A CROSS - SECTIONAL CASE STUDY OF THE RESULTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION AND DIFFUSION IN PROCESS CITY, U.S.A.

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

THOMAS REID ANDERSON

1975

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A CROSS-SECTIONAL CASE STUDY OF THE RESULTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION AND DIFFUSION IN PROCESS CITY, U.S.A.

presented by

Thomas Reid Anderson

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration

Major professor

Date 5-7-75

ABSTRACT

A CROSS-SECTIONAL CASE STUDY OF THE RESULTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION AND DIFFUSION IN PROCESS CITY, U.S.A.

By

Thomas Reid Anderson

The basic problem undertaken in this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of four groups with regard to appropriate public school function.

There are more than seventy universities in the United States involved in implementing and diffusing the concept of community education. These universities, via established "Community Education Development Centers," have contact with nearly one thousand school districts where implementation and diffusion of the concept is being attempted. In addition, an increasing number of communities have expressed an interest in the idea.

To work successfully with interested public school personnel and other significant community members in such implementation, the development center staff members may wish to develop a clear understanding of innovation and its diffusion. Local practitioners may wish to view themselves as much change agents as community educators. The lack of reliable and accurate information regarding the effects of

community education may lead decision makers to rely solely upon the reputation of advocates as a basis for continued diffusion. As a result, community education may be under promotion rather than systematic implementation. This research was an attempt to develop a tool which can assist those involved with the implementation and diffusion of community education. "Process City," pseudonym for the case study site in Michigan, consented to seek the benefit of such a community analysis. Process City incorporates a school district which established community education as a philosophical mode of operation in 1967. The benefit of the conducted research in Process City can be expressed in terms of monitoring the progress of diffusion. In other communities, where implementation is in contemplation stages, the research method could give indication of possible acceptance of the idea: groups who support, groups who oppose, and groups who are unaware of the concept.

The study was designed to sample four populations in Process City: the teachers, the community educators, the program participants, and significant others. Each has an integral role in the implementation and diffusion of community education. Awareness of the level of sophistication regarding the concept among the various populations as well as a measure of the agreement shared among them was sought.

A mailed questionnaire was used in the data collection process. The instrument was designed in two sections.

Section One displayed thirty statements constructed so as to reflect the respondents' degree of agreement with the latest developments in community education. In Section Two, the respondents were asked to rank various community organizations according to their perception of each organization's support for current school policy (a community education philosophy).

Data were analyzed with the assistance of the Michigan State University, College of Education, Research Consultation Office. A computer program was developed which would conduct a Multivariate Analysis of Variance with data of Section One. The print-out supplied all information necessary to complete the analysis of that section. The Univariate Analysis of Variance was displayed for differences in perception among the groups with regard to nine dependent variables. The displayed information also contained data necessary to conduct the post hoc Scheffé test where appropriate.

The Kendall Coefficient of Concordance, W, was used to analyze the data collected with Section Two of the survey instrument. The ranking of support for a community education oriented school policy and the degree of agreement among the four groups was sought.

The major findings of the study included:

1. There is no statistically significant difference among Process City teachers, community educators, program participants, and significant others with regard to their

perception of the effect of a community education philosophy on the K-12 operation of schools.

2. There is no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the appropriate use of school facilities.

3. Significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of children and youth.

4. Significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of adults.

5. Significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of the school's role in the delivery of all types of human services.

6. No significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of the school's role in developing the total community to its greatest potential.

7. Significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of an effective method of improving school-public relations.

8. No significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of the importance of home-school communication.

9. Significant differences were observed among the four groups regarding their perception of appropriate functions for public schools.

10. There is a relation among the four groups with regard to the ranking of twenty-one community organizations in terms of their support for Process City public school policy.

The general conclusions of this study were that: (1) Process City community education implementation and diffusion efforts are effective with teachers and significant others, but (2) people who participate in existing programs are not aware of the full potential of community education,

and (3) support for current school policy from selected community groups is high among school staff and youth serving agencies but low among senior citizens and nonparents.

The results of this research suggest a need for further exploration of methods to monitor the diffusion of community education. If possible, a research, development, and diffusion "package" should result, preferably one which local practitioners could easily apply.

A CROSS-SECTIONAL CASE STUDY OF THE RESULTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION AND DIFFUSION IN PROCESS CITY, U.S.A.

By

Thomas Reid Anderson

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

1975

To my mother and father.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are various individuals and organizations who helped make this dissertation possible. To each I wish to express my sincere appreciation.

First, I thank the chairman of my committee, Dr. Samuel A. Moore, II. Dr. Moore's patience and insight were especially valuable during the time spent selecting a topic for study. Once past this hurdle, his guidance continued to provide the inspiration necessary to complete the project.

Dr. Howard Hickey and Dr. Archibald Shaw each made contributions to the completed study. Both read with succinct scrutiny each chapter of the document. Their suggestions, criticisms, and comments improved its quality immensely. A special thanks, too, to Dr. Shaw for serving as liaison between Michigan State University and the National Center for Community Education during our year as Mott Interns.

C. Brent Poulton epitomizes the especial friendship which developed among members of the 1974 Michigan State Mott Interns. The time spent together in like and extenuating circumstances has produced unique and life-long relationships.

The faith in my abilities expressed by officials of the Charles S. Mott Foundation is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Without such faith, expressed via the provided fellowship, the attempted task would not have been feasible.

My association as an intern with Dr. Jack Minzey of Eastern Michigan University's Center for Community Education proved most meaningful. His willingness to share his expertise and the resources of the center to polish my training while allowing time to write this dissertation is appreciated.

It is with deep love that I thank my wife Mary Kay. It is difficult to visualize the completion of any important task without her devoted confidence in my abilities. She is my source of encouragement and inspiration. These two years of sacrifice and transient living have brought us closer together than ever. For this, above all else, I am truly thankful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Introduction

The basic problem undertaken in this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of four groups with regard to appropriate public school function.

Many advocates of educational reform, both past and present, have postulated the concept of community education. The February issue of the 1936 Journal of Educational Sociology was dedicated to the concept of "Community Education." In addition to an editorial by E. George Payne which synopsized the thoughts of the day with threads of Deweyan philosophy, the issue contained articles with now hauntingly familiar ideas imbued within their titles: "Community Coordination: The Next Movement in Education," by Julius Yourman and "The School as the Center of the Community," by Nathan Payser. Maurice Seay and Frank Manley were at this same time attempting practical applications of the philosophy in Tennessee (TVA) and in Flint, Michigan. Through the decades of 1940 and 1950, other scholars and practitioners advanced the idea. A. B. Shaw, E. Clapp, E. Olson, and L. A. Cook all wrote of and/or implemented the philosophy during this period. Community education, then, has as a matter of

historical fact a solid philosophical foundation which has developed over a period of forty years through scholarly and practical application by a variety of individuals.

It has been since 1964, however, that the idea has spread from identification with a handful of school districts to acceptance by several hundred.[1] This move to practical application of the philosophy at the school district level can be traced in large measure to the philanthropic efforts of C. S. Mott of Flint, Michigan. Nearly all communities attempting to diffuse the concept today can look back to the initiation of their "program" and find the influence of the Mott Foundation. The introduction of the concept was either a direct result of "seed money" or state legislation which grew from the seed money idea. This is not to say that the task has been or is a single-handed effort of the Mott Foundation. In addition to the monetary boost of the past twelve years, numerous scholars such as E. O. Melby, Howard McClusky, and Clyde Campbell have given especial impetus to the spread of the concept with their speaking and writing. Statistics recently collected indicate the extent of this recent surge. "In 1971, there were 1,290 'community schools.' These schools involved 1,733,972 people in programs yearly (a weekly average of 645,463 persons). They spent $32,189,473 on community education."[2]

---

[1]Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 150.

[2]Ibid.

In addition, fifteen universities, with the incentive of Mott grants, have established regional centers for community education. These centers and their counterparts, the "cooperating centers," are responsible for dissemination of the concept throughout their region. Boards of education and other interested community groups can rely on the expertise of the staff at these centers for pertinent information regarding implementation procedures, funding suggestions, data regarding established programs, and pre-service and in-service training of professionals to man their operation.

Recent state and federal legislation has also encouraged the development of community education. In Michigan, for example, the legislature reimburses a portion of the salaries of community education professionals based on the size of the district. Federal monies have recently been designated for the same purpose as well as for the establishment of new regional and cooperating centers at universities across the country.

As a result of the recent emergence of the community education philosophy, more and more school boards are taking time to consider the potential of the concept as an answer to any number of ills. Some are drawn by its potential to curb juvenile delinquency, some want to utilize school buildings to the optimum, others to improve public relations. The myriad of reasons to adopt the concept attest to its potential on the one hand while contributing to

confusion regarding its ultimate purpose on the other. This has prompted a concerted effort on the part of experts to succinctly define the concept. Minzey asserts that the components of community education may be listed progressively as follows: (1) the K-12 program, (2) the use of facilities, (3) programs for children and youth, (4) programs for adults, (5) delivery of community services, and (6) community involvement or self-actualization.[1] In describing these components the author weaves threads of progression and continuity which should ultimately lead, in his opinion, to the maturation of a community. The hierarchy of needs theory of A. H. Maslow[2] concerning the progression of the individual to self-actualization parallels Minzey's paradigm of community education in action. He offers the following definition of the concept:

> Community Education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all of its community members. It uses the local school to serve as the catalyst for 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 toward the end of self-actualization.[3]

---

[1]Jack Minzey, speech delivered in Flint, Michigan, on May 8, 1974.

[2]A. H. Maslow, "Some Basic Propositions of a Growth and Self-Actualization Psychology," in Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, ed. by A. W. Combs (Washington: NEA, 1962).

[3]Jack Minzey and Clyde LeTarte, Community Education: From Program to Process (Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972), p. 19.

Other leaders, in defining the concept, also allude to the importance of this "process" of community self-actualization. Weaver states, ". . . It is based upon the premise that education can be made relevant to people's needs and that the people affected by education should be involved in decisions about the program."[1] An organization of professional community educators notes that: "The community school serves as a catalytic agent by providing leadership to mobilize community resources to solve identified community problems."[2] These definitions are part of the effort to establish community education with basic similarity throughout the country. While the adaption of the concept molds to the needs of each locale, possibly making them appear different, it is hoped by some writers that the basic goals and objectives of each will be similar.

> While the developmental process usually does vary by community, depending on size, socio-economic setting, rural-urban-suburban divisions, etc., some general procedures have been successfully employed in many communities. It is important that some developmental process be followed so that community education is established as a way of life and not just as an experimental program.[3]

As community education becomes established in cities and towns across the country it is increasingly important to monitor the progress of the operation toward the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 18.

[2]Minzey and LeTarte, Program to Process, p. 18.

[3]Tony S. Carrillo and Israel C. Heaton, "Strategies for Establishing a Community Education Program," Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 165.

originally established goals. Innovation diffusion, especially in education, has a tendency to be taken for granted once adoption has occurred. The danger of such practice is obvious. "The consequences of an innovation need systematic analysis and the fact that the innovation does what it is supposed to do needs documentation."[1] "Educational innovations are almost never evaluated on a systematic basis."[2] Community educators must realize that "decisions to implement, expand, or continue an innovation need to be based on more than intuition."[3] This is not an easy task. As with the personal, synergic rewards of the teacher, the knowledge that one has been successful or unsuccessful sometimes is not immediately apparent. Rogers and Svenning point this out:

> The fact that consequences or effects of educational innovations are often difficult to isolate, control, and evaluate is another distinguishing characteristic of educational change. In agriculture, we readily can see the effects of a particular fertilizer within one growing season, while, in contrast, innovations in education often produce far less tangible evidence of their effectiveness.[4]

---

[1]Richard I. Miller, "Implications for Practice From Research on Educational Change," Research Implications for Educational Diffusion, Major papers presented at the National Conference on Diffusion of Educational Ideas (East Lansing, Michigan: March 1968), p. 174.

[2]Mathew B. Miles, "Innovations in Education: Some Generalizations," Innovations in Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 657.

[3]Ibid., p. 658.

[4]Everett M. Rogers and Lynne Svenning, Managing Change, Operation PEP (California: San Mateo County Board of Education, 1969), p. 23.

Monitoring the self-actualization of a community will take concerted, systematic effort. At least one scholar is optimistic about our approach to innovation during the past ten years. John Gardner states: "Perhaps the most distinctive thing about innovation today is that we are beginning to pursue it systematically.[1] Rogers and Jain, however, are less optimistic when limiting their observations to education:

> What is lacking is understanding of the process or change and systematic assessment of the consequences of education. . . .
> . . . . . .
> We have ignored the study of consequence variables which reflect the effects of innovation.[2]

The impact of community education has been touted with much vigor by strong advocates of the concept. There is little empirical evidence, however, which specifically supports this effectiveness. While research efforts have been scant, the claims of the proponents cannot be disregarded merely on that basis. As Van Vorhees points out: "There is currently little research that either supports or denies the effectiveness of community education."[3] VanVorhees, an ardent

---

[1]John W. Gardner, Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 75.

[2]Everett M. Rogers and Nemi C. Jain, "Needed Research on Diffusion Within Educational Organization," Research Implications for Educational Diffusion, Major papers presented at the National Conference on Diffusion (East Lansing, Michigan: March 1968), pp. 93, 98.

[3]Curtis VanVorhees, "Community Education Needs Research for Survival," Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 203.

promoter of the importance of community education research, notes that "potentially, the doctoral dissertation is the single greatest contributor to community education research."[1] While he urges research on the one hand he is adamant in warning of another aspect of the problem:

> Suppose we find that the community education process doesn't produce as we have hypothesized? Will we hang it up or patch it up? History says the latter. Quite possibly we will have created another organization that feeds its own needs more and more and its original ideals less and less. I hope, of course, that we will admit it if we are mistaken. If our hypotheses are correct, however, we must tell the world and move forward.[2]

These thoughts preceded the topic selection of this paper.

Need for the Study

When officials in a school district implement a philosophical construct which differs from that of the past, successful diffusion depends, in part, upon common understanding of that philosophy. Methodology designed to periodically measure the diffusion of common understanding would be extremely useful. Evaluative procedures most popularly used to measure successful diffusion often involve the subjective opinion of the professional educator. Lacking reliable and accurate information on the effects of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 204.

[2] Ibid., p. 205.

innovation, educational decision makers come to rely upon the reputations of its advocates as a basis for continued diffusion efforts.[1] As a result, community education may be one of many educational innovations being promoted rather than systematically diffused after careful testing.[2] Community education, as a philosophy, needs the unbiased support of research conducted in a manner which is above question. This, necessarily, involves risk! The results could very well assert that the perceptions of community members in no way support the claims of the concepts' entrepreneurs.[3]

Previous research of this type has been designed to measure the difference in perception of community education advocates at the university level and top school administrators. Equally important are the perceptions of the staff at the local level (teachers), the programs' participants, and members of the community power structure. The task, then, is one of comparative analysis--comparing not only the expressed perceptions of those included in this study but comparing the results of this study with those of the past.

A comparative evaluation of the suggested groups with regard to their perception of appropriate public school

---

[1]Rogers and Svenning, Managing Change, p. 25.

[2]Ibid.

[3]VanVorhees, Research, p. 203.

function will be of interest to the local community education practitioner, the superintendent, the school board, and university representatives interested in the concepts' diffusion. Each needs to be aware of the effectiveness of implementation procedures being used. If an effective research procedure can be developed to measure simply and quickly the status of the diffusion of community education in any locale, the practitioner may gain renewed confidence in the research and development phase of the movement. As Baldridge effectively argues:

> . . . More and improved relationships are definitely needed between the research and development specialists in universities, research centers, and educational laboratories and the field users in public schools, state agencies, legislatures, and colleges.[1]

One evaluative measure of this research, then, will be its use in the future as a field technique by the local practitioner.

Purpose of the Study

It may be beneficial for leaders of the community education movement to monitor the current status of the concept's diffusion. The researcher's primary purpose in this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of four groups with regard to appropriate public school

---

[1]Victor J. Baldridge et al., Improving Relations Between R & D Organizations and Schools (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, California Center for Research and Development in Teaching, November 1973), p. 3.

function. All samples were selected from one case study site, Process City, U.S.A. The four groups included in the study were community educators, school staff (teachers), program participants, and members of the community power structure.

The local community education practitioner would benefit, and thus the successful diffusion of the concept would benefit, from knowledge of which groups and individuals currently support the project. In this study the researcher identified twenty-one groups, classes of individuals, or organizations and asked all respondents to rank the twenty-one according to how they perceive the degree of each group's support for current school policy.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the especial purposes of the research:

Adoption: A decision to make full use of a new idea as the best course of action available.[1]

Community Education: A philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all of its community members. It uses the local school as the catalyst for bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to

---

[1]Everett M. Rogers, Communication of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 26.

develop a positive sense of community, improve community living, and develop the community process toward the end of self-actualization.[1] It is based upon the premise that education can be made relevant to people's needs and that the people affected by education should be involved in decisions about the program.[2]

Community Educator: An individual within the system who is overtly committed to the concept of community education. This definition includes, in addition to the individual designated as the person responsible for the organization and administration of the project, the superintendent, the staff from the university regional or cooperating center in that area, the building directors, paraprofessionals, and any other school administrator of whom it can be said has a vested interest in the success of community education.

Community Power Structure: The framework of individuals within the community which, over time, influences most decisions made regarding the well-being of citizens. This framework may appear as a monolithic structure with one leader at the top level or as a factional or caucus structure with two distinct power groups. It may also appear as a coalitional or polylithic structure or as an amorphous

---

[1] Minzey and LeTarte, Program to Process, p. 19.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

pattern with no discernible, evident framework of leadership.[1]

Consequences: Changes that occur within a social system as a result of the adoption or rejection of an innovation.[2]

Diffusion: The process by which innovation spreads; the spread of a new idea from its source of invention or creation to its ultimate users or adopters.[3]

Innovation: Any change which represents something new to the individual or system being changed; any product, process or practice not presently being used.[4]

Perception: A mental image: concept. All behavior is a product of the perceptual field of the behaver at the moment of action.[5]

Power: The ability or authority to dominate men, to coerce and control them, obtain their obedience, interfere with their freedom, and compel their action in particular

---

[1]Fred D. Carver and Donald O. Crowe, "An Interdisciplinary Framework for the Study of Community Power," Educational Administration Quarterly 5 (Winter 1969): 50-64.

[2]Everett M. Rogers, with F. L. Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 17.

[3]E. M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 19-20.

[4]R. G. Havelock, J. C. Huber, and S. Zimmerman, A Guide to Innovation in Education (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1969), p. 2.

[5]A. W. Combs, "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality," Perceiving (Washington: NEA, 1962), p. 50.

ways. It may be the outcome of personal charisma, which induces obedience to the genius of an individual leader or of tradition, the sacrosanct character of an institution, or rational acceptance; or the result of a monopoly of wealth. Every social order is a system of power relations with hierarchical super- and sub-ordination and regulated competition and cooperation.[1]

Vested Interest: An interest in a particular idea or philosophy clothed or possibly subconsciously biased by the fact that one's livelihood depends on the popular success or acceptance of such.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Experts in the field of community education speak of the concept making a difference with regard to six component areas.[2] Will the respondents of this study concur with this premise? Specifically, will the respondents perceive:

RQ1. That implementation of the community education concept would cause the K-12 operation of schools to function more effectively?

Ho: 1. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of community educators, teachers, program participants, and significant others in the

---

[1]Larry W. Hughes, "Know Your 'Power' Structure," The American School Board Journal 154 (May 1967): 33-35.

[2]Minzey, speech in Flint, Michigan, May 8, 1974.

community with regard to their perception of the effect of a community education philosophy on the K-12 operation of schools.

RQ2. That school facilities should be used to a greater extent in meeting the needs of all community residents?

Ho: 2. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the appropriate use of school facilities.

RQ3. That one function of the public schools is to expand their role in meeting the needs of children and youth?

Ho: 3. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of children and youth.

RQ4. That it should be a public school function to seek an expanding role in meeting the needs of adults?

Ho: 4. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of adults.

RQ5. That the neighborhood school has a unique role to play in the delivery of all types of human services?

Ho: 5. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their

perception of the schools' role in the delivery of all types of human services.

RQ6. That the ultimate value of public education lies in its ability to create a process through which the community may resolve its problems?

Ho: 6. There will be no significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the schools' role in developing the total community to its greatest potential.

In addition, school officials are interested in whether the diffusion of the community education concept has a direct effect on public opinion of schools and improved communication between home and school. An objective of this study is to measure the degree of difference in perception among the four groups regarding these variables.

RQ7. Will the respondents perceive that the implementation and diffusion of community education has helped improve the public's opinion of schools?

Ho: 7. There will be no significant difference between the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an effective method of improving school-public relations.

RQ8. Will the respondents perceive that the implementation and diffusion of community education has helped improve communication between home and school?

Ho: 8. There will be no significant difference between the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perceptions of the importance of home-school communication.

RQ9. Has the diffusion of community education in Process City been successful enough to show agreement between the change agent and receivers regarding appropriate functions for public schools?

Ho: 9. There will be no significant difference between the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of appropriate functions for public schools.

In a well-planned innovation diffusion, the change agent monitors the plan's support as time passes. "Superficial or inconsistent knowledge of the community is inadequate."[1] It was deemed appropriate to measure the concept's support among community groups as perceived by the community educators, the teachers, the program participants, and members of the community power structure.

RQ10. To what community organizations can the community educator look for support of the concept at this point in time?

Ho: 10. There will be no significant relation among the four groups with regard to the ranking of twenty-one

---

[1]American Association of School Administrators, Judging Schools With Wisdom (Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1959), p. 3.

community organizations in terms of their support for current school policy.

General Design

All samples used in this study were drawn from one community, Process City, U.S.A. Process City is one community where the implementation and diffusion of community education is being attempted. The case study site is located within the designated area of responsibility of the Center for Community Education at Eastern Michigan University. This area covers southeast Michigan, northern Ohio, all of Pennsylvania, and western New York. The expertise and judgment of the center's director, Dr. Jack Minzey, was solicited along with other expert opinion in determining the case study site. Criteria used in the final selection of Process City were: the concept's diffusion began at least three years ago (established) and the effort was deemed successful by the experts.

The samples were drawn from four populations within Process City. The first population and sample to be considered was the most difficult to delineate. It was necessary, for the purposes of this research, to identify members of the Process City power structure. These individuals influence important decisions which affect the community. Their perceptions of appropriate public school function in Process City at this point in time are germane to the concept's future. To identify important decision makers the

researcher applied the knowledge gained by studies conducted in the past twenty years by sociologists such as Hunter and political scientists like Dahl. A combination of the reputational,[1] pluralist,[2] and decisional[3] methods of power structure identification was used by the researcher to delineate the power structure members of Process City. Bonjean expresses the essence of current thought regarding this subject:

> Certainly a combination of methods (any two or three) appears to be the most satisfactory means for the study of community leadership at our present stage of development.[4]

The sifting and sorting process of power structure discernment yielded a population of twenty-six "significant others."

The other populations considered in the study were the community education professionals, the teaching staff in schools where the concept was being diffused, and the participants of the programs and/or recipients of services resulting from the concept's diffusion.

---

[1]Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1953).

[2]T. J. Anton, "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics," Administrative Science Quarterly 7 (March 1963): 429.

[3]Walter Boek, "Field Techniques in Delineating the Structure of Community Leadership," Human Organization 4 (Winter 1965): 360.

[4]Charles M. Bonjean and D. M. Olsen, "Community Leadership: Directions of Research," Administrative Science Quarterly 9 (December 1964): 296.

All persons who shared the "vested interest" trait were included in the community educator sample. An individual whose livelihood depends on the successful diffusion of community education in Process City is said to have a "vested interest" in the concept. Examples of such individuals include the director of community education, the building or community center coordinators, the superintendent, and other administrators who advocate the concept in Process City. Investigation using the above criteria yielded a population of sixteen.

A random sample was drawn from a list of all teachers who work in a school where the diffusion of the concept, community education, is being attempted. A table of random numbers was utilized. The sample (N) for this population (160) was fifty respondents.

A random sample of all individuals who participated and/or derived benefit from the programs and services of the project, community education, was drawn from a list secured from the school files. This sample (N), representing a population of 418, was 100 respondents.

Instrument

A mailed questionnaire was designed to measure the perceptions of respondents regarding appropriate functions for public schools and to rank selected community groups according to their support for current school policy.

The questionnaire was designed in two sections. Section One displayed thirty statements which asked the respondent to agree or disagree based on a Likert scale. Each statement was designed to gauge the perception of the respondent with regard to appropriate public school function.

In Section Two of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rank various community groups according to that group's support for current school policy.

After pre-testing and revision, instructions and a cover letter were written to include in the first mailing of the questionnaire. Care was taken to identify each questionnaire with a specific respondent so that follow-up procedures would be efficient.

Two weeks after the first mailing, a second was initiated. A more appropriate cover letter was designed and included, asking that the respondents take part in the study. One week later, follow-up phone calls were made to the remaining nonrespondents.

Nature of the Data

The following data were gathered for purposes of analysis:

1. Responses to items regarding appropriate public school function in Process City
2. Rating of local support for the current school policy in Process City

Analysis of Data

1. The multivariate analysis of variance
2. The univariate analysis of variance
3. Post hoc Scheffé tests
4. Coefficient of concordance, W
5. Pairwise Spearman rank correlation coefficient

Limits of the Study

The validity of single case studies in the field of power structure research has been questioned by the experts. Walton asserts:

> There is great need to take research of community power away from single case studies (Hunter, Olmstead) and find ways to make comparative studies, the findings of which will be applicable over a broader base.[1]

Walton's null hypothesis, however (Ho: Comparative studies tend to find factional and coalitional power structures), was rejected, "comparative studies showing no significant departure from the results of single case studies."[2] Clark, in a study of fifty-one communities, had to rely on tremendous monetary and human resources to complete his research.[3] The ideas expressed by Clark suggest the single researcher

---

[1]John Walton, "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure," American Journal of Sociology 76 (January 1971): 434.

[2]Ibid., p. 437.

[3]Terry Clark, "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," American Sociological Review 33 (August 1968): 576-593.

might reap more valid results regarding the power structure of a single community.

Studies which are designed to analyze people's perception are limited by the nebulous nature of that entity. The ever-changing character of a person's perception can, at best, only be measured, interpreted, and the significance of same be acted upon immediately lest the perception have already changed. The results of this study will be of benefit only if considered relatively soon after completion.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in six chapters.

In Chapter II, the Review of Related Literature, the pertinent literature is reviewed.

In Chapter III, the case study site, Process City, is described. Historical perspective, education emphasis, and demographic data are included.

In Chapter IV, the Design of the Study, the procedures used in selecting the sample populations will be described, the steps followed in the development of the questionnaire are to be outlined, and the way in which the data produced by the instrument will be organized and statistically analyzed will be detailed.

In Chapter V, the Analysis of Data, the actual data collected will be presented and analyzed in accordance with the stated hypotheses of Chapter I.

In Chapter VI, the Summary and Conclusions, collated summaries, a statement of conclusions, and discussion of the implications of the research will be included.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature centers on three knowledge categories. Writings and research findings concerning innovation diffusion, community power structure, and community education have been selected for inclusion. The researcher attempted to discern the extent to which community education, as an innovation, has been diffused in one community. One unique feature of the research was the attempt to ferret the power structure of the community for use as respondents. A common base of understanding between reader and researcher with regard to these three knowledge categories will be of benefit.

The Diffusion of an Innovation

Until most recently, community education was not regarded as an innovation. In the real sense, the concept would not qualify. Rogers defines an innovation as "an idea, practice, or object perceived as new. . . ."[1] Havelock describes it in a very similar way, adding that it is "any

---

[1]Everett M. Rogers, Communication of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 26.

product, process or practice not presently being used."[1] Community education is not a new idea. Writers and practitioners have identified with the concept throughout the history of schools. One of the writer's contentions is, however, that in the past ten years community education's diffusion as an innovation has been attempted. The success of this attempt has yet to be empirically validated, yet many school districts are considering the possibility of a new role for their schools. One step in the right direction is greater understanding of the successful diffusion of innovations in other fields, as well as those in education.

In his book, Planning for Innovation, Havelock offers a classification of change theories. The author's extensive attention to dissemination and utilization of knowledge results in three categories or perspectives of change. Varying with the philosophical bent of the individual researcher, the categories are: (1) the social interaction perspective (SI), (2) the research development and diffusion perspective (RD&D), and (3) the problem-solver perspective (PS).[2]

---

[1]R. G. Havelock, J. C. Huber, and S. Zimmerman, A Guide to Innovation in Education (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1969), p. 2.

[2]R. G. Havelock et al., Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge (Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1969), p. 8.

Social Interaction Perspective (SI)

When an innovation, in the form of knowledge of a product or practice, is brought to the attention of a potential receiver population, the social interactionists are concerned with the phases through which the receivers pass in deciding to adopt or reject an innovation. Secondarily, the related issue of the mechanisms by which the innovation diffuses through the receiving group is of interest. The social interactionist holds that the most effective means of spreading information about an innovation is through personal contact. Further, he says that the key to adoption of an innovation is social interaction.

In discussing The Social Psychology of Organizations, Katz and Kahn highlight the influence of social interaction on the peer group in producing individual change. They comment:

> The behavior of associates does exert tremendous power over the individual.
>
> Changing several people at the same status level in the organization introduces the possibility of continuing reinforcement of the behavioral changes.
>
> The possibility of discovering an acceptable solution calling for change is greater in groups not inhibited by authority figures.[1]

Since equal status and power encourage full discussion, free decision making, and the internalization of decisions, the peer group is touted as a more useful vehicle

---

[1]Daniel Katz and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 395.

for intragroup processes. "Research evidence clearly establishes the effectiveness of such group discussion and decision-making in changing behavior and attitudes where the individual is the target of attempts to produce change."[1] It would appear that synergism is a major factor in changing group norms and individual behavior. Individuals need to feel that their decisions make significant impact on the group. While postulating the importance of upward influence within an organization, Likert's Linking Pin is pertinent to this discussion. Likert states:

> . . . each member of the organization must feel that the objectives are of significance and that his own particular task contributes in an indispensible manner to the organization's achievement of its objectives.[2]

In the case of an innovation, individuals also respond positively to situations where they feel their decisions influence their own fate. Another thought on group interaction is expressed by Katz and Kahn: "Discussion and decision about problems of importance invoke powerful individual forces of self-expression and self-determination."[3]

Much of the research thus far discussed, with regard to the group method of modifying individual behavior, is based on the work of Lewin et al. Conclusions offered by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 396.

[2] R. Likert, Organization Theory, ed. by D. S. Pugh (London: Cox and Lyman Ltd., 1971), p. 286.

[3] Katz and Kahn, Psych. of Orgs., p. 401.

Katz and Kahn, as well as others, center on two assumptions of Lewin's research:

1. The peer group is made up of people who come together as equals with respect to formal authority and formal status.
2. People come into the group because of common interests of their own and not as formal representatives of other groups. They can disagree or even leave the group, without consequences.[1]

Among the social interactionists, the research of Everett Rogers is undoubtedly the best known. In the Diffusion of Innovations his five-stage process model was postulated as follows:

> At the awareness stage the individual is exposed to the innovation but lacks complete information about it. He then becomes interested in it and seeks information in the interest stage. At the evaluation stage, the individual mentally applies the innovation to his present and anticipated future situation, and then decides whether or not to try it. The individual uses the innovation on a small scale in order to determine its utility in his own situation at the trial stage. At the adoption stage the individual decides to continue full use of the innovation.[2]

Awareness is more completely described by the author as the point at which

> . . . the individual is exposed to the innovation but lacks complete information about it. The individual is aware of the innovation, but is not yet motivated to seek further information. The primary function of the awareness stage is to initiate the sequence of later stages that lead to eventual adoption or rejection of the innovation.[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 405.

[2]Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 81-82.

[3]Ibid., p. 82.

The receiver at this stage, says Rogers, is relatively passive. Need does not spawn awareness of an innovation but, rather, awareness of a new idea creates a need for that innovation.

During the interest stage, individuals actively seek information about an innovation. Rogers points out that:

> The individual favors the innovation in a general way, but he has not yet judged its utility in terms of his own situation. The function of the interest stage is mainly to increase the individual's information about the innovation.[1]

During the interest stage, according to Rogers, positive or negative attitudes toward an innovation begin to develop.

It is during the third stage of this model that a period of "mental trial" exists. The individual goes through a period of time during which he "mentally applies the innovation to his present and anticipated future situation, and then decides whether or not to try it."[2]

If the results of the "mental trial" are favorable, the individual is ready to enter the trial stage. During this stage "the individual uses the innovation on a small scale in order to determine its utility in his own situation. The main function of the trial stage is to demonstrate its usefulness for possible complete adoption."[3]

Adoption, the last of Rogers' five stages, is the point at which the individual decides whether or not the new

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid., p. 83. [3]Ibid.

idea should be incorporated as part of living. "Adoption implies continued use of the innovation in the future."[1]

In a later work, Communication of Innovations, Rogers and Shoemaker redescribe the innovation-decision process, conceptualizing four functions. They suggest:

> The innovation-decision process is a mental process through which an individual passes from first knowledge of an innovation to a decision to adopt or reject, and to later confirmation of this decision.[2]

The four functions the authors postulate are knowledge, persuasion, decision, and confirmation. The earlier five-stage model is encompassed by the first three functions. The confirmation function which has been added seems like an accountability stage where the individual evaluates the decision made. Rogers and Shoemaker add another possibility:

> Discontinuance is a decision to cease use of an innovation after previously adopting it. Discontinuance, then, is essentially adoption of an innovation, followed by rejection.[3]

While Havelock recognizes the social interaction perspective as valid, he points out difficulties inherent in the methodology. The perspective, which stems from rural sociology, often views innovation as something relatively fixed and concrete. Since the innovation being studied is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 86.

[2] Rogers and Shoemaker, Communication, p. 39.

[3] Ibid.

often something which is visibly used, such as a new fertilizer, a new seed, or an improved corn picker cleaner, observation of it is very susceptible to quantitative empirical analysis. The author notes:

> Because of the strong empiricists orientation of the SI approach, it has generated relatively few explicit strategies or action alternatives. SI theorists generally prefer to sit back and ponder the "natural" process without meddling in it.[1]

Five generalizations regarding the SI approach are presented by Havelock:

> (1) The individual user or adopter belongs to a network of social relationships which largely influences his adoption behavior; (2) his place in the network (centrality, peripherality, isolation) is a good predictor of his rate of acceptance of new ideas; (3) informal personal contact is a vital part of the influence and adoption process; (4) group membership and reference group identifications are major predictors of individual adoption; (5) the rate of diffusion through a social system follows a predictable S-curve pattern.[2]

Havelock presents four strategies and five tactics which he perceives stem from the social interaction perspective. The strategies are:

> Natural diffusion. "Diffusion," in the social context, refers to the spread of the adoption of an innovation; . . . after 10% to 20% have adopted, the

---

[1]R. G. Havelock, Innovations in Education: Strategies and Tactics (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1971), p. 8.

[2]Ibid., p. 7.

vast majority of potential adopters will shortly follow. . . .[1]

Natural communication network utilization. Such a strategy would include identification of opinion leadership and circles of influence within the social system, and channeling of information to such key points.[2]

Network building. A complex strategy which results from the use and enhancement of informal social relationships in a client system by a change agent. Through informal personal contact the support of opinion leaders in the system is enlisted in the first phase of network building. Demonstrations and other forms of group meetings are emphasized in the diffusion program. . . .[3]

Multiple media approaches. Effective innovation strategies, as well as effective advertising campaigns, employ a variety of media to reach potential users. Researchers have verified that different kinds of media are optimally effective at different stages in the adoption process. A successful strategy of media use would synchronize different media with the progressive stages of user involvement.[4]

The following tactics which are normally presented as specific action steps associated with a given strategy and are employed to carry out that strategy, are not so postulated by Havelock. He suggests no particular relationship between the tactics and the preceding strategies. The tactics are:

Mass media dissemination. The dissemination of new ideas through television, radio, and the popular press. It is usually most effective (a) for reaching opinion

---

[1]R. G. Havelock, A Guide to Innovation Diffusion (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1970), Appendix A, p. 6.

[2]Havelock, Strategies, p. 9.

[3]Havelock, A Guide, Appendix A, p. 9.

[4]Ibid., Appendix A, p. 7.

who are media-oriented, (b) for creating awareness of new ideas, (c) for conveying simple ideas, and (d) for dissemination in crisis situations. Effective utilization usually requires that mass media be combined with other approaches.[1]

The "county agent." Locally based full-time experts on innovation (for which the "county agent" of agricultural extension is a commonly cited model) are crucial adjuncts to the "natural diffusion process" because they serve as the feeding points and personal contacts for the earliest adopters and opinion leaders. . . .[2]

The salesman. The county agent typically does not have time or resources to reach every member of the social system but the salesman can. Driven by profit motivation, both personal and corporate, the salesman utilizes personal and informal contact to the maximum. Moreover, he may be more effective than the "expert" county agent in reaching the less progressive and more isolated sectors of the community.[3]

Prestige suggestion. Identifying use of the innovation with leaders and other well-known personalities on the assumption that these individuals have true opinion leadership. . . .[4]

Opinion leadership utilization. . . . if opinion leaders can be influenced, then the rest of the social system will follow. . . .[5]

Research Development and Diffusion Perspective (RD&D)

Those who advocate the research, development and diffusion perspective are only secondarily interested in the receiver's response to a new idea. This results from their

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Havelock, Strategies, pp. 9-10.

[3]Ibid., p. 10.

[4]Havelock, A Guide, Appendix A, p. 8.

[5]Ibid.

relative confidence that the originator of the innovation can effectively discern the receiver's need. The RD&D expert presents a model which depicts the process of change as an orderly sequence beginning with the identification of a problem, proceding through activities which result in finding solutions to the problem, and ending with diffusion of the solution to a target group. Both the SI and the RD&D perspectives see the sender as determining the receiver's state, but the SI perspective does not presume a receiver need. Such presumption is accentuated with the RD&D approach. Rogers' recent definitions of change may enhance our discussion:

> Change is either immanent or contact. Immanent change occurs when members of a social system with little or no external influence create and develop a new idea (that is, invent it), and then it spreads within the system. Contact change occurs when sources external to the social system introduce a new idea.[1]

Our special interest, with regard to this discussion, is in contact change. The SI and RD&D perspectives are both examples of contact change. They differ, however, in accordance with Rogers' further breakdown of the term.

> Contact change may be either selective or directed. Selective contact change results when members of a social system are exposed to external influences and adopt or reject a new idea from that source on the basis of their needs. Directed contact change, or planned change, is caused by outsiders who, on their own or as representatives of change agencies,

---

[1]Rogers and Shoemaker, Communication, p. 38.

> intentionally seek to introduce new ideas in order to achieve goals they have defined.[1]

Rogers would hold that those who are of the RD&D persuasion run the constant risk that the problem discernment phase of their operation merely reflects his definition of directed contact change.

RD&D experts, however, maintain that the degree of technical skill and rational, careful planning brought to the diffusion is the key to its success. Emphasis is placed on large-scale planning of change and innovation. Relatively high costs of developmental stages are accepted in anticipation of relatively assured long-run benefits for large numbers of people. Much time is devoted to detailed development of a program based on scientific knowledge, followed by rigorous tests and evaluation procedures. The result is an innovation "package" which is a worthy solution to the detected need and, no doubt, will be willingly accepted by the receiver population. Members of the RD&D school perceive the receiver as passive, but rational. The receiver will accept and adopt an innovation if it is presented in a meaningful form at an opportune time. Mechanisms for distribution are not elaborate with RD&D methodology because of the foregoing assumption. Havelock makes the following statement regarding the RD&D perspective.

---

[1]Ibid.

> The planning of change is conceptualized in terms of a theoretical framework which describes the change process as a continuum of activities from research to practice, and a rational division of labor is specified for carrying out these activities.[1]

Another view of the RD&D perspective is presented in the paper, "Innovations in Education: Some Generalizations," by Matthew Miles. Included in Miles' conceptualization of change strategies are the chronological stages of innovation design, local awareness and interest, local evaluation, and local trial. The author concurs with Rogers in terms of the types of change. He states that the type of change depends on its point of origin. The change process may be initiated either by the target system itself (immanent), or by systems in the environment of the target system (contact).[2]

In deviation from the rule postulated by RD&D advocates, Miles and Lake focus on the activities of the receiver population rather than those of the sender. They view the objective of any strategy as the adoption of an innovation by the target group. Confining their research to a focus on the school as a total sociotechnical system, the authors favor a model which employs an external change agent team. The purpose of the agent team is to "formulate,

---

[1]Havelock et al., Planning, p. 53.

[2]M. B. Miles, "Innovations in Education: Some Generalizations," in Innovations in Education, ed. by M. B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 631.

apply, evaluate, and disseminate some variations of a basic strategy of planned change in collaboration with several school systems."[1] This RD&D perspective methodology has as an underlying goal the desire to assist the school in understanding the change process and, therefore, to become "self-renewing."

The basis for many state accountability models, the ten-step, change strategy model of Miles and Lake, follows:

1. Establish a temporary system or focal group of superintendent and his cabinet, the board and change agent. Clarify expectations of parties involved.
2. Collect information from system members.
3. Formulate statements of how goals, attitudes, and beliefs in different groups in the system agree with or are discrepant from one another and what problems most urgently need solution.
4. Using the data from step three, examine current operations, work on problems shown in the data and improve problem-solving effectiveness of the focal group as a team.
5. Carry out plans from previous step with other relevant groups. Repeat steps one, two and three with other groups under guidance of focal group.
6. Set up structures and procedures to institutionalize and support continuing self-renewal process.
7. Phase out active participation by external change agent staff.
8. Complete an assessment of the change program to date.
9. Feed the findings back into the school system.
10. Disseminate accounts of the methods and results of the change program.[2]

---

[1]M. Miles and D. Lake, "Self-Renewal in School Systems: A Strategy for Planned Change," in Concepts for Social Change, ed. by G. Watson (Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1967), p. 81.

[2]Ibid., pp. 83-84.

The desire to assist school systems increase their ability to successfully reflect community needs is explicit in this statement by Miles and Lake:

> We intend to help these school systems become self-renewing. A self-renewing school system would have the ability to continuously sense and adapt to its changing external and internal environment in such a manner as to strengthen itself and optimally fulfill its goal of providing quality education.[1]

As with the social interaction perspective, Havelock suggests RD&D strategies and tactics. First the strategies:

> Development of high performance products. . . . In this process, most of the adaptation and translation problems of the user are anticipated and adjusted for. The final outcome is therefore "user-proof," guaranteed to work for the most fumbling and incompetent receiver.[2]
>
> Information system building. Sometimes the "product" of development will itself be a system for diffusion and innovation. . . .[3]
>
> Engineered diffusion projects and programs. . . . (1) careful advance planning, (2) innovation packaging, (3) careful identification, selection, and preparation of the target audience, (4) multimedia presentation, (5) some sort of active user involvement, (6) systematic follow-up, and (7) experimental evaluation and documentation. . . .[4]
>
> Experimental social innovation. . . . Innovative social science projects can be designed as field experiments which include many of the features of laboratory experimentation so as to insure valid and readily interpretable results. . . .[5]

> Administered and legislated change. A change strategy which assumes that an innovation can be effectively diffused through legislative or administrative fiat; . . .[6]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 82. [2]Havelock, Strategies, p. 11.

[3]Ibid. [4]Ibid., pp. 11-12. [5]Ibid., p. 12.

[6]Havelock, A Guide, Appendix A, p. 7.

> Fait accompli. This strategy of change consists of installing an innovation without consulting users or without informing them in advance.[1]
>
> Systems analysis. . . . A systematic strategy of innovation which begins with the careful construction of an optimum but detailed ideal model of the problem area. Comparison of this ideal model with current operational reality highlights various shortcomings and focal points for change effort. . . .[2]

Havelock indicates RD&D tactics are essentially the tactics of research itself, like hypothesis building, design, sampling, instrumentation, measurement, statistical analysis and inference, and derivation of implications. He relates these tactics to development and diffusion as follows:

> Experimental demonstration. In the hands of a skilled demonstrator, and under ideal circumstances, a demonstration of an innovation can be quite powerful for adoption. . . . To be effective a demonstration must look convincing. First, it must clearly and dramatically show that the innovation makes a difference, that it changes things for the better. Second, it must look natural, something that the client can really use in his own setting with his resources.[3]
>
> Research evaluation. In lieu of using an "experimental demonstration" with its potential bias one may perform a careful documentation and evaluation over time to measure the success or failure of the innovation.[4]
>
> User need surveys. Systematic collection of information on the needs of the client system on the assumption that such "diagnostic" data will be used in problem solving or in the design and development of useful innovations.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 6.

[2] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 10.

[3] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 6.

[4] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 9.

[5] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 10.

Successive approximation. Through a series of evaluations and contingent redesigns an innovation can gradually be shaped into a more useable product.[1]

Translation. In order that potential users understand fully the innovation and its theoretical basis, the change agent may often be required to translate such information into language familiar to his client.[2]

Packaging for diffusion. Clear, attractive and effective labelling, printing and formating of the innovation can add a richness and a potential power for future adoption.[3]

Problem-Solver Perspective (PS)

As with Rogers' "immanent change," the problem-solver perspective (PS) emphasizes the receiver as an important focus. The receiver population initiates the innovation process by identifying an area of concern or sensing a need for change. Although outside assistance may be involved in change activity, the receiver participates fully in the process. Contrasting with the SI and RD&D perspectives, PS actively involves the receiver in finding an innovation to solve locally identified problems. The relationship between sender and receiver is one of collaboration. The receiver, however, known in the PS perspective as the "client system," usually makes final decisions regarding the process.

With the PS perspective, there is just one value upon which any change is planned. This primary consideration is "user need." To initiate a sequence of activities which lead to eventual change, the user senses and articulates a need. This need is then translated into a problem

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid. [3]Ibid., Appendix A, p. 8.

statement, and diagnosis follows as an integral phase of the process. Assisted by a nondirective change agent, the user conducts a search and retrieval of possible solutions from various forms of resources. The innovation (solution) is then selected and applied by the user. Following adoption of an innovation, the user monitors its progress and adapts it to the situation. Important at this stage is some evaluative tool to determine the solution's effectiveness in meeting the originally expressed need. If it appears that the innovation process has been successful, the user must build the internal capacity for its maintenance. The outsider, who has been involved during this entire process in a collaborative and consultive role, now begins the withdrawal of even this limited external assistance. The individuals who have worked with the change agent begin to increase their participation and become internal change agents. The internal change agent assists the capacity of the receiver population to become self-renewing.

Basic to PS theorists' interest in self-renewing organizations is the iterative, or repeated recycling procedure emphasized by Lewin. Lewin depicts change as "unfreezing," "moving," and "freezing."[1] He depicts sweeping social change as action steps followed by reconnaissance

---

[1]Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," in Readings in Social Psychology, ed. by G. E. Swanson et al. (New York: Holt, 1952), p. 472.

of results and decisions which lead to the next series of action steps.

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley present a model, based on Lewin's premises, which is typical of the PS perspective:

1. Development of a need for change ("unfreezing").
2. Establishment of a change relationship.
3. Working toward change ("moving").
   a. Diagnosis of client problems.
   b. Examination of alternative routes and goals and intentions of action.
   c. Transformation of intentions into change efforts.
4. Generalization and stabilization of change.
5. Achieving a terminal relationship.[1]

The model is designed to include a change agent and differs from the norm of PS methodology which calls for such introduction as optional and determined by the user.

The authors note that "problem awareness" is key to "unfreezing" an organization. Usually "the total system lacks concerted sensitivity to the problems."[2] In addition, "some confidence in the possibility of a more desirable state of affairs" on the part of the receiver population is important.[3] Willingness to accept external assistance also improves the climate for change. Resistance to change agents and other external assistance, note the authors, stems from the belief that exposure of problems is an admission of failure to manage effectively.

---

[1]Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley, The Dynamics of Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1958), pp. 130-136.

[2]Ibid., p. 131. [3]Ibid.

Another concern of Lippitt et al. focuses on the client system relationship with the change agent. Implicit in this discussion is the needed awareness of various subsystems of an organization less convinced of the need for change. These pockets of resistance can be significant deterrents to change particularly if they influence other subsystems to join their ranks.

Problems related to working toward change ("moving") are discussed by the authors:

1. The client system is often unwilling or unable to put forth the necessary effort to obtain needed information.
2. A discerned problem often broadens and reveals other related problems as information is gathered. It is at this point that groups and individuals with vested interests become aware of possible threat posed by the change and defensive reactions become evident.
3. Time must be carefully considered. With change coming from within, the client is key to the effort. His sometime inept procedure, hostility from subgroups, proper information gathering, and alternative's exploration all take considerable time. Implementation becomes a slow process.
4. While moving towards alternatives for action, cognitive and motivational problems may arise. Even though the specific problem is discerned, the people involved sometimes are unable to suggest possible remedies or, refuse to use them.
5. Very often the proper feedback mechanisms are neglected. Without pertinent feedback the system cannot evaluate an innovation's impact.[1]

Stages four and five of the Lippitt et al. model are concerned with what Lewin called "freezing." "Freezing,"

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 136-140; paraphrased by the author.

according to Lewin, is not a concrete phenomenon one can expect to happen if all preceding steps are taken. He states:

> A change toward a higher level of group performance is frequently short lived: after a "shot in the arm," group life soon returns to the previous level. This indicates that it does not suffice to define the objective of a planned change in group performance as the reaching of a different level. Permanency of the new level, or permanency for a desired period, should be included in the objective.[1]

Finally, Lippitt et al. call for the withdrawal of the change agent from the client system. As stated previously, their model of innovation is reliant upon the use of the external change agent. They note that "the relationship between the change agent and the client system . . . is the most important single aspect of the change process."[2] They also state:

> Our sequential order of phrases is too logical to represent the change process as it usually unfolds. In any given case one is likely to see that the phases overlap and repeat themselves. Yet the seven phases, as we have derived them from our case materials, actually do seem to fit almost all of the examples we have examined, and we believe that they are useful not only for the purposes of systematic analysis but also for the purposes of professional change agents.[3]

Watson presents a model of the problem-solver perspective which focuses on introducing innovations in school systems. The model includes the following ten phases:

1. Sensing. The most probable and necessary first step is to establish an open, sharing, trusting climate within which staff members feel comfortable expressing

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 472-473. [2]Ibid., p. 143. [3]Ibid.

their perceptions of specific problems. Everyone should regard this sensing as their responsibility.

2. Screening. A mechanism must be established to prioritize innovations. The organization's structure should incorporate this function.
3. Diagnosing. The problem needs to be placed in proper perspective with regard to all aspects of the organization. Structurally, a research and development unit should be established.
4. Inventing. The discerned problem, in proper perspective, now deserves the best possible solution. Wide participation in the production of possible solutions is the structural implication suggested by Watson.
5. Weighing. Now the array of possible solutions needs screening and appraising. A research-development bureau or a special organization-wide committee, established especially for this purpose, is the structural implication suggested by Watson.
6. Deciding. Some method needs to be devised to decide to implement an innovation. Ideally, Watson would employ an organization-wide consensus mechanism.
7. Introducing. Some mechanism is necessary to carry responsibility for strategically introducing change to the system.
8. Operating. This step will assure the innovation an ample amount of time to prove or disprove its worth.
9. Evaluating. Provision needs to be instituted (early in the process) for continuous, periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the innovation.
10. Revising. This is the culmination of the "self-renewing" function of this model. If previous steps have been effective, revision of the innovation should be evident.[1]

One of the key points asserted by Watson can be likened to Rogers' description of immanent change. Both authors imply the importance that change occur as a result of within-group awareness of the need for innovation. Rogers goes one step further when he describes lasting change as

---

[1]Goodwin Watson, "Toward a Conceptual Architecture of a Self-Renewing School System," in Change in School Systems, ed. by G. Watson (Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1967), pp. 110-115; paraphrased by the author.

that which occurs more slowly and originates from within the group. Watson couples the "sensing" on the part of individuals with the necessary structural mechanisms of the organization. "Sensing" and "screening" cannot operate separately. One is ineffective without the other. This notion is supported by Lippitt et al., who see the futility of establishing procedural change without the support of a flexible organizational structure.[1] The importance of an awareness of existing organizational structure is emphasized at each step of Watson's model. He states: "The discussion of each step will close with a summary statement of the structural implication of that step for the self-renewing school."[2]

Havelock provides a synopsis of his view of the PS perspective utilizing six strategies and nine related tactics:

> System self-renewal. . . . The development of an atmosphere favorable to continuing innovation and an internal capacity for problem-solving through the collaboration of an "inside-outside" team in the training of various "process" skills.[3]
>
> Action Research. An approach which involves the collaboration of the university social scientists and the school personnel in diagnosing and evaluating existing problems. . . .[4]

---

[1] Lippitt et al., Dynamics, p. 31.

[2] Watson, Self-Renewing School, p. 110.

[3] Havelock, A Guide, Appendix A, p. 10.

[4] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 5.

Collaborative action inquiry. Similar to "action research," but the collaboration between social scientists outside and school personnel inside is more emphasized than in action research, and a true team effort results.[1]

Human relation laboratory. A "temporary system" for improving problem-solving skills which can be adapted for use by individuals, groups, organizations or communities. . . .[2]

Consultation. A widely used and variously defined change strategy, based on the assistance of an outside expert(s) in helping a system work through its own problems and define its own needs, primarily through the use of reflection and authentic feedback.[3]

Sharing of practice innovations. Because the PS viewpoint stresses the user and user-involvement it places special value on user-originated innovations. Lippitt and his colleagues, for example, have developed elaborate strategies by which teachers can share new classroom teaching practices with each other. The program includes systematic screening and evaluation by teachers, themselves.[4]

Havelock's tactics are:

Sensitivity training group ("T-group"). Most variants of human relations training include an extended series of more-or-less unstructured group sessions which give members a chance to examine group dynamics in the "here-and-now." Such groups are designed to build sensitivity to others and to the way others react to oneself. Members learn how to establish norms of trust and openness to giving and receiving new ideas. . . .[5]

Reflection. . . . Restating the client's problems. By listening to his own words and actions "reflected" back to him by the change agent, the client can begin to move toward serious self-examination and self-diagnosis.[6]

Authentic feedback. A non-evaluative perception and interpretation of an individual's behavior as it affects the person who receives it. . . .[7]

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid., Appendix A, p. 7.

[3]Ibid., Appendix A, p. 6.

[4]Havelock, Strategies, p. 5.

[5]Havelock, A Guide, Appendix A, p. 9. [6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., Appendix A, p. 5.

> Role playing. Acting out roles of other members of a system in "simulations" of real situations. . . .[1]
>
> Group observation and process analysis. Self-conscious examination by a group of its own on-going interaction processes in order to understand group processes and to enhance group trust and openness. . . .[2]
>
> Derivation conference. Usually comprised of resource persons and client system representatives meeting on a temporary basis to collaborate on problem definition, information retrieval, derivation of implications for action and planning for implementation. . . .[3]
>
> Survey feedback. Involves a systematic collection of data from members of an organization on such questions as job satisfaction, supervisory behavior, work motivations, etc. This data is summarized and fed back to administrators and their subordinates as a means of confronting real perceptions and performance. . . .[4]
>
> Brainstorming. A group retrieval technique in which members suggest innovative problem solutions while they deliberately restrain critical judgement. . . .[5]
>
> Synectics. . . . Brainstorming can be systematized and combined with experiment and other problem solving steps to produce a systematic invention and innovation technique. . . .[6]

Linkage

Combining the work of many theorists, Havelock has postulated a fourth perspective, the "Linkage Perspective." His model evolves around the link between a user system and a resource system. Linkage is seen as a series of two-way interaction processes which connect the systems. Important

---

[1] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 9.

[2] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 6.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 10.

[5] Ibid., Appendix A, p. 4.

[6] Havelock, Tactics, p. 7.

to the success of the process is the exchange of messages in two-way interaction with an effort to stimulate the problem-solving behavior of the sender and receiver in reciprocal fashion. The resource systems, as an example, should appreciate the user's internal needs and problem-solving patterns, while the user must be able to appreciate the invention-solution-formulation-evaluation processes of the resource systems. Havelock holds that this type of collaborative interaction will improve the problem-solving techniques of those interested in change while building relationships of trust between user and resource.[1]

Community Power Structure

The study of community power has been the subject of controversy between sociologists and political scientists ever since the significant research of Hunter. The essence of Hunter's 1953 research is that power structure can be discerned by asking individuals to name community members who, in their opinion, wield the most community influence. These interviewed individuals make choices on the basis of reputation as to the most influential members of their community. These choices are then placed on a panel which may include as many as one hundred individuals. This large panel is then asked to name the most influential community

---

[1]Havelock et al., Planning for Innovation, pp. 11-17.

members. This redundancy improves the accuracy of the method. Hunter's method is referred to in the research as a panel approach or the reputational method.

Boek brings out the differences hotly contested between sociologists and political scientists. He describes the work of Dahl, who introduced the pluralist method of power structure identification.[1] Other names for this pluralist method are the decisional method or the issue-centered approach. "The pluralist school, based principally on political science, views the community as a collection of individuals and attempts to measure in quantitative terms the amount of power held by each individual."[2] Unique to this approach is its attempt to find the power within each decision made in the community. To the pluralist, every community decision is influenced by separate individuals. The theory of just a few individuals influencing all decisions is not accepted. Dahl's conception of power, as described by Anton, begins with the intuitive notion that "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do."[3] This is a fourfold conception with:

---

[1]Walter Boek, "Field Techniques in Delineating the Structure of Community Leadership," Human Organization 4 (Winter 1965).

[2]Thomas J. Anton, "Power, Pluralism and Local Politics," Administration Science Quarterly 7 (March 1963): 431.

[3]Ibid., p. 440.

1. a base, source, or domain of one actor's power over another. . . .
2. a means or instrument used in the exertion of power.
3. the amount or extent of an individual's power. . . .
4. the scope or range of power.[1]

All of the above is brought out in relation to each decision made in a given community.

In an article on community power structure, Carver and Crowe point out four power structure configurations:

1. Monolithic power. Few individuals hold most of the power.
2. Factional or caucus. Rule by committee or board.
3. Coalitional or polylithic. Power shifts according to issue about which a decision is to be made.
4. Amorphous. No discernible pattern of power.[2]

These power configurations are visualized by the authors as existing on a line or continuum. The poles of the continuum are: no power discernible and power resting with only a few. Research has been conducted emphasizing each of these configurations. Hunter, of course, has postulated the monolithic power structure. Hollingshead and Lynd favor the factional or caucus theory. Robert Dahl is convinced that power varies with each issue and Olmstead asserts that in many communities decisions are based on social activity.[3] Carver and Crowe indicate that "all of the above methods

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]F. D. Carver and D. O. Crowe, "An Interdisciplinary Framework for the Study of Community Power," Educational Administration Quarterly 5 (Winter 1969): 56.

[3]Ibid., p. 67.

contain an implicit assumption depending on type."[1] They point out that, in the final analysis, the discerned power structure may merely reflect the researcher's philosophy. Anton would certainly support this particular assertion. He speaks of the researcher's philosophical bent regarding power having a direct effect on what his studies will reflect. Anton further asserts that the researcher's discipline has a direct effect on what type of power structure finally emerges. According to Carver and Crowe the missing variable in most studies is saliency. They suggest two questions which they believe all power structure studies should address: "(1) Does a particular individual have power, and (2) do they elect to use said power to determine every issue?"[2]

Even with the controversy between political scientist and sociologist readily apparent to anyone reading the literature, researchers continue to side with one school or the other. James Longstreth, for example, suggests that accurate information regarding community power structure may be gained using the reputational method of discerning those in power. The author points to his study which statistically ranks groups in every community in terms of their efficiency in identifying top influential leaders. The efficiency rank is determined by totaling each group rating in each of three

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid.

categories: accuracy ratio, identification ratio, and selection effectiveness ratio. The ranking shows the efficiency of some common community groups and organizations:

1. News Media
2. Banking and Finance
3. Chamber of Commerce
4. Women's Clubs
5. Health
6. Lawyers
7. General Businessmen
8. Partisan Politics
9. Farmers
10. General Government Officials
11. County Commission
12. Religion
13. Educators
14. Labor
15. Minorities[1]

McCarty and Ramsey laid claim to the belief that: "Power structure varies from community to community in patterned ways and truly idiosyncratic power structures are rare."[2] In their study, the board of education membership reflected the type of decision-making posture in correspondence with the power structure of the community. The dominated power structure (monolithic) results in a dominated school board. To continue, the authors point out that a factional school board results from a factional power structure in the community. The pluralist school board

---

[1]James W. Longstreth, "Knowing Who's Who in 'Power Structure' Can Pay Dividends," The American School Board Journal 153 (August 1966): 11.

[2]Donald J. McCarthy and Charles E. Ramsey, "Community Power, School Board Structure and the Role of the Chief School Administrator," Educational Administration Quarterly 4 (Spring 1968): 19.

results from the status-congruent or issue-centered power structure. The sanctioning board of education results from an inert or amorphous power structure which, as previously described, has no apparent pattern of power. This information is used by the authors to urge superintendents to vary their role in governing the affairs of the school system depending on the power structure apparent in their community. They recommend that if the power structure is discerned to be dominated, they can assume that their school board is dominated, and they should serve a functionary role. Whereas, if the power structure is determined to be factional, the superintendent can assume that the board is factional and, consequently, would be most effective in the role of political strategist. The superintendent as professional advisor could best handle the status-congruent board which results from a pluralistic power structure. With the sanctioning board, which the authors postulate is a product of an amorphous power structure, a superintendent would probably be most effective as a decision maker.

James D. Preston has been instrumental in modifying the traditional reputational approach to discerning power structure within communities. In research reported in 1969, the reputational nominations were secured from three sources, namely: a panel of community informants, a stratified random sample, and the top reputational leaders within two communities. The findings showed:

> (1) Leadership appeared to be general rather than specialized. (2) The three groups of respondents were in substantial agreement regarding the identity of leaders, and (3) The leadership structures in both communities were highly visible, that is, there was a relative absence of symbolic and concealed leaders.[1]

Several social, economic, and demographic characteristics of communities A and B were then compared with similar characteristics from New Haven and Burlington. These were offered as a suggested explanation for the differences in findings. The technique used by Preston may be summarized in the following way:

1. An officer of all formal organizations was asked to list programs during the past five years which had been carried on cooperatively with other organizations.
2. Civic club members were asked: "What, in your opinion, have been the most significant activities, programs or events in this community during the past five years? Who were the individuals most actively involved in each of these?"
3. Officials and employees of the Chamber of Commerce were asked to review preliminary lists based on responses by others and to make additions if necessary. They were also asked to describe programs mentioned. (When the informants began "snowballing," that is, mentioning programs time and again, questioning was ended by the researcher.)
4. At this point, selections are made of those action-oriented community programs, mentioned two or more times by respondents. This yields the most logically significant programs over the five-year span.
5. Using newspapers and whatever other data is available a list is compiled of the individuals who were most influential in each of these action programs.
6. Finally, all "actors" are interviewed. They are asked to name others who they feel helped them to succeed with their programs. This yields an

---

[1]James D. Preston, "The Search for Community Leaders: A Re-examination of the Reputational Technique," Sociological Inquiry 39 (Winter 1969): 46.

> additional list of "actors." They, in turn, are interviewed and all information is sifted to reveal an action, issue, decisional power structure.[1]

Few researchers have attacked the study of power structure using pure research. Most researchers cling to the case study method of discerning power structure. One exception is a study by Terry Clark. Clark initially interviewed eleven strategically placed informants in each of fifty-one communities. The strategically placed informants were: the mayor, the chairman of the democratic and republican parties, the president of the largest bank, the editor of the newspaper with the largest circulation, the president of the chamber of commerce, president of the bar association, the head of the largest union, the health commissioner, the urban renewal director, and the director of the last major hospital fund drive.[2] Each was interviewed about the same four issues: urban renewal, the election of the mayor, air pollution, and the anti-poverty program. These issues were chosen because they usually involve different types of community actors in differing relationships with one another. The "ersatz" decisional method was then applied to each informant responding to each issue with his

---

[1]Ibid.; paraphrased by the author.

[2]Terry N. Clark, "Community Structure, Decision-Making Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," American Sociological Review 33 (August 1968): 578.

perception regarding the leading actor involved with that issue. A cross-classification was then applied using five decisional stages:

> (1) Who initiated action on the issue, (2) who supported this action, (3) who opposed, (4) who negotiated with whom, and (5) whose views tended to prevail in each of the four issue areas generated?[1]

With this attempt to improve on the single case study, Clark relied on tremendous monetary and human resources to reveal power structures in fifty-one different communities. The conclusions of the Clark study hint that the single researcher will reach more meaningful conclusions from a thorough single case study.

John Walton, in agreement with Clark, is concerned with the limitations of the single case study. He believes that comparative studies will apply over a much broader base and, consequently, prove more meaningful. Walton's null hypothesis, however (Ho: Comparative studies tend to find factional and coalitional power structures.), was rejected, "comparative studies showing no significant departure from the results of single case studies."[2] Still convinced of the relative merit of the comparative approach, Walton summarizes:

---

[1]Ibid., p. 592.

[2]John Walton, "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure," American Journal of Sociology 76 (January 1971): 434.

> (1) The type of power structure identified by studies that rely on a single (discipline) method may well be an artifact of that method. (2) Social integration and region, variables which reflect something of the political life of the community, show some association with power structure. (3) Economic variables reflecting patterns characteristic of increasing industrialization are moderately associated with less concentrated power structures.[1]

The author offers advice to anyone interested in an attempt to compare the power structures of many communities:

> Comparative studies should employ samples stratified with regard to demographic and economic characteristics. Considerably more attention should be devoted to change, especially vis-à-vis metropolitan development and larger governmental units.[2]

The recurring theme throughout the literature seems, of late, to concentrate on the danger of the "self-fulfilling prophecy." Many authors point out the dangers of a given method in an attempt to encourage research with less inherent bias. Most are written in opposition to Hunter's reputational method. Wolfinger's assertion is an example:

> There are two major causes of ambiguity inherent in asking respondents to name in rank order the most powerful members of their community: the variability of power from one type of issue to another; and the difficulty of making sure that researcher and respondent share the same definition of power.[3]

Polsby also rejects the reputational method when he states:

---

[1]Ibid., p. 437. [2]Ibid., p. 438.

[3]Raymond E. Wolfinger, "Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power," American Sociological Review 25 (October 1960): 637.

> . . . researchers should study the outcomes of actual decisions within the community. It is important, but insufficient, to know what leaders want to do, what they intend to do, and what they think they can do.[1]

A political scientist, Polsby suggests the pluralist approach will overcome the "self-fulfilling prophecy." He points out five advantages of the pluralist approach:

1. The first, and perhaps the most basic presupposition of the pluralist approach, is that nothing categorical can be assumed about power in any community.
2. To avoid a researcher's "self-fulfilling prophecies," the unspoken notion among pluralist researchers is that, at bottom nobody dominates in a town, so that their first question to a local informant is not likely to be, "who runs this town, but rather, does anybody at all run this town?"
3. In the pluralist approach, an attempt is made to study specific outcomes, in order to determine who actually prevails in community decision making.
4. The pluralist puts high value on overt activity as indicative of involvement in issues and tends to look upon the collection of "reputations" for leadership as a much less desirable research procedure.
5. For the pluralists, "false class consciousness" does not exist, because it implies that the values of analysts are imposed on groups in the community.[2]

Bonjean and Olson concur with Polsby in regard to the dangers of the self-fulfilling prophecy. They, however, are critical of the pluralist approach. In their judgment:

1. The "event analysis" technique has a strong tendency to highlight overt decision making. This tendency ignores the possible reality of someone behind that "decision maker" controlling the power.
2. Event analysis involves expensive, time consuming field work.

---

[1]Nelson W. Polsby, "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative," The Journal of Politics 22 (August 1960): 484.

[2]Ibid., pp. 476-479; paraphrased by the author.

3. The event analysis or decisional method ignores those actors who may be able to keep latent issues from emerging into open controversy.[1]

The authors point to four characteristics which they believe are most important in identifying the two ideal-type leadership structures and thus perhaps any structure falling between these two:

1. Legitimacy. Those in public office.
2. Visibility. To measure this phenomenon necessitates the use of the reputational approach, at least to some degree (to reveal the non-visible or covert leaders).
3. Scope of influence.
4. Cohesiveness.[2]

It appears, then, that the decisional approach should be suppplemented to some degree by the reputational approach. Certainly a combination of methods (any two or all three) appears to be the most satisfactory means for the study of community leadership at our present stage of development.[3]

Community Education

The term "Community Education" often generates confusion among individuals who attempt to understand its meaning. The almost casual reference to community schools on school buses of a district seems to suggest no difference between those who have adopted the concept and those who

---

[1] C. M. Bonjean and D. M. Olson, "Community Leadership: Directions of Research," Administrative Science Quarterly 9 (December 1964): 281-285.

[2] Ibid., p. 295.

[3] Ibid., p. 296.

have not. To present common ground for this paper, the meaning of the term will be explored.

Sociologists have in the past defined community in the sense in which it is used in this paper. Among many definitions of community that have been offered, three characteristics are usually agreed upon at the minimum, namely: locale, common ties, and social interaction.[1] This writer will attempt, however, to avoid the simplicity of this formula. The formula seems to imply two quite different though related concepts, one referring to the community and one to community. The community usually refers to a collection of people in a certain locale. This locale, of course, is related to a specific geographic area. Nomadic peoples of arid lands, whose emotional attachment to any given locale is minimal, would not fit this description of community. Community, as distinguished from the community, emphasizes the common ties and social interaction components of the definition. In this sense, community is viewed by some sociologists as "the most fundamental and far-reaching of sociology's unit ideas."[2] It is characterized not so much by locale as by "a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional depth, moral commitment, social

---

[1]George A. Hillary, Jr., "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology 20 (June 1955): 115.

[2]Robert A. Nisbet, The Sociological Tradition (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1967), p. 47.

cohesion, and continuity in time."[1] A German sociologist, Ferdinand Tonnies, has offered the term gemeinschaft to refer to community in this sense. Gemeinschaft's overarching capability pervades both the fixed agricultural settlement and a nomadic tribe of gypsies with no fixed locale at all. In both of these communities, there exists some kind of unity, of co-unity, whatever may be the nature of the uniting bond.

While it is significant to understand community in the sense of gemeinschaft, there is another sense of community prevalent in America today.

> Just as agricultural technology, heralded by some scientists as the greatest revolution of all time, marked the advent of the community, so now modern technology may be marking its demise, heralding a revolution of perhaps equal significance.[2]

The speed of modern transportation and communication is already bringing significant change to our concept of locale and space. As a result, "some observers conclude that the settlement or locale concept of the community may soon become archaic and disappear, or, if retained, be restricted to the backwaters of the postcity era."[3] As a result, Tonnies' description of the Gesellschaft society seems

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Jessie Bernard, The Sociology of Community (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman and Co., Pub., 1973), p. 4.

[3] Melvin M. Webber, "The Post-City Age," Daedalus 97 (Fall 1968): 1099.

prevalent in today's world. This gesellschaft community is characterized by:

1. A community tie based on territory rather than kinship.
2. Division of labor with great specialization.
3. Proliferation of society and organization.
4. Lack of acquaintance with others, even neighbors.
5. Formalized social control, set by law and enforced by police.
6. High interdependence with other communities.
7. Anonymity of many persons, where few associate with community life.[1]

Many students of community fear that the gesellschaft concept may leave modern man in fruitless "quest for community."[2]

To some extent, educators have for years attempted to define their role in terms of the gemeinschaft society. This concern to reflect the wants and needs of the immediate community extends into the past to the thoughts of the Greeks and Romans.

> Some of the ancient philosophers viewed education as a process of building up a sense of community responsibility. They agreed that the truly educated man was one who was socially moral and determined to make his society better for having lived in it. They were aware of the potency of education as a force in shaping society and advocated an educational system that would be closely in touch with the wants and needs of society. They believed that people could be taught to rely on

---

[1]American Association of School Administrators, "Today's Community," Educational Administration in a Changing Community, 1959 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1959), p. 47.

[2]Nisbet, Sociological Tradition, p. 11.

their own intelligence and abilities to overcome their difficulties.[1]

This desire to build a sense of community through schools is found in many historical eras. In a thorough study, Scanlon pinpoints the evidence of "cultural transformation" in pre-colonial South America, the Middle Ages, and in several settings during the Industrial Revolution.[2] The process was seldom, if ever, called community education. The basic tenets of today's philosophy, however, were apparent.

The building blocks of today's concept were also evident in colonial America. Early mention of the philosophy occurred in 1945 when the "Report on the Conditions and Improvement of Public Schools in Rhode Island," by Barnard, was published. Barnard highlighted the role of the school in improving community and individual living.[3] In the gemeinschaft society of colonial America the public school

---

[1]W. Fred Totten and Frank J. Manley, The Community School: Basic Concepts, Function and Organization (Galien, Michigan: Allied Educational Council, 1969), p. 15.

[2]David Scanlon, "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education," Community Education, Principles and Practices From Worldwide Experience, 58th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, ed. by Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), pp. 38-65.

[3]Robert A. Nashlund, "The Impact of the Power Age on the Community School Concept," The Community School, The 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, ed. by Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 256.

was often the center of community activity. This role function, however, did not occur because of deliberate organization or development with that end in mind. Schools sometimes became the center of community life because of the lack of other facilities with sufficient size to house town meetings and other community-wide functions.

As America's growth felt the impact of the Industrial Revolution, the role of the public school became more refined in terms of its purpose. This refinement closely follows the first legal reasons for establishing educational systems. The Massachusetts Act of 1642 implies that public education was designed to support social and religious traditions, to deal with the curricula, religious education, vocational training, basic literary skills, and to define its purpose strictly in terms of utility.[1] In effect, the increasing demand for technical knowledge drew the school away from its "cultural transformation" heritage. The Massachusetts Act, with its specific implications, was quite compatible with the American concept of education more than two hundred years later.

> In 1893, the National Educational Association appointed what is now known as "The Committee of Ten" under the chairmanship of Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University. With the exception of one member who was associated with a public school, all were associated almost exclusively with higher education.

---

[1]James R. Solberg, "The Evolution and Implementation of the Community-School Concept" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970), p. 12.

> The committee concerned itself with the teaching of subjects in Secondary schools, the need for uniformity in content, standardization of requirements, time allotment and admission to college.[1]

This return to standardization, uniformity, and strict utilitarian purposes of schools persisted for approximately twenty-five years. One benefit, derivative of this era, is the opposition provoked by the philosophy of the Committee of Ten. A number of important writers came to the defense of the community-education idea. One of the most famous of these defenders was John Dewey. He stated:

> The development within the young of the attitudes and dispositions necessary to the continuous and progressive life of a society cannot take place by direct conveyance of beliefs, emotions, and knowledge. It takes place through the intermediary of the environment. The environment consists of the sum total of conditions which are concerned with the execution of the activity characteristic of the living being. The social environment consists of all activities of fellow beings that are bound up in carrying on the activities of any one of its members. It is truly educative in its effect, in its efforts, in the degree in which an individual appropriates the purposes which actuate it, becomes familiar with its methods and subject matters, acquires needed skills, and is saturated with its emotional spirit.[2]

As early as 1899, Dewey advocated the notion that schools cannot operate as islands apart from their communities. This was the beginning of the precept that schools could perhaps be an effective social change agent. By monitoring the needs of the community, the school could

---

[1]Ibid., p. 41.

[2]John Dewey, Democracy in Education (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1916), p. 225.

effectively reflect each social change as it slowly came about. To Dewey, failure to develop these meaningful relationships between school and community resulted in educational waste.[1]

Dewey's student, Joseph K. Hart, was even more specific in describing the relationship between the school and community:

> Education is not apart from life. . . . The democratic problem with education is not primarily a problem of training children; it is a problem of making a community within which children cannot help growing up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined to freedom, reverent to the goals of life, and eager to share in the tasks of the age. Schools cannot produce the result, nothing but the community can do so.[2]

During the thirties, advocates of the concept of community education continued to air their view. The February 1936 issue of the Journal of Educational Sociology was dedicated to the concept. An editorial by E. George Payne tied the ideas of Dewey to events of the day. Julius Yourman and Nathan Payser wrote of "The School as a Center of the Community and Community Coordination: The Next Movement in Education." It was also during the thirties that the first book to deal comprehensively with community education and the community school was published. Edited by

---

[1]John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 89.

[2]Joseph K. Hart, The Discovery of Intelligence (New York: The Century Company, 1924), p. 382.

Everett, the volume's essence is captured in the following quotation:

> Life educates. Schools can give direction to the educative process not by presuming to educate for life, but by becoming an organic part of life itself. Both children and adults live in a world where needs and wants are bound together. Schools must combine the economic, social, intellectual, esthetic and moral elements of our culture, just as ordinary people combine them in everyday life.[1]

> At first the school saw its objective narrowly, as handing down the factual heritage; the second stage sees the wider meaning of education as adjustment, and bravely the school seeks to meet all the problems of maladjustment of individuals and communities; the dawning third stage carries back to the community the responsibility for education and leaves the school with the responsibility for leadership and service.[2]

Two other books, published during the thirties, reflected the educational theorists' concern with community education. Yeager pointed out that "public schools should be concerned in setting up the school-community as a great laboratory."[3] Clapp described the community school as meeting a variety of needs. She wrote:

> First of all, it meets as best it can, and with everyone's help, the urgent needs of the people, for it holds that everything that affects the welfare of the children and their families is its concern. Where does it end and life outside begin? There is no

---

[1]Myles Horton, "The Community Folk School," in The Community School, ed. by Samuel Everett (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), p. 267.

[2]Julius Yourman, "Community Coordination: The Next Movement in Education," Journal of Educational Sociology 9 (February 1936): 328.

[3]William A. Yeager, Home-School-Community Relations (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1939), p. 499.

> distinction between them. A community school is a used place, a place used freely and informally for all the needs of living and learning. It is, in effect, the place where learning and living converge.[1]

Garr used an interesting simile to describe the schools of the day:

> Many schools are like little islands set apart from the mainland of life by a deep moat of convention and tradition. Across the moat there is a drawbridge, which is lowered at certain periods during the day in order that the part-time inhabitants may cross over to the island in the morning and back to the mainland at night. Why do these young people go out to the island? They go there in order to learn how to live on the mainland.
>
> After the last inhabitant of the island has left in the early afternoon, the drawbridge is raised. Janitors clean up the island, and the lights go out. . . .
>
> Such, in brief, is the relation of many American schools to many an American community.[2]

In his writings, Seay, an early community education practitioner with the Tennessee Valley Authority, defined the community school as:

> The term currently applied to a school that has two distinctive emphases--service to the entire community, not merely to the children of school age; and discovery, development, and use of the resources of the community as a part of the educational facilities of the school.[3]

---

[1]Elsie Clapp, Community Schools in Action (New York: The Viking Press, 1939), p. 89.

[2]William G. Garr, Community Life in a Democracy (Washington: National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1942), p. 34.

[3]Maurice F. Seay, Two Distinctive Emphases, 44th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 227.

In his thoughts on community education, Stout referred to the previously discussed locale-gemeinschaft consideration:

> The point to be emphasized is that a community is not merely a political unit or a geographic unit or a commercial unit; it is pre-eminently a social unit. Thus, . . . we may say that a community consists of people who live in a more or less contiguous area and are engaged in such social processes and relationships as may normally arise in the pursuit of the chief concerns of life.[1]

In addition to individuals, organizations also became concerned with the community school concept. In 1947, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) reviewed the principles of community education in a yearbook publication. In so doing, the ASCD recommended several strategies for awakening the sleeping giants of the public trust.[2]

The thirties initiated an extensive effort by writers to explore the capacities and capabilities of the community education concept. With pragmatic attempts to put theories into practice, proponents of the concept have made their most concerted effort since that time. Maurice Seay with the Tennessee Valley Authority, Frank Manley in

---

[1]Dorman G. Stout, "Community Is a Social Unit," in The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective, ed. by Edward G. Olsen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 362.

[2]Willard E. Goslin, ed., Organizing the Elementary School for Living and Learning, Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington, D.C.: ASCD of the NEA, 1947).

Flint, Michigan, along with less renowned leaders of projects in other states such as Nebraska, served an evolutionary apprenticeship not unlike the writers of their time. This evolutionary process continues today, as practitioners attempt to apply the broad definitions of the concept in some practical way at the local level. This awesome task can be appreciated when considering the all-encompassing definition of the community school as espoused by Seay:

> The community school is a school which has a vision of a powerful social force--a vision capable of being transformed into reality. The vision is engendered by an understanding of the power of education, of what education can accomplish, when put to work in a responsible way.[1]

A definition of this sort, of course, is over-arching in its scope. The task of the practitioner becomes one of dividing the philosophical constructs into palatable, obtainable goals. Writers have attempted this task by describing the characteristics of the community school. Olsen, summarizing the characteristics described by many writers, indicates that the community school:

1. Improves the quality of living here and now.
2. Uses the community as a laboratory for learning.
3. Makes the school plant a community center.
4. Organizes the core-curriculum around the processes and problems of living.

---

[1]Maurice F. Seay, "The Community School: New Meaning for an Old Term," The Community School, 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1953), p. 2.

5. Includes lay people in school policy and program planning.
6. Leads in community coordination.
7. Practices and promotes democracy in all human relationships.[1]

The 1974 conceptualization of the community education philosophy is based largely on the writings of the authors mentioned above. The current modus operandi of a community school is also a distillation of the many practical implementation experiences of the last forty years. As the early writers developed and expanded their theories, so too did the early practitioners. Most projects initiated during the thirties were based upon the extensions of the school. Frank Manley of Flint, Michigan, persuaded philanthropist Charles Stewart Mott to donate funds for the purpose of gaining greater utilization of school buildings while curbing juvenile delinquency. Payser described the efforts of the school in providing outreach to help recent immigrants in New York City acclimate to American life. Seay, working with the Tennessee Valley Authority, found ways of taking the school to the people of the hills while enlisting their involvement in creating learning experiences with meaning and worth. While all these efforts were admirable, they merely represent the beginnings of the developing application of a philosophy. During the thirties and forties the practical applications of the philosophical

---

[1]Edward G. Olsen, School and Community (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 12.

concept remained in the stages of programmatic implementation. By 1950 an acceptable model of the community school would have included, in addition to the K-12 program, maximum use of facilities in providing additional programs for children, youth, and adults. Some writers of that era, however, warned that the essence of community education was not maximized by a series of add-on programs. Melby explains why classes for adults are not quite enough to prepare our people for all aspects of living:

> In the physical sciences it is necessary for us to establish (at great cost) laboratories where the forces of nature may be studied. In the social sciences, however, no such expenditure needs to be made. The laboratory lies all about us. It is in a sense fallow and waiting to be developed. More than that, in its development this laboratory, this community, needs the specialized competencies of school faculties. At the same time, the school faculties need the laboratory if their studies are to be most effective. It, therefore, seems obvious that some method must be found for bringing the school and the community together in a process of mutual improvement.[1]

Shaw, in an extensive article about his hypothetical community, Random Falls, depicts the ideal community development processes necessary to insure that the school reflect social change much nearer its actual occurrence.

> The thesis . . . is that any genuinely felt problem provides the starting point; that people of varied backgrounds but a common concern will discover the inappropriateness of their own quick answers and be led to deeper study together; that open-mindedness will

---

[1]Ernest O. Melby, "An Education-Centered Community," in The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective, ed. by Edward G. Olsen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 402.

> develop under such a process; and that the proposals made here will be among the ideas studied. When a few have come to this stage it is clearly time to bring in the many. From all the wisdom of the group will come proposals peculiarly appropriate to the particular community.[1]

Practitioners of the day began to think in terms of the process of community education. Process was distinguished from programs in that programs lead to process. In 1938, Everett had alluded to process when he said: "All life is education versus education is gained only in formal institutions of learning. Education requires participation versus education is adequately gained through studying about life."[2] Support for process came from all corners of educational leadership. The National Education Association, when forming the "Bill of Rights for American Education" in 1951 included:

> The public school can meet its responsibility effectively only if it considers the diversity of interest and experience which characterizes the community of our land. To bar from the school any sincere and honest views is to deny the essence of the democratic aspiration; to give priority to a single exclusive system of beliefs would likewise deny the essence of this aspiration.[3]

---

[1]Archibald B. Shaw and John Lyon Reid, "The Random Falls Idea: A Proposed Educational Program and Plant for Youth and Community Growth," The School Executive 75 (March 1956): 85.

[2]Samuel Everett, "The Issues Involved," The Community School (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), p. 457.

[3]National Education Association and other organizations, "Bill of Rights for American Education," in The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective, ed. by Edward G. Olsen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 465.

A recent encapsulation of process is stated by Minzey and LeTarte:

> The term community self-actualization is here used to mean the ability of a community to become the best that it is capable of becoming. In essence, 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.[1]

The authors' reference to self-actualization is consistent with the work of Maslow, who was concerned with the maturing individual. The transition of the process of becoming an individual, to the process of becoming a community, can be conceptualized as Maslow and others describe the process of becoming.

> This force is one main aspect of the "will to health," the urge to grow, the pressure to self-actualization, the quest for one's identity.
>
> We can no longer think of the person as "fully determined" when this phrase implies "determined only by forces external to the person." The person, insofar as he <u>is</u> a real person, is his own main determinant. Every person is, in part, "his own project" and makes himself.
>
> The process of growth is the process of <u>becoming</u> a person. <u>Being</u> a person is different.[2]

Rogers supports Maslow's notion:

> The self and personality emerge from experience, rather than experience being translated to fit the pre-conceived self-structure. It means that one becomes

---

[1]Jack D. Minzey and Clyde LeTarte, <u>Community Education: From Program to Process</u> (Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972), p. 33.

[2]A. H. Maslow, "The Process of Becoming," in <u>Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming</u>, ed. by A. W. Combs (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Assoc., 1962), p. 234.

> a participant in and observer of the ongoing process of organismic experience, rather than being in control of it.
>
> The individual moves toward more acceptantly being a process, a fluidity, a changing. He lives in a more existential fashion.
>
> Such living in the moment, then, means an absence of rigidity, of tight organization, of the imposition of structure on experience. It means instead a maximum of adaptability, a discovery of structure in experience, a flowing, changing organization of self and personality.[1]

Comparing the process of becoming an individual to the process of becoming a community is highly idealistic. There are those who say that forces are apparent in the structure of American life today which make this nigh on to impossible. Arnstein, in discussing citizen participation points out that:

> Participation of the governed in their government is, in theory, the cornerstone of democracy--a revered idea that is vigorously applauded by virtually everyone. The applause is reduced to polite handclaps, however, when this principle is advocated by the have-not blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Eskimos, and whites. And when the have-nots define participation as redistribution of power, the American consensus on the fundamental principle explodes into many shades of outright racial, ethnic, ideological, and political opposition.[2]

Arnstein's point of focus is that the empty ritual of simulated citizen participation in decision making does not result in the synergistic fulfillment of each participant.

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "The Process of Becoming," in Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, ed. by A. W. Combs (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Assoc., 1962), p. 234.

[2]Sherry R. Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," American Institute of Planners Journal 34 (July 1969): 216.

The individual needs to feel as though he has an important role in determining solutions to local community problems. The individual also, according to Arnstein, needs a share of the power in order to have process become a reality.

Another apsect of the ever-burgeoning community education model is the component dealing with outreach and delivery of community services. The public schools' unique ability to incorporate the gemeinschaft societal paradigm is the essence of this aspect of the concept. Gores, in discussing the schoolhouse of the future, notes the inclusion of offices where various community agencies could be provided space.[1] These offices in every elementary building enhance the ability of these agencies to deliver their respective services. The Dana Whitmer Center in Pontiac, Michigan, has been so designed. Other communities, such as Atlanta, Georgia, have also taken advantage of the schools' unique ability to return the largest urban centers to gemeinschaft societies.

The 1974 version of the concept of community education, then, is postulated as a theoretical construct within which a community self-actualizes. Minzey states:

> Community Education has moved from programs which were added on to the regular school schedule to a philosophical concept that has changed the role of the public schools. Schools which were primarily responsible for the limited education of the children of our

---

[1]Harold G. Gores, "The Schoolhouse of the Future," The National Elementary Principal 52 (September 1972): 10.

> communities between the ages of five and sixteen have now perceived an additional responsibility of providing for the educational needs of all members of the community. In addition, these community education oriented schools have addressed themselves to the problems of community service and community development.[1]

Minzey offers six components which, he asserts, encompass the basic tenets of the concept:

1. An Educational Program for School Age Children. This program is the traditional program offered by all school districts. It is frequently referred to as the K-12 or day school program. This is listed as an ingredient of Community Education for two reasons. First, it is a vital part of the educational program of any community and second, it is often left out when we describe Community Education, leaving the impression that Community Education is an add on to the regular program. The important point is that the regular program is a key part but not the only part of education, and it should be tied into the total community education program. It should also be mentioned that in Community Education, attention should be given to relevance, community involvement, and the use of the community to enhance classroom teaching.
2. Use of Community Facilities. It has long been a contention of community educators that school buildings are used only a fraction of the time that they could be used. Many communities build additional facilities such as recreation buildings, community centers, and boys clubs to be used while the school buildings stand idle. There is often an abundance of unused space in most communities in school buildings, fire halls, churches, city buildings, and recreation facilities and maximum use should be made of these facilities before new ones are constructed. School buildings, in particular, should become a focal point for community activities and services.
3. Additional Programs for School Age Children and Youth. This aspect of Community Education presumes that there is an ever increasing need for additional activities and education for youngsters. Despite the fantastic growth in the amount of recorded knowledge, students

---

[1]Jack D. Minzey, "Community Education--Another Perception," Community Education Journal 4 (May-June, 1974): 7.

are receiving a decreasing amount of time exposed to the formal school day. Additional information, activities, and experiences can be provided by expanding offerings to students before school, after school, weekends and summers. Enrichment, remedial and supplemental educational activities can be offered as well as recreational, cultural, and avocational programs. This dimension of Community Education offers a fine option for year-round schools since it makes maximum use of educational facilities on a voluntary basis and truly is "year-round" education rather than a rotating vacation period which is typical of most year-round plans.

4. Programs for Adults. This aspect of Community Education provides the same services to the adult population as offered to school age children and youth. Included would be such things as basic education, high school completion, recreational, avocational, cultural, and vocational education. The needs of adults would be recognized as being as important as those of the school age student, and the student body would be perceived as being all of the people who reside in that community.
5. Delivery and Coordination of Community Services. In most communities it has been found that there is not a shortage of community services, but there is a woeful lack of coordination. As a result, a specific community agency's services are generally provided to fewer than 10% of those in the community who either need or qualify for such services. In addition to the lack of coordination, most community services are organized and delivered on a community wide basis rather than in the neighborhoods where people can avail themselves of such services. The school, by means of its school buildings and community school personnel, can help identify problems and resources and provide the coordination necessary to bring these two together. The key role of the schools is catalytic and the school would not provide programs or services which are either already provided or capable of being provided by other agencies. Only when existing agencies are unable to provide services would the community education coordinator assist in the development of new programs. The coordinator actually acts as a broker, relating problems to resources and making referrals to the appropriate sources.
6. Community Involvement. This phase of Community Education has often been described as the effort to return "participatory democracy." The idea is to help persons who live in a particular neighborhood

> participate in the identity of local problems develop the process for attempting to solve such problems. In areas the size of an elementary school attendance area, the school assists in the development of a community council whose membership is based on community representation and two-way communications. Community education personnel assist this council in its organization and development until the community councils are able to continue as viable organizations on their own.[1]

The concept, as described, is receiving ever-increasing support across the United States. Groups other than educators are accepting the basic tenets of the concept. The United States Jaycees have incorporated community education as part of their national platform as have the Junior League, the American Association of University Women, and the national P.T.A. Over seven hundred school districts across the nation have adopted the philosophy and are attempting to move closer to community self-actualization. As of 1975 some fifty-seven universities had established "centers for community education" across the country.

This plan to establish a common-sense, educationally motivated approach to community problem solving and restoration of the declining sense of community within individuals is encouraging. If this trend continues, then indeed, as Olsen points out, the key to societal salvation may be at hand:

> To save society, community education must be given top priority. To save education, and to develop distinctively community education, we school administrators,

---

[1]Minzey, Another Perception, p. 7.

> teachers, and students must become deeply, persistently, and insistently concerned with metropolitan-area problems of housing, employment, urban renewal, welfare, conservation, transportation, public health, prejudice, and discrimination of all kinds.[1]

Summary

The literature of three knowledge categories is included in the preceding review. The basis for the inclusion of each is justified by the design of the study. Information regarding the diffusion of an innovation is relevant to those interested in the implementation of the community education concept. The work of Rogers, Havelock, Katz, Lewin, and Lippitt lends clarity to the inner workings of such implementation and diffusion. Their consummate expertise and combined knowledge will ease the task of community education change agents.

The above authors agree that the change agent's knowledge of community power structure will also ease implementation of change in communities. Studies by Hunter, Dahl, Preston, and Clark all increase understanding of the rationale for community decision making. The studies point out the various methods of discerning power structure, the different types of structures believed to exist, and the controversy over methodology between political scientists and sociologists.

---

[1]Edward G. Olsen, "City Suburb, and Education," The Community School and Its Administration 8 (April 1970): 1.

Also included in this review is a linear description of the historical development of community education. Seay refers to such an effort as "threads" that tie the modern conceptual base of community education to the philosophers of the past. Some of the "threads" cited are contributed by such notables as Dewey, Hart, and Yourman. The writings of Seay, Olsen, Clapp, Garr, and Everett express the magnitude of the concept as viewed during the thirties and forties. The development of community education during the past twenty-five years is gleaned from the writings of Shaw, Weaver, Minzey and LeTarte, Seay, and Olsen.

The writings of other authors like Rogers, Maslow, and Arnstein helped weave the previously noted literature into a pattern relevant to this study.

CHAPTER III

A BRIEF CASE STUDY DESCRIPTION OF "PROCESS CITY"

As stated in Chapter I, the site of this case study is representative of a typical community within the Eastern Michigan University Center for Community Education's area of responsibility. This geographic area as defined by the center's director, Dr. J. D. Minzey, covers southeast Michigan, northern Ohio, all of Pennsylvania, and western New York. Following expert opinion advanced in power structure literature, this study concentrated on just one community within this area that is most typical of those who have adopted the concept of community education. Criteria used in the final selection of Process City are: the concept's diffusion began at least three years ago, and the effort is deemed successful by the staff at the Center for Community Education at Eastern Michigan University.

Process City in Historical Perspective

Process City and its schools have always been closely allied. In fact, the city came about as a result of decisions made in a neighboring school district. Finding their district too large to handle, the now neighboring

school district petitioned the state to establish, within their school boundaries, a new school district. It was the result, then, of school business decisions that Process City gained its own identity.

The area grew slowly. It was not until World War I, when a large industry in another neighboring community expanded, that people began to purchase property for building homes. A thriving business area developed. The Process City Athletic Club became well known for its wrestling matches. In 1924, the first physician moved into town to establish a practice. Another sign of solid roots, the local funeral home, was established in 1927. The hospital was built during that same year and served the community for approximately thirty-five years. Another sign of established community orientation, the first traffic light, was installed on Process City's busiest corner the following year. The area continued its growth and the following churches were established: Process City First Baptist, Tabernacle Baptist, Free Will Baptist, Calvary Baptist, Church of Christ, Process City First Methodist, Free Will Methodist, Process City Lutheran, St. Margaret's Episcopal, St. Mary Magdalene Catholic Church, and The Church of the Nazarene.

This was one of the areas hardest hit by the depression and the bank failures of the 1930's. Many persons lost their homes. Business places closed. The majority of the

community's residents were on relief. The population had depended on the large industries for employment. During this time attempts were made to annex Process City and the large city immediately adjacent. All efforts failed. As a result, however, first emphasis was placed on incorporation of the area into a city. On January 5, 1942, a 92 percent vote of the electors approved the charter and elected the first council. This council consisted of a mayor and councilmen, who took their oath on February 2, 1942.

The new city was without operating funds until the summer taxes, due in July, were collected. In order to receive their share of the state gas and weight monies, the city requested a special census from the federal census bureau. Twenty-eight women volunteered their services. Under the direction of a federal census taker, they counted 15,340 persons. The 1960 census showed 25,631 persons, while the 1970 census counted 29,382 living within the city.

Demographic Perspective

In July, 1972, a report was submitted to the Process City School Board in response to their request for pertinent data regarding the residents of their community. The report was prepared and submitted by the South Eastern Michigan Council of Governments. The report is entitled: 1970 Census Fourth Count Data for SEMCOG Civil Divisions. The

data provided valuable background information relative to this study. A better understanding of the typical respondent randomly selected in Process City resulted.

Family incomes in Process City vary as in most communities. Atypically, however, the largest percentage of Process City family incomes are in the $10,000 to $15,000 range. Forty-two percent of the residents living in Process City earn more than $10,000 but less than $14,999. Almost 60 percent of residents earn between $7,000 and $15,000 yearly. Few families earn less than $2,000 or more than $25,000. In fact, at either end of the continuum, 20 percent of the total number of families are in each income category under $7,000 or over $15,000 annual income. Data in 1960 were not organized in a comparable manner. However, it is clear that Process City continues to have relatively few families with extremely high or low annual incomes.

Data relative to the type of occupation held by the majority of Process City residents may further elucidate the community composition. The largest percentage of workers in Process City are involved in operating machinery for local industry. Almost 34 percent of the Process City workers fit this category. This figure matches closely the percentage of people who earn $10,000 to $15,000 per year. The data point out that Process City has the smallest percentage of residents in the professional-technical occupations of any of the surrounding communities. Compared with

forty-eight communities, Process City ranked forty-sixth in percentage of people employed as managers or administrators. Conversely, the community ranked first in percentage of persons employed as machine operatives and in the top fourth when ranked according to the number of persons working as civil servants. Over 65 percent of the residents were in "blue collar" occupations and an additional 17 percent were in clerical jobs. In the broad category generally encompassing "nonprofessional" occupations (no college necessary), Process City again ranks high with 78 percent of its residents so classified. Comparing the above data with that collected in 1960, there is no significant change in the type of employment held by Process City residents.

As might be surmised, few Process City residents have attended college. Approximately 8 percent of the residents have attended college. Compared with forty-eight other communities, Process City had the lowest percentage of residents with "some college" or who were college graduates. A comparison with the 1960 census data indicates that there has been little change in the number of residents who attend college (up 2 percent) and no change at all in the number of college graduates. When considering the number of residents who have graduated from high school in combination with those who have attended college or graduated from college, the percentage remains quite small (just

37 percent). This figure does, however, represent a 10 percent increase from 1960. Most of this increase has been in the high school graduate category (29.2 percent). Almost 63 percent of the residents of Process City have less than eleven years of schooling. Process City leads the forty-eight compared communities in three categories of educational level. These categories are: less than eight years (17 percent), eight years (18 percent), and nine to eleven years (27 percent).

Process City ranks only fourth from the bottom of the forty-eight compared communities in percentage of husband and wife families. Over 13 percent of the families are single parent, and of those, the greatest percentage (10.88) have female heads of households. Over 70 percent of the single parent families have children eighteen years of age or younger. By actual count, 981 children under the age of eighteen come from single parent families. Since such data cannot totally reflect the stepfather-stepmother relationships that exist, it is only partially indicative of potential stresses which exist for some school children. "Broken" homes are not necessarily bad homes, but should alert schools and social agencies to an awareness of potential problems.

More than 45 percent of Process City residents did not live in the same house in 1965. Eighteen percent changed residency in the 1969-70 year. Transiency of residents

"through" the community has averaged 11 percent annually for more than a decade.

Process City and Community Education

In 1974, Process City won the National Community Education Association's "All American Community Education City" award. The program that brought Process City this honor began in 1965 with initial impetus from the superintendent of schools.

The community education program in Process City is staffed by paid and volunteer workers. The number of volunteers, however, outnumbers the professional staff by four to one. These volunteers formed eight neighborhood advisory councils. Besides helping with programs such as Library Aides, Pre-School Story Hour, and many sport activities, the councils worked with the city to improve parks, mobilize home repairs for elderly residents, and organize summer enrichment programs.

Schools and the city work closely in the process of community education. Thus, the community education program is an integral part of total education in Process City, not a series of add-on programs. Rather than a director of community education and his/her program, the elementary principals are neighborhood directors. In addition, each school (elementary) has a lay person in the position of Community Aide. This person acts as the positive link between schools and the small community surrounding the school.

One of the unique aspects of Process City community education is the commitment to "outreach." Outreach, as defined by school officials and community leaders, seems to fit the mold of Minzey's sixth component. The idea of community involvement, community development, perhaps an attempt to revitalize participatory democracy is evident in the descriptions of Process City's outreach.

Many other communities are beginning to look toward Process City as a model of successful community education. Empirical information would greatly enhance decisions made by officials of these communities concerning the concept's diffusion in their locale. Such information is not currently available. The results of this research should be timely and meaningful.

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In attempting to describe the basic design used in this study, five things were considered: the sample, operational measures, testable hypotheses, design, and analysis.

The Sample

All samples used in this study were drawn from Process City, the community described in Chapter III. Four populations are represented by the selected sample: community educators, teachers, program participants, and the community power structure.

An interview technique was used to delineate the power structure of Process City. In keeping with suggested practice reported in the literature and cited in Chapter II, a combination of methods was used in the construction of that interview. Basically, the technique described by Preston greatly influenced this phase of the research:

1. An officer of all formal organizations was asked to list programs during the past five years which had been carried on cooperatively with other organizations.
2. Civic club members were asked: "What, in your opinion, have been the most significant activities, programs or events in this community during the past five years? Who were the individuals most actively involved in each of these?"

3. Officials and employees of the Chamber of Commerce were asked to review preliminary lists based on responses by others and to make additions if necessary. They were also asked to describe programs mentioned. (When the informants began "snowballing," that is, mentioning programs time and again, questioning was ended by the researcher.)
4. At this point, selections are made of those action-oriented community programs, mentioned two or more times by respondents. This yields the most logically significant programs over the five-year span.
5. Using newspapers and whatever other data are available, a list is compiled of the individuals who were most influential in each of these action programs.
6. Finally, all "actors" are interviewed. They are asked to name others who they feel helped them to succeed with their programs. This yields an additional list of "actors." They, in turn, are interviewed and all information is sifted to reveal an action, issue, decisional power structure.[1]

As this list of reputed influential citizens clarified, a new research problem also became evident. The final tally showed that some members of the power structure were also included in another population of this research. One of the assumptions of the analysis used in this study was independence among the strata. If the original strategy were to be retained, some adjustment was in order. One of two remedies would resolve the problem--collapse the populations in question or redefine one or the other to assure independence. The two populations in question were the power structure and the community educators. The reader may recall the emphasis placed upon the relationship of these

---

[1]James D. Preston, "The Search for Community Leaders: A Re-examination of the Reputational Technique," Sociological Inquiry 39 (Winter 1969): 46; paraphrased by the author.

groups in preceding chapters. As Longstreth suggests, Knowing Who's Who in Power Structure Can Pay Dividends. This study was designed to analyze possible differences in perceptions regarding a specific philosophy of public school function. If these populations were collapsed, such information, at least between them, would be obscured. An important aspect of the future value of the study would be negated. A simple redefinition of the power structure assured independence and reinstated the desired comparison. All power structure members who were not hired by the public schools now formed the stratum, "significant others." This redefinition altered only to a slight extent the number of designated members of the power structure population. Just one member of that group was now excluded. The fact that one of the most influential members of the community was also a high-ranking school official is, however, noteworthy. The significance of this occurrence will be discussed later.

The sifting and sorting process of power structure discernment, coupled with the decision discussed above, yielded a population of twenty-six "significant others."

Persons who share the "vested interest" trait form the community educator sample. An individual whose livelihood depends on the successful diffusion of community education has a vested interest in the concept. Interviewing

top school officials and each building principal disclosed a population of sixteen.

The number of community educators varies from one school district to another. In some, especially trained professionals are hired and designated as those responsible for community education (the community education coordinator). In others, inservice programs are conducted in an attempt to realign the professional energies of existing staff. In Process City, the latter is true, with the elementary school principal bearing the major responsibility for community education. In addition, most principals have hired a lay leader (community-school aide) to assist in conducting community education activities.

A random sample was drawn from an official list of 160 teachers who work in the elementary schools where the diffusion of the community education concept was being attempted. A table of random numbers was used to select a sample (N) of fifty respondents.

During the interviews of each building principal, an attempt was made to identify those individuals who participate and/or derive benefit from the programs and services of community education. In most schools the community-school aide also assisted in compiling the list of possible respondents. The resulting compilation included those individuals who were significantly involved in classes, volunteer programs, or were the recipients of some other

community education service. A random sample was drawn from a list of 418 "program participants." A table of random numbers was used to select a sample (N) of one hundred respondents.

Operational Measures

This study was designed to measure the perceptions of respondents regarding appropriate functions for public schools. It is a comparative analysis of four groups in one community. In addition, respondents were asked to rank selected community groups according to their perceptions of said groups' support for current school policy.

Since much time had already been devoted to personal interviews in Process City, in an attempt to discern the various samples, and since completion of the data gathering process would have required an additional 192 interviews, the use of a mailed questionnaire was deemed appropriate. Others, according to Borg, have relied on this technique to complete education studies:

> The mailed questionnaire survey has been the most widely used in education because it has been a valuable technique in helping to understand the current situation in some educational area.[1]

The previously described personal interviews were beneficial to the total response rate as was predicted by Babbie: "On the whole, the appearance of a research worker . . . seems

---

[1]Walter R. Borg, Educational Research (New York: David McKay, Inc., 1963), p. 202.

to produce a higher completion rate than is normally true for straightforward mail surveys."[1]

In designing the questionnaire, consideration was given to the possible imposition on the time and privacy of the respondent. Steps were taken to insure that such imposition was justified in their minds. Two suggestions of Moser were incorporated:

1. As the interest of the respondent increases so does the response rate.
2. The sponsorship or official backing will normally get a bigger response.[2]

Further factors for improved response to a mailed questionnaire were suggested by Selltiz:

1. The questionnaire's length.
2. The attractiveness of the questionnaire.
3. The ease with which the questionnaire can be completed and returned.
4. Quality printing.
5. Offering the sample population results or an abstract of the study.[3]

The original questionnaire was designed in two sections. Section One displayed thirty statements which asked the respondent to agree or disagree based on a five-point Likert scale. Each statement was designed to gauge the perception of the respondent with regard to appropriate

---

[1]Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), p. 159.

[2]C. A. Moser, Survey Methods in Social Investigation (London: Heinemann Educational Books Limited, 1958), p. 179.

[3]Claire Selltiz et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967), p. 237.

public school function. Inherent in the full array of statements were the six components of community education as discussed in Chapter II.

The order of the statements was given considerable attention. Babbie suggests that in a self-administered questionnaire:

> The potential respondent who glances casually over the first few questions should want to answer them. Perhaps they will ask for attitudes that he is aching to express.[1]

In addition, care was taken to avoid the appearance of one statement affecting the response to subsequent ones. Positive and negative statements were used in hopes that the respondent would come to closely analyze each, and to alleviate the built-in bias of positive responses.

In Section Two of the questionnaire the respondnets were asked to rank various community groups according to their perceptions of said groups' support for current school policy. Each group was listed, followed by a five-point Likert scale which began with very low and progressed to very high (VL, L, M, H, VH). For purposes of data analysis, to be explained later in this chapter, a simple ranking of the groups would have sufficed. It was decided, however, that the same format would be used in both sections of the questionnaire for purposes of respondent convenience and

---

[1]Babbie, Research Methods, p. 150.

comfort. The researcher later compiled each ranking in numerical terms, achieving the needed effect.

The questionnaire was pre-tested during the aforementioned series of personal interviews. The individual who agreed to an interview was often associated with someone who would look at the questionnaire while the interview was being conducted. Staff members of the Center for Community Education at Eastern Michigan University also pretested the survey and offered suggestions. Without exception each pre-test respondent, who was also a Process City resident, noted an obvious flaw in the instrument. The term "community education" was used in all but three of the thirty statements of Section One. The meaning of the term was also assumed with its use in the questionnaire instructions. Process City residents did not associate the term community education with the function of their schools. Use of the term and its assumed meaning only served to confuse and frustrate the respondent. As a result, each statement was rewritten with this important consideration in mind. Care was also taken not to lose the original intent of each statement with regard to the components of community education. The list of community groups in Section II was also revamped to better reflect the specific groups of Process City.

The instrument was again pre-tested and the results compiled. The seeming ease with which the second pre-test

group responded to the statements reflected the sound advice of the first. Several ambiguities were corrected, but the new statements drew consistent responses and seemed to reflect the perceptions of the respondent with regard to public school function. Section Two was not changed as it elicited no negative comments.

The revised instrument was discussed and reviewed with the Michigan State University Research Consultation Office. No major changes were suggested.

Instructions for the questionnaire were written in concise but friendly terms. Care was taken to assure the respondent that data would be handled in composite form with no single individual being identified. A friendly "Thank You" was also included.

To precede the instructions, a cover letter was designed to introduce and explain the research instrument. Moser's suggested sponsorship was obtained prior to writing the letter. The researcher's familiarization with the community had revealed the most likely cohorts. The superintendent of schools was approached and agreed to sign the cover letter. This endorsement of the research came from one of the most respected citizens in the community. In addition, an Eastern Michigan University professor and former Process City resident agreed to sign the cover letter. This endorsement was also of significance since the professor

initiated the community education concept in Process City and is highly respected as a result.

Lists were compiled including the names and addresses of all respondents. These compilations were separated according to the four sub-groups in question. Each respondent of each list was assigned a code number. This number was placed on the questionnaire sent to that respondent. After two weeks, a follow-up mailing was initiated including all whose numbered questionnaire had not returned. With regard to the follow-up procedures, a suggestion by Babbie was considered:

> Follow-up mailings may be administered in a number of ways. In the simplest, nonrespondents are simply sent a letter of additional encouragement to participate. A better method, however, is to send a new copy of the survey questionnaire with the follow-up letter. If potential respondents have not returned their questionnaires after two or three weeks, there is a good likelihood that the questionnaires will have been lost or misplaced. Receiving a follow-up letter might encourage them to look for the original questionnaire, but if it is not easily found, the letter may go for naught.[1]

An additional copy of the questionnaire was included with the follow-up letter. In each mailing, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was included to further encourage the respondent to participate. One week later a follow-up phone contact was made with each of the remaining non-respondents.

The rate of response is recorded in Table 4.1.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 164.

Table 4.1.--Respondents' rate of response.

Group	Number Sent	Initial Return %	Follow-Up Return (Mail)	Follow-Up Return (Phone)	Total %	Total N
Significant Others	26	.35	.19	.17	.70	18
Program Participants	100	.41	.12	.06	.61	60
Teachers	50	.40	.26	.06	.72	40
Community Educators	16	.81	.19	--	100	16
Total	192	.50	.13	.11	.74	134

Design

This researcher chose to use a cross-sectional survey. Prior to selecting this design, the following was noted:

1. A measure of difference in perception was being sought.
2. A design was needed which would adjust to different school districts/communities at selected times in the future.
3. Simplicity of design would encourage practitioners to apply the instrument in their communities.

The use of the selected design is supported by Babbie:

> First, if the researcher's aim is single-time description, then a cross-sectional survey is probably the most appropriate. He would identify the population relevant to his interests, select a sample of respondents from that population, and conduct his survey. The researcher interested in documenting the differences in

> political attitudes of men and women could deal with this interest through a cross-sectional survey.[1]

In a cross-sectional survey, according to the author, data are collected at one point in time from a sample selected to describe some larger population at that time. Such a survey can be used not only for purposes of description but also for the determination of relationships between variables at the time of the study.[2]

As the research plan evolved, two questions required attention, namely: what variables should be considered and over what strata? Since the community education concept is the main ingredient of this research, all variables relate directly to that philosophy. Basically, Minzey's six component model was incorporated, with each component serving as a dependent variable. Two additional variables were community education's effect on home-school communication and on school-public relations.

The strata--community educators, teachers, program participants, and significant others--were selected to provide an interesting comparison of perceptions with regard to the concept. Other strata, of course, may be selected in some future study using this same methodology.

The statements of Section One are designed to reflect the respondent's perception regarding the eight variables. Each variable is represented by three or more

---

[1]Ibid., p. 68. [2]Ibid., p. 62.

statements. The variable matrix depicted in Table 4.2 illustrates the design of Section One. The reader may note that a ninth variable was added to the design when the total of all thirty statements is considered.

Testable Hypotheses

Following are the hypotheses designed to examine the crucial research questions associated with this study. They are stated in words and in symbolic form.

One: There will be no difference among the mean scores of community educators, teachers, program participants, and significant others in the community with regard to their perception of the effect of a community education philosophy on the K-12 operation of schools.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Two: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the appropriate use of school facilities.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Three: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of children and youth.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Four: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of adults.

Table 4.2.--Variable matrix: A multivariate analysis of variance.

	Community Educators	Program Participant	Teachers	Significant Others
K-12	Mean of Items: 2, 17 & 20	Mean of Items: 2, 17 & 20	Mean of Items: 2, 17 & 20	Mean of Items: 2, 17 & 20
Use of Facilities	Mean of Items: 3, 22, 12, & 6	Mean of Items: 3, 22, 12 & 6	Mean of Items: 3, 22, 12 & 6	Mean of Items: 3, 22, 12 & 6
Programs: Children and Youth	Mean of Items: 1, 14, 25 & 10	Mean of Items: 1, 14, 25 & 10	Mean of Items: 1, 14, 25 & 10	Mean of Items: 1, 14, 25 & 10
Programs: Adults	Mean of Items: 1, 7, 19 & 29	Mean of Items: 1, 7, 19 & 29	Mean of Items: 1, 7, 19 & 29	Mean of Items: 1, 7, 19 & 29
Delivery of Services	Mean of Items: 5, 18, 21 & 30	Mean of Items: 5, 18, 21 & 30	Mean of Items: 5, 18, 21 & 30	Mean of Items: 5, 18, 21 & 30
Community Development	Mean of Items: 4, 9, 13, 16 23 & 27	Mean of Items: 4, 9, 13, 16 23 & 27	Mean of Items: 4, 9, 13, 16 23 & 27	Mean of Items: 4, 9, 13, 16 23 & 27
Improving P.O. of Schools	Mean of Items: 8, 11 & 28	Mean of Items: 8, 11 & 28	Mean of Items: 8, 11 & 28	Mean of Items: 8, 11 & 28
Improving Home-School Communication	Mean of Items: 15, 24 & 26	Mean of Items: 15, 24 & 26	Mean of Items: 15, 24 & 26	Mean of Items: 15, 24 & 26
Total	Mean of all items	Mean of all items	Mean of all items	Mean of all items

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Five: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the school's role in the delivery of all types of human services.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Six: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perceptions of the school's role in developing the total community to its greatest potential.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Seven: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perceptions of an effective method of improving school-public relations.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Eight: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to perceptions of the importance of home-school communication.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Nine: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perceptions of appropriate functions for public schools.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

Ten: There will be no relation among the four groups with regard to the ranking of twenty-one community organizations in terms of their support for current school policy.

Ho: $r = 0$

H_1: $r \neq 0$

Analysis

The responses to Section One of the questionnaire were recorded on a Fortran Coding Form and readied for transfer to keypunch cards. All responses were given a numerical value as depicted in Table 4.3. Reverse scoring was used on negative items to assure that all responses scored alike.

Table 4.3.--Item scoring.

Positive		Negative	
Strongly Agree	5	Strongly Disagree	1
Agree	4	Disagree	2
Neutral	3	Neutral	3
Disagree	2	Agree	4
Strongly Disagree	1	Strongly Agree	5

The use of the computer facilities and equipment at Michigan State University was solicited. The computer was programmed to perform one parametric statistical function and one function that was nonparametric.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the total mean scores. This statistical tool allowed the researcher to examine the difference in perception among the four groups with regard to the community education philosophy. Kerlinger notes the versatility of an analysis of variance:

> . . . a method of identifying, breaking down, and testing for statistical significance variances that come from different sources of variation. That is, a dependent variable has a total amount of variance, some of which is due to the experimental treatment, some to error, and some to other causes. Analysis of variance's job is to work with these different variances and sources of variance.[1]

Since four independent groups were under study, a test for "k" independent samples was sought. Since assumptions were made regarding normality and homogeneity, a parametric statistic was appropriate. Siegel explains:

> A parametric statistical test is a test whose model specifies certain conditions . . . about the parameters of the population from which the research sample was drawn. Since these conditions are not ordinarily tested, they are assumed to hold. The meaningfulness of the results of a parametric test depends on the validity of these assumptions.[2]

When the one-way "ANOVA" is used to simultaneously analyze many dependent variables, it is referred to as a "multivariate analysis of variance." Such a technique was valuable

---

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 147.

[2]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 30-31.

in determining whether any difference in perception occurred among the four groups. The "F" test was applied to determine whether a significant difference occurred between the means. Use of the F test is explained by Kerlinger:

> . . . A "t" test of the difference between two means, if significant, simply tells the investigator that there is a relation. That there is a relation between two variables is inferred from the significant difference between the means. An F test, similarly, if significant, simply says that a relation exists. The relational fact is inferred from the significant differences between two, three, or more means. A statistical test like F says--that there is or is not a relation between the independent variable (or variables) and the dependent variable.[1]

If the multivariate was significant at the .05 level, showing a difference in perception of community education, two other techniques were applied. First, the univariate test to discern differences which might occur among the four groups with regard to each of the eight variables. This was done at reduced "alpha" levels to prevent "inflated alpha." This technique, called the "guarded F," merely divides the multivariate alpha level (.05) by the number of variables (eight) to insure the accuracy of the originally selected level of significance on the total scores. If this technique were not applied and each variable was tested at the .05 level, the total alpha would, in this case, be close to .40! This, of course, would not be acceptable. In addition, the fact that a relation does exist among the four groups is not enough information for purposes of the research. Between

---

[1]Kerlinger, Foundations, p. 227.

what specific groups the difference occurred then became a key question. The post hoc Scheffé was used to discern this difference. The Scheffé test, if used with discretion, is a general method that can be applied to all comparisons of means after an analysis of variance. If and only if the F test is significant, one can test all the differences between means; one can test the combined mean of two or more groups against the mean of one other group; or one can select any combination of means against any other combination.[1]

The statistical tool selected to analyze data collected with Section Two of the questionnaire is the Kendall coefficient of concordance. With this analytical methodology it was possible to rank the groups in terms of their support for current school policy. In addition, the degree of agreement among the four populations as to such support was measured. The appropriateness of the use of the Kendall "W" is supported by Siegel:

> When we have k sets of rankings, we may determine the association among them by using the Kendall coefficient of concordance W. Whereas r_s and T express the degree of association between two variables measured in, or transformed to, ranks, W expresses the degree of association among k such variables. Such a measure may be particularly useful in studies of interjudge or intertest reliability, and also has applications in studies of clusters of variables.[2]

---

[1]H. Scheffé, "A Method for Judging All Constrasts in the Analysis of Variance," Biometrika 40 (June 1953): 87.

[2]Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, p. 229.

The ability of the community educator to estimate the support for school policy among several categories of citizens is important. If the community educator concurs with other judges (in this case, the other populations), a certain confidence regarding the reliability of that estimate is gained.

The null hypothesis that "k" sets of rankings are independent was tested by taking from the "s" distribution the probability associated with the occurrence under Ho of a value as large as an observed "s." If an observed "s" is equal to or greater than that shown in a table of critical values of "s" for the .05 level of significance, the Ho was not retained.

In the event the null hypothesis was not retained, that is, the four groups differed in their "best estimate" of a "true" ranking, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to discern which set "k" differed with community educators.

Summary

The samples of this study represent four populations of Process City, U.S.A. Each population--teachers, community educators, program participants, and significant others--has an integral role in the implementation and diffusion of community education. Awareness of the level of sophistication regarding the concept among the various

populations as well as a measure of the agreement shared among them would be useful.

Various methods were used to select the samples. In the case of the teachers and program participants, a simple random sample was drawn from sampling frames which were carefully screened for repeated names, blanks, and current addresses. The community educators, identified by the Process City superintendent of schools, were all included in the study (sixteen). Significant others were selected via the reputational decisional power structure methodology described earlier.

Operational Measures

A questionnaire was designed and mailed to respondents in Process City. The instrument was designed in two sections. Section One displayed thirty statements which asked the respondent to agree or disagree in a fashion designed by Likert. In Section Two the respondents were asked to rank various community organizations according to their perception of said groups' support for current school policy (a community education philosophy). The questionnaire was pre-tested and changes made where appropraite.

Mailing of the questionnaire was conducted in three blocks of time. The first mailing was given two weeks to return. A second mailing was initiated exactly two weeks after the first. One week later, nonrespondents were

contacted via telephone and asked to take part in the study. This procedure yielded the results depicted on page 102 (Table 4.1).

Design

Since data were sought which would familiarize those interested in current perception of community education, a cross-sectional survey was used. The cross-sectional survey according to experts will yield current information and can be repeated at a future date to discern any change which might take place in the interim.

The six-component model of community education developed by Minzey was used to design the survey instrument.

Analysis

The multivariate analysis of variance, the univariate analysis of variance, and the post hoc Scheffé were used to analyze the data collected with Section One of this study. Differences in perception among the four groups with regard to community education were being sought.

The Kendall coefficient of concordance, W, was used to analyze the data collected with Section Two of the survey instrument. The researcher sought the degree of agreement among four (k) sets of judges regarding the ranking of twenty-one (N) groups and/or organizations in the community.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter the gathered and analyzed data will be presented. The thrust of this presentation is designed to clarify the earlier stated hypotheses. Inherent in the statistical analysis is the desire to lend empirical emphasis to one community's perception of appropriate public school function. Emphasis, in this case, was meant to lend clarity to differences in perception regarding community education among teachers, participants, community educators, and significant others in Process City, U.S.A. In addition, these groups were asked to rank various organizations and categories of people according to their support for current school policy.

The hypotheses proposed in Chapter I and restated in Chapter IV are again presented. Data, presented in tables and explained in detail, accompany each null hypothesis. No attempt will be made, at this time, to interpret the meaning or significance of the presented data.

Raw Data

Table 5.1 may help familiarize the reader with data collected regarding the respondent's perception of community

Table 5.1.--Observed cell means and standard deviations for differences in community education perception.

		Program Participant	Community Educators	Teachers	Significant Others
K-12	$\bar{X}$	12.02	14.13	11.13	12.1
	Std. Dev.	1.84	1.9	2.3	1.6
FAC.	$\bar{X}$	13.96	16.13	14.9	15.1
	Std. Dev.	2.27	2.73	2.34	1.8
YOUTH	$\bar{X}$	16.7	18.8	17.3	16.4
	Std. Dev.	1.8	1.3	1.95	2.1
ADULTS	$\bar{X}$	16.42	18.44	17.23	16.2
	Std. Dev.	2.24	1.55	2.04	2.63
SERV.	$\bar{X}$	14.85	17.38	15.33	15.4
	Std. Dev.	2.42	1.86	2.2	2.2
DEV.	$\bar{X}$	22.27	25.94	22.68	22.94
	Std. Dev.	3.25	2.18	3.37	3.84
P.O.	$\bar{X}$	11.65	13.5	12.18	11.8
	Std. Dev.	1.9	1.27	1.75	1.65
COMM.	$\bar{X}$	10.3	11.5	10.9	10.9
	Std. Dev.	1.51	1.37	2.04	1.56
C.E.	$\bar{X}$	118.15	135.75	121.58	121.0
	Std. Dev.	11.53	10.36	11.58	12.36

education. The mean and standard deviation are shown for each of eight community education variables. The ninth, a composite, represents a measure of the respondent's perception of the appropriateness of a community education philosophy in its entirety. Such information is basic to the comparisons drawn in the first portion of this chapter. Most of the depicted scores will appear again and again as analyses proceed.

Assumptions

The question of parametric statistical assumptions has been discussed in preceding chapters. With the collection of data, however, comes the opportunity to empirically test for at least one of these assumptions. It is prudent to bear in mind the controversial status of parametric-nonparametric design decisions. Kerlinger says that:

> . . . It is assumed in using the t and F tests (and thus the analysis of variance), for example, that the samples with which we work have been drawn from populations that are normally distributed . . . it is also assumed that the variances within the groups are statistically the same. That is, variances are assumed to be homogeneous from group to group, within the bounds of random variation. If the populations from which samples are drawn are not normal and if the variances differ widely, then statistical tests such as F are vitiated.[1]

With regard to homogeneity of variance, Lindquist disagrees:

---

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 286.

> . . . Unless variances are so heterogeneous as to be readily apparent, that is, relatively large differences exist, the effect on the F test will probably be negligible.[1]

Boneau confirms this:

> . . . In a large number of research situations the probability statements resulting from the use of t and F tests, even when assumptions of normality and homogeneity are violated, will be highly accurate.[1]

With such disagreement among experts on this subject, it may prove best to ignore the issue completely in an attempt to avoid a win-lose situation. Best use of data, however, calls for an attempt to verify, if possible, the assumptions of a parametric test.

Data were available to test one assumption, homogeneity of variance. The results are depicted in Table 5.2. Note that nine tests were conducted. The hypothesis in each test was: Ho: S^2Largest = S^2Smallest. The reader may note that with regard to the sixth variable, community development, homogeneity of variance was not confirmed. The sweeping confirmation of homogeneity among the variances of all other variables, however, tends to negate the importance of such information. With confirmation of the composite ninth variable, suspicion of a faulty assumption is further reduced.

---

[1]E. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953), p. 81.

[2]C. Boneau, "The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the t Test," Psychological Bulletin 57 (January 1960): 49-60.

Table 5.2.--Homogeneity of variance--perception of community education.

Variable	D.F.	F	Critical Value	Decision	
K-12	4,39	2.21	2.37	C/>/F	Retain
FAC.	4,15	2.41	3.01	C/>/F	Retain
YOUTH	4,15	2.6	2.93	C/>/F	Retain
ADULTS	4,17	2.87	2.93	C/>/F	Retain
SERV.	4,59	1.7	2.53	C/>/F	Retain
DEV.	4,17	3.0	2.93	C/</F	Do Not Retain
P.O.	4,59	2.2	2.53	D/>/F	Retain
COMM.	4,39	2.2	2.61	C/>/F	Retain
C.E.	4,17	1.42	2.93	C/>/F	Retain

Hypothesis Testing--Perception of Community Education

There follows a series of nine univariate analyses of variance. Each test addresses an earlier stated null hypothesis. The essence of such analysis was designed to discern differences in perception regarding community education among four Process City groups. Data pertinent to each hypothesis are presented along with explanatory comment. The Scheffé post hoc test is also depicted where appropriate.

> One: There will be no difference among the mean scores of community educators, teachers, program participants, and significant others in the community with regard to their perception of the effect of a community education philosophy on the K-12 operation of schools.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

Table 5.3 shows data pertinent to the first dependent variable. Note that the critical value is stated in guarded terms. This is in accord with the previously discussed attempt to compensate for an inflated alpha.

Table 5.3.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable one, K-12.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	34.36	8.8	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	3.90		
Total	N-1=133			

C /</F Do Not Retain Ho.

The null hypothesis was not retained, stating that at the .0063 (.05 divided by eight dependent variables) level of significance there are differences in perception of community education's effect on the K-12 program among the four groups. Post hoc testing was not appropriate. The Scheffé procedure allows further exploration and interpretation of gathered data. In a conservative way (to attain significance, differences have to be substantial), further insight regarding differences in perception was pursued via this

test. By referring to Table 5.1, a visual comparison of means draws attention to the disparity between community educators and teachers. This visible difference, however, does not lend the clarity necessary for investigatory purposes. Table 5.4 depicts the results of the post hoc Scheffé test conducted with data relevant to the first variable. When subjected to the scrutiny of this method, differences in the mean scores of the compared groups were judged not of statistical significance. The decision in each case was based on the null hypothesis that the difference between the compared groups was zero. The null hypothesis of each comparison was retained at the .01 confidence

Table 5.4.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable one, K-12.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision $Ho:\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=2.11$	5.14	.556	- .75 to 4.97	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=2.014$	5.14	.584	- .004 to 6	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=2.01$	5.14	.678	-1.48 to 5.5	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=$ .89	5.14	.405	-1.19 to 2.97	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=$ .09	5.14	.534	-2.84 to 2.66	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=-.99$	5.14	.562	-3.88 to 1.9	Retain

level since each computed interval contained zero. Differences discerned by the univariate analysis of variance were apparently not due to any comparisons relevant to this study.

Two: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the appropriate use of school facilities.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

Data relevant to the second dependent variable, use of facilities, are displayed in Table 5.5. Note that the critical value is less than F; therefore the null hypothesis cannot be retained. Post hoc testing was conducted with results similar to the Scheffé analysis of variable one (K-12). In Table 5.6, there results show that each computed interval again contains zero. These comparisons reveal no differences of interest to the research effect.

Table 5.5.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable two, use of facilities.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	22.76	4.3	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	5.25		
Total	N-1=133			

C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.

Table 5.6.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable two, use of facilities.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}\ (ms)$ $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision $Ho:\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=2.16$	3.59	.644	- .15 to 4.47	Retain
$\bar{X}_5-\bar{X}_3=1.23$	3.59	.68	-1.21 to 3.67	Retain
$\bar{X}_5-\bar{X}_4=1.07$	3.59	.787	-1.76 to 3.9	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.93$	3.59	.47	-2.62 to .76	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=-1.09$	3.59	.62	-3.32 to 1.14	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=-.16$	3.59	.652	-2.5 to 2.18	Retain

Three: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of children and youth.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

As Table 5.7 illustrates, the null hypothesis addressing the third variable was not retained. In keeping with the established format of the selected design, post hoc testing was initiated. As Table 5.8 indicates, the differences discerned by the univariate test and of interest to the research are between community educators and program participants as well as community educators and teachers. No other significant differences were detected.

Table 5.7.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable three, programs for children and youth.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	20.57	5.9	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	3.44		
Total	N-1=133			
C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.				

Table 5.8.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable three, programs for children and youth.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision Ho:$\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=2.05$	4.21	.272	.9 to 3.2	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=1.5$	4.21	.303	.22 to 2.78	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=2.31$	4.21	.637	-1.37 to 4.99	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.55$	4.21	.38	-2.15 to 1.05	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=.256$	4.21	.5	-1.9 to 2.37	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=.81$	4.21	.53	-1.42 to 3.04	Retain

Four: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of adults.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

The respondent's perception with regard to the fourth component of community education differed according to the univariate analysis of variance (see Table 5.9).

Table 5.9.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable four, programs for adults.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	21.41	4.5	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	4.7		
Total	N-1=133			

C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.

The post hoc Scheffé, depicted in Table 5.10, shows the difference occurred between the community educators and the program participants.

Five: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the school's role in the delivery of all types of human services.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

Table 5.10.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable four, programs for adults.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision $Ho:\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=2.02$	3.65	.371	.67 to 3.37	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=1.21$	3.65	.414	-.29 to 2.71	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=2.22$	3.65	.745	-.52 to 2.92	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.81$	3.65	.444	-2.43 to .8	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=.195$	3.65	.59	-1.96 to 2.35	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=1.003$	3.65	.617	-1.25 to 3.3	Retain

The univariate null hypothesis (Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$) was again not retained on the delivery of services variable (see Table 5.11). The groups which disagreed regarding the school's most appropriate role in the delivery of human services were again the community educators and the program participants. Table 5.12 depicts those results.

Table 5.11.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable five, delivery of services.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	26.91	5.2	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	5.14		
Total	N-1=133			
C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.				

Table 5.12.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable five, delivery of services.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision Ho:$\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=2.53$	3.95	.638	.01 to 5.05	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=2.05$	3.95	.673	-.61 to 4.71	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=1.93$	3.95	.779	-1.15 to 5.01	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.475$	3.95	.465	-2.32 to 1.37	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=-.594$	3.95	.613	-3.01 to 1.83	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=-.119$	3.95	.645	-2.67 to 2.43	Retain

Six: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the school's role in developing the total community to its greatest potential.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1\neq M_2\neq M_3\neq M_4$

While the univariate test showed the sixth null hypothesis was not retained, the Scheffé analysis did not discern differences of interest to the research (see Tables 5.13 and 5.14).

Table 5.13.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable six, community development.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	26.91	5.2	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	5.14		
Total	N-1=133			

C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.

Table 5.14.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable six, community development.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(RV)}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision Ho:$\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=3.67$	4.03	.919	-.03 to 4.37	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=3.26$	4.03	.94	-.53 to 7.05	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=2.99$	4.03	1.26	-2.09 to 8.07	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.41$	4.03	.67	-3.1 to 2.29	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=-.68$	4.03	.883	-4.24 to 2.88	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=-.27$	4.03	.93	-4.02 to 3.48	Retain

Seven: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an effective method of improving school-public relations.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

The seventh null hypothesis was not retained as depicted in Table 5.15. The univariate F ratio is 4.8, which exceeds the critical value 2.48. While these data indicated a difference in perception among the groups, it was not known just where the discrepancy occurred.

Table 5.15.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable seven, improving school-public relations.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	14.9	4.8	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	3.09		
Total	N-1=133			
C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.				

The post hoc Scheffé (Table 5.16) showed the difference to be between the community educators and teachers.

> Eight: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perceptions of the importance of home-school communication.

Ho: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

The eighth hypothesis, which dealt with differences in perception regarding the effect of a community education philosophy on home-school communication, was retained by the univariate analysis of variance. The critical value, 4.28,

exceeded the F ratio, 2.7 (Table 5.17). It is concluded that there does not appear to be a difference of statistical significance. Therefore, null hypothesis eight was not retained. This decision negated the use of post hoc testing.

Table 5.16.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable seven, improving school-public relations.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}\ (ms)$ $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision $Ho:\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=1.85$	3.79	.494	-.02 to 3.72	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=1.33$	3.79	.272	.3 to 1.36	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=1.67$	3.79	.604	-.62 to 3.96	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-.53$	3.79	.36	-1.9 to .84	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=-.183$	3.79	.475	-1.98 to 1.62	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=.3417$	3.79	.5	-1.56 to 2.24	Retain

Table 5.17.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable eight, home-school communication.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	7.78	2.7	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	2.81		
Total	N-1=133			

C/>/F Retain Ho.

Nine: There will be no difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of appropriate functions for public schools.

Ho: $M_1=M_2=M_3=M_4$

H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2 \neq M_3 \neq M_4$

When the ninth variable, a composite of the eight preceding variables, was subjected to the scrutiny of the univariate analysis of variance, the null hypothesis was not retained. The difference of interest in this research was discerned by the Scheffé to occur between the program participants and the community educators. All other contrasts proved not statistically significant. (Tables 5.18 and 5.19).

Table 5.18.--Univariate analysis of variance--variable nine, community education.

Source	df	M.S.	Obtained F	Tabled (Guarded) F
Between Groups	k-1=3	1307.93	9.84	4.28
Within Groups	N-k=130	132.9		
Total	n-1=133			
C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.				

Table 5.19.--Illustration of the construction of Scheffé method confidence intervals--variable nine, community education.

Contrast, Ψ (C)	$\sqrt{(J-1)\ F}$ (M)	$\sqrt{1/N_1+1/N_2}$ (ms) $\sqrt{(\ RV\ )}$	Confidence Interval (CI)	Decision $Ho:\mu_1-\mu_2=0$
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_1=17.6$	5.43	3.24	.01 to 35.19	Do Not Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_3=14.18$	5.43	3.42	-4.39 to 32.75	Retain
$\bar{X}_2-\bar{X}_4=14.75$	5.43	3.96	-6.75 to 36.25	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_3=-3.43$	5.43	2.36	-16.26 to 9.4	Retain
$\bar{X}_1-\bar{X}_4=-2.85$	5.43	3.12	-19.75 to 14.05	Retain
$\bar{X}_3-\bar{X}_4=.575$	5.43	3.28	-17.25 to 18.4	Retain

Hypothesis Testing--Ranking of Public School Support

When officials in a school district implement a philosophical construct which differs from that of the past, successful diffusion depends, in part, upon common understanding of that philosophy. Methodology designed to periodically measure the diffusion of common understanding would be useful. One such method, comparing perceptions of the philosophy, has already been described. Another, suggested by the design of this researcher, would rank selected community groups in terms of their support for school policy which embraces the philosophy in question. The selected groups, in such a case, would be ranked via the perception of their peers, those who live and work in the community.

The information derived from such methodology could indicate where emphasis should be placed in future implementation procedures.

The procedure selected to analyze the ranking of school support in Process City was Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W. This method allows for consideration of the relation among several rankings of N objects, individuals, or groups much in the same way that the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, r_s, deals with that relation among two such groups. The previously described groups--teachers, community educators, program participants, and significant others--became the judges (k) needed in Kendall's method while the groups and/or individuals to be ranked (N) were selected by the researcher.

The collected data were scored in such a way as to allow each group (k) to rank the community organizations (N) via their perception of said organization's support for school policy. These observed ranks were then cast into a k x N table (see Table 5.20). From that table, sums (R_j) of ranks assigned by the k judges were determined and recorded (see Table 5.20, R_j). The remaining procedure for determining the value "s" required:

1. Determining the mean of the R_j $(\frac{R_j}{N})$
2. Expressing each R_j as a deviation from the mean $(R_j - \frac{R_j}{N})$.

Table 5.20.--Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W - k x N table.

	Teachers	Custodians	Students	Principals	Business Leaders	Parents	Civic Organizations	Public Officials	Church Groups	Senior Citizens	Social Services	Women's Clubs	Racial Minorities	Higher Income	Middle Income	Low Income	Fraternal Groups	Non-Parents	Youth Serving Agencies	Parks and Recreation	School Secretaries	
Program Participants	2	6	5	1	12	8	11	10	15	20	13	18	19	16	9	14	17	21	4	3	7	
Community Educators	5	17	3	1	15	2	10	13	12	20	8	14	18	11	4	19	16	21	7	9	6	
Teachers	2	9	7	1	16	5	12	10	15	19	13	14	18	11	8	17	20	21	6	3	4	
Significant Others	2	15	13	1	14	7	9	6	17	20	8	12	19	16	11	10	18	21	3	4	5	
R_j	11	47	28	4	57	22	42	39	59	79	42	58	74	54	32	60	71	84	20	20	22	925
$R_j - \frac{\Sigma R_j}{N}$	-33.05	2.95	-16.05	-40.05	12.95	-22.05	-2.05	-5.05	14.95	34.95	-2.5	13.95	29.95	9.95	-12.05	15.95	26.95	39.95	-24.25	-24.25	-22.05	
$R_j - \frac{\Sigma Rj}{N}^{2}$	1092.3	8.7	257.6	1604.0	167.7	486.2	4.2	25.5	223.5	1221.5	4.2	194.6	897.0	99.0	145.2	254.4	726.3	1596.0	578.4	578.4	486.2	

3. Squaring the deviations.

4. Summing the squares to obtain "s."

All of the above information may be gleaned from Table 5.20.

Since the proportion of ties was small, affecting the value of W only negligibly, the formula:

$$W = \frac{s}{1/12\ k^2(N^3-N)}$$

was deemed appropriate for determining the coefficient of concordance. When the observed data were applied, the following results occurred:

$$W = \frac{s}{1/12\ k^2(N^3-N)}$$

$$= \frac{10650.9}{1/12\ (4)^2(21^3-21)}$$

$$W = .87$$

The method for determining whether the observed value of W is significantly different from zero depends on the size of N. Since N = 21 is greater than 7, a chi square score was computed, the significance of which, for df = N - 1, was tested by reference to a table of critical values of chi square. As depicted in Table 5.21, the chi square score (69.6) exceeded the critical value (45.32) at the .001 level of significance. Since this was so, the null hypothesis (Ho: r = 0) that the k rankings are unrelated was not

retained. It was determined that the agreement among the four judges is higher than it would be by chance.

Table 5.21.--Illustration of Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W --support for current school policy.

Sum of Squares (s)	Coefficient of Concordance (W)	Chi Square (χ^2)	Critical Value of Chi Square (C)
10650.9	.87	69.6	45.32
a = .001			
C/</F Do Not Retain Ho.			

Seigel emphasizes that ". . . a high or significant value of W does not mean that the orderings observed are correct."[1] It is possible, in fact, that a variety of judges can agree in ordering objects because they all employ the wrong criteria! The purpose of this research methodology, however, is to ascertain a consensual ordering rather than one that is objective. The degree of agreement, then, is emphasized, as much as the actual ordering of the community groups.

Despite the preceding argument it remains possible to compile a consensus ranking of the groups in question. This "best estimate" is associated with least squares. Thus, a best estimate of the least support for current

[1]Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, p. 238.

school policy in Process City is determined by the order of the sums of ranks. The group with the highest observed R_j value, non-parents, was least supportive of current school policy among the twenty-one groups listed (see Table 5.20). In "best estimate" terms, then, principals, whose R_j was smallest, are persons most likely to support current school policy. The five groups who, by consensus, are strong supporters of current school policy in Process City were:

1. Principals (most supportive of twenty-one groups)
2. Teachers
3. Parks and recreation agencies
4. Youth serving agencies
5. School secretaries

The five groups that, by consensus, are least supportive of current school policy in Process City were:

1. Non-parents (least supportive of twenty-one groups)
2. Senior citizens
3. Minorities
4. Fraternal groups
5. Low income group

Summary

Prior to applying the collected data to investigatory procedures, a concern for its validity was dissipated. This was accomplished by analyzing the observed cell standard deviations. The largest deviation (squared) was divided by the smallest (squared) and the resulting score was checked against an F ratio at the .05 level of significance with k and N_L - 1 degrees of freedom. Homogeneity of variance was confirmed in all but one variable. It was concluded that

the variances considered were homogeneous and that the discrepancy was due to factors unrelated to the outcome of the research.

The hypotheses were tested using four procedures: The Multivariate Analysis of Variance, The Univariate Analysis of Variance, the Post Hoc Scheffé, and the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance. In the final analysis the hypotheses of Part One (variables 1-9) showed only six differences in perception regarding community education. Although all but one (#8, home-school communication) of the nine univariate analyses of variance described the null hypothesis as not being retained, the post hoc Scheffé tests yielded but six differences in perception out of fifty-four possible contrasts. These differences occurred between:

1. The community educators and the program participants regarding the variable, programs for children and youth.
2. The community educators and teachers with regard to the variable, programs for children and youth.
3. The community educators and program participants regarding programs for adults.
4. The community educators and program participants regarding the school's role in the delivery of human services.

5. The teachers and the community educators regarding the best way to improve the public's opinion of schools.
6. The program participants and the community educators regarding community education.

The final hypothesis considered (Ho: 10) dealt with the ranking of community groups in terms of their support for current school policy (a community education philosophy). Kendall's W was used to discern whether the ranking of twenty-one community organizations, by one group, was related to the rankings by all others. The null hypothesis that there was no relation among the rankings was retained. The computed W, .87, shows that the degree of agreement among the four groups (k) was substantial.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will include a brief summary, a statement of conclusions, a discussion of implications of the results, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

There are more than seventy universities in the United States involved in implementing and diffusing the concept of community education. These universities, via established "Community Education Development Centers," have contact with nearly one thousand school districts where implementation and diffusion of the concept are being attempted. In addition, an increasing number of communities have expressed an interest in the idea.

To work successfully with interested public school personnel and other significant community members in such implementation, the development center staff members may wish to develop a clear understanding of innovation and its diffusion. Local practitioners may wish to view themselves as much change agents as community educators. The lack of reliable and accurate information regarding the effects of community education may lead decision makers to

rely solely upon the reputation of advocates as a basis for continued diffusion. As a result, community education may be under promotion rather than systematic implementation. This research was an attempt to develop a tool which might assist those involved with the implementation and diffusion of community education. "Process City," a pseudonym for the case study site in Michigan, hopefully will reap the benefit of such a community analysis. Process City incorporates a school district which established community education as a philosophical mode of operation in 1967. The benefit of the conducted research in Process City can be expressed in terms of monitoring the progress of diffusion. In other communities, where implementation is in contemplation stages, the research method could give indication of possible acceptance of the idea; groups who support, groups who oppose, and groups who are unaware of the concept.

Literature reviewed as background for the study included three knowledge categories: Innovation and Diffusion, Community Power Structure, and Community Education. The writings of Rogers and Havelock contributed heavily to understanding research of the past regarding innovation diffusion. Hunter and Dahl provide the basis for much follow-up research by others in the study of community power. The "threads" of community education, which began in colonial times, are later expanded by Dewey, Olsen, Shaw, and Minzey.

The study was designed to sample four populations in Process City: the teachers, the community educators, the program participants, and significant others. Each has an integral role in the implementation and diffusion of community education. Awareness of the level of sophistication regarding the concept among the various populations as well as a measure of the agreement shared among them was sought.

A mailed questionnaire was used in the data collection process. The instrument was designed in two sections. Section One displayed thirty statements constructed so as to reflect the respondent's degree of agreement with the latest developments in community education. In Section Two, the respondents were asked to rank various community organizations according to their perception of said organizations' support for current school policy (a community education philosophy).

The data were analyzed with the assistance of the Michigan State University, College of Education, Research Consultation Office. A computer program was developed which would conduct a multivariate analysis of variance with data of Section One. The print-out supplied all information necessary to complete the analysis of that section. The univariate analysis of variance was displayed for differences in perception among the groups with regard to nine dependent variables. The displayed information also

contained data necessary to conduct the post hoc Scheffé test where appropriate.

The Kendall coefficient of concordance, W, was used to analyze the data collected with Section Two of the survey instrument. The ranking of support for a community education oriented school policy and the degree of agreement among the four groups were being sought.

Conclusions

Analysis of the data provides the following conclusions:

1. There is no statistically significant difference among Process City teachers, community educators, program participants, and significant others with regard to their perception of the effect of a community education philosophy on the K-12 operation of schools. (See Table 5.4, p. 120.)

2. There is no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the appropriate use of school facilities. (See Table 5.6, p. 122.)

3. There is a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of children and youth. Specifically these differences occurred between the community educators and the teachers and the community educators and the program participants. (See Table 5.8, p. 123.)

4. There is a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an expanded role for public education in meeting the needs of adults. All groups concurred with the exception of the community educators and the program participants. (See Table 5.10, p. 125.)

5. There is a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the school's role in the delivery of all types of human services. This difference was between the community educators and the program participants. (See Table 5.12, p. 126.)

6. There is no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the school's role in developing the total community to its greatest potential. (See Table 5.14, p. 127.)

7. There is a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of an effective method of improving school-public relations. This difference occurred between the community educators and teachers. (See Table 5.16, p. 129.)

8. There is no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of the importance of home-school communication. (See Table 5.17, p. 129.)

9. There is a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the four groups with regard to their perception of appropriate functions for public schools. Specifically, this difference occurred between the community educators and the program participants. (See Table 5.19, p. 131.)

10. There is a relation among the four groups with regard to the ranking of twenty-one community organizations in terms of their support for Process City public school policy. (See Table 5.21, p. 135.)

Discussion

This study may be one example of a research technique which can be successfully applied to monitor the diffusion of an innovation. The findings indicate that Process City teachers, significant others, and community educators agree, conceptually, regarding what are appropriate school functions. Since the community educators are responsible for the implementation and diffusion of the concept, such agreement is welcome. In terms of the five-stage innovation diffusion model of Rogers, this may indicate that teachers and significant others are aware of the concept, have sought information about it in an interest stage, have mentally applied the idea in present and anticipated circumstances (the evaluation stage), are moving toward trying the idea in the trial stage, and are considering adoption of the concept.

Most differences in perception exist between the community educators and the program participants. The two groups differ with regard to the following variables:

1. An expanded role for schools in meeting the needs of children and youth.
2. An expanded role for schools in meeting the needs of adults.
3. The appropriate role for schools in assisting in the delivery of all types of human services.
4. The community education concept.

Likening the research results to the work of Rogers, the participants have either proceeded through his five-stage model and moved on to discontinuance, or they are not yet aware of the concept. Apparently, as Havelock might assert, the Process City "participants" do not share the common understanding necessary to move into the latter stages of innovation adoption. The orientation of the participants toward school function seems traditional, based on the belief that schools are for children and the three R's. This does not mean that the diffusion process is ineffectual. It means, simply, that while diffusion may be progressing toward adoption of the concept by many, the methods used have not been successful with program participants. Any number of reasons for such an occurrence may be applicable. Lippitt, Watson and Westley point out that sometimes the client system is unwilling or unable to put forth the necessary effort

to obtain needed information. If this was, indeed, thought to be the problem, perhaps a change of diffusion perspective emphasis would be appropriate. If the research development and diffusion perspective is being used in Process City with the above results, perhaps the problem-solver perspective would be more efficient with that population. Then again, the same authors indicate that the timing of an innovation's diffusion is important. If change has been planned to come from within as with the problem-solver technique, considerable time must be given to allow the client system to properly conduct information gathering and exploration of all alternatives. Implementation becomes a slow process. Patience is the byword in this case, especially if the change agent is confident the technique applies is appropriate.

The benefit of this research technique is in helping to statistically verify to what stage given populations have progressed. Whether to alter the diffusion process, based on the given facts, remains a function of and is dependent upon the expertise of the change agent(s).

It is clear that the diffusion process being applied in Process City is effective in disseminating the concept among significant others. The fact that community educators and significant others agree, conceptually, about appropriate public school function is indicative of successful diffusion. Such congruence among community leaders of greatest

influence vastly improves the chances of innovation adoption. As stated in Chapter IV, a power structure discernment technique was used to identify the significant other population. It is interesting to note that the results showed the superintendent of schools as one of the most respected, influential members of the community. His being a strong advocate of the community education philosophy has undoubtedly eased the diffusion process.

The ranking of twenty-one community organizations by the four groups has yielded a list which can be used by the change agent to organize further diffusion efforts. The groups close to the bottom of the list are, in the perception of the respondents, not as supportive of school policy as those at the top. These groups may become specific targets of future dissemination efforts. Increased understanding of the concept must precede any anticipated increase in their community school participation.

It is encouraging that, in the perception of the respondents, park and recreation agencies are very supportive of Process City school policy. In some communities, the concept espoused by Process City's school board is viewed by leaders in parks and recreation as very threatening--many times with good reason! As community educators gain increased sophistication, however, the tendency to duplicate the services of such agencies is diminishing. With the territorial threat squelched, each entity has the capacity to increase

the effectiveness of the other. Neighborhood schools, with their unique ability to identify recreation needs, alert the recreation specialist who can provide programs to meet those needs. Such sophistication would probably not be available at every neighborhood school if not for a cooperative effort. Process City has, apparently, a high degree of such cooperation and hopefully, this will continue.

One characteristic of the concordance, W, ranking stands out as somewhat incongruous. Aside from school staff the five groups most supportive of school policy all have something to do with youth. The least supportive, on the other hand, are groups traditionally ignored by schools. The last two in particular--senior citizens and non-parents--have in many communities become particularly anti-school in recent years. The emphasis of community education has been to change that orientation. Yet, here in a community where community education is espoused, and even this research has verified the progress of the diffusion of the concept, the list of groups perceived to be supportive seems to indicate that most people still regard schools as a youth serving agency.

Another factor of interest, though not addressed by hypothesis testing, is the male/female ratio among those who participate in Process City community education. School officials in each elementary neighborhood were asked for a list of those adults who are involved in community education

(the "participants" in this study). The city-wide list was very impressive. The numbers of people involved and the wide variety of functions and activities attest to the dedication and success of community education advocates. The number of men involved, however, was very slight. Ninety-eight percent of those adults reported to be involved in community education at the neighborhood level are women. One vast, untapped resource is the men of those neighborhoods. The change agent(s) may wish to emphasize a renewed effort to diffuse the concept of expanded school usage among adult males.

To conclude, successful community education diffusion efforts in Process City seem, in the opinion of this researcher, to have reached a point of stagnation. The climate for further diffusion, however, holds much promise. Staff and significant others are supportive of the concept. It remains to assert concentrated effort toward all who would participate at local neighborhood schools once common understanding is established. A close perusal of the current status of past efforts has been conducted. It is hoped that the results of this project will be useful information which, thoughtfully applied, may lead to further diffusion efforts.

Recommendations

Results of this study have implications for further research. It is recommended that future studies be designed:

1. as cooperative theses to allow the simultaneous analysis of several communities.
2. to examine and compare the community education efforts of urban and rural or "gemeinschaft-gesellschaft" communities.
3. to include techniques which are easily understood, thus encouraging use by the practitioner.
4. as part of a task force approach to community education implementation. This would include the researcher's involvement as a task force member.
5. to include a research, development, and diffusion "package" as one result. Such a package would help local practitioners understand the steps necessary to insure successful implementation of community education.
6. to investigate the diffusion of other types of innovations.
7. to replicate the study where community education is said to have failed.
8. to replicate the study where community education implementation is in beginning stages.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM

SPONSORING SCHOOL DISTRICT

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM
SPONSORING SCHOOL DISTRICT

September 30, 1974

To Whom It May Concern:

The bearer of this letter, Mr. Thomas R. Anderson, is doing a cooperative research project authorized by the _____ School District. He is studying certain things about the effectiveness of Community Education in_____.

Mr. Anderson is a doctoral student from Michigan State University and has a well-developed plan of research which will yield information helpful to our schools and community.

If you have any further questions, I will be glad to answer your inquiries.

We will appreciate any cooperation or courtesy you might extend to him.

Sincerely,

_____

Assistant Superintendent

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT COVER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT COVER AND
FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

January 20, 1975

We are asking your help in a research project designed to analyze your perceptions of the role of public schools in today's society. This project is jointly sponsored by _____ Public Schools, Eastern Michigan University's Center for Community Education and Michigan State University. Enclosed is an instrument designed to obtain your opinion of the appropriateness of several possible functions of public schools.

While the literature purports the value of expanding the school's role to meet the needs of community residents of all ages, it is imperative to involve the opinion of those who will be affected by such change. We ask that you consider each statement relative to the role of public education and respond by indicating the degree to which you agree with that statement. In addition, it will be helpful if you rank the community groups and organizations listed in Part II of the instrument in terms of the degree to which you think they support current school policies. Your thoughtful consideration of these tasks will help us determine the appropriateness of our own educational philosophy.

Conclusions drawn from this study will assist both university and public school officials in their efforts to provide meaningful educational services. Your contribution as an involved member of this community is essential to the study and will be greatly appreciated. Completion of the instrument will take just thirty minutes. It would be extremely helpful if you would return the instrument in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope in ten days.

Thank you so much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Superintendent _____ Schools	Thomas R. Anderson Doctoral Candidate Michigan State University	William F. Kromer Director of NCCE Eastern Michigan University

February 3, 1975

The intent of this letter is to keep you informed regarding the progress of the research project, "A Community Assessment of Public School Function." This study, sponsored jointly by Eastern Michigan University's Center for Community Education, _____ Public Schools, and Michigan State University, was initiated with a mailed questionnaire on January 20, 1975. You were selected to give your perceptions of appropriate functions of the public school. Your response to items on the questionnaire will provide valuable information necessary to the completion of the research.

The original mailing of the questionnaire reaped a high percentage of return. To adequately represent the feelings and perceptions of all respondents, however, it is necessary to seek as close to 100 percent return as is possible. If you have not already responded to the questionnaire, may we take this opportunity to urge and encourage your participation. Enclosed, please find an extra copy of the questionnaire for use in the event the original is lost or was misplaced.

We cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of, and our appreciation for, your participation in this study.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Superintendent _____ Schools	Thomas R. Anderson Doctoral Candidate Michigan State University	William F. Kromer Director of NCCE Eastern Michigan University

APPENDIX C

A COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNCTION

APPENDIX C

A COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT OF
PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNCTION

This questionnaire attempts to discern people's perceptions of appropriate public school functions. It is part of a study sponsored and supported by your school district and two universities.

None of your answers will ever be seen except by the research staff. We hope what we learn from all of you will help make schools and communities better places in which to live and learn.

It is important that you answer the questions as accurately as you are able. However, be aware of the difference between this instrument and a test--there are no correct answers which we expect. This instrument asks only for your feelings and perceptions.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Do not identify yourself.

2. Be frank and honest in responding, as there are no right or wrong answers.

3. All questions need only a circle to show your response.

4. Most people find these questions interesting. We hope that is also your impression. Thank you for being part of this important research.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, are Neutral, Agree, or Strongly Agree with that item.

If you:						
Strongly Disagree, circle SD. . . .	(SD)	D	N	A	SA
Disagree, circle D.	SD	(D)	N	A	SA
are Neutral, circle N	SD	D	(N)	A	SA
Agree, circle A	SD	D	N	(A)	SA
Strongly Agree, circle SA	SD	D	N	A	(SA)

I- 1.	Public schools should be responsible for the education of both children and adults	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 2.	Student learning will be enriched if schools involve a variety of community members in school functions. . .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 3.	In planning the construction of a new school facility, the total learning needs of people of all ages should be given consideration	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 4.	The public schools should provide opportunity for increased involvement by citizens in community activities . .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 5.	Public school officials should assist the community in holding a resource agency responsible for undelivered services	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 6.	School gymnasiums should be used by adults for recreation purposes . . .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 7.	School officials should provide the opportunity for adults to gain their high school diploma	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 8.	Schools should communicate regularly with older citizens in their neighborhood	SD	D	N	A	SA
I- 9.	The ultimate value of public education lies in its ability to bring about change and subsequently resolve community problems	SD	D	N	A	SA

If you:	Strongly Disagree, circle SD. . . .	(SD)	D	N	A	SA
	Disagree, circle D.	SD	(D)	N	A	SA
	are Neutral, circle N	SD	D	(N)	A	SA
	Agree, circle A	SD	D	N	(A)	SA
	Strongly Agree, circle SA	SD	D	N	A	(SA)

I-10.	Social and recreational activities for teen-agers should not be provided by the school during evening hours	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-11.	Regularly scheduled home visitations by school staff members are not beneficial to the educative process .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-12.	School buildings should be thought of as community centers which are sometimes used for the education of children	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-13.	School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to develop community power and work toward developing the community into the best it is capable of becoming	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-14.	The school should provide increased opportunity for elementary aged children to participate in high interest activities following the regular day of instruction	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-15.	Improved public opinion of schools will result from increased involvement by citizens of all ages in community life	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-16.	School councils should represent only those who have children attending that school	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-17.	School curriculum improvement will result as one direct consequence of the involvement of parents as volunteers in elementary schools	SD	D	N	A	SA

If you:					
Strongly Disagree, circle SD. . . .	(SD)	D	N	A	SA
Disagree, circle D.	SD	(D)	N	A	SA
are Neutral, circle N	SD	D	(N)	A	SA
Agree, circle A	SD	D	N	(A)	SA
Strongly Agree, circle SA	SD	D	N	A	(SA)

I-18. Public school personnel should assist the community in developing an appropriate agency for delivery of human services if unavailable	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-19. The board of education need <u>not</u> be concerned with the needs of older citizens when planning school programs	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-20. If schools attempt to expand their role to better meet the needs of all age groups, the regular instructional program will become <u>less</u> effective. .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-21. Public schools should assist both in discerning community problems and relating those problems with appropriate resources	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-22. Maximum use should be made of existing community facilities (educational, religious, recreational, etc.) before new construction is considered	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-23. School councils and advisory groups should address important school <u>and</u> community issues	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-24. Public schools should hire expert consultants to assist in improving school public relations	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-25. Children should be given the opportunity to become involved in school programs prior to their kindergarten experiences	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-26. School-public relations are improved when handled primarily by school personnel	SD	D	N	A	SA

If you:						
	Strongly Disagree, circle SD. . . .	(SD)	D	N	A	SA
	Disagree, circle D.	SD	(D)	N	A	SA
	are Neutral, circle N	SD	D	(N)	A	SA
	Agree, circle A	SD	D	N	(A)	SA
	Strongly Agree, circle SA	SD	D	N	A	(SA)

I-27.	A greater number of people should be involved in the decision-making processes addressing community problems	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-28.	Neighborhood citizen advisory groups should be established in each school to aid school-community communication	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-29.	If avocational (hobby) activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school . .	SD	D	N	A	SA
I-30.	The school should cooperate with other agencies in developing common goals, identifying overlapping responsibilities and recognizing voids in services provided	SD	D	N	A	SA

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE TO
COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please rate the following individuals and groups as you view their support for current school policy.

If you view the group's support as:

Very Low, circle VL	(VL)	L	M	H	VH
Low, circle L	VL	(L)	M	H	VH
Moderate, circle M	VL	L	(M)	H	VH
High, circle H	VL	L	M	(H)	VH
and Very High, circle VH	VL	L	M	H	(VH)

II- 1.	Teachers	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 2.	Custodians	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 3.	Students	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 4.	Principals	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 5.	Business Leaders	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 6.	Parents	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 7.	Civic Organizations	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 8.	Public Officials	VL	L	M	H	VH
II- 9.	Church Groups	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-10.	Older Americans	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-11.	Social Service Agencies	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-12.	Women's Clubs	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-13.	Racial Minorities	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-14.	Higher Income Group	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-15.	Middle Income Group	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-16.	Low Income Group	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-17.	Fraternal Groups	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-18.	Non-Parents	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-19.	Youth-Serving Organizations	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-20.	Park and Recreation Agencies	VL	L	M	H	VH
II-21.	School Secretaries	VL	L	M	H	VH

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Association of School Administrators. Judging Schools With Wisdom. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1959.

_____. "Today's Community." Educational Administration in a Changing Community. Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.

Baldridge, Victor J. Improving Relations Between R & D Organizations and Schools. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, California Center for Research and Development in Teaching 1973.

Bernard, Jessie. The Sociology of Community. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Co., 1973.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay, Inc., 1963.

Clapp, Elsie. Community Schools in Action. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.

Combs, Arthur W. "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Edited by Arthur W. Combs. Washington: The National Education Association, 1962.

Dewey, John. Democracy in Education. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1916.

_____. The School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899.

Everett, Samuel. "The Issues Involved." The Community School. Edited by Samuel Everett. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Gardner, John W. Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Garr, William G. Community Life in a Democracy. Washington: National Council of Parents and Teachers, 1942.

Goslin, Willard E. Organizing the Elementary School for Living and Learning. Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: ASCD of the National Education Association, 1947.

Hart, Joseph K. The Discovery of Intelligence. New York: The Century Company, 1924.

Havelock, Ronald G. A Guide to Innovation Diffusion. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1970.

_____. Innovations in Education: Strategies and Tactics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1971.

_____. Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1969.

_____; Huber, J. C.; and Zimmerman, S. A Guide to Innovation in Education. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1969.

Horton, Myles. "The Community Folk School." The Community School. Edited by Samuel Everett. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1953.

Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

LeTarte, Clyde, and Minzey, Jack D. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972.

Lewin, Kurt. "Group Decision and Social Change." Readings in Social Psychology. Edited by G. E. Swanson. New York: Holt Publishing, 1952.

Likert, Rensis. "The Principle of Supportive Relationships." Organization Theory. Edited by D. S. Pugh. London: Cox and Lyman Ltd., 1971.

Lindquist, E. Design and Analysis of Experiments. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.

Lippitt, Ronald; Watson, Jeanne; and Westley, Bruce. The Dynamics of Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1958.

Maslow, A. H. "The Process of Becoming." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Edited by A. W. Combs. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1962.

_____. "Some Basic Propositions of a Growth and Self-Actualization Psychology." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Edited by A. W. Combs. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1962.

Melby, Ernest O. "An Education-Centered Community." The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective. Edited by Edward G. Olsen. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Miles, Mathew B. "Innovations in Education: Some Generalizations." Innovations in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

_____, and Lake, D. "Self-Renewal in School Systems: A Strategy for Planned Change." Concepts for Social Change. Edited by G. Watson. Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1967.

Moser, C. A. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. London: Heinemann Educational Books Limited, 1958.

National Education Association. "Bill of Rights for American Education." The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective. Edited by Edward G. Olsen. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

Nisbet, Robert A. The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1967.

Olsen, Edward G. School and Community. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Process of Becoming." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Edited by A. W. Combs. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1962.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovation. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

_____, and Shoemaker, F. L. Communication of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Seay, Maurice F. "The Community School: New Meaning for an Old Term." The Community School. Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1953.

_____. "Two Distinctive Emphases." Forty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Selltiz, Claire. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Stout, Dorman G. "Community Is a Social Unit." The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective. Edited by Edward G. Olsen. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Totten, W. Fred, and Manley, Frank J. The Community School: Basic Concepts, Function and Organization. Galien, Michigan: Allied Educational Council, 1969.

Watson, Goodwin. "Toward a Conceptual Architecture of a Self-Renewing School System." Change in School Systems. Edited by Goodwin Watson. Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1967.

Yeager, William A. Home-School-Community Relations. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1939.

Periodicals

Anton, Thomas J. "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics." Administrative Science Quarterly 7 (March 1963): 425-57.

Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." American Institute of Planners Journal 34 (July 1969): 216-24.

Boek, Walter. "Field Techniques in Delineating the Structure of Community Leadership." Human Organization 4 (Winter 1965): 358-64.

Boneau, C. "The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the t Test." Psychological Bulletin 57 (January 1960): 49-64.

Bonjean, Charles M., and Olsen, D. M. "Community Leadership: Directions of Research." Administrative Science Quarterly 9 (December 1964): 278-300.

Carrillo, Tony S., and Heaton, Israel C. "Strategies for Establishing a Community Education Program." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 165-67.

Carver, Fred D., and Crowe, Donald O. "An Interdisciplinary Framework for the Study of Community Power." Educational Administration Quarterly 5 (Winter 1969): 50-64.

Clark, Terry. "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities." American Sociological Review 33 (August 1968): 576-93.

Gores, Harold B. "The Schoolhouse of the Future." The National Elementary Principal 52 (September 1972): 8-14.

Hillary, George A. "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." Rural Sociology 20 (June 1955): 111-23.

Hughes, Larry W. "Know Your Power Structure." The American School Board Journal 154 (May 1967): 33-35.

Longstreth, James W. "Knowing Who's Who in 'Power Structure' Can Pay Dividends." The American School Board Journal 153 (August 1966): 10-11.

McCarthy, Donald J., and Ramsey, Charles E. "Community Power, School Board Structure and the Role of the Chief School Administrator." Educational Administration Quarterly 4 (Spring 1968): 18-26.

Minzey, Jack. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 150-53.

_____. "Community Education--Another Perception." Community Education Journal 4 (May-June 1974): 7-61.

Nashlund, Robert A. "The Impact of the Power Age on the Community School Concept." The Community School. The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Olsen, Edward G. "City, Suburb, and Education." The Community School and Its Administration 8 (April 1970): 1-4.

Polsby, Nelson W. "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative." The Journal of Politics 22 (August 1960): 474-85.

Preston, James D. "The Search for Community Leaders: A Re-examination of the Reputational Technique." Sociological Inquiry 39 (Winter 1969): 39-48.

Scanlon, David. "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education." Community Education, Principles and Practices From Worldwide Experience. Fifty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Scheffé, H. "A Method for Judging All Contrasts in the Analysis of Variance." Biometrika 40 (June 1953): 83-91.

Shaw, Archibald B., and Reid, John Lyon. "The Random Falls Idea: A Proposed Educational Program and Plant for Youth and Community Growth." The School Executive 75 (March 1956): 47-86.

VanVorhees, Curtis. "Community Education Needs Research for Survival." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 203-205.

Walton, John. "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure." American Journal of Sociology 76 (January 1971): 430-38.

Webber, Melvin M. "The Post City Age." Daedalus 97 (Fall 1968): 1091-1110.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. "Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power." American Sociological Review 25 (October 1960): 636-44.

Yourman, Julius. "Community Coordination: The Next Movement in Education." Journal of Educational Sociology 9 (February 1936): 327-30.

Special Publications

Jain, Nemi C., and Rogers, Everett M. "Needed Research on Diffusion Within Educational Organization." Research Implications for Educational Diffusion. Major papers presented at the National Conference on Diffusion. East Lansing, Michigan, March 1968.

Miller, Richard I. "Implications for Practice From Research on Educational Change." Research Implications for Educational Diffusion. Major papers presented at the National Conference on Diffusion. East Lansing, Michigan, March 1968.

Rogers, Everett M., and Svenning, Lynne. Managing Change. Operation PEP. San Mateo, California: San Mateo Board of Education, 1969.

Unpublished Works

Solberg, James R. "The Evolution and Implementation of the Community School Concept." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.