

---

[90] Jack D. Minzey and Clyde LeTarte, Community Education: From Program to Process, (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972), p. 33.

[91] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

recognition that goal determination is important and can be valuable in planning educational programs.[92]

Previous to this study, the identification of several categories of community education goals representing many diverse communities was based on a historical examination of "the evolution of the community education concept"; secondly, input was solicited from many professionals and community members from all parts of the United States.[93] To be successful, a community must involve the people themselves in determining the direction of a program or a community. Toffler agreed and warned of the danger inherent in not encouraging more widespread participation in goal-setting.

> ...In short, in politics, in industry, in education, goals set without the participation of those affected will be increasingly hard to execute. The continuation of top-down technocratic goal-setting procedures will lead to greater and greater social instability, less and less control over the forces of change; an ever greater danger of cataclysmic, man-destroying upheaval.
>
> To master change, we shall need both a clarification of important long-range social goals and a democratization of the way in which we arrive at them....[94]

The balance of this chapter was designed, specifically, not to present an exhaustive historical account of the growth and development of community education; others

---

[92]DeLargy, op. cit., pp. 30-36.

[93]Ibid., pp. 43-67.

[94]Toffler, op. cit., Future Shock, p. 477.

have completed that chore.[95] The purpose of this section on community education was to analyze and discuss the various phases of implementation, and the changes that the community education concept has undergone. These changes were clearly illustrated in the variation of approaches to program implementation used by community educators and by the changing nature of the community school itself.

Background and Foundations

John Dewey stated a rationale for educational change and innovation. The foundation of community education was laid with the mortar of Dewey's rationale.

> Whenever we have in mind the discussion of a new movement in education, it is especially necessary to take the broader, or social, view. Otherwise, changes in the school institution and tradition will be looked at as the arbitrary inventions of particular teachers, at the worst transitory fads, and at the best merely improvements in certain details--and this is the plane upon which it is too customary to consider school changes....
>
> Can we connect this "New Education" with the general march of events? If we can, it will lose its isolated character; it will cease to be an affair which proceeds only from...over-ingenious minds....It will appear as part and parcel of the whole social evolution....[96]

There was more to the substance of community education philosophy. Hamlin discussed public participation in the schools and wrote,

---

[95] See especially Decker, op. cit., Chapter II, pp. 20-79.

[96] John Dewey, School and Society (revised ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915), pp. 4-5.

> There is a growing realization that the public schools are public. They belong to the public. The public pays their costs. They should be conducted in the public interest. They should serve the total public.[97]

Fred Totten described the difficulty in stating a precise definition of community education.

> Community education cannot readily be defined in specific terms. It can be described and explained,...there is no authoritative definition. Community education is an all-inclusive phenomenon functioning in the community to help people of all ages, races, religions, and socio-economic backgrounds to fulfill their learning needs and to aid in the development and improvement of the entire community.[98]

One of the difficulties in pinpointing a definition of community education has been the flexibility and the change in the concept itself. Over the past forty years, community education has grown from a concept that promoted the increased use of school facilities for recreational activities and adult enrichment, to one that now advocates "the establishment of community linkages in order to provide a complete delivery system of human services to a community."[99]

Even though the definition of community education has varied over the years, and continues to do so,[100]

---

[97]Hamlin, op. cit., p. 2.

[98]W. Fred Totten, The Power of Community Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1970), p. 3.

[99]Larry E. Decker, "Linkages Influencing the Approaches in Sharing the Action," a speech delivered at a workshop entitled, "Community/Schools: Sharing the Space and the Action," Arlington, Virginia, April 15-16, 1974.

[100]See "The Definition Issue," NCSEA News, May 1971, in which thirteen community educators defined the concept.

according to Jack Minzey, this flexibility and variation has not represented anything unstable in or threatening to the community education movement. He suggested that the greatest strength of community education currently is its ability to retain the elasticity to bend toward new directions and the ability to receive new input.[101]

Despite the effects of a four decade evolution, the philosophy of community education has retained a certain overall uniformity in spirit and purpose. Its quality of being flexible has allowed professionals the latitude to stretch the philosophy to accommodate new approaches without obliterating the philosophy itself. Therefore, the following philosophical statement captured the meaning and intent of community education.

> Community School Education is a comprehensive and dynamic approach to public education. It is a philosophy that pervades all segments of education programming and directs the thrust of each of them towards the needs of the community. The community school serves as a catalytic agent by providing leadership to mobilize community resources to solve identified community problems. This marshalling of all forces in the community helps to bring about change as the school extends itself to all people.[102]

Community education programs have become far more complex over the years. Initially, community education emphasized

---

[101]Jack D. Minzey, "Community Education, the Past and Future," address to C.S. Mott Fellows, National Center for Community Education, Flint, Michigan, May 9, 1974.

[102]"Philosophy of Community Education," statement by National Community School Education Association Board of Directors, at a meeting, Flint, Michigan, April 26-28, 1968.

programs which were often added on to the traditional school program. There were some notable exceptions, however, particularly those programs directed by Elsie Clapp in Kentucky, several rural efforts sponsored by the Tennessee Valley Authority and by the "Community Education Center" in Glencoe, Illinois.[103] Although the community education programs of today have become more diversified, there are several unifying factors that were traced through the past forty years by Maurice Seay. The programs were shown to have substantial consistency. Seay searched "for the threads that proved strong in earlier programs of Community Education."

> These threads appear again and again in a great variety of programs in widely separated geographical regions. The clear light of the long perspective will help us to see them and to measure their strengths. Then we can use our understanding of these persistent threads to help us build fresh, innovative programs for the seventies and eighties.[104]

The threads that have continually repeated themselves during the past forty years were:

1. The community school recognizes the basic fact that education is a continuous process.

---

[103]For additional information see Maurice F. Seay and Associates, Community Education: A Developing Concept, Chapter 2 (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 19-46. Also see Samuel Everett, The Community School (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1938).

[104]Maurice F. Seay, "Threads Running Through the Community School Movement," Community Education Journal, Vol. 2, No. 1 (February 1972), p. 16.

2. Educational objectives are stated in terms of changed behavior.

3. Educational activities are based upon the problems, needs, and interests of those for whom they are planned.

4. The school serves the community and the community serves the school.

5. School and neighborhood become a focal point for understanding other, larger communities of people.

6. The community school challenges school and community leaders.[105]

One of the most frequently misunderstood relationships is the one "between the concept of Community Education and its programs." Minzey and LeTarte attempted to clarify this misconception.

> ...Community Education is the over-arching conceptual base, while programs are the activities related to the solution of specific community needs. Thus, enrichment opportunities, recreation programs, cultural activities, avocational offerings, and political and civic programs are partial ways of resolving certain community problems....[106]

Additional confusion and debate has continued over the emphasis upon and relationship between "program" and "process."

> ...The most important aspect of Community Education is not program but process. It is the relationship between these two terms which is fundamental to the concept of Community Education. The ultimate goal of Community Education is to develop a process by which members of a community learn to work together to identify problems and to seek out solutions to these problems. It is through this process that an on-going procedure is established for working together on all

---

[105] Ibid., pp. 16-19.

[106] Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 4.

community issues.[107]

The term Community Education Program is often referred to as a total effort in a community; it was not meant to emphasize programs rather than process. The Community Education Program represents the unique blending of the needed programs in a community and the process by which they are identified, implemented and evaluated.

For additional background, the following listing of overall community education objectives was included. These objectives were meant to describe general characteristics reflective of many community education programs; obviously, variation has characterized community education programs and, in all likelihood, will continue to.

1. Community Education attempts to develop a number of community programs.
   The term program here means specific activities aimed at community participation.... It is important that such programs be based on community needs and desires. These programs would include such things as adult education, high school completion, enrichment classes for school age students, avocational activities, vocational training, basic education, recreation, citizenship, cultural offerings and special programs aimed at solving community problems. These programs will be an acknowledgment of the importance of developing a concept of education as a lifetime experience....

2. Community Education attempts to promote interaction between school and community.
   This goal may be accomplished in the more overt and simplistic way of opening the school for more hours of the day, days of the week, and weeks of the year....The purpose of an improved

---

[107] Ibid.

relationship is to cause the traditional school programs to do those things for which they were intended--namely, to reflect the ideals of the society and to prepare young people for living in that society....

3. Community Education attempts to survey community resources and to coordinate their interaction.
These resources will be both formal and informal, institutional and individual. In every community there are untapped resources of assistance which can be useful in both the traditional and Community Education programs. Industry and business have facilities, programs and activities which can be converted into educational aids and community assets....

   Such resources are not only of tremendous use to Community Education and its various programs, but by recognizing and using these resources another by-product accrues to the educational programs. For as community members are more involved in assisting in the educational and community programs, there is a personal satisfaction gained by those individuals who are involved and the result is often a more positive attitude toward the educational system and its personnel.

4. Community Education attempts to bring about a better relationship between social and governmental agencies.
In most communities, there are a myriad of agencies designed to cope with community needs. There are also many differing organizations and institutions which make up the environment of each community member....

5. Community Education attempts to identify community problems and ferret out the needs of the community.
Ability to perform this function is dependent upon successful communication between the school and the community. It also implies a different role and responsibility for the school than the traditional teacher-pupil-subject role. If the communication channels are clear, then it becomes the responsibility of the school to assess the nature of the problem and decide what role it should play. It may refer, coordinate, or provide the entire service itself, depending upon the situation. The school is not all

things to all people, but is instead an expediter, a facilitator or an ombudsman whose main concern is solving community problems.

6. Community Education attempts to develop a process by which the community can become self-actualized.
The many problems which are plaguing our societies are compounded by the apathetic resignation of those who live within them. Action is dismissed by a feeling of powerlessness or by the attitude embodied in "you can't fight city hall." The solutions to problems and the changes required to improve our society can only be meaningful and long-lasting if such change comes from the community itself....[108]

The background material presented here focused on the concept of community education; a working definition was stated and overall objectives were listed. This entire effort was designed to set the stage for a consideration of the community school, most often the vehicle responsible for implementing a community education program.

The Emerging Community School

Many changes in the community education concept over the years represented conceptually new approaches rather than significantly new philosophical orientations. The community schools, in several parts of America, became laboratories where experiments in educational and community improvement were conducted. Several of these experiments resulted in the discovery of new approaches to the implementation of community education and new methods of providing services for people. An overview of these changes was organized and

---

[108] Ibid., pp. 24-29.

will be presented by decade, beginning with the 1930's. The four plus decades of experimentation with new approaches coincided with several key phases in the evolution of community education development and the community school. Ernest Melby's description of the community school provided a framework for examining its changing role and expanding function.

> ...The community school is a school, to be sure, which functions in a neighborhood, but it seeks to relate the neighborhood to the rest of the community. It draws its resources from the rest of the community, from the whole city, from the county, from the state, from the nation, from the profession. It brings people into the community and it takes the community out of its isolation into the world outside. And therefore we are not trying to isolate the people who live in this community,...we are trying to relate them to the outside world....[109]

The first decade of assorted attempts at organizing community education programs was in the 1930's. Because rural and urban communities were faced with different problems, community education revealed its elastic quality in the programs designed to solve differing community problems. The rural South of the 1930's was one of economic hardship and deprivation. Elsie Clapp consented to administer "an experiment in rural education" at Ballard School, not far from Louisville, Kentucky. Her vision centered around a school that could coordinate and manage the

---

[109]Ernest O. Melby, "Address to Second Annual Convention of National Community School Education Association," The Community School and Its Administration, Vol. 6, No. 5 (January 1968), p. 3.

lacking resources of a small community toward helping to cope with the overbearing social, economic and educational problems faced by community residents.[110]

With assistance from the federal government, which recognized the dire circumstances in the South, the Tennessee Valley Authority was established, according to Seay, to plan a program of conservation and resource-use and promote it through educational programs.[111] One example of such a program was at the Highlander Folk School of Summerfield, North Carolina, where a cooperative was formed in an attempt to improve the economic level of the community farms.[112]

Residents of American urban communities were confronted with their share of problems, too, and consequently, turned to the emerging community school for assistance. Samuel Everett wrote about Paul Misner's description of the efforts in Glencoe, Illinois, where a community education center was established to meet the needs of a community existing in a world that was constantly changing.[113]

Perhaps the most discussed community education program of all was the one that was conceived by Frank Manley in Flint, Michigan. He designed the first programs

---

[110]Elsie R. Clapp, Community Schools in Action (New York: Viking Press, 1940), pp. 3-6.

[111]Seay and Associates, op. cit., p. 22.

[112]Samuel Everett, The Community School (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1938), pp. 265-297.

[113]Ibid., p. 80.

essentially to provide the youth of Flint with an opportunity to use school playgrounds instead of the city streets. Flint was, indeed, fortunate that Manley was able to persuade Charles Stewart Mott to finance his early venture.[114]

Community education in the 1930's had already begun to branch out and gave indications that it was a concept that could provide a community with enough freedom to search for options suitable to the solution of its own particular problems. The curious mix of programs and process was present from the very beginning as exemplified in the rural South and in urban Flint. Community schools were beginning to open in many other communities in America as well.[115]

Strong trends in two directions developed during the 1940's. First, because schools were being utilized for activities in addition to traditional K-12 functions, a new emphasis toward enrichment and avocational activities was stressed, particularly for children. Secondly, after World War II, many community education programs began to provide a wide variety of activities for adults.[116] A great deal of the post-war community school activity was a direct outgrowth of the cooperation that had developed between school and community during the crises of the war years. Schools

---

[114]William Minardo, "The Right Man for the Right Job," Community Education Journal, Vol. 2, No. 5 (November 1972), pp. 13-14.

[115]Minzey, op. cit., Address to C.S. Mott Fellows.

[116]Ibid.

took leadership roles in the distribution of rationed food commodities and remained open for public service programs, including adult education classes. Seay wrote,

> ...The plain logic of the educational possibilities in such cooperation caught the attention of philanthropists and many other socially-sensitive leaders. Several of them helped community schools directly and enlisted the help of government, national educational associations, and various other educational agencies in promoting the community school idea.[117]

There was optimism after the War, and the hope that community education might become more widely known and accepted. Nelson Henry edited a two volume work by numerous educational leaders which outlined methods for the reorganization and improvement of American education. There were several references to the potential of partnerships in school-community cooperation and planning. Repeatedly, two foci emerged; 1) that schools should be institutions that provide services to everyone in the community, and not be restricted to only the education of young persons, and 2) every attempt ought to be made to enhance the educational program of the school by developing and expanding the physical and human resources available in a community.[118]

During the 1950's the community education program of Flint had become the most successful and comprehensive

---

[117] Seay and Associates, op. cit., p. 23.

[118] Nelson B. Henry, ed., American Education in the Postwar Period, Forty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Parts I and II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).

program of its kind. The success of the Flint program was the result of the hard work of many individuals and the financial commitment of C.S. Mott. One important development gave a great boost to the community education movement: the creation of the professional position of community school director. Along with the advent of the community school director came the notion of community outreach, and with it, a new dimension was added to community education. A paid, professional staff member was made responsible for all the community education activities of a school district or building.[119] Each community developed its own specific guidelines and job description for the community school director, but essentially they shared a functional similarity. Usually his duties were to:

1. Develop and supervise a broad range of educational, community development, and recreational programs of pre-school to senior citizen age groups to be conducted on school premises or in the school neighborhood after normal school hours and on Saturdays and during the summer vacation periods.

2. Periodically survey on a house to house basis the needs and desires of the residents in the area served by the school, and to adapt and develop programs offered on the basis of changing needs and demands.

3. Develop systematic methods of liaison and joint planning and effort with the public and private human service agencies, including programs with the police, sheriff's department, and others.

4. Develop and utilize to the maximum extent citizen volunteer action in enriching programs

---

[119]Minzey, op. cit., Address to C.S. Mott Fellows.

offered and in providing individualized attention and support as needed.

5. Stimulate neighborhood self-help and self-development movements to deal with problems of change and obsolescence, and to promote more effective use of available community resources by neighborhood groups themselves sponsoring positive change.[120]

The community outreach function meant that there was an individual at the school who was responsible for helping to form community councils and who attempted to be sensitive to the needs of community residents.[121] A corollary development during the 1950's was the spread of the Flint brand of community education to neighboring communities, particularly to Hazel Park, Michigan, where a comprehensive program was implemented largely through the efforts of the superintendent, Wilfred Webb. Van Voorhees stressed the importance of the superintendent and his role as it relates to the success of a community education program.

> If anyone is indispensable to the initiation of community education as currently practiced, it is the superintendent. The goals and objectives of community education usually reflect his understanding of, and interest in, the idea.[122]

Unfortunately, community education did not spread as rapidly in the 1950's as some might have predicted. On

---

[120] Community Education Concept, unpublished report, Center for Community Education Development, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1971.

[121] Interview with Pat Barley, Community School Director at Oak Community School, Flint, Michigan, April 8, 1974.

[122] Van Voorhees, op. cit., "Community Education Needs Research for Survival," p. 203.

October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first Sputnik which triggered a wave of new criticism over the direction of American educational practices. The trends toward community-centered learning and the expanded role of the community school were replaced by a massive retreat to teaching children academically-oriented subject matter and catering very little to adults.[123]

Community education gathered new momentum in the 1960's because of several key developments. American technologists wasted little time pursuing and equalling Soviet achievements.[124] The Civil Rights Movement, furthermore, kindled renewed curiosity about the role of the school with respect to serving all community members. Blacks began to demand equal educational opportunity and meaningful input into the schools that were charged with educating their children.[125]

New developments in Flint, which was still viewed as the center of community education, were crucial to the expansion of the concept. In an interview with Decker, Douglas

---

[123]Edward G. Olsen, "The Community School: Pattern for Program," address delivered at the Conference on Community Education for School Board Members and School Administrators, Southwest Region, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, March 7, 1969, p. 372.

[124]Sidney Hook, Education for Modern Man (New enlarged ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), pp. 8-9.

[125]A. Harry Passow, ed.; Urban Education in the 1970's (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1971), pp. 1-8.

Procunier provided the following information about the Mott Foundation's new commitment to a national effort at spreading the concept of community education.

> In April, 1963, the Mott Foundation established a community education center at Northern Michigan University. This center was the first in what has become a regional network of centers whose purpose is the promotion and dissemination of community education. By July, 1971, the regional network was composed of 14 centers located throughout the United States....In the latter part of 1971, the Regional Centers began a further extension of the dissemination network to include other educational institutions as cooperating centers.[126]

A second development was the creation of the Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leaders in 1964. This program represented a cooperative partnership between the Flint Community Schools and seven Michigan universities. It has been funded during the past ten years specifically to bring outstanding educators to Flint in order to facilitate their learning more about community education and to help them pursue advanced graduate degree programs at higher education institutions. Over these ten years, several hundred individuals have participated in what came to be known as the Mott Fellowship program. Many of these people have gone on to assume a variety of positions of leadership in the field of education.[127]

In 1966, the National Community School Education

---

[126]Decker, op. cit., unpublished dissertation, p. 59.

[127]Interview with Ernest O. Melby, Michigan State University, June 24, 1974.

Association was formed. Its purpose was "to further promote and expand community schools and to establish community schools as an integral and necessary part of the educational plan of every community."[128] The organization provided services to members and to professional institutions requesting information. Its membership has grown steadily. Currently, there are nearly 2000 individual and institutional members.[129]

It was not surprising that with the efforts of the Mott Foundation and a national organization, community education began to be rapidly adopted in many American communities. For example, Atlanta, Minneapolis, Miami and other communities of all sizes launched programs designed to meet local needs. In addition, Canadian cities and towns in Ontario and Manitoba began programs as well.

The first part of the decade of the 1970's has been characterized by the continued national spread of community education. There have been several new centers of community education development that have opened at colleges, universities and state departments of education. Their efforts at dissemination will continue to bring community

---

[128]National Community School Education Association, Second Annual Membership Directory, p. 4.

[129]National Community Education Association Board of Directors meeting, Flint, Michigan, June 12-14, 1974. (Note: the organization is now referred to as N.C.E.A. by a vote of the membership at the 8th Annual Convention in Baltimore, Maryland, November 1973).

education to additional school districts. As of July 1974, there were nearly fifty regional and cooperating centers servicing the entire United States. Working together with the National Community Education Association, new projects in research and media development have been planned.[130]

A significant development, thus far in the 1970's may carry with it important implications for the future of the community education movement. Increasingly, individual states have been passing legislation to help support community education. Such legislation has been passed in nine states and in the District of Columbia. These states include Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Utah, and Washington.[131] In addition, state legislation has provided states with additional revenues to be used for community education development in local school districts.

At the national level, because of the unified effort of community educators and interested senators and representatives, there are bills before both the House (H.R. 69) and the Senate (S. 1534) that, if passed, will pump new federal revenue into communities expressly for developing

---

[130] Ibid.

[131] Larry E. Decker, "Status of Community Education Development in State Educational Agencies," revised report, June 10, 1974.

community school programs.[132] Local communities will have to plan carefully for the expenditure of these new funds, particularly because they represent additional external community ties.

In addition to federal and state legislation, many states have formed associations for community educators. In a sense, they mirror the National Community Education Association because their aim has been to act as clearinghouses for information and relevant community education news for a particular state.

Slowly, through four decades to the present, the community school has emerged from a building where children could come for recreational activities after school hours to the new, sophisticated institution of the 1970's which has been called the "Community/School."[133] Educational Facilities Laboratories made an important distinction between what they called the "community school," which typically opens its doors for public use after school hours, and the "Community/School Center" which does not differentiate between school and public hours because the entire facility is operated for continuous use by all age groups in a community. What actually has developed is a multi-partnership between the school and the other public service

---

[132] Ibid.

[133] Larry Molloy, Community/School: Sharing the Space and the Action (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973).

agencies in the community. There have been several important reasons why communities have sought alternative methods for planning new educational structures, not the least of which has been a shortage of funds for all community agencies including the school. The emerging partnership that has evolved between school and community agencies resulted in what Larry Molloy called "shared spaces" for programming. Community/School Centers, like community education programs, have varied in their design according to the nature of the partnership that developed. But it was significant that the new trend in planning for these structures has resulted in greatly improved relations between school and community.[134]

The chief advantage of the Community/School Center has been the increased amount of time a facility can be utilized. In addition, because a partnership has developed, much more coordination of services for people has resulted. Many Community/School Centers have a number of social service agencies housed in the same facility as the school. The most interesting of these new facilities were:

1. Thomas Jefferson Junior High and Community Center, Arlington, Virginia
2. Human Resources Center, Pontiac, Michigan
3. John F. Kennedy School and Community Center, Atlanta, Georgia
4. Wendell Williams Community School, Flint, Michigan

---

[134] Ibid.

Each of these facilities represented the combined involvement of school representatives, community residents, and agency personnel.[135]

As reflected in the foregoing analysis of community education and the emerging community school, by decade and phase, it was evident that the many experiments in educational and community improvement often resulted in a healthy, productive working relationship between schools and communities. Educators must continue the trend toward creating learning environments that meet the needs of all community members. Harold Gores warned,

> The big question is whether people involved in education can adjust to the great forces that beat upon the schools. If the educators fail to respond, it is predictable that their establishment will be replaced by some other institution that cares more about people.[136]

Community educators currently stand at the threshold of the future.

> These will be exciting years as the schoolhouse--or whatever it will be called--moves to center stage as the principal instrument for shaping the renewal of our human habitations. In our central cities, schools will be moving into the mainstream of social reconstruction by providing the nexus for neighborhoods and by improving the economy through the recycling of space; in suburbia, the schoolhouse will be only one of the places where people, young and old, will gather to learn from each other; and back in the hills and down in the deltas, there will emerge the general center where all people are entitled to receive the social

---

[135] Ibid., pp. 10-40.

[136] Harold B. Gores, "Community Education: Schoolhouse of the Future," Leisure Today (April 1974), p. 22.

services that are appropriate to their condition.[137] The community school and community education, because of their penchant for flexibility and adaptability, afford great potential in meeting the challenges of the future.

---

[137] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate and describe the extent of agreement on the importance of community education goals as perceived by groups of regional and cooperating center directors, superintendents, principals and community education directors. The purpose of this chapter was to describe the research setting, define the population and sample selection procedures, describe the instrumentation that was used for data collection and how it was administered, and finally, explain the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data.

The decision to undertake this research represented much reflection upon conversations held with a number of community educators, school administrators, doctoral committee members, other faculty members in the Department of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University, research consultants, and officials of the Minnesota State Department of Education. Their encouragement and suggestions were major motivators behind the decision to carry out the research and select the setting.

The Research Setting

The National Community Education Scene

The Mott Foundation has divided the United States into fifteen geographical regions that have been served by regional centers for community education development beginning in 1963. One of the objectives of most regional centers has been to establish cooperating centers within a regional service area. Generally, these cooperating centers are at colleges and universities, but recently an attempt has been made to open cooperating centers at state departments of education. At the time this research began (April 1974), there were fifteen regional centers and thirty-one cooperating centers. The cooperating centers included five state departments of education, one county department of education, a community college, and twenty-four colleges and universities.[1] During this study several additional cooperating centers were funded and opened, keeping pace with the Mott Foundation's goal of establishing one hundred centers throughout the United States.[2]

The centers for community education development have been staffed with at least one full-time individual whose responsibilities include administering the activities

---

[1]Mott Foundation, "C.S. Mott Foundation Regional and Cooperating Centers for Community Education Development," revised report, February 1, 1974.

[2]Munoz, op. cit., p. 3.

of the center, planning, directing and evaluating the services of the center, and teaching community education courses at those centers which are located in higher education institutions.[3] The centers offer the following free services:

1. Consultant assistance to communities interested in understanding or implementing community education.
2. Training for community school personnel, including workshops and graduate level courses.
3. Financial assistance for implementing new community education programs in communities or for establishing cooperating centers.
4. Evaluation of community needs, resources and community education programs.
5. Research information and other programs that assist community education development.[4]

Community Education in Minnesota

In May, 1974, Minnesota, with its over 130 community education school districts--urban, suburban and rural--provided the ideal laboratory suggested earlier by Tyler. Prime factors in the growth of community education in Minnesota included the following: 1) The Center for Community Education Development, College of St. Thomas, 2) The Community Education Section, State Department of Education, 3) The Community Education Act passed by the Minnesota State

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Dissemination Program Manual, op. cit., p. 8.

Legislature in 1971, and 4) the dedicated efforts of many professional community educators, public officials, school administrators, boards of education and supportive community residents.[5]

According to the criteria defined and established in Chapter II, school districts that were operating community education programs and were receiving funds from the state numbered over 130 at the time of this investigation (April 1974). However, because many of these districts had applied for funding only recently, it was decided, after consultation with Lawrence Erie, Director of the Community Education Section of the Minnesota State Department of Education, that only the sixty-six districts operating community education programs as of September, 1973, should participate in the study.

Minnesota has become one of the leading community education states in America. Minnesota community educators have formed a state community education association which will continue to attract new membership. In addition, according to Erie,

> I have never been engaged in a more thrilling mission. I have seen community education grow from three community education school districts prior to 1969 to 134 districts today. Our goal is to have 436 districts in the program within

---

[5]For further information on the scope of community education development in Minnesota and for details about individual programs see, "Community Education in Minnesota," Special Issue, Community Education Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3 (May 1973).

10 years....[6]

The Population and Sample Selection

Population

The population in this study consisted of the directors of all the regional and cooperating centers for community education development throughout the United States, as of May 1974, and the principals, superintendents and community education directors who represented the sixty-six Minnesota school districts that were operating community education programs as of September, 1973. After receiving the names of the sixty-six Minnesota school districts, the researcher assigned them to urban, suburban or rural categories with the following results: 1) urban - 11, 2) suburban - 19, and 3) rural - 36.

The target population of center directors was reviewed with Douglas Procunier of the Mott Foundation. It was decided that for the purposes of this study only community education development centers at higher education institutions, with an active full-time director on staff as of May, 1974, would be eligible to participate in this study. As a result, the target population was reduced to thirty-one. This reduction served a useful purpose because all "missing elements" (centers without full-time directors)

---

[6]Lawrence Erie, "Management by Objectives Adopted by Community Education," Minnesota Community Education, Vol. 2, No. 5 (June 1974), p. 2.

were removed from the sampling frame. Precision in the sampling frame is most desirable in survey research.[7] The list of thirty-one center directors represented fifteen regional and sixteen cooperating centers, as well as a total geographical representation of all community education service regions in the United States.

Sample

After discussions with McSweeney and the Research Consultation Office, it was decided that the entire population of thirty-one center directors, sixty-six superintendents, and sixty-six community education directors would be sampled. For the population of principals, which was over three hundred, it was decided that a probability sample of fifty urban, fifty suburban and fifty rural principals would be selected.[8] A list with the names of 373 community school principals was sorted into appropriate groups of urban, suburban and rural principals. Fifty principals were randomly selected from each category for sampling.

---

[7]Maryellen McSweeney, lecture on "Frame Problems in Survey Research," Michigan State University, April 4, 1974. The sampling frame for center directors ultimately became the list of thirty-one directors. In order to make the frame precise, McSweeney suggested that all missing and foreign elements be removed.

[8]McSweeney, op. cit., Advanced Research Methods in Education, pp. 16-28.

Statement of the Testable Hypotheses

In order to determine whether or not there was significant agreement in rating categories of community education goals by groups of regional and cooperating center directors, superintendents, principals and community education directors, the following hypotheses were examined:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between regional and cooperating center directors and all other administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors).

Hypothesis 1A:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and principals.

Hypothesis 1B:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and superintendents.

Hypothesis 1C:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and community education directors.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between principals, superintendents and community education directors.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no interaction between groups of urban, suburban and rural principals, superintendents and community education directors on the ratings of the eleven categories of goals.

Instrumentation

After carefully reviewing DeLargy's original CEGI-3, it was decided that that particular instrument was inappropriate for the objectives of this study. However, the seventy-five goal statements developed by DeLargy were used as the basis for developing a modified instrument.

In its modified form, the instrument used in this study, the CEGI-4, was designed to contain a rating scale from very low to very high which yielded an intensity-of-importance score upon which certain comparisons between groups were made. This particular rating scale resembled other similar methods of modifying Likert scales.[9]

Survey research has involved extensive use of the questionnaire as a survey instrument. The questionnaire is a flexible instrument, capable of being custom-designed to assist in the investigation of some research problem.[10]

---

[9]Earl S. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Monterey, California: Wadsworth Co., 1973), pp. 253-278.

[10]Walter Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1963), p. 202.

Initially, in the development of the questionnaire, all of DeLargy's seventy-five goal statements were incorporated into an instrument with different instructions and a new rating scale. DeLargy measured the reliability and discussed the validity of his CEGI-3.[11] Therefore, it was assumed that the newly developed CEGI-4, because it utilized the same seventy-five goal statements, shared similar reliability and validity.

It was suggested that a field-test be conducted in order to determine whether or not the CEGI-4 would consistently gather the data necessary to test the hypotheses under investigation. The field-test was conducted in April, 1974, while the researcher was in attendance at a national workshop on community schools in Arlington, Virginia. According to McSweeney, it was essential for field-testing that persons be identified who closely resembled the target population in the projected study.[12] Also attending the workshop were several superintendents and principals from Virginia and the surrounding Mid-Atlantic region. In addition, there were several community education directors, not only from the Mid-Atlantic region, but from several other states. The directors of two centers for community education development also attended. Twenty-five persons were

---

[11] DeLargy, op. cit., pp. 93-97.

[12] Interview with Maryellen McSweeney, Michigan State University, April 11, 1974.

asked to participate in the field-testing of the CEGI-4. In addition to rating the seventy-five goal statements, the respondents were asked to identify any statements that were vague or otherwise difficult to understand. They were also asked to indicate which statements might be removed from the questionnaire because of redundancy. Other comments with respect to the general improvement of the instrument were solicited.

The results of the field-testing prompted a number of revisions in the CEGI-4. Twenty-two items were eliminated and several ambiguous statements were re-worded in order to reduce confusion about their meaning. The revised instrument was reviewed by the Research Consultation Office, where it was suggested that after data retrieval was completed, a reliability check on the instrument should be run. No additional changes were recommended, and Hoyt's reliability measure eventually indicated that the revised CEGI-4 had a reliability of .96.

The CEGI-4 included a clear set of directions that asked the respondent to circle only one symbol for each goal statement. The response categories were represented by the following symbols: VL denoted very low, L - low, M - medium, H - high, and VH - very high. All fifty-three goal statements and the instructions can be examined in Appendix C. The identical questionnaire was mailed to all respondents, except that center directors were asked to respond to items H-1 and H-2 which were located on a fourth page in the

instrument. The two question supplement for center directors was designed to determine whether or not there was congruence among center directors with respect to their perceptions of which groups would rate the items in the CEGI most similarly or least similarly to themselves; principals, superintendents or community education directors. The supplement was also included in Appendix C.

Administration of the Questionnaires

The questionnaires were prepared for mailing along with appropriate cover letters explaining the purpose of the research to potential respondents (see Appendix B). The instrument was attractively and neatly printed on blue paper and was reduced in length in an attempt to obtain optimal returns. A return envelope with postage was provided. According to A.N. Oppenheim, the mailed questionnaire has advantages for survey research that include access to a population that may be widely distributed geographically and uniformity in the questionnaire and its instructions which usually provide better understanding by different groups of respondents.[13] The CEGI was mailed on April 27 and on May 4, 1974. On May 22, a follow-up mailing was sent to the non-respondents with June 7 established as a cut-off date for receiving usable questionnaires. The response record

---

[13]A.N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (New York: Basic Books, 1966), pp. 24-47.

was presented in Table 3.1. In Table 3.2 a geographical breakdown for principals, superintendents and community education directors was presented. Because center directors often serve urban, suburban and rural school districts and communities, they were treated as a total group without any single geographical label.

Table 3.1

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RECORD

Group	Number Sent	Initial Return	Follow-up Return	Usable N	Usable %
Center Directors	31	24	7	31	100
Principals	150	118	12	130	87
Superintendents	66	50	11	61	92
Community Education Directors	66	53	5	58	88
Total	313	253	35	280	92

Table 3.2

GEOGRAPHICAL RESPONSE BREAKDOWN FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Group	Number Sent	Number Returned	Usable n	Usable %	Total N	Total %
Principals	150	130			130	87
(urban)	50	50	50	100		
(suburban)	50	37	37	74		
(rural)	50	43	43	86		
Superintendents	66	61			61	92
(urban)	11	10	10	91		
(suburban)	19	16	16	84		
(rural)	36	35	35	97		
Community Education Directors	66	58			58	88
(urban)	11	10	10	91		
(suburban)	19	18	18	95		
(rural)	36	30	30	83		

Research Method and Statistical Procedures

The research method used in this study was descriptive as well as comparative. The community education goal ratings for groups of center directors, principals, superintendents and community education directors were described. In addition, these ratings were compared and the extent to which there was agreement or convergence was analyzed and

discussed. According to John Best, descriptive research allows the researcher to describe and interpret what exists from the data that has been gathered.[14]

The CEGI data were transferred onto computer data coding forms by the researcher and were then punched on data cards by the Key Punch Division of the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory. All computer programming was suggested by the Office of Research Consultation of the College of Education and run on the CDC 6500 System at the Computer Center at Michigan State University. Findings, recommendations and conclusions were drawn from the data, and interpretations were made with respect to the stated purposes of this study. The statistical procedures used in data analysis included:

1. Basic statistics which yielded means and standard deviations.

2. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance techniques which allowed for comparisons of scores on the ratings of community education goals by the various groups and determined whether or not significant differences existed in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals.

3. A correlation matrix between variables.

---

[14]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 102.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the research setting, define the population and describe the sampling procedures that were employed. In addition, a discussion of the development, field-testing and administration of the survey instrument was included. Finally, the type of study was identified and the statistical procedures for data analysis were outlined.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter was designed to contain the results of the statistical analyses of the data and was divided into the following sections:

1. A graphic representation and description of the descriptive data relevant to this study.
2. A discussion of the results of the tests of the Hypotheses.
3. A discussion of the Research Questions germane to this study.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was significant agreement on the importance of categories of community education goals as rated by groups of regional and cooperating center directors, principals, superintendents and community education directors. This was accomplished by grouping the administrators according to position, testing the effect of the position variable on the rating of the categories of goals and, in addition, testing the area or geography variable on the ratings of the categories of goals.

Descriptive Data

The descriptive data introduced discussions of the Hypotheses tests and Research Questions. Data in Table 4.1

Table 4.1--A Comparison of Means, Standard Deviations, Kruskal-Wallis H Values, Mean Discrepancies and Goal Ranks Between Principals, Superintendents, Community Education Directors and Center Directors on the Fifty-Three Community Education Goals Identified in the CEGI-4.

Goal	Principals n = 130		Superintendents n = 61		Comm. Ed. Directors n = 58		Center Directors n = 31		Kruskal-Wallis H	Mean Discrepancy	Total N = 280		Goal Rank
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.			mean	s.d.	
1	3.92	.92	4.28	.86	4.05	.83	4.48	.77	14.824*	.56	4.09	.89	10
2	3.69	1.10	3.49	1.10	3.62	1.06	4.42	.92	17.926*	.93	3.71	1.10	26
3	3.66	.93	3.38	.99	3.60	.88	4.06	.89	10.856*	.68	3.63	.94	29
4	3.84	.96	3.90	.91	4.10	.91	4.52	.85	17.819*	.68	3.98	.95	13
5	3.12	.98	3.00	.97	3.34	.97	4.03	.87	23.920*	1.03	3.24	1.00	41
6	3.64	.89	3.61	.94	3.79	.85	3.90	.91	3.488	.29	3.69	.90	28
7	4.35	.70	4.30	.74	4.26	.83	4.00	.73	4.329	.35	4.28	.74	4
8	4.20	.89	4.41	.64	4.38	.83	4.26	1.00	2.524	.21	4.29	.85	3
9	3.40	1.00	3.00	.75	3.36	.95	3.97	.80	23.540*	.97	3.37	.95	40
10	3.71	1.10	3.48	.96	3.86	.89	3.77	.92	4.915	.38	3.70	1.01	27
11	4.23	.75	4.20	.68	4.43	.68	4.26	.66	4.297	.23	4.27	.72	5
12	3.63	.90	3.59	.96	3.66	1.10	3.55	.96	.385	.11	3.62	.96	30
13	4.02	.93	4.21	.80	4.43	.73	4.26	.89	8.839*	.41	4.17	.87	8
14	3.73	.98	3.67	1.00	3.79	1.04	3.97	.84	1.827	.30	3.76	.98	25
15	3.38	.90	3.31	.89	3.83	.94	4.61	.67	52.025*	1.30	3.60	.97	31
16	3.91	.91	3.95	.97	4.24	.86	3.81	1.05	6.564	.43	3.97	.94	14
17	3.44	1.00	3.41	1.01	3.64	1.09	4.39	.80	22.964*	.98	3.58	1.04	32

* Denotes significant difference when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 3 degrees of freedom at the .05 alpha level (7.815).

Table 4.1--Continued.

Goal	Principals n = 130		Superintendents n = 61		Comm. Ed. Directors n = 58		Center Directors n = 31		Kruskal-Wallis H	Mean Discrepancy	Total N = 280		Goal Rank
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.			mean	s.d.	
18	4.21	.76	4.43	.69	4.40	.72	4.39	.76	5.202	.22	4.31	.74	1
19	2.79	1.10	2.62	.78	2.98	.89	3.52	.77	19.775*	.90	2.88	.99	52
20	3.82	.83	3.74	.91	4.21	.69	4.13	.81	13.810*	.47	3.92	.84	21
21	3.98	1.02	3.98	.99	4.09	.94	3.52	1.06	6.222	.57	3.95	1.01	16
22	3.59	.90	3.43	.97	3.55	.94	3.77	1.09	3.685	.34	3.57	.95	33
23	3.72	.98	3.72	1.03	4.03	.84	3.94	.81	4.425	.31	3.81	.95	24
24	4.19	.76	4.34	.75	4.40	.79	3.94	.77	10.719*	.46	4.24	.77	6
25	3.41	.97	3.38	1.00	3.69	.84	4.23	.67	21.024*	.85	3.55	.96	34
26	3.42	1.01	3.28	.88	3.48	.84	4.45	.57	36.128*	1.17	3.51	.97	36
27	4.00	.81	3.93	.83	4.05	.85	3.97	.80	.815	.12	3.99	.82	12
28	3.84	.79	3.72	.84	4.05	.78	4.42	.76	18.642*	.70	3.92	.82	21
29	3.96	.82	4.03	.87	4.26	.81	3.74	.96	9.499*	.52	4.01	.85	11
30	2.85	.92	2.67	.94	3.16	.83	3.32	.94	14.963*	.65	2.92	.93	51
31	3.43	.85	3.21	.86	3.45	.88	3.87	.85	11.640*	.66	3.44	.87	39
32	3.32	.89	3.34	.89	3.72	.81	3.68	.91	11.820*	.40	3.45	.89	38
33	2.30	1.10	2.16	.88	2.78	1.01	3.19	.95	26.771*	1.03	2.47	1.07	53
34	3.75	.84	3.97	1.00	4.00	.90	4.55	.57	23.546*	.80	3.94	.89	18
35	3.25	.83	3.41	.97	3.59	.70	4.35	.55	36.480*	1.00	3.52	.87	35

* Denotes significant difference when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 3 degrees of freedom at the .05 alpha level (7.815).

Table 4.1--Continued.

Goal	Principals n = 130		Superintendents n = 61		Comm. Ed. Directors n = 58		Center Directors n = 31		Kruskal-Wallis H	Mean Discrepancy	Total N = 280		Goal Rank
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.			mean	s.d.	
36	4.02	.76	4.26	.63	4.41	.65	4.35	.71	14.731*	.39	4.19	.72	7
37	3.06	.95	2.93	1.00	3.40	1.08	3.74	.86	15.942*	.81	3.18	1.00	43
38	2.89	1.04	2.72	1.08	3.14	1.10	4.00	.82	31.995*	1.28	3.03	1.10	48
39	3.05	.98	2.84	.86	3.09	.78	4.10	.79	37.482*	1.26	3.13	.96	44
40	3.21	1.31	2.82	1.19	2.81	1.13	3.81	.95	17.350*	1.00	3.11	1.25	45
41	4.06	.74	4.15	.77	4.24	.71	3.81	.87	6.975	.43	4.09	.76	10
42	3.56	.92	3.85	.98	4.31	.73	4.42	.72	38.916*	.86	3.88	.94	22
43	3.66	.89	3.93	.98	4.29	.70	4.48	.51	33.986*	.82	3.94	.89	18
44	2.82	1.01	2.70	1.01	3.47	.99	3.97	.91	42.735*	1.27	3.05	1.08	46
45	3.38	.93	3.28	.82	3.52	.78	4.10	.87	19.759*	.82	3.46	.90	37
46	4.12	.84	4.41	.72	4.36	.74	4.74	.44	17.593*	.62	4.30	.78	2
47	2.94	.96	2.66	.93	3.33	.78	3.58	.85	26.954*	.92	3.03	.95	48
48	2.99	.96	2.67	.85	3.12	.77	3.52	.72	21.668*	.85	3.01	.90	49
49	2.79	.95	2.85	.95	3.31	.92	3.39	.95	18.757*	.60	2.98	.97	50
50	3.08	1.01	3.05	.96	3.21	.91	4.16	.86	29.994*	1.11	3.22	1.02	42
51	3.72	.78	3.98	.79	4.26	.66	4.35	.80	29.656*	.63	3.96	.80	15
52	3.65	.91	3.64	.98	4.10	.81	4.35	.75	24.361*	.71	3.82	.93	23
53	3.74	1.02	4.02	.90	4.34	.74	3.74	1.32	15.479*	.60	3.92	1.00	21

* Denotes significant difference when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 3 degrees of freedom at the .05 alpha level (7.815).

included the means and standard deviations for all fifty-three goals and were presented along with a breakdown by position (principal, superintendent, community education director and center director). Significant differences were noted (*) when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 3 degrees of freedom at the .05 alpha level (7.815). In this item analysis significant differences were observed on thirty-nine goals. All fifty-three goal statements can be examined in Appendix C. Table 4.1 also indicated the discrepancy mean and a rank for each of the fifty-three goals. The means and standard deviations for all respondents, N = 280, were also presented.

A comparison between all administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors) and center directors on the rating of all fifty-three goals was presented in Table 4.2. The comparison was based on means and standard deviations. Significant differences were noted (*) where they occurred when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 1 degree of freedom at the .05 alpha level (3.841). Significant differences were observed on thirty-six goals.

The effect of geography on the rating of each of the fifty-three goals was presented in Table 4.3. The groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators contained principals, superintendents and community education directors. Means and standard deviations were listed. There was no observable geographical effect on the ratings of any of the

Table 4.2--A Comparison of Means, Standard Deviations and Kruskal-Wallis H Values Between All Administrators (Principals, Superintendents and Community Education Directors on Each of the Fifty-Three Goals in the CEGI-4

Goal	All Administrators n = 249		Center Directors n = 31		Kruskal-Wallis
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	H
1	4.04	.89	4.48	.77	7.652*
2	3.63	1.09	4.42	.92	16.242*
3	3.58	.93	4.06	.89	6.966*
4	3.92	.94	4.52	.85	14.575*
5	3.14	.98	4.03	.87	20.845*
6	3.67	.89	3.90	.91	1.904
7	4.32	.74	4.00	.73	5.575*
8	4.29	.83	4.26	1.00	.051
9	3.29	.95	3.97	.80	14.870*
10	3.69	1.02	3.77	.92	.156
11	4.27	.72	4.26	.68	.038
12	3.63	.96	3.55	.96	.089
13	4.16	.87	4.26	.89	.442
14	3.73	.99	3.97	.84	1.135
15	3.47	.92	4.61	.67	40.975*
16	4.00	.92	3.81	1.05	.810
17	3.48	1.02	4.39	.80	21.085*
18	4.31	.74	4.39	.76	.442
19	2.80	.99	3.52	.77	15.929*
20	3.89	.84	4.13	.81	2.358
21	4.00	.99	3.52	1.06	6.204*
22	3.54	.93	3.77	1.09	2.178
23	3.80	.97	3.94	.81	2.587
24	4.28	.77	3.94	.77	5.991*
25	3.47	.95	4.23	.67	18.179*
26	3.40	.94	4.45	.57	34.857*

* Denotes significant difference when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 1 degree of freedom at the .05 alpha level (3.841).

Table 4.2--Continued

Goal	All Administrators n = 249		Center Directors n = 31		Kruskal-Wallis
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	H
27	4.00	.82	3.97	.80	.107
28	3.86	.80	4.42	.76	13.520*
29	4.05	.84	3.74	.96	3.300
30	2.88	.92	3.32	.94	6.335*
31	3.38	.86	3.87	.85	8.787*
32	3.42	.89	3.68	.91	2.213
33	2.38	1.05	3.19	.95	16.379*
34	3.86	.90	4.55	.57	17.878*
35	3.42	.84	4.35	.55	33.908*
36	4.17	.72	4.35	.71	1.947
37	3.11	1.00	3.74	.86	10.946*
38	2.91	1.07	4.00	.82	27.823*
39	3.00	.91	4.10	.79	34.520*
40	3.02	1.25	3.81	.95	11.012*
41	4.12	.74	3.81	.87	4.194*
42	3.81	.94	4.42	.72	12.353*
43	3.88	.91	4.48	.51	13.253*
44	2.94	1.04	3.97	.91	24.034*
45	3.39	.87	4.10	.87	17.447*
46	4.25	.79	4.74	.44	11.128*
47	2.96	.94	3.58	.85	11.592*
48	2.94	.91	3.52	.72	12.379*
49	2.93	.96	3.39	.95	7.544*
50	3.10	.97	4.16	.86	29.395*
51	3.91	.79	4.35	.80	9.953*
52	3.75	.93	4.35	.75	13.274*
53	3.95	.96	3.74	1.32	.213

* Denotes significant difference when the value of the Kruskal-Wallis H exceeded chi-square with 1 degree of freedom at the .05 alpha level (3.841).

Table 4.3--A Comparison of Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Discrepancies Between Groups of Urban, Suburban and Rural Administrators (Principals, Superintendents and Community Education Directors), N = 249, on Each of the Fifty-Three Goals in the CEGI-4.

Goal	Urban n = 70		Suburban n = 71		Rural n = 108		Mean Discrepancy
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	
1	4.17	.80	4.00	.97	3.98	.90	.19
2	3.69	1.11	3.75	.95	3.51	1.16	.24
3	3.67	.88	3.65	.91	3.47	.98	.20
4	3.93	.95	3.93	.87	3.90	.99	.03
5	3.29	.97	3.04	.98	3.11	.98	.25
6	3.73	.88	3.77	.83	3.56	.93	.21
7	4.30	.71	4.30	.82	4.34	.71	.04
8	4.26	.88	4.32	.79	4.30	.82	.06
9	3.40	1.08	3.38	.83	3.17	.91	.23
10	3.81	1.09	3.68	1.03	3.61	.97	.20
11	4.30	.75	4.24	.69	4.27	.73	.06
12	3.63	.84	3.46	1.05	3.73	.96	.27
13	3.96	.95	4.39	.73	4.15	.86	.43
14	3.80	1.02	3.56	1.18	3.80	.83	.24
15	3.36	1.04	3.63	.93	3.44	.83	.27
16	3.87	.93	3.97	.94	4.09	.90	.22
17	3.56	1.04	3.62	1.09	3.33	.96	.29
18	4.17	.83	4.35	.74	4.36	.68	.19
19	2.80	1.15	2.79	.97	2.80	.89	.01
20	3.81	.89	3.93	.85	3.92	.80	.12
21	4.04	.95	3.99	1.05	3.99	.99	.05
22	3.49	.94	3.44	.92	3.65	.92	.21
23	3.90	.98	3.79	.98	3.73	.95	.17
24	4.19	.79	4.24	.84	4.36	.70	.17
25	3.41	.89	3.49	.94	3.48	1.01	.08
26	3.50	1.03	3.46	.88	3.29	.92	.21

Table 4.3--Continued

Goal	Urban n = 70		Suburban n = 71		Rural n = 108		Mean Discrepancy
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	
27	4.00	.76	4.14	.80	3.90	.86	.24
28	3.81	.82	3.87	.75	3.88	.83	.07
29	3.93	.94	4.06	.91	4.12	.71	.19
30	2.87	1.01	2.77	.81	2.94	.93	.17
31	3.43	.94	3.42	.79	3.32	.86	.11
32	3.30	.94	3.46	.77	3.46	.92	.16
33	2.20	.97	2.52	1.05	2.40	1.08	.32
34	3.81	.86	4.04	.87	3.77	.93	.27
35	3.51	.86	3.41	.80	3.37	.86	.14
36	4.01	.79	4.24	.71	4.22	.67	.23
37	3.21	1.03	2.97	.86	3.13	1.06	.16
38	3.11	1.04	2.63	1.02	2.95	1.09	.48
39	3.10	1.04	2.99	.73	2.95	.93	.15
40	3.34	1.34	2.86	1.30	2.92	1.13	.48
41	4.01	.81	4.15	.82	4.18	.64	.17
42	3.74	.93	3.87	.94	3.81	.95	.13
43	3.81	.94	3.94	.84	3.87	.94	.13
44	2.83	.99	3.03	1.04	2.95	1.08	.20
45	3.49	.90	3.51	.83	3.24	.87	.27
46	4.16	.85	4.38	.78	4.22	.77	.22
47	2.99	1.07	3.04	.76	2.89	.96	.15
48	3.00	1.02	3.06	.81	2.83	.88	.23
49	2.77	1.07	2.90	.85	3.05	.95	.28
50	3.06	1.09	3.27	.96	3.02	.90	.25
51	3.70	.87	3.99	.67	3.99	.78	.29
52	3.64	1.05	3.79	.88	3.80	.87	.16
53	3.94	.98	4.01	.85	3.91	1.02	.10

fifty-three goals when the mean discrepancy value for each goal was also reported. The range for mean discrepancies was .01 to .48. However, it was significant to note that only six goals had a mean discrepancy value that exceeded .27. It should be pointed out that because center directors often serve urban, suburban and rural areas, they were not included in this geographical breakdown or in the subsequent test of the effect of geography on the rating of the goals.

The correlation between the eleven categories of goals was presented in Table 4.4. High and low correlations between categories can be observed. The highest correlation, .78, was observed between Category Eight (Health) and Category Eleven (Social Problems & Issues). The lowest correlation, .36, was observed between Category Four (Coordination) and Category Nine (Enrichment). According to Fisher's Table, the correlation values between categories were significant.[1] The correlations were high, which suggested close overall relationships between one category and another, and between all the categories and community education. No negative correlations appeared.

---

[1]Allen L. Edwards, Experimental Design in Psychological Research (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1960), p. 362.

Table 4.4--Dependent Variables Correlation Matrix for the Eleven Categories of Community Education Goals in the CEGI-4.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	1.00										
2	.50	1.00									
3	.67	.64	1.00								
4	.62	.44	.58	1.00							
5	.62	.60	.56	.51	1.00						
6	.52	.74	.59	.44	.60	1.00					
7	.64	.59	.57	.52	.66	.61	1.00				
8	.56	.59	.51	.55	.53	.59	.60	1.00			
9	.41	.60	.54	.36	.47	.46	.45	.38	1.00		
10	.49	.55	.61	.42	.47	.52	.43	.43	.58	1.00	
11	.61	.70	.58	.54	.61	.66	.67	.78	.50	.45	1.00

Tests of the Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was significant agreement between principals, superintendents, community education directors and center directors on the ratings of eleven categories of community education goals. In order to accomplish that objective, seven hypotheses were tested and the results were discussed below.

Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and all other administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors). Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing center directors and all other administrators on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were reported in Table 4.5.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (4.8708 with 33 and 784 degrees of freedom) was obtained (P less than .0001) and since six of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance (P less than .0045), Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that significant differences between center directors and all other administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors) could be observed on six of the dependent variables.

Category 1: Needs Identification & Evaluation (F-Ratio = 7.592)

Table 4.5--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Center Directors and All Administrators.

Multivariate

D.F. = 33 and 784 F-Ratio = 4.8708

P Less Than .0001

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	29.7088	3.9115	7.5952	.0001*
School as a Comprehensive Agency	25.7526	15.6098	1.6498	.1782
Resources (Human & Physical)	23.5040	5.4052	4.3484	.0052
Coordination	60.9467	6.1031	9.9862	.0001*
Involvement	89.2089	8.9918	9.9211	.0001*
Communications	7.1113	7.8063	.9110	.4361
Leadership	130.2991	7.2638	17.9381	.0001*
Health	89.4327	9.5657	9.3493	.0001*
Enrichment	1.5063	3.4345	.4386	.7256
Recreation & Social Activities	24.6831	8.2648	2.9865	.0316
Social Problems & Issues	787.8808	44.8085	17.5833	.0001*

D.F. for Hypothesis = 3 D.F. for Error = 276

* Denotes Significant Difference at .0045 alpha Level

Category 4: Coordination (F-Ratio = 9.9862)

Category 5: Involvement (F-Ratio = 9.9211)

Category 7: Leadership (F-Ratio = 17.9381)

Category 8: Health (F-Ratio = 9.3493)

Category 11: Social Problems & Issues (F-Ratio = 17.5833)

The significant differences that resulted from testing Hypothesis 1 can be further amplified by examining Tabel 4.6 which contained a listing of cell means and standard deviations for all administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors) and center directors on the eleven categories of goals. The cell mean values which were underlined indicated that the discrepancy between means was large enough so that significant differences resulted. On all categories where differences were observed, the mean values for center directors were higher than the group or groups with which they differed.

Hypotheses 1A, 1B and 1C tested for significant differences between center directors and principals, superintendents and community education directors respectively. The results of these tests were reported below. In addition, the cell mean values which were underlined in Table 4.6 indicated the categories where differences were observed and identified which group or groups differed significantly from center directors.

Table 4.6--Cell Means and Standard Deviations for All Administrators and Center Directors on the Eleven Categories of Community Education Goals in the CEGI-4.

Category	ALL ADMINISTRATORS						CENTER DIRECTORS	
	Principals n = 130		Superintendents n = 61		Comm. Ed. Directors n = 58		n = 31	
	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.
1	11.12	2.02	10.97	2.08	11.95	1.82	12.68	1.89
2	27.08	4.19	27.25	3.38	27.88	3.86	28.68	4.13
3	15.38	2.33	16.13	2.38	16.31	2.09	16.74	2.62
4	15.32	2.55	16.07	2.63	16.79	2.40	17.68	1.85
5	18.79	3.07	18.11	3.09	19.69	2.74	21.48	2.97
6	14.41	2.83	14.10	2.80	14.86	2.45	14.81	3.22
7	13.47	2.78	13.67	2.97	14.88	2.38	17.19	2.27
8	11.57	3.34	10.62	2.98	12.59	2.77	13.94	2.77
9	11.41	1.79	11.10	1.74	11.36	1.88	11.42	2.25
10	18.38	2.83	18.66	2.83	19.72	2.61	18.97	3.60
11	31.12	6.30	29.54	6.30	33.47	6.57	39.58	6.18

* Note: The underlined mean values indicate where significant differences occurred.

Hypothesis 1A

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and principals. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing center directors and principals on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were reported in Table 4.7.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (5.4980 with 11 and 266 degrees of freedom) was obtained (P less than .0001) and since three of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance (P less than .0045), Hypothesis 1A was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that significant differences between center directors and principals could be observed on three of the dependent variables.

Category 3: Resources (Human & Physical) F-Ratio = 11.6219)

Category 4: Coordination (F-Ratio = 21.0105)

Category 7: Leadership (F-Ratio = 18.7230)

Hypothesis 1B

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and superintendents. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing center directors and superintendents on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were reported in Table 4.8.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (5.3781

Table 4.7--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Center Directors and All Administrators.

Multivariate

D.F. = 11 and 266 F-Ratio = 5.4980

P Less Than .0001

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	23.1799	3.9115	5.9260	.0156
School as a Comprehensive Agency	34.3253	15.6098	2.1990	.1393
Resources (Human & Physical)	62.8188	5.4052	11.6219	.0008*
Coordination	128.2292	6.1031	21.0105	.0001*
Involvement	27.4391	8.9918	3.0516	.0818
Communications	1.2191	7.8063	.1562	.6931
Leadership	136.0005	7.2638	18.7230	.0001*
Health	17.2326	9.5657	1.8015	.1807
Enrichment	1.5403	3.4345	.4485	.5037
Recreation & Social Activities	39.0403	8.2648	4.7237	.0307
Social Problems & Issues	281.4359	44.8085	6.2809	.0128

D.F. for Hypothesis = 1 D.F. for Error = 276

* Denotes Significant Difference at .0045 alpha Level

Table 4.8--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Center Directors and Superintendents.

Multivariate

D.F. = 11 and 266 F-Ratio = 5.3781

P Less Than .0001

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	55.2060	3.9115	14.1136	.0003*
School as a Comprehensive Agency	30.0641	15.6098	1.9260	.1664
Resources (Human & Physical)	3.9302	5.4052	.7271	.3946
Coordination	38.8124	6.1031	6.3594	.0123
Involvement	175.1523	8.9918	19.4790	.0001*
Communications	20.0524	7.8063	2.5687	.1102
Leadership	146.6997	7.2638	20.1960	.0001*
Health	214.2864	9.5657	22.4014	.0001*
Enrichment	2.9123	3.4345	.8479	.3580
Recreation & Social Activities	23.4505	8.2648	2.8374	.0933
Social Problems & Issues	1326.7476	44.8085	29.6093	.0001*

D.F. for Hypothesis = 1 D.F. for Error = 276

* Denotes Significant Difference at .0045 alpha Level

with 11 and 266 degrees of freedom) was obtained (P less than .0001) and since five of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance (P less than .0045), Hypothesis 1B was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that significant differences between center directors and superintendents could be observed on five of the dependent variables.

Category 1: Needs Identification & Evaluation (F-Ratio = 14.1136)

Category 5: Involvement (F-Ratio = 19.4790)

Category 7: Leadership (F-Ratio = 20.1960)

Category 8: Health (F-Ratio = 22.4014)

Category 11: Social Problems & Issues (F-Ratio = 29.6093)

Hypothesis 1C

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and community education directors. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing center directors and community education directors on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were reported in Table 4.9.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (4.4831 with 11 and 266 degrees of freedom) was obtained (P less than .0001) and since two of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance (P less than .0045), Hypothesis 1C was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that significant differences between center directors and community education directors

Table 4.9--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Center Directors and Community Education Directors

Multivariate

D.F. = 11 and 266 F-Ratio = 4.4831

P Less Than .0001

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	10.7405	3.9115	2.7459	.0987
School as a Comprehensive Agency	12.8684	15.6098	.8244	.3647
Resources (Human & Physical)	3.7631	5.5042	.6962	.4048
Coordination	15.7985	6.1031	2.5886	.1088
Involvement	65.0353	8.9918	7.2327	.0076
Communications	.0625	7.8063	.0080	.9288
Leadership	108.1971	7.2638	14.8954	.0002*
Health	36.7792	9.5657	3.8449	.0510
Enrichment	.0663	3.4345	.0193	.8897
Recreation & Social Activities	11.5584	8.2648	1.3985	.2380
Social Problems & Issues	755.4588	44.8085	16.8597	.0001*

D.F. for Hypothesis = 1 D.F. for Error = 276

* Denotes Significant Difference at .0045 alpha Level

could be observed on two of the dependent variables.

Category 7: Leadership (F-Ratio = 14.8954)

Category 11: Social Problems & Issues (F-Ratio = 16.8597

Hypotheses 2, 3 and 4

For Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 the two-way Anova with a three by three design was used. The results were described below and presented in Tables 4.10, 4.12 and 4.13.

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between principals, superintendents and community education directors. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing principals, superintendents and community education directors on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were reported in Table 4.10.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (3.0981 with 22 and 460 degrees of freedom) was obtained (P less than .0001) and since three of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance (P less than .0045), Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that significant differences between principals, superintendents and community education directors could be observed on three of the dependent variables.

Category 4: Coordination (F-Ratio = 7.1104)

Category 7: Leadership (F-Ratio = 5.5671)

Table 4.10--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Principals, Superintendents and Comm. Ed. Directors.

Multivariate

D.F. = 22 and 460 F-Ratio = 3.0981

P Less Than .0001

Univariage

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	17.5347	4.0236	4.3582	.0139
School as a Comprehensive Agency	12.8264	15.6165	.8213	.4411
Resources (Human & Physical)	22.4780	5.2883	4.2505	.0154
Coordination	45.2575	6.3649	7.1104	.0011*
Involvement	37.1231	9.1419	4.0608	.0185
Communications	8.7932	7.5502	1.1646	.3138
Leadership	41.1130	7.3851	5.5671	.0044*
Health	57.3009	9.8871	5.7955	.0035*
Enrichment	2.1375	3.2864	.6504	.5228
Recreation & Social Activities	36.4471	7.5603	4.8208	.0089
Social Problems & Issues	232.3560	46.3521	5.0128	.0074

D.F. for Hypothesis = 2 D.F. for Error = 240

* Denotes Significant Difference at .0045 alpha Level

Category 8: Health (F-Ratio = 5.7955)

The differences between principals, superintendents and community education directors in Categories 4, 7 and 8 can be seen by comparing the cell mean values in Table 4.11. The categories where differences were observed were indicated by this symbol (*).

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors). Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators on the eleven variables of interest were performed. The results were presented in Table 4.12.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (.9087 with 22 and 460 degrees of freedom) was not obtained (P less than .5836) and since none of the univariate F-Ratios reached significance, Hypothesis 3 was not rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that no significant differences among groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators could be observed on any one or all of the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant interaction between groups of urban, suburban and rural principals, superintendents and community education

Table 4.11--Cell Means and Standard Deviations for Principals, Superintendents and Community Education Directors on Eleven Categories of Goals.

Category		Principals			Superintendents			Comm. Ed. Directors		
		U n=50	S n=37	R n=43	U n=10	S n=16	R n=35	U n=10	S n=18	R n=30
	1 m	11.14	11.35	10.91	11.10	11.06	10.89	11.50	11.94	12.10
	sd	2.39	1.55	1.91	1.52	2.38	2.13	1.78	1.39	2.07
	2 m	27.24	27.46	26.58	27.00	26.94	27.46	29.20	27.17	27.87
	sd	4.56	4.21	3.74	2.87	3.62	3.48	2.97	3.70	4.19
	3 m	15.54	15.54	15.04	16.80	16.06	15.97	15.80	16.22	16.53
	sd	2.66	1.99	2.19	2.39	2.02	2.55	1.75	1.73	2.39
*	4 m	14.90	15.78	15.42	17.20	16.38	15.60	16.10	17.50	16.60
	sd	2.80	1.95	2.68	1.75	2.47	2.83	2.56	1.89	2.58
	5 m	18.86	19.11	18.44	18.40	18.06	18.06	19.10	20.39	19.47
	sd	3.49	2.55	3.00	3.47	3.09	3.07	2.28	2.33	3.08
	6 m	14.62	14.54	14.05	14.30	13.13	14.49	14.50	14.78	15.03
	sd	2.99	2.84	2.64	2.31	2.73	2.91	1.78	1.96	2.92
*	7 m	13.72	14.00	12.72	15.00	12.56	13.80	15.10	15.06	14.70
	sd	2.79	2.17	3.12	2.36	3,83	2.55	2.28	2.18	2.59
*	8 m	11.94	11.70	11.02	9.90	10.25	11.00	12.00	12.83	12.63
	sd	3.88	2.87	3.04	2.69	3.07	3.04	2.40	2.20	3.20
	9 m	11.36	11.43	11.47	10.90	10.81	11.29	11.80	11.00	11.43
	sd	1.89	1.71	1.78	.99	1.90	1.84	1.69	2.25	1.71
	10 m	18.08	19.24	18.00	18.40	18.25	18.91	19.90	18.61	20.33
	sd	2.99	2.51	2.76	3.03	3.71	2.33	2.33	2.64	2.54
	11 m	31.86	31.30	30.12	29.80	28.86	29.77	32.40	33.94	33.53
	sd	7.51	5.87	7.40	5.20	6.89	6.46	6.34	6.32	6.96

U, S, R Denote Urban, Suburban and Rural respectively.
m Denotes Mean and sd Denotes Standard Deviation.
* Denotes categories on which significant differences occurred.

Table 4.12--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Differences Between Groups of Urban, Suburban and Rural Administrators.

Multivariate

D.F. = 22 and 460 F-Ratio = .9087

P Less Than .5836

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	.9991	4.0236	.2483	.7803
School as a Comprehensive Agency	3.7966	15.6165	.2431	.7844
Resources (Human & Physical)	1.6601	5.2883	.3139	.7309
Coordination	12.0114	6.3649	1.8871	.1538
Involvement	6.5749	9.1419	.7192	.4882
Communications	1.6872	7.5502	.2235	.8000
Leadership	11.6423	7.3851	1.5765	.2089
Health	.6988	9.8871	.0707	.9318
Enrichment	1.3345	3.2864	.4061	.6668
Recreation & Social Activities	2.7369	7.5603	.3620	.6967
Social Problems & Issues	11.9669	46.3521	.2582	.7727

D.F. for Hypothesis = 2 D.F. for Error = 240

directors on the eleven categories of goals.

Multivariate and univariate analyses for area by position interaction on all eleven dependent variables were performed. The results were presented in Table 4.13.

Because a significance multivariate F-Ratio (1.3547 with 44 and 881 degrees of freedom) was not obtained (P less than .0644) and since no significant univariate F-Ratios were obtained, Hypothesis 4 was not rejected. Consequently, it was concluded that no significant area by position interaction effects were found on any one or all of the dependent variables as rated by groups of urban, suburban and rural principals, superintendents and community education directors.

This section presented the results of the seven Hypotheses tested in this study. Because the effect of area on the goal ratings was a major topic for investigation in this research effort, three additional tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences between the entire groups of urban, suburban and rural principals; urban, suburban and rural superintendents; urban, suburban and rural community education directors. No differences were anticipated because Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not rejected, and because no differences were found, data were not presented.

One final fact required clarification. The sampling procedures outlined in Chapter III included the use of a probability sample for selecting principals. Typically, when probability sampling is used, a weighting of the

Table 4.13--Multivariate and Univariate Tests for Interaction Effects of Area by Position.

Multivariate

D.F. = 44 and 881 F-Ratio = 1.3547

P Less Than .0644

Univariate

Variable	Hypothesis Mean Square	Mean Square Error	Univariate F	P Less Than
Needs Identification & Evaluation	1.3017	4.0236	.3235	.8621
School as a Comprehensive Agency	9.9946	15.6165	.6400	.6345
Resources (Human & Physical)	3.3431	5.2883	.6322	.6401
Coordination	7.5194	6.3649	1.1814	.3196
Involvement	2.6983	9.1419	.2952	.8810
Communications	7.0694	7.5502	.9363	.4436
Leadership	13.5692	7.3851	1.8374	.1224
Health	8.9958	9.8871	.9099	.4589
Enrichment	1.2402	3.2864	.3774	.8247
Recreation & Social Activities	18.0435	7.5603	2.3866	.0519
Social Problems & Issues	18.2937	46.3521	.3947	.8124

D.F. for Hypothesis = 4 D.F. for Error = 240

results is necessary because the samples may not represent equal or similar percentages of the target populations. In Table 4.14, a distribution of the probability samples for urban, suburban and rural principals was presented.

Table 4.14--Distribution and Percentages of the Probability Sample for Principals by Urban, Suburban and Rural Areas.

Area	Available N	Sampled n	%
Urban	141	50	35
Suburban	129	50	39
Rural	103	50	48
Total	373	150	40

It was suggested by McSweeney that a weighting of the ratings of principals was not needed in this study for two reasons. First, the percentages formed by dividing sample size fifty into each available N for urban, suburban and rural areas did not vary greatly, and therefore, none of the three areas had a significant overrepresentation. Secondly, both Hypothesis 3 for area main effect and Hypothesis 4 for area by position interaction were not rejected. Any weighting of the principals' ratings would not have made a difference in the results because representation was not overly unequal.[2]

[2]Interview with Maryellen McSweeney, Michigan State University, July 12, 1974.

Research Questions

The analysis of the descriptive data and the tests of the Hypotheses provided answers to the six Research Questions that were stated in Chapter I. Below, each question has been re-stated and discussed.

Research Question 1

> To what extent is there agreement between center directors on the community education goals listed in the CEGI?

An examination of Table 4.1 indicated that the standard deviations for the goal ratings by center directors had a range from .44 to 1.32. However, only four goals had a standard deviation of 1.00 or higher. On the basis of standard deviation data, it was concluded that there is general agreement between center directors on community education goals, and that the group of center directors is relatively homogeneous.

Research Question 2

> Which groups will center directors identify as most likely and least likely to rate the goals like center directors; principals, superintendents, community education directors?

Table 4.15 illustrated the responses of center directors to the questions of which groups would most likely and least likely rate the goals like center directors.

Table 4.15--Responses to Items H-1 and H-2 in the CEGI-4.

Item	Number of Responses		
	Principals	Superintendents	Community Education Directors
H-1	0	3	28
H-2	24	7	0

Item H-1 showed that 28 center directors indicated that community education directors would be most likely to rate the goals like center directors. Three center directors indicated that superintendents would be most likely to rate the goals like center directors. This response pattern was consistent with Hypothesis 1C which, even though rejected, revealed significant differences between center directors and community education directors on only two of the eleven categories of goals (see Table 4.9).

Item H-2 showed that 24 center directors indicated that principals would be least likely to rate the goals like center directors, and 7 center directors indicated that superintendents would be least likely. The results of Hypotheses 1A and 1B indicated that center directors differed less significantly with principals than with superintendents. Significant differences between center directors and principals were observed on three of the eleven categories of goals (see Table 4.7), while significant differences between center directors and superintendents were

observed on five of the eleven categories of goals (see Table 4.8). This data indicated that the center directors' perceptions were inaccurate with respect to which group would rate the goals least like themselves.

Research Question 3

> Which categories of goals will center directors rate different from principals, superintendents and community education directors?

The tests of Hypotheses 1A, 1B and 1C indicated that significant differences occurred between center directors and each of the three other groups. The specific categories upon which there were differences were listed in the discussion of each of three Hypotheses tests. In addition, the differences were graphically represented in Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9; Table 4.6 presented cell mean differences.

Research Question 4

> Which of the fifty-three goals in the CEGI will have the highest and lowest mean ratings?

The mean ratings for all fifty-three goals were presented in Table 4.1. Individual group means, and the Grand Mean for all respondents (N=280), were presented. The goals were ranked from one to fifty-three based on the Grand Mean for each goal. Goal number 18, "To establish public schools as learning centers for all ages and sectors of the community," had the highest mean rating, 4.31. Goal number 33, "To provide child care for working mothers," had the lowest mean rating, 2.47.

Research Question 5

> With no distinction as to urban, suburban or rural, how will groups of principals, superintendents and community education directors rate the goal categories in the CEGI?

Hypothesis 2 was tested and provided insight into this question (see Table 4.10). Significant differences between principals, superintendents and community education directors were observed on three categories of goals (Coordination, Health and Leadership). Essentially, Hypothesis 2 tested position main effect, and because there were differences, it was concluded that the respondent's position did affect his rating of the eleven categories of goals in the CEGI.

Research Question 6

> Are the differences between urban, suburban and rural areas such that principals, superintendents and community education directors reflect these differences in their goal ratings in the CEGI?

This problem was investigated in two ways. First, Hypothesis 3 for area main effect was tested and no significant differences were observed between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators. Each group was composed of principals, superintendents and community education directors from the same geographical setting (urban, suburban or rural).

Secondly, Hypothesis 4 for area by position interaction was tested and indicated that there were no significant effects of the interaction of area by position on the

ratings of the eleven categories of goals. It was concluded that geographical area did not have a strong influence on the ratings of the eleven categories of goals by principals, superintendents and community education directors.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of data analysis relevant to the purpose of the study were presented. Descriptive data on the ratings of the fifty-three goals were collected, analyzed and graphically presented. The goal ratings, where significant differences occurred, were indicated. Mean discrepancies, a mean rank for each goal and standard deviations were also reported. A correlation matrix illustrating the relationship between the eleven categories of goals was also included.

Seven Hypotheses were tested by employing multivariate and univariate tests for significant differences. Hypotheses 1, 1A, 1B, 1C, and 2 were rejected, while Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not rejected.

The last part of this chapter contained a discussion of the six Research Questions that this study investigated. Answers to all six questions were provided by further examination of the descriptive data and the Hypotheses tests.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The objectives of this chapter were to present a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings and conclusions that resulted from the data analysis, and to present recommendations for further research.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of this study was to determine if there was significant agreement between principals, superintendents, community education directors and the directors of regional and cooperating centers for community education development on the ratings of eleven categories of community education goals as identified in the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI-4).

Limitations of the Study

The limitations included:

1. This study was limited geographically to the State of Minnesota in an attempt to investigate the importance of community education goals within a

small section of America.

2. Even though a substantially high rate of return characterized this investigation, the findings were based on data provided by those who responded. All reasonable efforts were made to contact non-respondents.

3. This study was limited to responses by professionals. Community residents were not given an opportunity to participate by rating the goals in the CEGI.

Review of the Related Literature

A selected review of literature restricted to the examination of materials pertinent to this study was presented. The Review included the concept of community, the community and the school, and community education. It was suggested that the basic concepts of community education are closely tied to the interactional processes of a community. The relationship between school and community was explored by analyzing roles played by community residents in their concern for effectively functioning educational programs and an overview of some of the problems faced by the schools of today was presented.

The Review also contained a section on community education and the community school which analyzed different phases of community education implementation and the changes

that the concept has undergone, particularly since the 1930's. The emerging community school that has been evolving for over four decades has provided communities with new approaches to solving community and educational problems.

Design of the Study

The design of the study was descriptive and comparative. It sought to analyze the convergence of community education goal ratings between principals, superintendents, community education directors and center directors.

The instrumentation employed in data collection included a questionnaire with fifty-three goal statements and a rating scale which yielded an intensity-of-importance score for each goal. The data collected on the 280 respondents were coded and then punched on data processing cards which were subsequently used with multivariate and univariate analyses of variance programs run on the C.D.C. 6500 Computer System at Michigan State University.

Findings and Conclusions of the Study

The findings of this study were clearly viewed by a brief amplification of the Hypotheses tests with respect to the results of each test.

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between regional and cooperating center directors and all other administrators (principals, superintendents and community education directors).

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. The results of the test indicated that significant differences between center directors and all other administrators as one group could be observed on six of the eleven categories of goals. It was concluded that a potential problem for community educators may continue to exist if greater convergence is not achieved between center directors and the other administrators involved in implementing community education programs.

The following three Hypotheses were discussed simultaneously:

Hypothesis 1A:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and principals.

Hypothesis 1B:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and superintendents.

Hypothesis 1C:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between center directors and community education directors.

These three Hypotheses were rejected. Each one revealed the extent to which center directors differed with each group on the ratings of the eleven categories of goals. Significant differences between center directors and principals occurred on three categories; between center directors and superintendents on five categories; between center directors and community education directors on two categories.

It was concluded that this information would be particularly helpful to center directors. After all, they had predicted that principals would rate the goals least like themselves, when actually superintendents rated them least like center directors (see Table 4.15). In general, it would be useful to know that significant differences on goal categories do exist at this time in the development of community education in Minnesota. Greater convergence will help encourage the growth of community education.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between principals, superintendents and community education directors.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected. It was a test of position main effect on the ratings of the goals and significant differences were observed on three categories. Therefore, it was concluded that position somehow affected the rating of the goals; differences may have resulted from position attitude, or they may have involved a respondent's orientation to community education, its concepts and its goals.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in the ratings of the eleven categories of goals between groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators.

Hypothesis 3 tested area main effect on the ratings of the categories of goals and was not rejected. Because no significant differences were observed, it was concluded

that area did not affect the rating of the goals by groups of urban, suburban and rural administrators.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no interaction between groups of urban, suburban and rural principals, superintendents and community education directors on the ratings of the eleven categories of goals.

Hypothesis 4 tested the dual effects of area by position on the ratings of the categories of goals. The Hypothesis was not rejected, which further supported the conclusion that area, even within a group, did not significantly affect the goal ratings.

Implications

Even though narrow in scope, the findings of this study have important implications, not only for the groups sampled in the study, but also for other school district administrators, teachers, community residents, and community agency directors. If community education goals are recognized as important and worth pursuing, then a coordinated effort should continue to be undertaken to overcome the problem of a significant lack of convergence between the professionals charged with implementing and operating community education programs.

Two important facts were revealed in the ranking of the fifty-three goals by principals, superintendents, community education directors and center directors. First, the goal with the highest mean ranking was a goal which is so

very fundamental to the perpetuation and growth of community education. That goal stated:

> To establish public schools as learning centers for all ages and sectors of the community.

The shared importance of that goal emphasized the power of convergence. It also indicated that even though significant differences may exist, there is some general understanding by school administrators of a basic purpose of community education programs. Secondly, the following goal statement had the lowest mean ranking:

> To provide child care for working mothers.

The overwhelming lack of convergence on this goal was reflected in the low ratings of superintendents and principals. Some school administrators apparently do not believe that the role of the school should include providing care for the children of working mothers. This issue is a sensitive one, but it illustrates a community need that may be met by public schools, particularly at a time when the population of school age children is declining. The child-care issue also points to the necessity for schools, like other societal institutions, to explore additional functions in order to better serve communities.

The most significant convergence between center directors and principals, superintendents or community education directors occurred on the following categories: School as a Comprehensive Agency, Communication, and Enrichment. A similar pattern of convergence was observed between groups of

principals, superintendents and community education directors. These patterns suggested that many administrators assigned higher ratings to community education goals which are more directly related to traditional educational efforts. While support for these categories of more traditionally oriented goals is important, additional administrative support for other community education programs as an integral part of the overall K-12 educational program is vital to the understanding and growth of community education.

The categories of goals illustrating the least amount of convergence included: Coordination, Leadership, Health, and Social Problems & Issues. Center directors rated the goals in each of these categories higher than principals, superintendents and community education directors. The test for position main effect revealed significant differences on the Coordination, Leadership and Health categories with community education directors rating the goals in these categories higher than principals or superintendents. The categories with the least convergence involve an expanded role and function for schools. Center directors and community education directors will have to do much more to convince principals, superintendents and school boards that these expanded functions can and ought to be performed by schools.

Center directors ought to reassess their views toward school principals. Principals can be key allies whose friendship and cooperation can provide a great thrust for community education. Without their support, community

education programs have a lesser chance of survival at the building level, even though a creative community school coordinator may be present at the site.

In the review of literature it was suggested that the role of the superintendent was a vital one with respect to the development of community education in any school district. The endorsement and support of the superintendent are, indeed, necessary. But this study indicated that superintendents differed significantly from center directors on five categories of goals which represented less convergence than there was between center directors and either principals or community education directors. If the superintendent is to remain a community education advocate, he should acquire a much more in-depth orientation to the community education concept, particularly after it has once been implemented in the district. Center directors might wish to plan workshops specifically for superintendents in order that superintendents will further appreciate the breadth of the community education concept and its potential for helping to plan for a better community.

There must continue to be an on-going reassessment of community education goals. The goals and the survey methods used in this study provide a relatively easy way to regularly investigate for convergence and to develop new goals. Such research will add measurably to a growing community education data base.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations were listed as suggestions for further research and investigation.

1. Replicate this study in one year in Minnesota to determine whether or not additional convergence will have developed.

2. Replicate the present study with the seventy additional school districts in Minnesota that have adopted community education programs since September, 1973. Further research in Minnesota will amplify the findings in this study.

3. Conduct in-depth studies in all states operating community education programs to determine whether or not such factors as area (urban, suburban and rural) and position vary in their effects on the goal ratings in different parts of the United States.

4. Develop a study to determine the extent to which community residents understand the goals of community education, particularly in communities that support community education programs.

5. Develop additional research techniques for the solicitation of more varied input into a community education goal-setting process, particularly by

teachers and other school staff members who may have only peripheral involvement in a community education program.

6. Develop a specific technique to be used for community education goal-setting by community members. Have them rate the goals, compare them to the CEGI, and investigate for similarity and convergence.

As community education continues to grow, it is suggested that growth proceed in some logical fashion and that those who benefit from community education programs be the people who have the biggest stake in the community, the residents. If community education programs are sustained only to provide school districts with new funding sources, a great opportunity to help communities with the direction of their own destinies will be diminished.

Although this study stressed the importance of convergence to the extent that significant convergence encourages a better understanding of community education goals, and consequently, makes implementation of the community education concept in American communities easier, there is a danger in total and unanimous convergence. Differences revealed because of position are not necessarily a detriment. Changes made in schools and communities should reflect the differences of those who work in the schools and live in the community.

American public schools are confronted with demands to more effectively serve their communities. In the process they will have to become less insular and increasingly involved in the interactional and problem-solving processes of the community. Community education provides a viable approach to planning for the greater integration of community resources and services with traditional school programs. Community education can assist schools in meeting community demands and in facing the challenges of the future. The course of community education will be charted by those who establish and pursue its goals.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Anderson, James G. Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

Babbie, Earl S. Survey Research Methods. Monterey, California: Wadsworth Co., 1973.

Bahrdt, Hans P. "Public Activity and Private Activity as Basic Forms of City Association." Perspectives on the American Community. Warren, Roland L., ed. New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Bendiner, Robert. The Politics of Schools. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Benne, Kenneth D. Education for Tragedy. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Berridge, Robert I. The Community Education Handbook. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1973.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Borg, Walter. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1963.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carter, Richard F. Voters and Their Schools. Stanford, California: Institute for Communication Research, 1960.

Clapp, Elsie R. Community Schools in Action. New York: Viking Press, 1940.

Conant, James B. The Child, The Parent and The State. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Danforth Foundation and the Ford Foundation. The School and the Democratic Environment. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America, Volume II. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1945.

Dewey, John. Education Today. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1940.

Dewey, John. School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915.

Dewey, John and Dewey, Evelyn. Schools of To-Morrow. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1915.

Easton, DAvid. A Framework for Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1960.

Everett, Samuel. The Community School. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1938.

Fantini, Mario D. and Young, Milton A. Designing Education for Tomorrow's Cities. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Hamlin, Herbert. Citizens Committees in the Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printing Co., 1952.

Henry, Nelson B., ed. American Education in the Postwar Period. 44th Yearbook, Parts I and II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education; University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Henry, Nelson B., ed. The Community School. 52nd Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education; University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Hickey, Howard W. and Van Voorhees, Curtis, eds. The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Hiemstra, Roger. The Educative Community. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.

Hook, Sidney. Education for Modern Man. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Kerensky, V.M. and Melby, Ernest O. Education II - The Social Imperative. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964.

Koerner, James D. Who Controls American Education? Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

LeTarte, Clyde E. and Minzey, Jack D. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972.

Levin, Henry M., ed. Community Control of Schools. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

Martin, Roscoe. Government and the Suburban School. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

Martindale, Don and Monachesi, Elio D. Elements of Sociology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Melby, Ernest O. Administering Community Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Melby, Ernest O. Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1959.

Melby, Ernest O. The Education of Free Men. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955.

Minzey, Jack D. and Olson, Clarence R. "Community Education: An Overview." The Role of the School in Community Education. Hickey, Howard W. and Van Voorhees, Curtis, eds. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Molloy, Larry. Community/School: Sharing the Space and the Action. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973.

Nelson, Lowry; Ramsey, Charles E. and Varner, Coolie. Community Structure and Change. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.

Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Parsons, Talcott; Bales, Robert F. and Shils, E.A. Working Papers in the Theory of Action. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.

Passow, A. Harry, ed. Urban Education in the 1970's. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University 1971.

Rash, Julie and Markun, Patricia M., eds. New Views of School and Community. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals and the Association for Childhood Education International, 1973

Rosenthal, Alan, ed. Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power and Public School Policy. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.

Sanderson, Dwight. Locating the Rural Community. Ithaca, New York: New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, 1939.

Sanderson, Dwight and Polson, Robert A. Rural Community Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1939.

Seay, Maurice F. and Associates. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Singer, Benjamin D. "The Future-Focused Role Image." Learning for Tomorrow. Toffler, Alvin, ed. New York: Random House, 1974.

Sower, Christopher; Holland, John; Tiedke, Kenneth and Freeman, Walter. Community Involvement. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Stein, Barry A. The Community Context of Economic Conversion. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Community Economic Development, 1971.

Sumption, Merle R. and Engstrom, Yvonne. School-Community Relations: A New Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

Toffler, Alvin, ed. Learning for Tomorrow. New York: Random House, 1974.

Totten, W. Fred. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1970.

United States Bureau of the Census. Census of Population: 1970, Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, Part 1, United States Summary - Section 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Warren, Roland L. The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1972.

Warren, Roland L., ed. Perspectives on the American Community. New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Weber, Max. Basic Concepts in Sociology. New York: Philosophical Library, 1962.

Weber, Max. The City. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Whyte, William H., Jr. et. al. The Exploding Metropolis. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1958.

Wirt, Frederick M. and Kirst, Michael W. The Political Web of American Schools. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1972.

Journals and Periodicals

Berger, Bennett M. "The Myth of Suburbia." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1961).

Bernard, Jessie. "Some Social-Psychological Aspects of Community Study: Some Areas Comparatively Neglected by American Sociologists." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March, 1951).

Blumenberg, Eleanor. "The School-Community Advisory Council: For Better or For Worse?" Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 46, No. 2 (February, 1971).

"Community Education in Minnesota." Community Education Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3 (May, 1973).

Elazar, Daniel J. "Are We a Nation of Cities?" The Public Interest, No. 4 (Summer, 1966)

Eliot, Thomas H. "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics." American Political Science Review, Vol. 53 (December, 1959).

Erie, Lawrence. "Management by Objectives Adopted by Community Education." Minnesota Community Education, Vol. 2, No. 5 (June, 1974).

Gores, Harold B. "Community Education: Schoolhouse of the Future." Leisure Today (April, 1974).

Grimshaw, William F., ed. "Mott Foundation Announces Creation of Community Education Board of Advisors." Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 2 (March-April, 1974).

Hillery, George A., Jr. "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." Rural Sociology, Vol. 20 (June, 1955).

House, Ernest R. "The Price of Productivity: Who Pays?" Today's Education, Vol. 62, No. 6 (September-October, 1973).

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. "The Role of Public Education." Today's Education, Vol. 63, No. 7 (November-December, 1973).

Kaufman, Harold F. "Toward an Interactional Conception of Community." Social Forces, Vol. 38, No. 1 (October, 1959).

Melby, Ernest O. "Address to Second Annual Convention of National Community School Education Association." The Community School and Its Administration, Vol. 6, No. 5 (January, 1968).

Minardo, William. "The Right Man for the Right Job." Community Education Journal, Vol. 2, No. 5 (November, 1972).

Moore, Samuel A., II. "Community Education: Package Plan vs. A Quest For Quality." Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January-February, 1974).

Mullarney, Patrick B. "Evaluating Community Council Effectiveness Using Provus' Discrepancy Model." Community Education Journal, Vol. 4, No. 3 (May-June, 1974).

"New Voices Gain Stature in Old Power Structure." Nation's Schools, Vol. 84, No. 3 (September, 1969).

Pendell, Richard C. "University Centers Key to Community Education." Community Education Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3 (May, 1973).

Ravitch, Diane. "Community Control Revisited." Commentary, Vol. 53, No. 2 (February, 1972).

Reiss, Albert J., Jr. "The Sociological Study of Communities." Rural Sociology, Vol. 24 (1959).

Roel, Ronald, Ed. "Searching For a 'Third Force': Can We Put the Public Back into Public Education?" The Journal of the Institute for Responsive Education, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter, 1974).

Seay, Maurice F. "Threads Running Through the Community School Movement." Community Education Journal, Vol. 2, No. 1 (February, 1972).

Shane, June Grant and Shane, Harold G. "The Role of the Future in Education." Today's Education, Vol. 63, No. 1 (January-February, 1974).

"The Definition Issue." NCSEA News (May, 1971).

Van Voorhees, Curtis. "Community Education Needs Research for Survival." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 3 (November, 1972).

Wilson, James Q. "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 29, No. 4 (November, 1963).

Zentner, Henry. "Logical Difficulties in Relating the Concepts Community, Society, and Institutions." Alpha Kappa Deltan, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Winter, 1958).

Unpublished Materials

"An Evaluation: School-Community Advisory Councils." Unified School District, Los Angeles, California, 1972.

"C.S. Mott Foundation Regional and Cooperating Centers for Community Development." Flint, Michigan: Mott Foundation, February 1, 1974.

"Community Education Concept." Center for Community Education Development, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1971.

Decker, Larry E. "An Administrative Assessment of the Consequences of Adopting Community Education in Selected Public School Districts." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Decker, Larry E. "Status of Community Education Development in State Educational Agencies." June, 1974.

DeLargy, Paul F. "Identification of Community Education Goals by Use of the Delphi Technique." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973.

Dissemination Program Manual. Mott Foundation Projects Office, Flint Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, 1968.

Munoz, Arnold. "The University Center for Community Education Development Director: Analysis of Role Conflict and Expectations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

McSweeney, Maryellen. "Advanced Research Methods in Education." Course Handbook, Michigan State University, 1974.

"Philosophy of Community Education." Statement by National Community School Education Association Board of Directors, Flint, Michigan, April 26-28, 1968.

Procunier, Douglas M. "An Analysis of Factors Necessary for Effective Innovation in Regional Community Education Dissemination Centers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

"Second Annual Membership Directory." National Community School Education Association, Flint, Michigan, 1967.

Van Voorhees, Curtis, ed. "Needed Research in Community Education." Institute for Community Education Development, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, 1971.

Weaver, Donald C. "The Emerging Community Education Model." National Community School Education Association, 1972.

Lectures and Speeches

Alinsky, Saul David. "Citizen Participation and Community Organization in Planning and Urban Renewal." Speech to the Chicago Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Chicago, January 29, 1962.

Decker, Larry E. "Linkages Influencing the Approaches to Sharing the Action." Speech, Educational Facilities Laboratories Workshop, Arlington, Virginia, April 15-16, 1974.

McSweeney, Maryellen. "Frame Problems in Survey Research." Lecture, Michigan State University, April 4, 1974.

McSweeney, Maryellen. "Response and Non-Response Patterns in Survey Research." Lecture, Michigan State University, May 21, 1974.

Minzey, Jack D. "A Report to the 15th Annual State Community Education Workshop." Flint, Michigan, October 28-30, 1970.

Minzey, Jack D. "Community Education, the Past and Future." Address to C.S. Mott Interns, National Center for Community Education, Flint, Michigan, May 9, 1974.

Olsen, Edward G. "The Community School: Pattern for Program." Address delivered at the Conference on Community Education for School Board Members and School Administrators, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, March 7, 1969.

Interviews

Barley, Pat. Community School Director, Oak Community School, Flint, Michigan, April 8, 1974.

McSweeney, Maryellen. Associate Professor of Education, Michigan State University, April 11 and July 12, 1974.

Melby, Ernest O. Distinguished Professor of Education, Michigan State University, June 24, 1974.

Mullarney, Patrick B. Director Northeast Community Education Development Center, University of Connecticut, December 11, 1973.

Tyler, Ralph W. Director Emeritus, Science Research Associates, Flint, Michigan, October 30, 1974.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ELEVEN CATEGORIES OF GOALS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE BREAKDOWNS

APPENDIX A

Goal Categories

I.	6, 28, 52	(3)
II.	8, 24, 28, 23, 27, 36, 50	(7)
III.	1, 22, 46, 53	(4)
IV.	4, 13, 34, 51	(4)
V.	2, 3, 11, 15, 20	(5)
VI.	16, 21, 32, 43	(4)
VII.	5, 17, 35, 42	(4)
VIII.	19, 30, 47, 48	(4)
IX.	7, 12, 31	(3)
X.	24, 29, 41, 45, 49	(5)
XI.	9, 10, 25, 26, 33, 37, 38, 39, 44, 50	(10)

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS MAILED

WITH THE CEGI-4

QUESTIONNAIRE

State of Minnesota

Department of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

April 29, 1974

Dear Superintendent,

Your school district is one of sixty-seven in Minnesota currently operating a community education program. A study is now being undertaken in Minnesota to assess the importance of a nationally identified set of community education goals.

You are in a key position to provide valuable information on how you rate items on the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI). Community education is a new and potentially potent force not only in Minnesota but throughout the United States.

We are undertaking this assessment to determine whether there is agreement on community education goals among groups of superintendents, principals and community school directors from Minnesota. Your cooperation is needed because not all community education districts are participating in this study. Neither your name nor the name of your school district will be identified when the results are reported.

The enclosed questionnaire should not take a great deal of your time. A stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the study will be mailed to you. Thank you for your time, and your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Erie
Director, Community Education Section

Michael Kaplan
Mott Intern, National Center for Community Education

MHK/jk

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

MOTT INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

May 3, 1974

Dear Center Director,

A study is now being undertaken to assess the importance of a nationally identified set of community education goals. You are in a key position to provide valuable information on how you rate items on the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI).

The purpose of this assessment is to determine whether there is agreement on community education goals among groups of center directors, superintendents, principals and community school directors. Your cooperation is needed because not all regional and cooperating centers are participating. Neither your name nor the name of your center will be identified when the results are reported.

The enclosed questionnaire should not take a great deal of your time. A stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the study will be mailed to you. Thank you for your time, and your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Kaplan
Mott Intern, Michigan State University

Douglas M. Procunier
Director, Training and Dissemination, Mott Foundation

Howard W. Hickey
Director, Mott Institute

MK/jk

State of Minnesota

Department of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

May 3, 1974

Dear Principal,

Your school building is one of over 300 in Minnesota currently operating a community education program. A study is now being undertaken in Minnesota to assess the importance of a nationally identified set of community education goals.

You are in a key position to provide valuable information on how you rate items on the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI). Community education is a new and potentially potent force not only in Minnesota but throughout the United States.

We are undertaking this assessment to determine whether there is agreement on community education goals among groups of superintendents, principals and community school directors from Minnesota. Your cooperation is needed because not all community school principals are participating in this study. Neither your name nor the name of your school building will be identified when the results are reported.

The enclosed questionnaire should not take a great deal of your time. A stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the study will be mailed to you. Thank you for your time, and your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Erie
Director, Community Education Section

Michael Kaplan
Mott Intern, National Center for Community Education

MHK/jk

State of Minnesota

Department of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

May 3, 1974

Dear Community Education Director,

Your school district is one of sixty-seven in Minnesota currently operating a community education program. A study is now being undertaken in Minnesota to assess the importance of a nationally identified set of community education goals.

You are in a key position to provide valuable information on how you rate items on the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI). Community education is a new and potentially potent force not only in Minnesota but throughout the United States.

We are undertaking this assessment to determine whether there is agreement on community education goals among groups of superintendents, principals and community education directors from Minnesota. Your cooperation is needed because not all community education directors are participating in this study. Neither your name nor the name of your school district will be identified when the results are reported.

The enclosed questionnaire should not take a great deal of your time. A stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the study will be mailed to you. Thank you for your time, and your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Erie

Lawrence Erie
Director, Community Education Section

Michael Kaplan

Michael Kaplan
Mott Intern, National Center for Community Education

MHK/jk

State of Minnesota
Department of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

May 22, 1974

Dear Community Educator,

A few weeks ago you received a questionnaire entitled "An Assessment of Community Education Goals as Identified in the Community Education Goals Inventory." Minnesota has over sixty-seven school districts currently operating community education programs and receiving reimbursement from State Legislature funds.

Superintendents, principals and community education directors from these districts are in key positions to provide information on how they, as groups, rate items on the Community Education Goals Inventory (CEGI). Your cooperation is needed to insure a representative coverage of community education districts.

This time of year is busy for school administrators and you perhaps have not had an opportunity to respond to the initial request. Therefore, for your convenience a stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed. This questionnaire will not require a great deal of your time. Neither your name nor the name of your school district or building will be identified when the results are reported.

We sincerely hope to make our study a good one. Your effort can greatly assist us.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Erie

Lawrence Erie
Director, Community Education Section

Michael Kaplan

Michael H. Kaplan
Mott Intern, National Center for Community Education

MHK/jk

APPENDIX C

THE CEGI-4

AN ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE

COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements have been identified as goals of community education. Rate each goal listed below according to its importance as you perceive it by circling the appropriate response.
Please do not sign your name. The information will be reported only in composite form; individuals, school districts, regional and cooperating centers will not be idenitifed.

RATING SCALE

VL	L	M	H	VH
Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High

Goals		Circle One
G-1	To use community services and resources for needs not met by the present school program.	VL L M H VH
G-2	To increase involvement of people as volunteers, advisory board members, and resource participants in the K-12 program.	VL L M H VH
G-3	To establish ways to increase involvement of citizens in the evaluation of community programs.	VL L M H VH
G-4	To coordinate individual, group, agency, school, business and industrial resources to deal with community problems.	VL L M H VH
G-5	To provide leadership training programs for professional and lay persons.	VL L M H VH
G-6	To develop means of evaluating the extent to which identified needs are being met by the program.	VL L M H VH
G-7	To provide the opportunity for individuals of all ages to pursue particular subject interests.	VL L M H VH
G-8	To use the school to promote cooperative home-school-community relationships.	VL L M H VH
G-9	To provide opportunities for individuals to analyze and discuss present and future social problems.	VL L M H VH
G-10	To provide alternative activities which could combat vandalism, juvenile delinquency and crime.	VL L M H VH
G-11	To increase participation by parents in continuing education for themselves and their children.	VL L M H VH
G-12	To provide enrichment activities involving the art, music and dance of local ethnic groups.	VL L M H VH
G-13	To coordinate community participation in programs and activities in order to eliminate duplication of services.	VL L M H VH

VL	L	M	H	VH
Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High

G-14	To use the schools as centers for training, retooling and upgrading of job skills.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-15	To provide opportunities for more people to participate in community decision-making.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-16	To communicate the "community education" concept to everyone.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-17	To establish representative neighborhood councils to provide leadership in developing a broad wants-and-needs-based program.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-18	To establish public schools as learning centers for all ages and sectors of the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-19	To identify general community mental health problems.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-20	To increase the involvement of individuals in community activities.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-21	To improve the public image of the school.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-22	To conduct regular surveys to establish the human and physical resources available to the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-23	To use schools to provide people with an opportunity to complete formal secondary education requirements.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-24	To provide the opportunity for people to use the recreational resources available within the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-25	To stimulate interests in present and future community problems usually characterized by public apathy.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-26	To help people prepare to cope with the impact of change.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-27	To establish community education centers, usually in schools.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-28	To develop a comprehensive and continuing process for identifying individual needs and wants of community residents.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-29	To provide organized physical and recreational activities for community members to meet identified needs.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-30	To increase knowledge of health matters by reporting survey results about community health.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-31	To offer courses and programs designed to develop increased understanding of one's self and others.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-32	To share, with other communities, ways and means used to meet local needs.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-33	To provide child care for working mothers.	VL	L	M	H	VH

VL Very Low	L Low	M Moderate	H High	VH Very High

G-34	To promote a cooperative working relationship between institutions, agencies, groups and industry.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-35	To provide increased opportunities for lay and professional people in the community to assume leadership roles.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-36	To expand the use of physical and human resources of the school for community purposes.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-37	To develop a program for meeting the employment needs of both the individual and the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-38	To help improve economic conditions in the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-39	To offer programs designed to increase understanding of political procedures, processes and issues.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-40	To offer alternative programs in schools for students unable to function effectively in the regular program.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-41	To provide opportunities to acquire skills for leisure time activities.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-42	To establish representative advisory councils to provide leadership for developing community goals and policies.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-43	Establishing effective communication between individuals, groups and organizations in the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-44	To assist residents in securing needed services from appropriate agencies, eg. transportation, housing, welfare, etc.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-45	To provide programs that offer opportunities for social interaction between people of differing backgrounds and ages.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-46	To make maximum use of community resources to provide a comprehensive educational program for the entire community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-47	To increase availability of community health services.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-48	To introduce or coordinate programs designed to improve community mental health.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-49	To improve and beautify the physical features of the community.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-50	To provide a forum for discussion designed to reduce misunderstandings caused by social issues and problems.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-51	To work with other agencies in jointly using and improving community facilities.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-52	To develop a program to identify major community needs.	VL	L	M	H	VH
G-53	To provide adequate funds to carry out the community education program.	VL	L	M	H	VH

Please respond to the following two items:

H-1 Check which one of the following groups you feel would most likely rate the goals on the CEGI the most similarly to the ratings of center directors.

_____ Principals of community schools
_____ Superintendents of community education districts
_____ Community school directors

H-2 Check which one of the following groups you feel would most likely rate the goals on the CEGI the least similarly to the ratings of center directors.

_____ Principals of community schools
_____ Superintendents of community education districts
_____ Community school directors

Typed and Printed in the U.S.A.
Professional Thesis Preparation
Cliff and Paula Haughey
144 Maplewood Drive
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Telephone (517) 337-1527