

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND THE CONGRUENCE OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD COMMUNITY EDUCATION

By

John Ambrose Fallon

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of the study was to determine whether there is a significant relationship between selected demographic variables of elementary community school directors and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Methodology

The design of this study, which was descriptive and comparative in nature, sought to provide a measure of two interrelated phenomena including:

- (1) the general evaluative nature of Black parent attitudes toward community education;
- (2) the congruence of elementary community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The operationalization of the study in the elementary school-communities of one public school district in Michigan represents an effort to control external validity, interaction, and related variables.

For purposes of data collection, three instruments were developed and utilized. The What Do You Think About Your Community Schools attitude scale provided an assessment of Black parent attitudes toward community education. An adaptation of the parental instrument, the Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes scale, was used to measure the perceptivity of community school directors in relation to Black parent attitudes. The Community School Directors' Demographic Data Form provided essential personal-qualitative data for establishing the independent variable tested.

The data gathered on 339 Black parents and 30 community school directors were coded according to respective school-community, transformed onto data-processing cards, and statistically analyzed by programs of multivariate, univariate, and regression analysis. All computational analyses were performed on the CDC 3600 Computer System at Michigan State University

Major Findings

Hypothesis 1. Age was not a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors

have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 2. The variable of race was not influential in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 3. Academic degree status was not a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 4. Job level was a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. It was found that teaching community school directors exhibited significantly more congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes than did released community school directors.

Hypothesis 5. Job location was not an essential variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 6. Contradictory evidence prohibits the declaration of years of experience as a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. However, there

appears to be a relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions.

Hypothesis 7. Residential background was not an influential variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8. Father's occupational status was not an essential variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 9. Geographic location of rearing, while exhibiting somewhat of a relationship, cannot be regarded as a key variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. Inconclusiveness of the evidence does not permit a declaration of variable significance.

In addition, evidence in the data suggests that Black parent attitudes toward community education are relatively positive and the perceptions of community school directors are reasonably congruent.

Implications and Recommendations

While being limited and modest in scope, the findings of this study have significant implications for several groups of individuals in particular: school

district administrators, community school principals, directors, teachers, and community development agents. If interpersonal perceptions and their behavioral consequences are considered to be important, all efforts to determine those factors and forces which affect congruent perceptions should be extended.

The following implications and recommendations are derived from the findings of the study.

1. Structural differentiations of the position of community school director should be continuously and extensively evaluated. While most evaluation in education is concerned with personnel or clientele, there exists a need for determining the parameters of position effectiveness. In addition, alternative positional structures relating to the leadership and administrative function in community education should be experimentally developed, practiced, and accordingly employed.
2. This study seems to reaffirm the long established assumption that there exists somewhat of a relationship between years of experience and occupational effectiveness. The fact that perception congruence increases concomitantly with years of experience is more than coincidental. Considering this finding, a concerted effort

should be extended by personnel officials to employ experienced community school directors in school communities which have been characterized by community disapproval regarding the school and minimal school-community interaction.

3. Personnel officials should give consideration to the demographic variables of father's occupational status and geographical location of rearing when screening and selecting prospective community school directors for positions in school communities which have a minority population. Such information, as implied in the findings of this study, could serve as indicators of perceptivity in relation to Black parent attitudes toward the school. Implicit in this recommendation is the fact that some prospective community school directors are not equipped or prepared to work in minority communities.
4. ¹¹⁶ (There should be continuous assessment of ~~community parent attitudes toward community education.~~ Survey techniques and instrumentation methods, including those applied in the present study, should be employed periodically for purposes of determining the general community school approval-disapproval concerning various

aspects of the community education process. Such information will indicate areas of strength and weakness and provide community educators with an empirical base for operation and decision making.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Replicate the present study in one year in Flint, Michigan to determine the stability of both Black parent attitudes toward community education and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of those attitudes.
2. Replicate the present study in another urban school district which employs the concept of community education. Further research would not only provide a guide for understanding community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education in another setting, but would test the credibility and generalizability of the findings in the present study.
3. Develop an in-depth study, based upon the present review of the literature and results, to determine the effects of in-service education, workshops, seminars, colloquia, academic courses, and home visitations upon the nature and

congruence of interpersonal leadership perceptions. Utilization of the One Group Pretest-Posttest Design¹ would, perhaps, serve to identify treatment measures which positively affect perception congruence and, thus, interpersonal behavior.

4. Develop a study designed to provide further knowledge concerning the focus of Black parent attitudes toward community education or education in general. Perhaps by determining those factors or aspects of education which significantly contribute to such attitude formation and development, a clearer understanding of the behavioral consequences can be derived.
5. Develop a case study examining the importance of understanding community attitudes toward education and their implications for educational administrators. As the role of the community in American education becomes more widespread and critical, such information should prove invaluable.
6. Develop a study designed to specifically determine the relationship between community school director years of experience and positional competence.

¹Donald T. Stanley and Julian C. Campbell, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), p. 8.

Such a study could have implications for the hiring of community school directors and provide insight into the widespread assumption that experience determines effectiveness.

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND THE CONGRUENCE OF
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF BLACK PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD
COMMUNITY EDUCATION

By

John Ambrose Fallon

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration and
Higher Education

1973

6-1-2005

DEDICATION

This thesis is respectfully and lovingly dedicated to my dearest wife, Pat, and son, Brent Damon; your encouragement and devotion "semper et ubique" made completion of this manuscript a reality. Your immeasurable sacrifice shall not go without reward.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with deepest appreciation that I acknowledge the direction, assistance, and most significantly the fellowship provided by Dr. Howard Hickey, who served as chairman of this study. His expert guidance and persistent encouragement gave greater meaning to a difficult task.

Sincere appreciation is also extended to Dr. Albert Levak for his generous editorial assistance and Dr. Dale Alam for support whenever needed. As active committee members, these gentlemen served "par excellance."

A special expression of gratitude is extended to Dr. Clyde Campbell, who so ably guided the past year of internship study and provided an exemplary model for personal development.

For the invaluable assistance in matters of research analysis and design, I wish to thank Robert Carr of the Research Consultation Office of the College of Education.

The National Center for Community Education and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation deserve special

acknowledgment for providing the unique kaleidoscope of internship experiences and financial assistance for study. In addition, the cooperation and willingness to be researched exhibited by the Flint Community Schools and the Black community of Flint is appreciated.

Additionally, to the Michigan State University National Center for Community Education Fellows, I am indebted for the opportunity to grow both personally and professionally through our collective activity.

Finally, and above all, I most appreciatively thank my wife, Pat, whose tolerance and fortitude are second to none, and son, Brent, who assisted in his own special way. Their hope and faith in me were truly inspirational.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Importance of the Study	7
Hypotheses of the Study	12
Assumptions	14
Design of the Study.	15
Population.	15
Sample	15
Procedure	16
Definition of Terms.	17
Limitations of the Study	20
Organization of the Thesis	21
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	22
Introduction	22
Perception and Perceptual Psychology	23
Attitude	37
Attitude Measurement	47
Community Education.	50
Community Education and the Community School	50
The Community School Director	60
Summary	69
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	71
Introduction	71
The Research Setting	72
Flint, Michigan	72
The Flint Community Schools	73

Chapter	Page
The Population and Sample Selection . . .	75
Population	75
Sample.	76
Statement of Testable Hypotheses . . .	79
Instrumentation.	80
Administration of the Surveys	87
Research Method and Data Analysis	
Technique.	89
Summary	90
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	91
Introduction.	91
Hypothesis 1.	94
Hypothesis 2.	101
Hypothesis 3.	103
Hypothesis 4.	106
Hypothesis 5.	108
Hypothesis 6.	111
Hypothesis 7.	115
Hypothesis 8.	119
Hypothesis 9.	121
Grand Means	124
Summary	127
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	130
Introduction.	130
Summary	130
Purpose of the Study	130
Limitations of the Study.	131
Review of the Literature.	131
Design of the Study	133
Findings of the Study.	134
Hypothesis 1.	134
Hypothesis 2.	135
Hypothesis 3.	135
Hypothesis 4.	136
Hypothesis 5.	136
Hypothesis 6.	137

Chapter	Page
Hypothesis 7.	138
Hypothesis 8.	138
Hypothesis 9.	139
Further Findings	139
Conclusions	140
Hypothesis 1.	140
Hypothesis 2.	140
Hypothesis 3.	141
Hypothesis 4.	141
Hypothesis 5.	141
Hypothesis 6.	141
Hypothesis 7.	142
Hypothesis 8.	142
Hypothesis 9.	142
Implications and Recommendations	143
Recommendations for Further Study.	145
Reflections	147
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	150
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. Community Attitude Survey Instructions	159
B. Memo Re: Community Attitude Survey	160
C. Letter Regarding Survey Instrument Distri- bution to Community School Directors.	161
D. Survey: What Do You Think About Your Community School	162
E. Survey: Community School Directors' Per- ceptions of Black Parent Attitudes	165
F. Community School Demographic Data Form	168
G. Community School Director I, II, III.	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3-1. Number of Black Parents and Community School Directors Comprising Samples	78
3-2. Parent Attitudes Toward Community Education .	84
4-1. Distribution of Community School Directors According to Demographic Variables . . .	92
4-2. Distribution of Parent and Community School Director Means and Perception Discrepancies Concerning General Community School Approval-Disapproval	95
4-3. Distribution of Parent and Community School Director Means and Perception Discrepancies Concerning Community School Program and Curriculum	96
4-4. Distribution of Parent and Community School Director Means and Perception Discrepancies Concerning Community School Staff and Personnel	97
4-5. Distribution of Parent and Community School Director Means and Perception Discrepancies Concerning Community School Buildings and Facilities	98
4-6. Distribution of Parent and Community School Director Means and Perception Discrepancies Concerning School-Community Interaction	99
4-7. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Age (N = 30)	101
4-8. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Age (N = 29)	101

Table	Page
4-9. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Age Concerning the Dependent Variables (N = 30)	102
4-10. Standardized Regression Coefficients of Community School Directors' Age and Perception Discrepancy Concerning the Dependent Variables (N = 30)	102
4-11. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Race Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables	104
4-12. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Two Community School Director Race Groups	104
4-13. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Two Community School Director Race Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables	105
4-14. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Two Community School Director Academic Degree Groups	106
4-15. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Academic Degree Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables	107
4-16. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Two Community School Director Academic Degree Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables.	107
4-17. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Two Community School Director Job Level Groups	109
4-18. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Job Level Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables.	109

Table	Page
4-19. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Two Community School Director Job Level Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables . . .	110
4-20. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Three Community School Director Job Location Groups	111
4-21. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Job Location Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables .	112
4-22. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Three Community School Director Job Location Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables	112
4-23. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Years of Experience (N = 30)	114
4-24. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Years of Experience (N = 29)	114
4-25. Standardized Regression Coefficients of Community School Directors' Years of Experience and Perception Discrepancy Concerning Dependent Variables (N = 30) . . .	114
4-26. Standardized Regression Coefficients of Community School Directors' Years of Experience and Perception Discrepancy Concerning Dependent Variables (N = 29) . . .	114
4-27. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Years of Experience Concerning Dependent Variables (N = 30) . .	116
4-28. Test of Hypothesis of No Association Between Community School Directors' Perception Discrepancy and Years of Experience Concerning Dependent Variables (N = 29) . .	117

Table	Page
4-29. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Three Community School Director Residential Background Groups	118
4-30. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Three Community School Director Residential Background Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables	118
4-31. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Residential Background Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables	119
4-32. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Four Community School Director Father's Occupational Status Groups	120
4-33. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Four Community School Director Father's Occupational Status Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables	121
4-34. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Father's Occupational Status Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables	122
4-35. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Five Community School Director Geographical Location of Rearing Groups . . .	123
4-36. Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors for Differences in Perception Discrepancy of Three Community School Director Geographical Location of Rearing Groups . . .	124
4-37. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Group Perception Discrepancy Means for Five Community School Director Geographical Location of Rearing Groups in Relation to Dependent Variables	125

Table	Page
4-38. Mean Perception Discrepancy Scores of Community School Director Geographical Location of Rearing Groupings Concerning Dependent Variables	126
4-39. Grand Means of Community School Director Perceptions and Black Parent Attitudes Toward Community Education Concerning Instrument Subscales.	127
4-40. Grand Means of Community School Director Perceptions and Black Parent Attitudes Toward Community Education	128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In many communities throughout the nation, education has been suffering from an increasing enormity of criticism. Public disenchantment, manifest in issues of community control, decentralization, accountability, social sensitivity, and community responsiveness have become festered to the point of inquiry and confrontation. There exists a challenging mandate for an education founded in relevance--relevance not only in terms of long-range objectives for youngsters, but also, for all citizens within the community. Accompanying this evolutionary American consciousness has developed a volatile atmosphere for educational change.

Recently, as "the first value choice of modern man," education is being beckoned to assume a greater responsibility for improving local communities.¹ Social problems exacerbated by a society growing more complex

¹Peter R. Drucker, Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 311.

have generated an emphasis upon the importance of school-community cooperation. Writings and studies by Doll,² Campbell and Gregg,³ and Seay⁴ reaffirm this urgency.

Thus, according to James B. Conant:

The nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore, to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreck havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable.⁵

The educational realization of the fact that the schools cannot remain independent from the community has given birth to the concept of community education. Inherent in the rationale of community education is a new direction for community self-actualization through school-community consensus regarding the role of the school. As a catalytic agent for community betterment

²Ronald Doll, Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964), p. 62.

³Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 200.

⁴Maurice Seay, The Community School and Community Self-Improvement (Lansing, Mich.: Office of Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954).

⁵James B. Conant, "Community and School Are Inseparable," in The School and Community Reader (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963), p. 53.

and problem solving, the school serves the community with extended services including adult education, student enrichment, job upgrading and retraining, health services, recreation, cultural activities, and senior citizen programs. The major objective is: " . . . to mobilize the human and institutional resources of a community in such a fashion that people of all classes and creeds are given necessary encouragement and opportunity to a better life, and local institutions become genuinely responsive to human needs and wants."⁶

Creative leadership at the school-community nexus is requisite to constructive reciprocal involvement. Of central importance to the successful development of the community education concept is the community school director, an administrative position common to most community schools.

Success of the community education program is dependent upon intelligent and dedicated leaders. Aside from formal administrative heads, these leaders today are the community school building-directors, especially trained for their work.⁷

Because the position of community school director is administrative in nature and requires sensitivity to peoples' needs and desires, an intimate knowledge of the

⁶Peter L. Clancy, The Flint Community School Concept (Brochure distributed by the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, 1969), p. 2.

⁷Leo E. Buehring, "New Patterns--Community Schools," Nations Schools, LXI (1958), 37.

community is imperative. A departure from the traditional approach, the educative community is limited only by the consensual perception of the director. "Superficial or inconsistent knowledge of the community is inadequate."⁸

Bullock, in studies of school district superintendents in Ohio, concludes that "survival and, most significantly, personal-positional power are contingent upon the administrator's perception of the community."⁹ The idealistic job of educating all of the people depends on power to maintain the educational organization, set the direction, and establish a climate conducive to change and adaptation. Consequently, perceptive precision is directly related to administrative effectiveness.

Daniel Griffiths elaborates on the issue of perceptual accuracy:

We should keep in mind when working with the community, just as when working with the faculty or any other group, that it is necessary to have accurate perception. One must know the group he is to work with. This means that the school

⁸American Association of School Administrators, Judging Schools With Wisdom (Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1959), p. 3.

⁹Robert P. Bullock, School-Community Attitude Analysis for Educational Administrators (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1959), pp. 2-3.

administrator should know the facts about his community, as well as the feelings and opinions of the community.¹⁰

In relation to decision making, Combs explains:

A broader, more accurate perception of the world permits adequate persons to behave more decisively. Decisions can be made with more certainty when one feels he is in command of the data and feels sufficiently sure of self to be unafraid to commit himself to action. Decisions made on the basis of more data are likely to be better.¹¹

Perception and its importance are not isolated or confined to only certain facets of administrative behavior. The school administrator's professional behavior, as verified in research by Campbell and Gregg, is "inexorably mediated through his perceptions."¹² In agreement, Combs corroborates:

The perceptual view of human behavior holds that the behavior of an individual is a function of his perceiving. That is to say, how any person behaves at a given moment is a direct expression of the way things seem to him at that moment.¹³

Despite the significance of accurate perceptual community assessments, a recent study by Milgram and Hill

¹⁰Daniel Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), p. 291.

¹¹Arthur W. Combs, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962), p. 57.

¹²Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., p. 178.

¹³Combs, op. cit., p. 67.

indicates that "school administrators ranked 'least accurate' in comparison with board members, teachers, and parents in perceiving community approval of new curriculum offerings."¹⁴ Implicit in the study's findings is the assumption that educational decisions may be inaccurately based on faulty perceptions, thus, resulting in the increased likelihood of misunderstanding, dispute, and conflict.

Research on intergroup relations indicates that majority group perceptions of minorities are largely incongruent and strongly influenced by stereotypic thinking and lack of communication.¹⁵ Also, school unawareness of the psycho-social circumstances inherent in minority group membership has led to contraindicated educational programs which have alienated minority citizens.¹⁶ Critics of education, while regarding no facet of the system immune from their charges, frequently indict administrators as responsible for both originating the

¹⁴Research Notes, Phi Delta Kappan, LIV, No. 1 (September, 1972), 63.

¹⁵John P. Dean and Alex Rosen, A Manual of Intergroup Relations (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 7.

¹⁶Robert A. Dentler, Bernard Mackler, and Mary E. Warshauer, The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Company, 1967), pp. ix-x.

current state of affairs and its rectification. With respect to education and minority communities, Dean and Rosen conclude: "Majority group leaders sensitized to problems of communication across racial lines realize that only by understanding the life history of the minority person and his range of psychological reactions to minority status, then can they develop effective working relationships."¹⁷

Schools are a major instrument of socialization for communities as well as the students they serve. Therefore, educational administrators on all levels must begin to evaluate their perceptions of the school-community for purposes of constructive leadership toward educational change.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study is to determine if there exists a significant relationship between selected demographic variables of elementary community school directors and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Importance of the Study

The need for research on administrative perceptions of community attitudes can best be illustrated by the dichotomous relationship between educational

¹⁷Dean and Rosen, op. cit., p. 36.

philosophy and practice. Although it is almost universally agreed that education can best be accomplished with the understanding of community attitudes toward schools, administrators have continued to direct their attention to internal conditions. According to Thompson: "My personal belief is that we tend to stress internal relations and structures to the point where we fail to see the significance of external relations or the interaction between internal and external activities."¹⁸

In spite of the advice of Harold C. Hand stressing that schools can be effective "only to the degree to which they continuously increase their knowledge of the attitudes with which they are confronted,"¹⁹ few studies have been conducted to determine the congruence with which community attitudes are perceived by educators.

Attitudes have been defined in many ways. According to Stern, there seem to be four general points of agreement.

1. Attitudes are socially formed. They are based on cultural experience and training and are revealed in cultural products. The study of life history data reveals the state of mind of the individual and of the social group from which he derives, concerning the values of the society in which he lives.

¹⁸James Thompson, Administrative Theory in Education, ed. by Andrew W. Halpin (New York: Collier-Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 37.

¹⁹Harold C. Hand, What People Think About Their Schools (New York: World Book Company, 1945), p. 2.

2. Attitudes are orientations toward others and toward objects.
3. Attitudes are selective. They provide for discrimination between alternative courses of action and introduce consistency of response in social situations of an otherwise diverse nature.
4. Attitudes reflect a disposition to an activity, not a verbalization. They are organizations of incipient activities, of actions not necessarily completed, and represent, therefore, the underlying dispositional or motivational urge.²⁰

These four definitions form a basis for understanding the nature of attitudes. Even though measurement of community attitudes is difficult, much of community citizens' behavior and actions can be defined in terms of these four ideas. It is evident that attitudes are socially formed, oriented toward objects, selective, and reflected in actions.

Unfortunately, the problem of attitude perception measurement is multi-faceted and situational. Nevertheless, Ramsayer asserts that "public school leaders must be aware of changes in thought and opinion which are antecedent to or accompanying institutional change if they are to meet the challenge of changing times."²¹

Basic to this study is the belief that administrative awareness of community attitudes concerning the

²⁰George Stern, "Measurement of Non-Cognitive Variables in Research on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963), p. 404.

²¹Bullock, op. cit., "Foreword" by John A. Ramsayer.

school, its program, and its personnel is significantly related to learning. Thus, a relevant school program must have a firm basis in home-school-community relationships. Campbell, in an argument postulating parental attitudes toward the school as influential determinants of childrens' academic motivation, states:

Indeed how fathers and mothers feel about a school can determine a youngster's success in school. If both parents and youngsters go through sieges of agonies and doubts over a long period of time then little learning is likely to occur.²²

With its foundation in community sensitivity, the increased development of community education on a national scale has intensified and specified the need for studying the concept and related areas. Within the past five years, largely attributed to the efforts of regional university centers for community education development, there has been a threefold expansion of school districts involved in community education. " . . . in 1968 there were 231 community education programs operating in the United States. As of June 1972 over 600 programs were initiated with prospects for 1500 by 1978."²³

Phenomenal expansion of the community education concept as a social force in modern education accompanied

²²Clyde M. Campbell, The Community School and Its Administration, XI, No. 2 (October, 1972).

²³Nick Pappadakis, Executive Director, National Community School Education Association, Interview, November 7, 1972.

by a limited and random research effort in the field has emphasized the need for a coordinated research endeavor and a master design. In 1971, an attempt to identify and disseminate research tasks was undertaken at the Institute for Community Education Development at Ball State University. This initial Research Symposium in Community Education focalized on current problems, as experienced by practitioners, and attempted to coordinate a master plan for research development. The Symposium, which was endorsed and funded by the Sears Foundation and the National Community School Education Association, has clearly delineated a comprehensive listing of specific research needs.

The research problem undertaken in this study has been identified by the Symposium as having "an impact on community school director selection, as well as future program development,"²⁴ Of importance is the fact that community education programs are uniquely heterogeneous and reflective of specific rural, suburban, and urban community characteristics.

In urban centers, the initial developmental process of community education " . . . invariably takes place in elementary school communities with substantial

²⁴Institute for Community Education Development, Needed Research in Community Education (Muncie, Ind.: Ball State University, 1971), pp. 12-13.

minority populations."²⁵ This phenomenon has emerged as a trend, even though it is based on local discretion.

Moreover, the majority of programs being implemented are based on the national demonstration and observation center for community education in Flint, Michigan. Fittingly, Flint as the research setting represents a microcosm of urban America.

In summary, tenets which fashion the need for this study are seen as having significant and important implications for those who are concerned with the nature of human communication, the improvement of selection of community education administrators, and the general development of community education.

Hypotheses of the Study

The major objective of this study is to determine whether there is a significant relationship between selected demographic variables of elementary community school directors and the congruence of their perceptions of minority parents' attitudes toward community education. The following hypotheses will be investigated:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant relationship between age and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

²⁵Dr. Curtis Van Voorhees, Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Interview, November 3, 1972.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant relationship between race and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant relationship between academic degree held and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant relationship between job level and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant relationship between job location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no significant relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 7:

There is no significant relationship between residential background and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8:

There is no significant relationship between father's occupational status and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 9:

There is no significant relationship between geographic location of rearing and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Assumptions

The basic assumptions of the study include:

1. Community school directors are genuinely concerned with social sensitivity as it relates to community betterment and problem solving.
2. Community school directors and sample minority parents are truthful in their responses.
3. Community school directors are interested in evaluating and upgrading their social skills.
4. The development of the concept of community education depends upon research specifically designed to further knowledge in the field, evaluate existing practices and principles, and set a direction for the future based in empiricism.

5. Community school directors, by virtue of their job structure and responsibility, are reasonably cognizant of Black parent attitudes toward community education.
6. Black parents have relatively positive attitudes toward community education.

Design of the Study

The study was designed to analyze the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Population

The population of the study consisted of parents and community school directors of thirty elementary school-communities in Flint, Michigan.

Sample

Included in the study sample are 30 community school directors employed in elementary schools in Flint, Michigan and 450 randomly selected Black parents, representing 30 elementary school-communities within the city school district.

The Black parents were randomly selected from school records with assistance from school district officials. Participation on the part of all citizens and community school directors was voluntary.

Procedure

By design, the study will be descriptive and comparative in nature. A questionnaire was developed by the researcher to determine Black parent attitudes toward community education based on a review of the literature, consultation with the Research Office of the College of Education at Michigan State University, and technical assistance from advisers.

The attitude questionnaire, with minimal modifications, was utilized to assess the community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

As a supplement to the attitude and perception questionnaires, a structured demographic questionnaire was used to collect data pertinent to establishing the independent variables tested.* The study is designed to determine whether the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of minority parent attitudes toward community education is significantly affected by selected demographic variables.

After the respondents were selected, the parent questionnaires were delivered by school personnel along with a note of explanation. At this time provisions for

*The specific elements of community school director demography selected for investigation in this study were established on the basis of previous and similar types of research, the review of the literature, and the practical experience of the researcher.

questionnaire collection were negotiated. Efforts to assure respondent anonymity were extended. Community school director questionnaires were administered by the researcher at a meeting of elementary community school administrators and retrieved immediately.

After Black parent attitudes toward community education were assessed for each school-community, an analysis of variance technique and regression analysis were utilized to determine the congruence of respective community school director perceptions of Black parent attitudes. Specific demographic variable categories within each hypothesis will be determined and serve as a basis for analytical grouping.

Definition of Terms

In order to avoid semantic confusion, the following terms will be defined.

Attitude.--refers to an "emotional stereotype. A generalized reaction for or against a specific psychological object."²⁶

²⁶L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitude (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929), p. 6.

Perception.--"an awareness of the environment gained through direct or intuitive cognition. Behavior is viewed as a function of perception."²⁷

Demographic Variables.--are "specific personal qualitative aspects characteristic of individuals."²⁸

Community School Director.--

. . . designates the actor who occupies the professional staff position in each Flint school responsible for the supervision, organization, and administration of the after-school, evening, and week-end portions of the community education program. The most universal title, although a variety of other titles are applied to the position in the theoretical and descriptive literature.²⁹

Congruence.--refers to the accuracy with which community school directors perceive Black parent attitudes.

Community School.--refers to the vehicle most commonly designated for the implementation of the community education process.

²⁷Combs, op. cit., p. 50.

²⁸Peter R. Cox, Demography (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 1.

²⁹Fermin Keith Blue, "The Flint Community School Director" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 2.

Minority (Black) Parents.--designates the Black adult legally responsible for a child or children attending an elementary school in Flint, Michigan.

Job Level.--refers to the structural differentiation of the position of community school director. Level I applies to a director with classroom teaching responsibilities as part of his appointment. Level II applies to a director who devotes full time to the duties of community school director.

School-Community.--identifies the geographical area which includes residences of all school enrollees within the designated school boundaries.

Social Sensitivity.--refers to an interest, understanding, and awareness of ethnic and racial characteristics of a school-community.

Community Education.--specifies the process by which residents of a school-community are involved in democratically determining their needs and desires, planning activities and programs designed to meet expressed needs and desires, and utilizing the school as a catalytic agent to develop reciprocally constructive school-community relationships. Community betterment and problem solving are the ultimate concerns of community education.

c

d

c

e

c

d

t

a

t

W

a

Job Location.--denotes the racial composition of the school-community in which a community school director is located for employment purposes. Categories of job location include (1) mostly Black, (2) roughly equal Black and White, and (3) mostly White.

Residential Background.--refers to the type of community in which community school directors resided during rearing such as urban, suburban, and rural.

Geographical Location of Rearing.--designates the geographical region of the United States from which a community school director originates. Categories for the variable of geographical location of rearing include Northeast, Southeast, Mid-South, Mid-West, Southwest, and Northwest.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study include:

1. The data collected are based on only one specific geographical location.
2. The study is concerned only with elementary school community education.
3. The study is concerned only with the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

No attempt is made to evaluate effectiveness of community education in terms of structure or outcome. No attempt is made to postulate ideal Black parent attitudes.

4. The description of leadership perceptions and Black parent attitudes is to be taken within the local context in which the research is undertaken.
5. The biases of the researcher and respondents must be considered.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis will be organized as follows:

Chapter I presents the rationale for the study, statement of the problem, hypotheses to be investigated, limitations of the study, terms pertinent to the study, the research design, and an overview of the thesis.

Chapter II presents a selected review of the literature.

Chapter III presents the research methodology and further description of the research design.

Chapter IV presents the data obtained and data analysis.

Chapter V includes a summary of the results, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this review of the related literature is to present a theoretical and philosophical background for the study and, consequently, a conceptual framework for examination of the data. This review is limited to only essential information pertinent to clarification of the investigation and includes three major topics: perception and perceptual psychology, "attitude," and community education.

The section on perception and perceptual psychology examines the definition and development of this theory, its importance in understanding interpersonal behavior, the concept of perceptual organization, and research concerned with perception in the helping professions.

The "attitude" section considers the historical perspectives of the construct, its characteristics and psychological dimensions, and a succinct review of attitude measurement.

inc

ana

sis

def

rol

nat

Res

and

a

th

li

pe

to

no

na

th

a

na

th

ne

sp

The review of community education literature includes two interrelated foci. First, an historical analysis of community education development is considered, which serves as a base for discussion of its definition, philosophy, and functions. Secondly, the role of the professional leadership position in community education is explored in a functional context. Research on community school director role expectations and perceived leadership effectiveness is included as a supplement.

Perception and Perceptual Psychology

To understand the most basic tenets advanced in this study, it becomes imperative to examine the literature under the rubric of phenomenological or perceptual psychology. Although this perceptual approach to the explanation of human behavior is relatively modern, its effect on the general art of administration has been profound. Moreover, the emergent contemporary theories of educational administration clearly indicate a scholarly respect for the perceptual point of view.

The fundamental thesis of perceptual psychology maintains that the overt behavior of an individual is the result of his perceptions of himself, his environment, and others at the moment of action. Combs, in specifically defining perceptual psychology, asserts:

The perceptual view of human behavior holds that the behavior of an individual is the function of his ways of perceiving. That is to say that how any person behaves at a given moment is a direct expression of the way things seem to him at that moment. People do not behave according to the facts as they seem to an outsider. How each of us behaves at any moment is a result of how things seem to us. What a person does, what a person learns is, thus, a product of what is going on in his unique and personal field of awareness. People behave in terms of the personal meanings existing for them at the moment of action.³⁰

The theory of perceptual psychology has been significantly advanced by the efforts of Adelbert Ames at Princeton University. In his classic demonstrations of physical perception, Ames concluded that (1) what is perceived is not what exists, but what one believes exists, and (2) what is perceived is what we have learned to perceive as a result of past opportunities and experiences.³¹ The importance of these findings has been, subsequently, reaffirmed by many social psychologists. For example, research by Proshansky, Lewin, Bruner and Goodman, McClelland and Atkinson, and Pepitone is based on the general assumption that overt forms of behavior are steered by individual perceptions of the environment.³²

³⁰ Arthur W. Combs, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962), p. 67.

³¹ Hadley Cantril, The Morning Notes of Adelbert Ames (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1960).

³² Albert Pepitone, "The Determinants of Distortion in Social Perception," in Basic Studies in Social Psychology, ed. by Harold Proshansky and Bernard Seidenberg (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 71.

In addition, Daniel Griffiths subscribes to this reasoning in developing a pragmatic theory of educational administration.³³

Renowned syndicated columnist Sydney Harris creatively illustrates the findings of Ames and others in the field of social perception.

We used to think in our naive way, that the act of perception consisted of two different things; the perceiver and the thing perceived. The act of perception simply meant "seeing what was there."

Perhaps, the most important advance in the behavioral sciences in our time has been the growing recognition that the perceiver is not just a passive camera taking a picture, but takes an active part in perception. He sees what experience has conditioned him to see.

We enter a restaurant, and six persons are sitting there. What do we see beyond the mere fact that these six are human beings? Do we all see the same picture either individually or collectively?

A European will note that these six are Americans by their dress and attitudes. A woman entering the room will probably note that the six consist of two married couples, an older woman and a single man. A Southerner will see one man who could possibly be a light-skinned Negro.

A homosexual will single out one of the men as a fellow deviate. An anti-Semite will immediately label one of the couples as "Jewish." A salesman will divide the group into "prospects" and "duds." And the waiter, of course, does not see people at all, but a "station" and "food" and "drinks."

What perceiver, then, "sees what is there"? Nobody of course. Each of us perceives what our past has prepared us to perceive; we select and distinguish, we focus on some objects and relationships, and we blur others, we distort objective reality to make it conform to our needs or hopes or fears or envies or affections.

Now we have begun to learn that the behavioral sciences contain this same subjective element: that our eyes and brains do not merely register some

³³Griffiths, op. cit., pp. 47-67.

objective portrait of other persons or groups, but that our very act of seeing is warped by what we have been taught to believe, by what (in a deeper sense) we need to believe.

And this is the main reason why communication is so difficult: we are not disagreeing about the same thing, but about different things. We are not looking at the same people in the dining room, or on the picket-line, or around the conference table. How to correct this built in warp may very well be the basic, and ultimate, problem of mankind's survival.³⁴

Implicit in the theory of perceptual psychology is a highly personal and individualized view of human behavior. As opposed to the earlier mechanistic nature of stimulus-response theory, this conception is often referred to as humanistic. With an emphasis on the individual in seeking clues to behavior, Abraham Maslow describes self-actualization as "an eventuation of self-awareness and a proclivity to express one's individuality in experiences with the environment, which requires honesty, concern for others, and a sense of responsibility for behavior."³⁵ Accordingly, failure to recognize individuality is the inability to understand what is real.

Forms of things have no absolute reality. Their truth lies in our personality. The meaning of experience comes from individual personal perception. These meanings constitute a pattern

³⁴Sydney J. Harris, "We Don't See What Is There," Detroit Free Press, January 4, 1966.

³⁵Abraham H. Maslow, The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York: The Viking Press, 1970), pp. 41-50.

which is reality for the person. It is upon these perceptions of what is real that persons base their actions and decisions.³⁶

In agreement, Purkey states: "The world of the self may appear to the outsider to be subjective and hypothetical, but to the experiencing individual it has a feeling of absolute reality."³⁷

While behavior within a physical context is based upon personal perceptions of physical objects, it can be assumed that interpersonal behavior results from person perception. Of critical importance to this notion is the focus of interpersonal perception. "Indeed, when we speak of person perception or knowledge of persons, we refer mostly to the observations we make about intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, abilities, purposes, traits--events that are, so to speak, inside the person."³⁸ Newcomb supports this assumption in that "it seems to be fact that we make our most important

³⁶Clark E. Moustakas, Self (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), pp. 277-78.

³⁷W. W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 13.

³⁸Renato Taguiri and Luigi Petrullo, ed., Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. x.

judgm

Furth

perso

while

seque

the

perco

beha

foun

edge

stud

feli

to o

prov

the

infl

and

rela

as C

Beha

for

Effe

1960

judgments of others in terms of their attitudes."³⁹ Furthermore, Coleman maintains that "accurate interpersonal perceptions result in successful relationships while inaccurate perceptions produce failures."⁴⁰ Consequently, attitudes and inner traits not only provide the first and most significant point of interpersonal perception, but the most enduring as well. Interpersonal behavior, then, to be situationally appropriate must be founded in accurate perceptions of attitudes and a knowledge of self. It is upon this suggestion that the present study is based.

Although accurate perceptions are essential to felicitous behavior, there are several forces which tend to obscure them. Cultural rules or customs, for example, provide barriers to pertinent information about ourselves, the situation, and others. Such norms, in addition to influencing behavior, also negatively effect honesty and authenticity which are basic to interpersonal relationships.

1. Norms designed to protect the feelings of another person: "don't criticize if you can't provide a constructive alternative"; "don't say anything

³⁹Theodore M. Newcomb, "The Cognition of Persons as Cognizers," in Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, ed. by Renato Taguiri and Luigi Petrullo (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 180.

⁴⁰James C. Coleman, Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1960), p. 351.

2

3

4

choic

orien

as po

focus

perce

unde

seem

huma

tura

Neve

and

Murp

poin

and

John

Teac

- if you can't say anything nice"; "never talk about someone behind his back."
2. Norms designed to increase self-protection: "people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."
 3. Norms suggesting that feelings only cause trouble: "let sleeping dogs lie"; "don't stir up a hornet's nest"; "don't rock the boat"; "when ignorance is bliss, it's folly to be wise."
 4. Norms suggesting that emotions are immature and should be masked: "only sissies cry"; "keep a stiff upper lip"; "learn to take it on the chin."⁴¹

Fundamental to the discussion of perceptual psychology in analytical terms is the concept of perceptual orientation or organization. While casually referred to as point of view, this notion provides the interpretive focus of human behavior. "To understand the individual's perceptual organization," according to Combs, "is to understand his behavior. Failure to understand how things seem to other people is the most persistent flaw in normal human relationships."⁴²

Individual perceptual organizations are structurally diverse and differentiated from person to person. Nevertheless, general categories have been developed and utilized for purposes of classification. Gardner Murphy, for example, characterizes two contrasting viewpoints:

⁴¹Edgar H. Schein and Warren G. Bennis, Personality and Organizational Change Through Group Methods (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), pp. 291-92.

⁴²Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965), pp. 12-13.

. . . field-dependent perceptual persons tend to be characterized by passivity in dealing with the environment; by unfamiliarity with and fear of their own impulses, together with poor control over them; by lack of self-esteem; and by possession of a relatively primitive, undifferentiated body image.

Independent or analytical perceptual performers, in contrast, tend to be characterized by activity and independence in relation to the environment; by closer communication with, and better control over their own impulses; and by relatively high self-esteem and a more differentiated mature body image.⁴³

Thus, according to perceptual theory, one could expect behaviors commensurate with such perceptual organizations.

Despite their individually unique nature, perceptual organizations possess three important general characteristics. First, they are selective in that they reflect only a limited part of the total range of percepts available in the environment. Individuals focus attention on some external and internal stimuli more than others based upon immediate adaptive relevancy. Quite often selection occurs at the subconscious level and does not reflect behavioral awareness. Nevertheless, this natural screening process has a sensitizing effect on the individual with regard to the environment.⁴⁴

⁴³Gardner Murphy, Personality Through Perception: An Experimental and Clinical Study (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. 469.

⁴⁴Jerome S. Bruner and Leo Postman, "Tension and Tension Release as Organizing Factors in Perception," Journal of Personality, XV (1947), 300-08.

Secondly, the perceptual organization is organized into a systematic pattern of consciousness. Coleman elaborates in that,

The perceptual field is not a mass of miscellaneous information or impressions, but a coherent pattern with focal points and background. Its organization into figure and ground occurs spontaneously in perceptions; the figure we see can be changed through learning, but the tendency to structure any field into figure and ground is one of our innate integrative characteristics. We tend to see "things" rather than discrete spots of color, for example, and to focus our attention on these things rather than on the spaces between them, which become part of the ground.⁴⁵

Moreover, satisfying or threatening percepts are generally magnified in our awareness and tend to remain constant. Consequently, our perceptual organizations are not only systematically organized, but are prioritized and somewhat stable.

Third, the meaning of what is perceived lies "partly in the individual systematic pattern itself and partly from its relationship to individuals as a source of amusement, enrichment, growth, or even danger."⁴⁶ Meaningfulness derives from present interests and inclinations, as well as past experiences. In homogeneous societies, people seem to have general consensual viewpoints due to similarities in background and experiences.

⁴⁵Coleman, op. cit., pp. 187-88.

⁴⁶Jerome S. Bruner, Jacqueline J. Goodnow, and George A. Austin, A Study of Thinking (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956), p. 13.

However, as individuals have specifically different experiences, each situation or environmental stimulus may result in different meanings within the same group. Thus, personal motive patterns and frame of reference are instrumental in determining situational meanings.

While overt behavior is considered the product of an individual's perceptual organization, it is clear that perceptions which run counter to this established point of view will be largely ineffective as a behavioral catalyst. In this view, perceptions which are incongruent will not be recognized or, at best, modified. In the final analysis, behavior must be directly related to and consistent with one's beliefs.

As general assumptions, we can say that if a potentially new concept of himself appears to the individual to be consistent with and relevant to the concepts already present in his systematized view of himself, it is accepted and assimilated easily. If the concept appears to have no relevance to that system, it is generally ignored. And if it is inconsistent and uncongenial with the system, it is likely to be rejected or distorted.⁴⁷

Hamachek concurs,

By and large, people tend to behave in a manner which is consistent with what they believe to be true. In this sense, seeing is not only believing; seeing is behaving. A fact is not what is; a fact is what one believes to be true.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Purkey, op. cit., p. 13.

⁴⁸Donald E. Hamachek, Encounters With the Self (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968), p. 38.

Social psychologists have long been intrigued with the prediction of behavior. Since behavior is always determined by the individual's perceptual organization, it seems that a thorough and complete knowledge of one's vantage point would provide an accurate informational basis for prediction. Bruner and Krick state, "The prediction of behavior, particularly complex behavior, is cripplingly incomplete without an account of the perceptual field of the predictee."⁴⁹ Furthermore, by reversing this process of inference, observed behavior will disclose the nature of one's perceptual organization. "To understand the perceptions of others, we need only to learn to interpret or read behavior backwards."⁵⁰

Having operationally defined and reviewed the theory of perceptual psychology, it is appropriate that a concise discussion of its educational implications be given. Perhaps, the most valuable contribution has been a distinction and clarification of those personal qualities essential to an effective helping relationship. Combs and Snygg regard effective helpers as "adequate persons" or those capable of admitting any and all

⁴⁹ Bruner and Krick, Perceptions and Personality (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1949-50), p. v.

⁵⁰ Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, "The Perceptual View of Behavior," in Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, ed. by James C. Coleman (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1960), p. 474.

experiences and integrating these experiences into their existing self-structure. Such a person can acknowledge his experience, allow it entrance into his consideration, and relate it in some fashion to the concepts he holds of himself and the world about him.⁵¹

Maslow, similarly, describes effective or self-actualizing persons as those displaying:

1. superior perception of reality
2. increased acceptance of self, others, and nature
3. increased spontaneity
4. increase in problem centering
5. increased detachment and desire for privacy
6. increased autonomy and resistance to acculturation
7. greater freshness of appreciation and richness of emotional reaction
8. higher frequency of mystic experiences
9. increased identification with the human species
10. changed, improved interpersonal relations
11. more democratic character structure
12. greatly increased creativity
13. certain changes in the value system⁵²

Working with others demands a concern for and knowledge of people. One method for acquiring this knowledge is through self-analysis. Allport, among others, declares that "knowledge of ourselves provides the initial and, perhaps, best hints for understanding

⁵¹Arthur Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach to Behavior (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 243.

⁵²Abraham H. Maslow, "Deficiency Motivation and Growth Motivation," in Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, ed. by James C. Coleman (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1960), p. 477.

others."⁵³ The process of self-analysis also provides insights into our own strengths and weaknesses and enhances personal growth.⁵⁴

Chris Argyris equates effectiveness with authentic relationships or "those relationships in which one enhances his awareness of self and others, thus, providing for mutual acceptance."⁵⁵ Such a situation, accordingly, requires authentic leadership behavior or leadership for reality:

Reality-centered leadership is not a predetermined set of best ways to influence people. The only predisposition that is prescribed is that the leader ought to first diagnose what is reality and then to use appropriate leadership patterns. In making his diagnosis, he must keep in mind that all individuals see reality through their own set of colored glasses. The reality he sees may not be the reality seen by others in their own private world. Reality diagnosis therefore, requires self-awareness and awareness of others.⁵⁶

Research in the helping professions lends credibility to the notion that perceptual organization

⁵³Gordon W. Allport, Becoming (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 106.

⁵⁴Elwood L. Prestwood, The High School Principal and Staff Work Together (New York: New York Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1957), p. 6.

⁵⁵Chris Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, Inc.), p. 21.

⁵⁶Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 207.

determines behavior and, thus, effectiveness. Robert Rosenthal's study in student-teacher relationships confirms the degree of student success as dependent on the teacher's perceptions of individual competence.⁵⁷ Studies by Truax and Dickenson⁵⁸ and Christensen⁵⁹ discovered a direct relationship between achievement and teacher warmth, understanding, and honesty.

Combs, in extensively studying prospective school counselors, has found that effective counselors can be recognized by virtue of perceptual organization analysis.⁶⁰ In addition, studies by Dickman involving student nurses, and Gooding concerning ministers indicate that the concept

⁵⁷Robert Rosenthal, Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966).

⁵⁸C. B. Truax and W. Dickenson, "Group Counseling With College Underachievers," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (1966), 245-47.

⁵⁹C. M. Christensen, "Relationship Between Pupil Achievement, Pupil Affect-Need, Teacher Warmth and Teacher Permissiveness," Journal of Educational Psychology, XI (1960), 169.

⁶⁰Arthur Combs and Daniel Soper, "The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counselors," in Florida Studies in the Helping Professions (Gainesville, Florida: The University of Florida Press, 1969), pp. 24-27.

of perceptual organization highly correlates with effectiveness and success in any helping relationship.⁶¹

Attitude

While contemporary theories of attitude are characterized by sophistication and complexity, it is clear that their evolution was significantly influenced by much earlier simplistic notions. A brief historical analysis of the concept reveals at least three unique conceptual periods of development.

Analytical attitude research was first recorded more than 100 years ago by Herbert Spencer. The initial theory construed attitude in terms of mentalistic psychology as a subjective mental preparation for action. "Arriving at correct judgments on disputed questions, much depends on the attitude of mind we preserve while listening to, or taking part in, the controversy; and for the preservation of a right attitude it is needful that we should learn how true, and yet how untrue are average human beliefs."⁶² Implicit in this mentalistic application of attitude is the psychological "set" of an individual.

⁶¹Arthur Combs, Florida Studies in the Helping Professions (Gainesville, Florida: The University of Florida Press, 1969), pp. 28-66.

⁶²Herbert Spencer, First Principles (New York: A. L. Burt Publishers, 1862), p. i.

The 1880's brought the erosion of the mental conception in favor of a physiological or motor theory. For example, Lange, in working with telegraph key operators, discovered that "subjects consciously prepared to react would respond more quickly than those focusing on incoming stimuli."⁶³ In this view, "the process of perception was considered to be a consequence of muscular readiness."⁶⁴ Accordingly, Giddings postulated physiological attitudes as "the foundation for understanding emotional expression."⁶⁵

Modern-day scholars, although differing greatly with respect to epistemology and philosophy, consensually refrain from reference to attitude as either mental or motor. In deliberately avoiding specific labeling, and thereby a psycho-somatic quandary, current psychologists regard attitude, generally, as a "neuro-psychic state of readiness for mental and physical activity."⁶⁶

⁶³L. Lange, "Neue Experimente," Philosophical Studies, IV (1888), 472-510.

⁶⁴Carl A. Murchison, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology (New York: Clark University Press, 1935), p. 799.

⁶⁵F. H. Giddings, The Principles of Sociology (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1896), p. 108.

⁶⁶Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren, eds., Attitudes (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 16.

Even though controversy marked the evolutionary period of attitude theory development, agreement as to its importance was evident. Thomas and Znaniecki, in 1918, hypothesized that the study of attitudes was the crux of social psychology.⁶⁷ Their monumental study of Polish peasants gave systematic priority to the concept of attitude and is recognized as the catalyst in popularizing a new direction for American social psychology. Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb concur: "Perhaps no single concept within the realm of social psychology occupies a more nearly central position than that of attitudes."⁶⁸ Gordon Allport suggests the concept has become "the most distinctive and indispensable notion in contemporary social psychology."⁶⁹ Finally, Shaw and Wright recently referred to attitudes as the most important social psychological development in the past fifty years.⁷⁰

⁶⁷W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (2nd ed.; New York: Alfred E. Knopf Publishers, 1927).

⁶⁸G. Murphy, L. B. Murphy, and T. M. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology (New York: Harper and Row, 1937), p. 889.

⁶⁹Murchison, op. cit., p. 798.

⁷⁰Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1967), p. 1.

Today the construct "attitude," despite its eminence is most difficult to specifically define. The range of the term from operational to metatheoretical defies qualification without contextual support. As a result, there seem to be three sources of variance inherent in a definition of attitude. First, the question of specificity versus generality in determining behavior is a cause for incongruity. In this view, theorists such as Rokeach and Eysenck consider attitude as a generalized, nondirectional, and pervasive disposition for the individual, while others tend to make them dependent upon a specific referent or class of referents.⁷¹

Secondly, definitional variation results from a generalization of the concept to include any predisposition to respond. Social interaction, as opposed to nonsocial or physical object distinction, is critical. The overwhelming majority of researchers today subscribe to the fact that an attitude is a predisposition to react to social aspects of the environment.⁷²

A third source of variance in definition is due to the theoretical conception of an attitude's make-up. Some writers perceive attitudes as tri-dimensional in

⁷¹Ibid., p. 2.

⁷²F. Heider, The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations (New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).

na

co

an

pu

at

th

to

ve

a

se

Ci

ox

co

in

re

E

s

e

C

p

b/

S

nature consisting of an affective component, a cognitive component, and a behavioral component. Others suggest an evaluative nature preceding overt behavior.⁷³ For purposes of this study, the theoretical basis of an attitude will be interpreted as affective and evaluative; the result of the cognitive processes and an antecedent to behavior.

To illustrate the conflict of opinion and, conversely, the great breadth of meaning characteristic of a definition of attitude, it becomes necessary to examine several current conceptions. For example, Krech and Crutchfield define attitude as " . . . an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual, and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual's world";⁷⁴ Campbell as "an individual's response consistency with regard to social objects";⁷⁵ English and English as "an enduring learned predisposition to behave in a consistent way toward a given class

⁷³D. Krech, R. S. Crutchfield, and E. L. Ballachey, Individual in Society (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962), p. 139.

⁷⁴D. Krech and R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems in Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1948), p. 152.

⁷⁵D. T. Campbell, "The Indirect Assessment of Social Attitudes," Psychology Bulletin, XLVII (1959), 31.

of objects";⁷⁶ and Anderson and Fishbein as "the evaluative dimension of a social object."⁷⁷ While there exist many other approaches to connoting the concept of attitude, a definition by Cardno seems to provide an adequate summary: "Attitude entails an existing predisposition to respond to social objects which, in interaction with situational and other dispositional variables, guides and directs the overt behavior of an individual."⁷⁸

Although the concept of attitude reflects a kaleidoscope of interpretations, the literature reveals general agreement on several interrelated characteristics. Perhaps the most basic feature of an attitude is its evaluative nature giving rise to motivated behavior. Attitudes, in this context, are affective reactions based on the conception of an object by an individual. Essentially, "conception is the act of placing two or more psychological entities in some relationship with one another."⁷⁹ For instance, an attitude object placed

⁷⁶H. B. English and A. C. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms (New York: McKey Publishing Co., 1958), p. 50.

⁷⁷L. R. Anderson and M. Fishbein, "Prediction of Attitude from Number, Strength, and Evaluative Aspect of Beliefs About the Attitude Object," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, II (September, 1965), 437.

⁷⁸J. A. Cardno, "The Notion of Attitude," Psychological Reports, I (1955), 345.

⁷⁹Anderson and Fishbein, op. cit., p. 438.

in a relationship with the goals of the conceiver specifies a degree of positive-negative preferability, thus producing motives for behavior. As the attitude object is considered to be congruent with personal goals, it will be positively evaluated, while its inhibition of goal attainment results in negative evaluation. The importance of the goal orientation determines the intensity of an attitude. As opposed to opinions, attitudes are not always conscious reactions and can be verbal or nonverbal response dispositions.

A second somewhat related dimension conceptually construes attitudes as varying in quality and intensity on a continuum from positive through neutral to negative.⁸⁰ Differentiation of the positive or negative psychological evaluations of objects in relation to goal attainment is represented by "valence." The strength of an attitude is depicted by its position on the continuum with intensity increasing as the extremities are approached. While motivations catalyzed by attitudes are correspondent to the strength of affective reactions, attitudes on one side of the continuum indicate positive reactions resulting in positive behavioral responses. Conversely, attitudes

⁸⁰J. E. McGrath, Social Psychology (New York: Holt Publishing Co., 1964), p. 13.

represented on the other side of the continuum distinguish negative affective reactions, which arouse negative responses.⁸¹

There is evidence to indicate that either side of the attitude continuum possesses a threshold point beyond which people become actively concerned with the psychological object in question. This scale component is directly related to the behavior of an individual. Consequently, there exists some maximum degree of curvilinear relationship between the attitude's location on the continuum and the overt behavior of the individual.⁸²

The significance of the neutral point on the continuum has been interpreted in at least two different ways. One consideration posits a neutral attitude position as indicative of no relationship between a person's goals and the psychological object, thus, the absence of an attitude. An alternative interpretation views the neutral point as a balance between positive and negative evaluation representing an ambivalent attitude.⁸³ This study, recognizing that all research

⁸¹L. Guttman, "The Principal Components of Scalable Attitudes," in Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences, ed. by Paul F. Lazarsfeld (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954), p. 256.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Shaw and Wright, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

subjects have a direct or indirect relationship with the psychological object under consideration, will assume the latter viewpoint.

Another general characteristic of attitudes postulates the learning process as a basis for their acquisition. Shaw and Wright conclude:

Attitudes are learned through interaction with social objects and in social events and situations. Since they are learned, attitudes demonstrate the same properties as other learned reactions such as latency and threshold, and they are subject to further change through thinking, inhibition, and extinction.⁸⁴

Of importance to the educational profession is the fact that attitudes can be changed by restructuring their instrumental components into alternate methods of conditioning.

An understanding of the objects from which attitudes emanate constitutes a fourth dimension or parameter of the construct. Without a distinction as to the concrete-abstract nature of their source, it is clear that "attitudes have specific social referents or classes of referents."⁸⁵ This view reflects the social context within which attitudes are learned and considers the scope of its referent system. Scope refers to the type

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 8.

⁸⁵M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (New York: Harper and Row Co., 1956), pp. 122-55.

and number of social objects serving as referents. As the definitiveness and scope are qualified, attitudes become stronger and more centralized. Thus, it would seem that attitudes toward self, being broad yet highly definitive, would be most central to an individual. Any attempt to change or modify a central attitude would encounter resistance on two accounts:

1. To change one central attitude is to involve many peripheral attitudes in alteration and breakdown, the result being a certain inertia on the part of the central attitudes.
2. More central attitudes possess greater value or importance to the individual behaviorally. It may be assumed that the more central attitudes are those that have been more highly learned because of more efficient reinforcement schedules. Such attitudes have lower thresholds of arousal and show greater consistency than attitudes which are less central. The improvement in consistency is due to increased selectivity on the part of the conceptual processes upon which the attitudes are based. Such increased selectivity reflects the greater importance to the individual of the goals involved in the evaluation of the object.⁸⁶

A fifth characteristic of attitudes considers their possessions of varying degrees of interrelatedness based on referent commonality or similarity in evaluative conception. Attitudes of a similar composition form subsystems while a composite of subsystems defines an individual's total attitudinal system. The same grouping phenomenon can occur with its foundation in consistent or similar evaluations or a combination of both.

⁸⁶Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 9.

Relationships between attitudes follow no logical pattern from person to person, a fact which reflects human uniqueness.⁸⁷

Finally, even though attitudes are learned and subject to change, they are characteristically stable and lasting. Predispositions to react can be significantly changed only in direct proportion to their varying centrality. Thus, peripheral attitudes can be altered with much greater ease than can central attitudes.⁸⁸

Attitude Measurement

Attitude measurement has significantly contributed to the scientific history of attitudes. Historically, the measurement of attitudes has assumed many different approaches. Contemporary research, however, reflects general consensus as to the desirability of a limited few methods. Edwards distinguishes the four most common methodologies as (1) direct observation of behavior, (2) direct questioning, (3) attitudinal

⁸⁷Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, op. cit., p. 142.

⁸⁸T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction (New York: Holt Publishing Co., 1965), p. 209.

statements, and (4) attitude scales.⁸⁹ Inherent in each method are certain advantages and disadvantages.

Direct behavior observation commonly involves carefully controlled conditions. As compared to other highly sophisticated and popular measurement techniques, "behavioral measures of attitude remain relatively crude in terms of reliability."⁹⁰ Moreover, this approach relies upon self-report or the interpretive report of observers for information. In addition, observational situations are often staged and provide misleading clues to individual attitudes.⁹¹

By utilizing the direct questioning technique, the researcher has the advantage of dialoging with the respondent. In so doing, questions can be answered and mutual understanding achieved. However, complications resulting from interpersonal irregularities between researcher and respondent are regarded as disadvantageous.⁹²

⁸⁹Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 1-13.

⁹⁰Charles A. Kiesler, Barry E. Collins, and Norman Mills, Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969), p. 17.

⁹¹Edwards, op. cit.

⁹²Ibid.

Attitude statements have been more widely utilized than any other measurement technique. As first developed by Thurstone in 1929, this judgmental procedure defines the general nature of an individual's attitudes. Conversely, its effectiveness is dependent on the perceptions of the observer and the honesty of the respondent. These factors are considered undesirable because of their implicit variableness.⁹³

Scales for the assessment of attitudes have become quite popular among modern researchers. Because of their unique construction, attitude scales employ a number of seemingly different tests which actually measure the same attitude. Just as with other attitude tests, this method has no guarantee of truthful responses.⁹⁴

Attitude scales differ in method of construction, method of response, and interpretation of scores. The Likert scale⁹⁵ has been most widely subscribed to as an indicator of preferability-nonpreferability concerning a psychological object. Respondents, in this case, have several answer categories representing all points of the

⁹³L. L. Thurstone, "The Measurement of Social Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XXVI (1931), 249-69.

⁹⁴Edwards, op. cit.

⁹⁵Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, No. 140 (1932), 1-55.

attitude continuum. This type of measurement allows for flexibility of response, while clarifying strength and intensity.

Community Education

Community Education and the Community School

While having realized phenomenal development and growth in recent years, it is clear that the fundamental concepts of community education have been existent for quite some time. An analysis of community education in historical perspectives serves to clarify its contemporary conceptualization. Totten and Manley point out that the principles of community education were first considered by the Greeks and Romans as a supplement to intellectualism.

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 upon their own intelligence and abilities to overcome their difficulties.⁹⁶

Community education, as it was known historically, has been operationalized in many historical-societal

⁹⁶W. Fred Totten and Frank J. Manley, The Community School: Basic Concepts, Functions, and Organization (Galien, Mich.: Allied Education Council, 1969), p. 15.

contexts. Scanlon points out that this process of "cultural transformation" has been evidenced in pre-Colonial South America, the Middle Ages, and in several settings during the Industrial Revolution. In each situation, the concept was uniquely labeled according to its varying purpose.⁹⁷

In the United States, community education can be traced to the mid-nineteenth century. During this period of increasing complexity due to techno-social change, educators and social philosophers recognized the need for improved community living. "It is a matter of vital importance to manufacturing villages, to close the deep gulf with precipitous sides, which too often separate one set of men from their fellows, to soften and round the distinctions of society which are nowhere else so sharply defined. . . ."⁹⁸ Schools in early rural America partially served this function in their role as meeting places and family activity centers, however, deliberate organization and development as true community schools was yet to come.

⁹⁷David Scanlon, "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education," Community Education, Principles and Practices from Worldwide Experience, 58th Year-book 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.

⁹⁸Henry Barnard, "Report on the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island," in Henry Barnard on Education, ed. by J. S. Brubacher (1845) (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1931), pp. 56-57.

In 1899 John Dewey advanced the notion that the schools could no longer afford to operate separate from their communities. In this view, schools were recognized as effective instruments for social intercourse and living was considered learning. Failure to develop meaningful relationships between school and community resulted in educational waste.⁹⁹

Hart¹⁰⁰ and King¹⁰¹ authoritatively emphasized the expanded responsibility of the school in seeking assistance and cooperation from community agencies. Adults as well as young people were believed to be the clientele of educational institutions.

The present-day interpretation of community education became particularly popularized during the depression era. Economic, social, and moral problems demanded that the schools assume greater responsibility for community and individual enhancement. While some perceived this as a radical departure from the traditional academic functions of the school, others saw it as an auspicious educational innovation.

⁹⁹John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 89.

¹⁰⁰Joseph K. Hart, Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities (New York: McMillan Co., 1913), p. 3.

¹⁰¹Irving King, Education for Social Efficiency (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1913), p. 35.

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.¹⁰²

Samuel Everett, in The Community School, was the first to present thorough documentation of the concept and philosophy of community education. His text advocated a new direction for education in which the people of a community would be involved in planning and development of the school as a life-centered institution.¹⁰³

Clapp, in defining the community school as a vehicle for community development, agrees:

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 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.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Julius Yourman, "Community Coordination--The Next Movement in Education," Journal of Educational Sociology, IX (February, 1936), 328.

¹⁰³ Samuel Everett, The Community School (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938).

¹⁰⁴ Elsie Clapp, Community Schools in Action (New York: The Viking Press, 1939), p. 89.

Olsen¹⁰⁵ and Henry¹⁰⁶ offer comparable definitions and philosophical applications of the idea which provide clarification and understanding.

In 1947, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development recognized the importance of community school development. In its yearbook, the basic principles of community education were presented along with strategies for maximizing heretofore dormant school-community relationships.¹⁰⁷

During the 1950's, the community education movement began to receive extensive treatment in the literature. Pragmatic theories and developmental considerations postulated by many writers in the field served to advance and accelerate the previously embryonic state of community education. For example, Loving described the community school as one which "relates community people to the outside world by helping them to utilize existing community services and by interpreting

¹⁰⁵Edward G. Olsen, ed., School and Community (New York: Prentice Hall, 1945), pp. 9-45.

¹⁰⁶Nelson B. Henry, The Community School, 52nd Yearbook, Part II (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1953), pp. 12-13.

¹⁰⁷Willard E. Goslin, ed., Organizing the Elementary School for Living and Learning, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association, 1947).

the local community to the larger society."¹⁰⁸ The community school was defined by Maurice Seay in terms of its potential:

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.¹⁰⁹

Several writers of this period have defined the community school by its possession of certain general characteristics. Olsen concisely summarized these characteristics essential to qualification as a true 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.
5. Includes lay people in school policy and program planning.
6. Leads in community coordination.
7. Practices and promotes democracy in all human relationships.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸Alvin D. Loving, "Crystallizing and Making Concrete the Community School Concept in Michigan Through Study of Ongoing Community School Practices" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1954), p. 39.

¹⁰⁹Maurice 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.

¹¹⁰Edward G. Olsen, School and Community (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 12.

Current conceptualizations of community education are based on several years of practical and formal experience with implementation. As compared to the largely philosophical notions of the past, today's definitions are characterized by realistic thinking. Prerequisite to any examination of present definitions and theories is an important distinction between community school programs and the process of community education.

First, the program component is an integral part of the process of community education and deals with the overt activities of a school-community. Programs are generally the outgrowth of some expressed community need or desire and are designed accordingly. Moreover, the initial level of entry into the process of community education is often at the program level.

Secondly, process is defined by Minzey as " . . . the attempt to organize and activate each community so that it more nearly reaches its potential for democratic involvement and development."¹¹¹ Thus, the interrelationship between program and process is reciprocal in nature and important in considering modern applications of community education.

¹¹¹ Jack Minzey, "Community Education : An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (November, 1972), 152.

The National Community School Education Association provides a comprehensive philosophical definition of community education depicting it as,

. . . a dynamic approach to public education. It is a philosophy that pervades all segments of educational programming and directs the thrust of each of them toward the needs of the community. The community school serves as a catalytic agent by providing leadership to mobilize community problems. This marshalling of all forces in the community helps to bring about change as the school extends itself to all people.¹¹²

The focus is also delineated:

Community school education affects all children, youth, and adults directly and it helps to create an atmosphere and environment in which all men find security and self-confidence, thus enabling them to grow and mature in a community which sees its schools as an integral part of community life.¹¹³

Kerensky and Melby describe community education as a "social imperative." In their view, schools and community agencies must develop cooperative social strategies to prevent further polarization of the American people. Communities must become education-centered and concerned with betterment if our society is to survive.¹¹⁴

¹¹²The Community Education Bulletin, Regional Center for Community Education Development, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, II, No. 3 (January, 1971).

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Vasil M. Kerensky and Ernest O. Melby, Education II--The Social Imperative (Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971), p. 125.

Van Voorhees equates the concept of community education with subscription to three interrelated premises:

1. every person, regardless of age, economic status, or educational background has unmet needs and wants which require the help of others for solution;
2. people in every community have untapped skills, talents, and services to share with others, either individually or through existing organizations, and;
3. in all communities there are many available public facilities that go unused a large portion of the day and evening.¹¹⁵

Operationally, the community education concept is based on a series of assumptions which represent a change from tradition. Although these notions have appeared frequently in the educational literature, their behavioral development has not been so evident. Minzey claims that nine general assumptions must be accepted before community education can be realistically implemented.

1. The public school has a capacity for far greater leadership and facilities to further such leadership than it is currently making.
2. Education should be made relevant to the community.
3. Each child is a Gestalt requiring consideration of his total environment in his education, rather than just his formal schooling.
4. Education is a life-time process.
5. Education is not just a dissemination of information or mastery of a subject, but it is as John Dewey says, "a reconstruction

¹¹⁵Curtis Van Voorhees, "The Definition Issue," National Community School Education Association News, Flint, Michigan (May, 1971), p. 8.

or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experiences and which increases the ability to direct the course of subsequent experience.

6. Community is a feeling, not a physical boundary.
7. Problems of our time are solvable.
8. The common good of the community is the good of all.
9. Ordinary people can influence solutions to problems and are willing to commit themselves to such solutions.¹¹⁶

Even though these assumptions imply a certain homogeneity among communities, situational differences do exist.

Nevertheless, the process of community education can adapt accordingly and function in any community. Also, any school can become a community school if it:

- (a) educates youth by and for participation in the full range of basic life activities
- (b) seeks increasingly to democratize in school and outside
- (c) uses community resources in all aspects of its program
- (d) actively cooperates with other social agencies and groups in improving community life, and
- (e) functions as a service center for youth and adult groups.¹¹⁷

Community education, then, seems to hold great promise for the development and actualization of communities. As a common-sense, educationally motivated approach to community problem solving and upgrading, it works to restore the declining sense of community

¹¹⁶Jack Minzey, "Community Education in the 70's," The Community School and Its Administration, IX, No. 8 (April, 1971).

¹¹⁷Lloyd Cook, The Modern Community School, ed. by Edward G. Olsen (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953), p. 192.

identification in individuals. In the future, community education could very well become the key to societal salvation.

To save society, community education must be given top priority. To save education, and to develop distinctively community education, we school administrators, 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.¹¹⁸

The Community School Director

In relatively recent years, the incorporation of a professional leadership and administrative function has greatly enhanced the development of community education. First created in 1951 in Flint, Michigan, the position of community services director emanated from a need for recreational program coordination.¹¹⁹ Shortly thereafter, many school districts began to adopt this idea and the role became modified to include total community educational responsibilities. From this initial appointment of sustained leadership has evolved the position of community school director. Today, every Flint community school, and most all community school

¹¹⁸Edward G. Olsen, "City, Suburb, and Education," The Community School and Its Administration, VIII, No. 8 (April, 1970).

¹¹⁹Frank J. Manley, private papers.

districts throughout the nation employ the services of such specially trained professionals.

The community school director is generally charged with any and all aspects of community development dependent upon the expressed needs and desires of the people residing within the school community. Quite often, the director's functional role is characterized by complexity and extends beyond the confines of his formal preparation. Whitt, in defining the community school director, illustrates the diversity of responsibility inherent in the position.

The community school director is a motivator, an expediter, a learning specialist, a community relations expert, a master of ceremonies, a community action agent, a VISTA volunteer, an evangelist for education, a counselor, a boy's club leader, a girl's club sponsor, a friend in the neighborhood, and a humanitarian concerned with the welfare of society.¹²⁰

Totten and Manley comply in that the community school director's responsibilities include:

. . . all areas of instruction, administration, curriculum development, supervision, public relations, and community organization. The director is a teacher, counselor, administrator, supervisor, salesman, leader, communicator, and human relations builder.¹²¹

¹²⁰Robert L. Whitt, A Handbook for the Community School Director (Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971), p. 41.

¹²¹Totten and Manley, op. cit., pp. 144-45.

Many interpretations of this type of community development leadership role have been advanced in the literature. Even though sociological principles provide their basis, the community educational implications seem clear. Biddle describes the community developer as "the skilled central figure and instigator of the process of human development."¹²² Such a position requires human skills, dedication, and a commitment to the welfare of others. It is this type of leader that is essential for schools to function, in a true sense, as community schools.¹²³

The position of community school director involves considerable flexibility and freedom as compared to other public school positions. Operating only within the general school district policies and guidelines, the director's time allocations, work schedule, and program strategies are determined by the assessed needs and desires of the school community. While most guidelines for directors are semantically different, they are functionally similar and include responsibility to:

1. develop and supervise a broad range of educational, community development, and recreational programs of pre-school to senior citizen age groups to be conducted on school

¹²²William Biddle, The Community Development Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 259.

¹²³Totten and Manley, op. cit., p. 144.

- premises or in the school neighborhood after normal school hours and on Saturdays and during the summer vacation periods.
2. periodically survey on a house to house basis the needs and desires of the residents in the area served by the school, and to adapt and develop programs offered on the basis of changing needs and demands.
 3. develop systematic methods of liaison and joint planning and effort with the public and private human service agencies, including programs with the police, sheriff's department, and others.
 4. develop and utilize to the maximum extent citizen volunteer action in enriching programs offered and in providing individualized attention and support as needed.
 5. stimulate neighborhood self-help and self-development movements to deal with problems of change and obsolescence, and to promote more effective use of available community resources by neighborhood groups themselves sponsoring positive change.¹²⁴

Within this context, the community school director functions as the key individual in marshalling the physical and human resources of a community so as to systematically attack its problems and satisfy its needs.

Whitt discusses the role of the community school director in terms of a tri-dimensional analysis or the man involved, the job required, and the setting in which the task is to be accomplished. Accordingly, the most important consideration for aspiring directors is an unyielding dedication to the principles of community education.¹²⁵

¹²⁴Community Education Concept, Center for Community Education Development, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1971.

¹²⁵Whitt, op. cit., pp. 39-41.

This position requires an uncommon number of hours per week. It has been estimated that many directors may spend as many as 60 hours a week, 48 weeks a year, often seven days a week to develop the program.¹²⁶

The Flint Board of Education has been instrumental in the nation-wide development of community education, and subsequently, the role of the community school director. Through an exceptional program of dissemination and training, the Board and the Mott Foundation have significantly influenced the expanded career opportunities available in the field. Brochures, handbooks, films, and other mediums have been utilized to depict the role of the director. Typical of the descriptive literature distributed from Flint is a pamphlet which portrays the director as a program supervisor and community agent in each Flint Community School.

He is the man at the helm of after-school activities, cooperatively working with his principal who bears ultimate responsibility for the school and its programs. It is his responsibility to know the children and the families living within the attendance boundary of the school to which he is assigned. He must know the needs of the community as well as the human resources available within the community and the city at large. Moreover, he is enthusiastic, understanding, innovative, and self-reliant. Through his personal efforts the community school director discovers the wishes of his community and then attracts people and provides programs within his school locality to satisfy their desires.

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 42.

He becomes involved in the areas of juvenile delinquency, adult education, area improvement, enrichment courses, senior citizens, retraining for job upgrading, inter-racial harmony, recreation, and service agencies for children and adults.¹²⁷

The overwhelming success of the Flint program since its inception has presented the need for diversified community school leadership and administration. As a result, the community school director position has been restructured with three succeeding levels of categorical responsibility currently in operation. First, the Community School Director I is a half-time teaching position with responsibility for developing and administering the community education program. In addition to teaching an afternoon schedule of classes, level I directors work weekdays, evenings, and weekends to maximize community educational opportunities. The level II directorship consists of full-time community school administration with extended summer program duties. Promotion to this level depends upon successful experience as a Director I. Finally, a third level position requires a Master's degree in educational administration, five years of community school director experience, and a commitment

¹²⁷The Role of the Community School Director in the Flint Community Schools (Flint, Mich.: Board of Education, 1969).

to perform the duties of assistant principal,¹²⁸ This study is concerned with levels I and II, as directors who occupy these positions are most commonly found in Flint elementary community schools.

Of importance to a discussion of the community school director position in the Flint Community Schools is the nature and sources of professional training available. All directors are certified teachers and are contractually involved in or have completed a Master's degree program offered cooperatively through the school district, Eastern Michigan University, and Central Michigan University. The course of study includes specialized administrative and leadership skill training, theory and philosophy of community education, and social foundations of education in general.

Another program through which Flint directors receive additional training is the quarterly two-week internship program sponsored by the Mott Foundation and the National Center for Community Education. Based on the pragmatic needs of practicing community school directors, the program involves directors-in-training from school districts throughout the nation and utilizes the Flint community as a laboratory for instruction and

¹²⁸Job Description--The Flint Community School Director, Flint, Michigan Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, 1971.

obs

cre

deg

in-

mur

mur

je

ha

th

di

in

he

Pa

hy

T

p

c

t

t

C

F

F

M

observation. Central Michigan University offers graduate credit for this program, however, the internship is non-degree.

Both programs are periodically supplemented by in-service activities and the bi-annual National Community Education Workshop held in Flint.

Research on the position and role of the community school director is confined to one national project and three studies done in Flint. The researchers have utilized the principles of role analysis to examine the role expectations and leadership effectiveness of the director as perceived by significant others directly or indirectly related.

Cowan, in studying the directorship expectations held by a sample of community school directors, principals, teachers, and adult education coordinators, hypothesized that role dissonance would be indicated. The results showed that, while community school directors, principals, and adult education coordinators were in close agreement in defining expectations of the role, teachers were significantly divergent, thus presenting the possibility for role conflict.¹²⁹

¹²⁹Alton W. Cowan, "The Building Director: A Critical Study of Expectations Held for the Position by Principals, Adult Education Coordinators, Teachers, and Building Directors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960).

In a similar study of role consensus, Crosby surveyed directors, parents, community leaders, and Mott Program (central office community education) administrators to determine their expectations of the director's role. It was found that all groups involved in the study perceived the director's role with no significant disagreement.¹³⁰

Blue, in a recent replication of the format and instrumentation advanced by Cowan, has concluded that significant differences were found to exist between the role expectations of directors and the perceived expectations of parents, teachers, building principals, and district administrators. In addition, perceived and actual conflict were found to be significantly different with actual conflict being greater and more acute between community school directors and parents and teachers.¹³¹

Becker recently studied the leadership effectiveness of practicing community school directors in thirty-seven school districts throughout the nation. Perceptions

¹³⁰Jerry D. Crosby, "A Study of the Expectancies Which Community School Directors and Related Others Have of the Community School Director's Roles in Serving Neighborhoods of Eight Inner-City Schools in Flint, Michigan" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965).

¹³¹Fermin Keith Blue, "The Flint Community School Director: Analysis of Role Conflict and Expectations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970).

of

di

tr

Th

sc

an

pe

at

pr

al

t.

a

I

h

g

p

o

s

t

h

-

R

3

R

of central office personnel, principals, teachers, and directors were recorded on a twenty-three item Administrative Image Questionnaire as a measure of effectiveness. The study indicated that "all groups rated the community school director as having good administrator attitudes and as being an effective administrator."¹³² Each group perceived the director's effectiveness as dependent on attitude, leadership skills, and management.

Summary

In Chapter II the literature relevant to the present study was examined. The section on perception and perceptual psychology provided several interpretations of this theory. Of importance is the consensual application of behavior as a function of perception. Interpersonal behavior, which is the keystone of the helping professions, and specifically education, is governed by how people view others according to their perceptual organization. This conceptualization, while of a relatively contemporary nature, is clearly substantiated by research.

The concept of attitude, as it was discussed in the second section, related a brief, yet significant historical review of the construct to definitional

¹³²William E. Becker, "A Study of the Leadership Effectiveness of the Community School Director" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972), p. 3.

ch

di

ca

hi

an

se

pr

de

co

di

of

re

ca

an

po

de

so

pe

ta

characteristics and psychological dimensions. As a pre-disposition to react to social object stimuli, attitudes can be quantified by a variety of measurement techniques.

The section on community education examined the historical evolution of the concept from the early Greek and Roman civilizations to the present. In addition, several current writers were cited to theoretically and philosophically establish community education as a democratic process of community self-actualization.

The literature pertinent to the position of community school director was treated separately. The director is a professional staff member characteristic of schools designated as community schools and has responsibilities for community development through educational, recreational, and life-enrichment activities and programs. Directors are specially trained for their position through several cooperative degree and non-degree educational programs. Practicing community school directors, as indicated in research, seem to be perceived by others with consensus regarding role expectations and leadership effectiveness.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate and describe the congruency of Community School Directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the community and the school system in which the study took place, define the population and sample selection procedures, explain the instrumentation developed for data collection and its administration, and finally, explain the methodology to be used in data presentation and analysis.

It is noteworthy that discussions concerning the value and practicality of this type of research were held with local school administrators, officials of the National Community School Education Association, doctoral committee advisers, and research consultants prior to beginning. Their genuine interest and willingness to assist were prime considerations in pursuing the study and selecting the research site.

The Research Setting

Flint, Michigan

The city of Flint, located in southeastern Michigan's Saginaw Valley, was officially incorporated by state statutes in September of 1855. Although the population was only 2,000 at this point in history, Flint became firmly established as one of the early international lumber capitals. As the lumber supply became nearly exhausted in 1886, several local foresighted entrepreneurs began the development of the carriage and wagon industry; a fact which was to provide the foundation for Flint's recognition as the first "vehicle city" in the country and eventually, "auto-maker for the world."

The half century from 1900 to 1950 brought phenomenal growth to the city of Flint. Suburban development was also catalyzed in response to expansion of the automobile industry. In 1930, Flint became recognized as the principal city and county seat of Genesee County and one of the first communities in Michigan to adopt a city-manager form of municipal government.

Later that year, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation was established in Flint. With the impetus and contributions of Charles Stewart Mott, a pioneer in the auto industry, the Foundation revolutionized the concept of urban community development. In operationalizing a

ph

Mc

as

la

pe

of

is

ho

Di

Di

\$i

Th

ur

da

to

43

sc

Li

ex

se

al

ac

ti

philosophy of "helping people to help themselves," the Mott Foundation gave Flint unprecedented world-wide fame as a model for community-school partnership.

Today Flint is recognized as Michigan's third largest city, following Detroit and Grand Rapids. It is populated by 193,000 people and has an approximate area of 33 square miles. The economic foundation of the city is directly related to the automobile industry. As the home of General Motors Buick Division, Chevrolet Truck Division, Fisher Body Operations, and A. C. Spark Plug Division, Flint boasts an annual average family income of \$11,350 according to the 1970 census.

The Flint Community Schools

The Flint Community School system is a large urban system serving the area congruent with the boundaries of the city. In providing educational services to the community, the district operates 139 primary units, 43 elementary schools, 8 junior high schools, and 4 high schools. The Genesee Area Skill Center and Flint Public Library are also operated by the city school system, but extend vocational education and library services to several county school districts.

The fact that the Flint Community Schools utilize all existing buildings and facilities as community activity centers is of primary importance to the objectives of this study. By extending the traditional school

day, week, and year, Flint schools operate on the philosophy of the community school concept and offer a myriad of programs and services to the entire community. In addition to the formal education program, such areas as adult education, job-upgrading and retraining, recreation, enrichment, and cultural activities are only a small measure of the extensive community education program. Primarily responsible for the development of this unique community school approach are the Community School Directors, who occupy administrative positions in all Flint Community Schools. Home School Counselors and Community Service Officers also provide essential supportive community services.

The Board of Education in Flint is composed of nine elected members. A board service term consists of six years, with three members elected every two years to provide continuity. The governance of the district is shared, although on a minute scale at present, with members appointed to respective community school councils.

As of September, 1972, some 43,000 K-12 students were enrolled in Flint Community Schools. An additional 13,999 adult enrollments were recorded in educational activities and 1,391 senior citizens were involved in educational programs. To serve the residents of the community, the district employs 2,344 professionals

and 1,132 noncertificated personnel. A supplement to the full-time staff includes approximately 450 part-time people.

The Flint Community Schools operating budget for fiscal 1972 was \$51,829,941 which includes \$3,378,541 for community programs. In addition to private, federal, and various state subsidizations, the district's funding derives from local property taxes levied at 29.20 mills. Current average individual property taxes earmarked for schools amount to \$216.81 per year with property assessed at 50 per cent of market value. This provides for a per-pupil expenditure of about \$771, which is matched by \$287 in state assistance for a total of \$1,058. In assessed valuation per pupil, Flint exceeds the Michigan average by approximately 6 per cent.

The Population and Sample Selection

Population

The population for this study consisted of community school directors and Black parents of thirty Flint Community Elementary Schools. The criteria for selection of the participating schools included:

- (1) A minimum of fifteen Black families with children in school residing within the boundaries of the school attendance area;

- (2) Evidence of an operating philosophy consistent with the community school concept.

Black parents with children in at least one Flint elementary school were chosen as community respondents because of their direct relationship to the school and immediate concern with educational affairs. Bullock supports this contention in that:

Parents are likely to be close and critical observers of school practices. Their judgments are usually based on more complete information, take into account a wider variety of factors, and constitute a more potent influence upon administrative behavior than those of persons who have no children in school.¹³³

The community school directors were selected for the study by virtue of their expanded focus of school-community responsibility. Unlike traditional school administrators, community school directors work directly with their respective communities. Basic to this approach is the fact that community needs and desires provide the foundation for school-initiated community educational programming.

Sample

It was decided to involve each of the community school directors representing the thirty schools conforming to the population selection criteria, while Black parent random samples included fifteen prospective

¹³³Bullock, op. cit., p. 17.

respondents per-school community. Through verification of the Research Bureau of the College of Education at Michigan State University, it was determined that a minimum of eight parents could be utilized to adequately represent the respective Black community attitudes toward community education. The unknown degree of Black parent cooperation required a sample of at least fifteen to insure a minimum return.

The state of Michigan educational assessment forms (CA-15A) served as the basis for Black parent sample selection. While the CA-15A forms included all school district students and parents classified by school, it was necessary to compose a secondary list of Black parents only. This measure eliminated the possibility of any Black parent being represented by more than one child and insured sample randomness.

Using a "stratified random sample technique"¹³⁴ and a table of random numbers, no less than fifteen Black parents were chosen from each school-community involved in the study. Table 3.1, which follows, illustrates the sample breakdown for community school directors and Black parents. In all, 450 parents and 30 directors were selected from the 30 schools involved.

¹³⁴Sydney J. Ardmore, Introduction to Statistical Analysis and Inference for Psychology and Education (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), pp. 498-99.

TABLE 3.1.--Number of Black parents and community school directors comprising samples

School Number	Number of Sample Parents	Number of Parent Respondents	Community School Directors
1	15	10	1
2	15	12	1
3	15	15	1
4	15	13	1
5	15	11	1
6	15	10	1
7	15	12	1
8	15	12	1
9	15	12	1
10	15	13	1
11	15	10	1
12	15	11	1
13	15	11	1
14	15	11	1
15	15	10	1
16	15	10	1
17	15	14	1
18	15	11	1
19	15	12	1
20	15	10	1
21	15	13	1
22	15	11	1
23	15	10	1
24	15	10	1
25	15	12	1
26	15	10	1
27	15	10	1
28	15	10	1
29	15	12	1
30	15	11	1
Total	450	339 ^a	30

^aOf the 111 sample parents not responding, 42 had moved to new unknown addresses and 69 chose not to reply.

Statement of Testable
Hypotheses

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between selected demographic variables of community school directors and the congruency of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education, the following hypotheses were investigated:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant relationship between age and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant relationship between race and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant relationship between academic degree held and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant relationship between job level and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant relationship between job location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no significant relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 7:

There is no significant relationship between residential background and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8:

There is no significant relationship between father's occupational status and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 9:

There is no significant relationship between geographic location of rearing and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Instrumentation

Upon reviewing the literature pertinent to attitude measurement, it was ascertained that no existing instrument could be utilized for this study. In addition, since the community education concept is relatively new, appropriate research methods have not been developed. This dilemma required the researcher to develop a community education-parent attitude survey.

The Michigan State University Research Bureau provided technical assistance and advice for the instrument's construction, while the literature contributed guidance. Borg comments:

In many cases the research worker wishes to measure attitudes for which no scale is available. Satisfactory attitude scales can be developed by the researcher if he follows closely the procedures outlined in textbooks on psychological testing: the Likert technique is usually the easiest method of developing scales needed in research projects.¹³⁵

Initially, community educators, university personnel, parents, and public school employees were consulted as to their views on probable areas of parental interest and concern. The community school representatives proved especially helpful as the construct being considered was community education. Categories within the realm of community education deemed important by consensus were:

- (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval
- (2) Program and Curriculum
- (3) Staff and Personnel
- (4) Buildings and Facilities
- (5) School-Community Interaction

After developing the parental interest areas into a composite list, an extensive screening process was

¹³⁵Walter Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963), p. 110.

7

employed to eliminate unnecessary and duplicate areas. Fourteen recommendations by Edwards were then used in transposing interest areas into attitude statements:

1. Avoid statements that refer to the past rather than to the present.
2. Avoid statements that are factual or capable of being interpreted as factual.
3. Avoid statements that are irrelevant to the psychological object under consideration.
4. Avoid statements that are likely to be endorsed by almost everyone or almost no one.
5. Select statements that are believed to cover the entire range of the affective scale of interest.
6. Keep the language of the statements simple, clear, and direct.
7. Statements should be short, rarely exceeding 20 words.
8. Each statement should contain only one complete thought.
9. Statements containing universals such as "all, always, none" and "never" often introduce ambiguity and should be avoided.
10. Words such as "only, just, merely" and others of a similar nature should be used with care and moderation in writing statements.
11. Whenever possible, statements should be in the form of simple sentences rather than in the form of compound or complex sentences.
12. Avoid the use of words that may not be understood by those who are to be given the completed scale.
13. Avoid the use of double negatives.
14. Avoid statements that may be interpreted in more than one way.¹³⁶

The survey statements, at this point, were submitted to the Research Bureau for evaluation and advisement. Adjustments relative to length, readability, and balance (equally positive and negative in number) were made accordingly.

¹³⁶Edwards, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

1

The survey form was then administered to a group of twenty Black parents outside the proposed research district for field testing. Although the results of the pre-test did not indicate changing or the omission of any items, the general format was revised to allow for inclusion of the response categories. Table 3.2 illustrates the statements as they were given to the parent pre-test sample.

For response categorizing and eventual questionnaire evaluation, the Likert scale was judged most advantageous. In indicating the virtues of his method Likert states: "First, the method does away with the use of raters or judges and the errors arising therefrom; second, it is less laborious to construct an attitude scale by this method; and third, the method yields the same reliability with fewer items."¹³⁷

As a result, response categories included the letter symbols SA, A, U, D, SD. The instructions made clear the fact that only one symbol was to be circled for each statement with SA denoting strongly agree; A, agree; U, undecided; D, disagree; and SD, strongly disagree.

It should be noted that since the study is concerned with the congruence of community school directors'

¹³⁷ Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, CXL (June, 1932), 42.

TABLE 3.2.--Parent attitudes toward community education^a

-
1. Most of the kids in our neighborhood seem to like our community school.
 2. Our Community School Director seems to know our community well.
 3. I believe that our community school program helps people to better themselves.
 4. I think that our community school should be the center of activity in our neighborhood.
 5. I wish more youth programs would be offered at our community school.
 6. I think that schools should include facilities for community use.
 7. There seems to be a good relationship between our community and the community school.
 8. In my opinion, schools could do much more to inform the community of programs and activities.
 9. Community school staff members seem to care more about money than people.
 10. Our community school administrators usually try to make parents feel at home in the school.
 11. I am proud of our city's community school system.
 12. The community school does little to involve community agencies with its program.
 13. The community school never seems to offer programs that interest me.
 14. Volunteers seem to do a better job than paid staff members at our community school.
 15. Our community school system does not seem to represent our community well.
 16. In my opinion, our community school has plenty of space and rooms for adult use.

TABLE 3.2.--Continued

-
17. I believe that schools should only be used for teaching children.
 18. Because of our Community School Director, our school really cares about community problems.
 19. Programs about art and music are not offered often enough to suit me.
 20. Our community school is one of the best in the city.
 21. It seems hard to get involved at our community school.
 22. I am sold on the after-school program for kids at our community school.
 23. The cost of our community school system seems too high for its worth in the community.
 24. I am satisfied with our community school's recreation facilities.
 25. The most important concern of our community school seems to be people.
 26. Our Community School Director does not seem to care about making our community a better place to live.
 27. Many changes should be made to improve our community school.
 28. I am satisfied with the health services provided at our community school.
 29. In my opinion, the community room is an important part of our community school.
 30. I feel that planning community school activities should include community people.
 31. I think our community school should offer more programs for older people and adults.
 32. My family is satisfied with our community school.
 33. In my opinion, we have a good community school staff.

TABLE 3.2.--Continued

-
34. I don't think that our community school is helping to make our community a better place to live.
 35. Our community school does a poor job in helping people to get along with others.
 36. The library at our community school is one of the best in the city.
 37. I believe that schools should be actively involved in solving the problems of the community.
 38. I think that the program in our community school is better than most other schools.
 39. The community school staff seems to be interested in the people of the community.
 40. Programs for adults are, generally, a waste of time.
-

^aResponse categories and instructions omitted.

1

perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education, the parent attitude survey with modified instructions, was also to be used for the Directors. The alternate instructions requested the directors simply to respond in a manner that would be viewed as characteristic of the typical Black parents in their school-communities. This technique is commonly used in similar types of research and gained approval of the Research Bureau.

To distinguish between parent and community school director instruments, separate names were devised. The parent instrument was entitled, What Do You Think About Your Community Schools and the Director survey, Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes. A self-explanatory Demographic Data Form was developed to accompany the Community School Director instruments.

Administration of the Surveys

The Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes instrument was administered on Tuesday, February 6, 1973, to the selected community school directors present at a meeting of the Department of Elementary Community Education. Directors not present were given instruments and instructions individually. All instruments were retrieved by the researcher

immediately upon completion. (For analytical and comparative purposes, the response sheets were coded according to respective schools.)

Sealed packets of the Black parent What Do You Think About Your Community Schools instrument were given to the Directors following completion of their surveys. Included in the packets were addresses of random sample parents (without names), and instructions for expedient and systematic administration. The community school directors were instructed to forward the packets to pre-arranged school-community contacts including Home-School Counselors, Community Service Officers, and Neighborhood Youth Corps personnel. The school-community contacts, in turn, were instructed to deliver the instruments to the addresses listed and make arrangements for retrieval. Explicit in the thorough instructions for delivery and pick-up was the caution against behavior that would bias the responses.

All parent instruments were returned to the Office of Elementary Community Education by March 16, 1973. As with the community school director surveys, parent surveys were coded to identify school reference, however, individual anonymity was insured. Of the total of 339 parent respondents, 193 were female and 146 were male.

Research Method and Data Analysis
Technique

The research method applied in this study is descriptive and comparative. It describes Black parent attitudes toward community education and, most importantly, the congruence with which community school directors perceive these attitudes. To paraphrase Best, "descriptive research involves describing and interpreting what exists from collected data."¹³⁸

For all hypotheses stated in this chapter, it was necessary to assign each respondent an individual survey subscale score for each of the five subscales of the instrument including general community school approval-disapproval, program and curriculum, staff and personnel, buildings and facilities, and school-community interaction. The scores obtained on the What Do You Think About Your Community Schools instruments for each school were averaged with the mean ($\bar{x}$) interpreted to constitute the typical Black parent attitudes. The Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes respective scores were also averaged with the difference or discrepancy between parent attitude scores and community school directors constituting the basis

¹³⁸John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 102.

1

for "analysis of variance and regression"¹³⁹ techniques on the data grouped according to community school directors' demographic variables. The school-community data were transformed onto computer data cards by the Key Punch Division of the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory. All computer programming was developed by the Office of Research Consultation of the College of Education and operationalized on the CDC 3600 Computer System at the Computer Center at Michigan State University. Findings, recommendations, and conclusions will be drawn from the information obtained and interpretations will be related to the study's purposes.

Summary

In the present chapter, the research setting has been briefly described, as has its community school system. The population was defined with an explanation of the sample selection process. Also included was an explanation of the attitude scale construction and its administration. Finally, the type of study was discussed and data analysis techniques were confirmed.

¹³⁹Jeremy D. Finn, *Multivariate: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Covariance and Regression: A Fortran Program Modified by David J. Wright for Michigan State University, C.D.C. 3600 Computer System.*

1

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the statistical analyses of the data and will be presented in the following manner:

- (1) Restatement of the hypotheses of the study and appropriate analysis of variance and regression results;
- (2) Graphic and quantitative description of the data;
- (3) Summarization of the findings of the study.

The purpose of the study was to determine if significant relationships exist between selected personal, positional, and situational demographic variables of elementary community school directors and the congruency of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. This was accomplished by grouping community school director and corresponding parent sample data according to community school director demographic variables (see Table 4.1) and examining the discrepancy

TABLE 4.1.--Distribution of community school directors
according to demographic variables

Demographic Variable	Groups	N
Age	23 yrs.	1
	24 yrs.	5
	25 yrs.	5
	26 yrs.	3
	27 yrs.	1
	28 yrs.	1
	29 yrs.	4
	30 yrs.	5
	33 yrs.	1
	34 yrs.	1
	43 yrs.	1
	44 yrs.	1
	49 yrs.	1
Race	White	17
	Black	13
Academic Degree	B.A. - B.S.	21
	M.A. - M.S.	9
Job Level	Teaching Director	17
	Released Director	13
Job Location	Mostly Black Community	19
	Roughly Equal Black and White	3
	Mostly White Community	8
Years of Experience	1 yr.	8
	2 yrs.	6
	3 yrs.	7
	4 yrs.	3
	5 yrs.	2
	6 yrs.	2
	7 yrs.	1
	24 yrs.	1

TABLE 4.1.--Continued

Demographic Variable	Groups	N
Residential Background	Urban	17
	Suburban	5
	Rural	8
Father's Occupational Status	Unskilled, Skilled Blue Collar	16
	Salaried professional, upper level manager or official	3
	Self-employed businessman, professional, farm owner or operator	6
	White collar clerical, sales, or public service	5
Geographical Location of Rearing	Northeast	8
	Southeast	1
	Midsouth	1
	Midwest	16
	Southwest	4

between Black parent attitudes toward community education and directors' perceptions of those attitudes (see Tables 4.2 through 4.6). As a basis for attitude and perception assessment, the following five aspects of community education were investigated and, subsequently, served as the focus of multivariate (collective) and univariate (individual) analysis of variance and regression analysis:

- (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval
- (2) Program and Curriculum
- (3) Staff and Personnel
- (4) Buildings and Facilities
- (5) School-Community Interaction

The Black parent and community school director instruments were respectively entitled, What Do You Think of Your Community Schools and Community School Director Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes.

The level of significance for each of the nine hypotheses investigated was established at .05 for purposes of controlling the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when it should have been accepted.

Hypothesis 1

The investigation of the relationship between age and the congruence of community school directors'

TABLE 4.2.--Distribution of parent and community school director means and perception discrepancies concerning general community school approval-disapproval

School	Parent Mean	Director Mean	Discrepancy ^a
1	3.550	3.875	- .325
2	4.000	4.250	- .250
3	3.308	4.000	- .692
4	3.673	2.875	.798
5	2.875	4.000	-1.125
6	3.438	3.125	.313
7	3.385	3.625	- .240
8	2.958	3.750	- .792
9	3.396	3.750	- .354
10	3.240	3.625	- .385
11	2.750	4.375	-1.625
12	3.375	3.375	.000
13	3.557	3.875	- .318
14	3.568	3.375	.193
15	3.775	4.750	- .975
16	3.337	4.500	-1.162
17	4.143	4.500	- .357
18	3.716	3.500	.216
19	3.833	4.000	- .167
20	3.800	4.250	- .450
21	3.365	4.625	-1.260
22	3.739	4.250	- .511
23	3.600	2.875	.725
24	3.813	4.000	- .188
25	3.604	4.000	- .396
26	2.900	4.500	-1.600
27	3.287	3.750	- .463
28	3.412	4.000	- .588
29	3.719	3.875	- .156
30	3.920	3.875	.045

^aPerception discrepancy scores were computed by subtracting the Community School Director mean scores from the Parent mean scores.

TABLE 4.3.--Distribution of parent and community school director means and perception discrepancies concerning community school program and curriculum

School	Parent Mean	Director Mean	Discrepancy
1	3.230	2.900	.330
2	3.500	3.700	- .200
3	3.327	3.700	- .373
4	3.377	2.700	.677
5	3.136	3.900	- .764
6	3.140	3.400	- .260
7	3.358	3.300	.058
8	2.958	3.600	- .642
9	3.025	3.500	- .475
10	3.392	3.200	.192
11	2.810	3.600	- .790
12	3.036	3.500	- .464
13	3.182	3.700	- .518
14	3.273	3.200	.073
15	3.600	4.300	- .700
16	3.020	4.200	-1.180
17	3.729	3.800	- .071
18	3.545	3.500	.045
19	3.317	3.600	- .283
20	3.510	3.800	- .290
21	3.277	3.600	- .323
22	3.464	3.900	- .436
23	3.480	3.000	.480
24	3.550	3.600	- .050
25	3.550	3.600	- .050
26	2.730	3.600	-1.470
27	2.880	3.300	- .420
28	3.120	3.200	- .080
29	3.333	3.700	- .367
30	3.682	3.600	.082

TABLE 4.4.--Distribution of parent and community school director means and perception discrepancies concerning community school staff and personnel

School	Parent Mean	Director Mean	Discrepancy
1	3.750	3.875	- .125
2	3.948	3.500	.448
3	3.400	3.750	- .350
4	3.615	2.625	.990
5	3.193	4.250	-1.057
6	3.787	4.000	- .213
7	3.583	4.125	- .542
8	3.281	3.875	- .594
9	3.354	3.625	- .271
10	3.644	3.125	.519
11	2.712	3.875	-1.163
12	3.159	3.875	- .716
13	3.602	4.125	- .523
14	3.670	3.875	- .205
15	3.775	4.625	- .850
16	3.287	4.125	- .838
17	4.161	4.375	- .214
18	3.739	4.000	- .261
19	3.729	3.750	- .021
20	3.900	4.625	- .725
21	3.500	4.250	- .750
22	3.727	4.125	- .398
23	3.550	3.375	.175
24	3.825	3.625	.200
25	3.813	3.625	.188
26	2.875	4.750	-1.875
27	3.438	3.375	.063
28	3.387	4.125	- .738
29	3.698	3.750	- .052
30	4.091	3.750	.341

TABLE 4.5.--Distribution of parent and community school director means and perception discrepancies concerning community school buildings and facilities

School	Parent Mean	Director Mean	Discrepancy
1	3.440	3.600	- .160
2	3.550	3.800	- .250
3	3.307	4.400	-1.093
4	3.846	3.600	.246
5	2.964	4.000	-1.036
6	2.980	3.000	- .020
7	3.067	3.600	- .533
8	2.867	4.400	-1.533
9	3.350	3.000	.350
10	3.308	2.400	.908
11	3.360	2.600	.760
12	3.600	2.400	1.200
13	3.382	3.600	- .218
14	3.545	3.400	.145
15	3.520	4.400	- .880
16	2.780	3.600	- .820
17	3.657	3.800	- .143
18	3.582	4.200	- .618
19	3.333	4.000	- .667
20	3.480	3.400	.080
21	3.338	3.800	- .462
22	3.600	3.800	- .200
23	3.380	3.200	.180
24	3.700	3.600	.100
25	3.400	3.200	.200
26	2.920	4.200	-1.280
27	3.060	4.600	-1.540
28	3.080	3.600	- .520
29	3.517	3.600	- .083
30	4.109	4.000	.109

1

TABLE 4.6.--Distribution of parent and community school director means and perception discrepancies concerning school-community interaction

School	Parent Mean	Director Mean	Discrepancy
1	3.500	3.556	- .056
2	3.787	4.000	- .213
3	3.430	3.556	- .126
4	3.658	3.222	.436
5	3.141	4.111	- .970
6	3.533	3.444	.089
7	3.611	3.778	- .167
8	3.407	3.889	- .481
9	3.546	3.778	- .231
10	3.470	3.778	- .308
11	3.111	4.333	-1.222
12	3.455	3.778	- .323
13	3.535	3.778	- .242
14	3.505	4.111	- .606
15	3.811	4.667	- .856
16	3.556	4.333	- .778
17	3.929	4.667	- .738
18	3.727	3.778	- .051
19	3.648	4.111	- .463
20	3.756	4.667	- .911
21	3.444	4.556	-1.111
22	3.616	3.667	- .051
23	3.667	3.111	.556
24	3.700	3.889	- .189
25	3.759	3.889	- .130
26	3.367	4.556	-1.189
27	3.556	3.111	.444
28	3.400	3.667	- .267
29	3.722	4.000	- .278
30	3.687	4.111	- .424

perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was hypothesized in the null form as:

H₀₁:

There is no significant relationship between age and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The test of hypothesis of no association between dependent and independent variables (regression analysis) indicates that no significant relationship exists between community school director perception discrepancy means and age ($P = .1324$). Because one community school director (school #20) was considerably older than the majority of directors, it was recognized that data from that particular school-community could significantly bias the statistical analysis results. Therefore, an additional regression analysis was computed excluding such data, however, the results reaffirmed the initial finding of no significant relationship between director perception discrepancy means and age ($P = .3422$). Based on the results of the regression analyses, it is concluded that null hypothesis 1 should not be rejected. Tables 4.7 and 4.8 indicate the results of the regression analysis including school #20 ($N = 30$) and excluding school #20 ($N = 29$) respectively.

TABLE 4.7.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and age (N = 30)

Covariate	N	Chi Square	df	P Less Than
Age	30	8.4664	5	.1324

TABLE 4.8.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and age (N = 29)

Covariate	N	Chi Square	df	P Less Than
Age	29	5.6464	5	.3422

The test of hypothesis of no association between perception discrepancy and age concerning the five subscales of the instrumentation indicates no significant results (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.10 represents the standardized regression coefficient concerning the relationship between dependent (subscale perception discrepancy) variables and the independent (age) variable.

Hypothesis 2

The null hypothesis investigated for the relationship between race and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

TABLE 4.9.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and age concerning the dependent variables (N = 30)

Dependent Variable	Square Multi-variate Regression	Multi-variate Regression	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.0237	.1539	.6796	.4167
2. Program and Curriculum	.0022	.0474	.0631	.8036
3. Staff and Personnel	.0115	.1074	.3269	.5721
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0229	.1512	.6553	.4251
5. School-Community Interaction	.0284	.1685	.8183	.3734

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 28

TABLE 4.10.--Standardized regression coefficients of community school directors' age and perception discrepancy concerning the dependent variables (N = 30)

Co-variate	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Age	30	.153940	.047400	-.107425	.151225	-.168507

Ho2:

There is no significant relationship between race and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for hypothesis 2 indicates that no significant relationship exists between the independent variable of race and community school directors group perception discrepancy means ($P = .3883$). Therefore, null hypothesis 2 is not rejected. Categorical groupings for race include (1) White and (2) Black.

The univariate analysis of variance indicates that there is no relationship between group perception discrepancy means and race concerning the five dependent variables of general community school approval-disapproval, program and curriculum, staff and personnel, buildings and facilities, and school-community interaction. Tables 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 indicate the mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director race groupings concerning the dependent variables, results of the multivariate test of equality of perception discrepancy mean vectors, and results of the univariate analysis of variance respectively.

Hypothesis 3

The null hypothesis examined for the relationship between community school directors' academic degree

TABLE 4.11.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director race groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
White	17	-.572118	-.344294	-.363353	-.283588	-.457059
Black	13	-.181769	-.185846	-.260000	-.227462	-.237385

Dependent Variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

TABLE 4.12.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of two community school director race groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Race	2	1.0959	5,24	.3883

TABLE 4.13.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for two community school director race groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	1.1225	3.5678	.0694
2. Program and Curriculum	.1849	.8939	.3526
3. Staff and Personnel	.0787	.2294	.6357
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0232	.0501	.8246
5. School-Community Interaction	.3555	1.7109	.2016

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 28

status and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

Ho3:

There is no significant relationship between academic degree and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Null hypothesis 3 is not rejected on the basis of the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors results. As indicated in Table 4.14, there is no significant relationship between group perception discrepancy means for two categories of community school director academic

TABLE 4.14.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of two community school director academic degree groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Academic Degree	2	1.0791	5,24	.3968

degree status ($P = .3968$) including (1) B.A. or B.S. and (2) M.A. or M.S. Table 4.15 reveals the mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director academic degree groupings concerning the dependent variables.

The univariate analysis of variance indicates no significant results in comparing the two groups of academic degree perception discrepancy means in relation to the dependent variables. Results of the univariate analysis of variance for hypothesis 3 appear in Table 4.16.

Hypothesis 4

The null hypothesis investigated for the relationship between community school directors' job level and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

Ho4:

There is no significant relationship between job level and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

TABLE 4.15.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director academic degree groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
B.A.						
B.S.	21	-.443571	-.259381	-.252476	-.293095	-.363286
M.A.						
M.S.	9	-.308222	-.313556	-.472778	-.180333	-.358556

Dependent variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

TABLE 4.16.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for two community school director academic degree groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.1154	.3292	.5708
2. Program and Curriculum	.0185	.0869	.7704
3. Staff and Personnel	.3058	.9131	.3475
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0801	.1736	.6802
5. School-Community Interaction	.0001	.0006	.9801

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 28

The multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for hypothesis 4 indicates that the relationship between job level and community school director group perception discrepancy means is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance ($P = .0151$). Based upon the results contained in Table 4.17, null hypothesis 4 is rejected. Table 4.18 indicates that teaching community school director perception discrepancy means are significantly less discrepant than those of released directors.

The univariate analysis of variance reveals that the dependent variable of staff and personnel ($P = .0077$) largely accounts for the multivariate significance. Table 4.19 contains the results of the univariate analysis of variance.

Hypothesis 5

The examination of the relationship between job location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was hypothesized in the null form as:

Ho5:

There is no significant relationship between job location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

TABLE 4.17.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of two community school director job level groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Job Level	2	3.5592	5,24	.0151 ^a

a = significance at .05 alpha level

TABLE 4.18.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director job level groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Released Director	13	-.538000	-.391462	-.628692	-.101769	-.529308
Teaching Director	17	-.299706	-.187059	-.081412	-.379706	-.233824

Dependent Variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

TABLE 4.19.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for two community school director job level groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.4183	1.2312	.2767
2. Program and Curriculum	.3074	1.5198	.2279
3. Staff and Personnel	2.2064	8.2643	.0077
4. Buildings and Facilities	.5691	1.2815	.2673
5. School-Community Interaction	.6432	3.2567	.0820

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 28

The multivariate test of equality of mean vectors indicates that no significant relationship exists between community school director job location and group perception discrepancy means ($P = .8461$). Based upon the results contained in Table 4.20, it is concluded that null hypothesis 5 should not be rejected. Categorical groupings of community school director job location include (1) communities which are mostly Black, (2) roughly equal Black and White, and (3) mostly White.

The univariate analysis of variance indicates that there is no relationship between group perception discrepancy means and job location concerning the

dependent variables. Tables 4.21 and 4.22 indicate mean perception discrepancy scores for community school director job location groupings in relation to the dependent variables and results of the univariate analysis of variance respectively.

TABLE 4.20.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of three community school director job location groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Job location	3	.5486	10,46	.8461

Hypothesis 6

The null hypothesis investigated for the relationship between community school directors' years of experience and the congruence of their perception of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

Ho6:

There is no significant relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The test of hypothesis of no association between dependent and independent variables (regression analysis) indicates that no significant relationship exists between community school director perception discrepancy means

TABLE 4.21.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director job location groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Mostly Black	19	-.383105	-.229316	-.322737	-.210105	-.328421
Roughly Equal Black and White	3	-.499667	-.244667	-.429667	-.385333	-.591667
Mostly White	8	-.413875	-.397250	-.267000	-.328750	-.355125

Dependent Variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction

TABLE 4.22.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for three community school director job location groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.0182	.0498	.9516
2. Program and Curriculum	.0810	.3759	.6902
3. Staff and Personnel	.0293	.0823	.9213
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0661	.1387	.8712
5. School-Community Interaction	.0900	.4056	.6706

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 2

Degrees of freedom for error = 27

and years of experience when all directors are included ($P = .1553$) (see Table 4.23). However, because one community school director had considerably more years of experience (school #20) than the majority of directors, an additional regression analysis was computed with exclusion of school #20. Based upon the second analysis (see Table 4.24) there appears to be a significant relationship between perception discrepancy and years of experience ($P = .0035$). In this case, as years of experience are increased perception discrepancy decreases, thus indicating a positional relationship between community school director years of experience and perception congruency. Because of the contradiction in analysis results and the relatively small number of directors involved in the study, it was decided that such an inconsistency would provide a source of external invalidity (generalizability). Therefore, hypothesis 6 was not rejected. Tables 4.25 and 4.26 indicate the standardized regression coefficients concerning the relationship between dependent (subscale perception discrepancy) variables and the independent (years of experience) variable when $N = 30$ and $N = 29$ respectively.

The test of hypothesis of no association between perception discrepancy and years of experience concerning the five subscales of the instrumentation indicates no

1

TABLE 4.23.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and years of experience (N = 30)

Covariate	N	Chi Square	df	P Less Than
Years of Experience	30	8.0179	5	.1553

TABLE 4.24.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and years of experience (N = 29)

Covariate	N	Chi Square	df	P Less Than
Years of Experience	29	17.6302	5	.0035

TABLE 4.25.--Standardized regression coefficients of community school directors' years of experience and perception discrepancy concerning dependent variables (N = 30)

Covariate	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Years of Experience	30	.129845	-.002394	-.150271	.152477	-.164973

TABLE 4.26.--Standardized regression coefficients of community school directors' years of experience and perception discrepancy concerning dependent variables (N = 29)

Covariate	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Years of Experience	29	.360185	.007731	-.071940	.162926	.105751

significant results including school #20 ($N = 30$) or excluding school #20 ($N = 29$) (see Tables 4.27 and 4.28 respectively).

Hypothesis 7

The null hypothesis investigated for the relationship between residential background and the congruence of community school directors' perception of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

Ho7:

There is no significant relationship between residential background and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for hypothesis 7 indicates that no significant relationship exists between the independent variable of residential background and community school director group perception discrepancy means ($P = .6427$). Based upon the results displayed in Table 4.29, null hypothesis 7 is not rejected. Categorical groupings for residential background include (1) urban, (2) suburban, and (3) rural.

The univariate analysis of variance results indicate that there is no relationship between group perception discrepancy means and residential background concerning the dependent variables. Results of the univariate analysis of variance appear in Table 4.30

TABLE 4.27.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and years of experience concerning dependent variables (N = 30)

Dependent Variable	Square Multivariate Regression	Multivariate Regression	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.0169	.1298	.4802	.4941
2. Program and Curriculum	.0000	.0024	.0002	.9900
3. Staff and Personnel	.0226	.1503	.6469	.4281
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0232	.1525	.6665	.4212
5. School-Community Interaction	.0272	.1650	.7834	.3837

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 28

TABLE 4.28.--Test of hypothesis of no association between community school directors' perception discrepancy and years of experience concerning dependent variables (N = 29)

Dependent Variable	Square Multivariate Regression	Multivariate Regression	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.1297	.3602	4.0250	.0550
2. Program and Curriculum	.0001	.0077	.0016	.9683
3. Staff and Personnel	.0052	.0719	.1405	.7108
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0265	.1629	.7363	.3985
5. School-Community Interaction	.0112	.1058	.3054	.5851

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 1

Degrees of freedom for error = 27

TABLE 4.29.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of three community school director residential background groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Residential Background	3	.7852	10,46	.6427

TABLE 4.30.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for three community school director residential background groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.0927	.2568	.7754
2. Program and Curriculum	.0205	.0931	.9114
3. Staff and Personnel	.1309	.3751	.6908
4. Buildings and Facilities	.0157	.0326	.9680
5. School-Community Interaction	.2797	1.3453	.2774

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 2

Degrees of freedom for error = 27

while mean perception discrepancy scores for community school director groupings of residential background appear in Table 4.31.

TABLE 4.31.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director residential background groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Urban	17	-.334412	-.260176	-.274235	-.286412	-.244706
Suburban	5	-.481400	-.358200	-.225800	-.206600	-.565800
Rural	8	-.499625	-.256875	-.470750	-.234500	-.483375

Dependent variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction

Hypothesis 8

The investigation of the relationship between father's occupational status and the congruence of community school directors' perception of Black parent attitudes toward community education was hypothesized in the null form as:

Ho8:

There is no significant relationship between father's occupational status and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8 is not rejected. Table 4.32 indicates that no significant relationship exists between father's occupational status and community school director group perception discrepancy means ($P = .1414$) according to the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors. Categorical groupings for father's occupational status include (1) unskilled and skilled blue collar, (2) salaried professional, upper level manager or official, (3) self-employed businessman or professional, farm owner or operator, and (4) white collar clerical, sales, or public service.

TABLE 4.32.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of four community school director father's occupational status groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Father's Occupational Status	4	1.4802	15,61.1337	.1414

The results of the univariate analysis of variance, as displayed in Table 4.33, indicate a relationship between group perception discrepancy means and father's occupational status concerning the dependent variables of staff and personnel ($P = .0156$) and buildings and facilities ($P = .0207$). This positive relationship, however, does not affect the multivariate results.

TABLE 4.33.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for four community school director father's occupational status groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.5479	1.7190	.1877
2. Program and Curriculum	.3076	1.5823	.2176
3. Staff and Personnel	1.0471	4.1621	.0156
4. Buildings and Facilities	1.3367	3.8646	.0207
5. School-Community Interaction	.3634	1.8589	.1614

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 3

Degrees of freedom for error = 26

Table 4.34 indicates the mean perception discrepancy scores of director groupings according to father's occupational status and reveals that perception discrepancies of group 2 are considerably less than the others.

Hypothesis 9

The null hypothesis investigated for the relationship between geographical location of rearing and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education was:

TABLE 4.34.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director father's occupational status groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Unskilled and skilled blue collar	16	-.605500	-.397875	-.530563	-.489875	-.521000
Salaried, professional, upper level manager or official	3	.050667	.142333	.542000	.065333	.031000
Self-employed businessman or professional, farm owner, or operator	6	-.171167	-.118500	-.141667	.393333	-.300333
White collar clerical, sales, or public service	5	-.305200	-.323800	-.368800	-.499200	-.162200

Dependent Variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

Ho9:

There is no significant relationship between geographical location of rearing and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The results of the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors indicates that the relationship between geographical location of rearing and community school director group perception discrepancy means is statistically significant when all thirty directors are included ($P = .0449$). However, because two groupings of director geographical location of rearing have only one respondent, school community, an additional multivariate test was computed excluding these two categories. The results of the second multivariate analysis utilizing three groupings ($N = 28$) indicate no significant relationship ($P = 7.3169$). Table 4.35 and 4.36 indicate the respective results of both multivariate analyses. Therefore, because of inconclusive evidence, null hypothesis 9 cannot be rejected.

TABLE 4.35.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of five community school director geographical location of rearing groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Geographical location of rearing	5	1.7509	20,70.5990	.0449

The univariate analysis of variance results (N = 30) indicate that the dependent variable of buildings and facilities (P = .0133) was largely responsible for multivariate significance (see Table 4.37).

TABLE 4.36.--Multivariate test of equality of mean vectors for differences in perception discrepancy of three community school director geographical location of rearing groups

Independent Variable	Groups	F-ratio	df	P Less Than
Geographical location of rearing	3	1.2030	10,42	.3169

The mean perception discrepancy scores for community school director groupings of geographical location of rearing appear in Table 4.38 and indicate that, when all directors are considered, the perceptions of those reared in the southeast and southwest are less discrepant.

Grand Means

The grand means of all Black parents (N = 339) and all community school directors (N = 30) in the study are indicated in Table 4.39 according to instrumentation subscales. It is evident that, on all subscales, community school directors perceived Black parents' attitudes

TABLE 4.37.--Univariate analysis of variance of group perception discrepancy means for five community school director geographical location of rearing groups in relation to dependent variables

Dependent Variable	Mean Between Square	F-ratio	P Less Than
1. General Community School Approval-Disapproval	.5555	1.8013	.1602
2. Program and Curriculum	.3868	2.1827	.1002
3. Staff and Personnel	.4566	1.4533	.2462
4. Buildings and Facilities	.2530	3.9200	.0133
5. School-Community Interaction	.3028	1.5257	.2252

Degrees of freedom for hypothesis = 4

Degrees of freedom for error = 25

TABLE 4.38.--Mean perception discrepancy scores of community school director geographical location of rearing groupings concerning dependent variables

Group	N	Dependent Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Northeast	8	-.658875	-.583875	-.655250	-.786000	-.511375
Southeast	1	.725000	.480000	.175000	.180000	.556000
Midsouth	1	.000000	-.464000	-.716000	1.200000	-.323000
Midwest	16	-.433063	-.178125	-.236250	-.093250	-.398063
Southwest	4	-.153500	-.191000	.001500	-.344500	-.157250

Dependent Variables are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

to be more positive¹⁴⁰ toward community education than was actually indicated. It is important, however, to point out that community school directors, as a group, appear to be reasonably cognizant of such attitudes (see Table 4.40). In addition, it is interesting to note that Black parent attitudes toward community education appear to be relatively positive.

TABLE 4.39.--Grand means of community school director perceptions and Black parent attitudes toward community education concerning instrument subscales

Group	N	Instrument Subscales				
		1	2	3	4	5
Black Parents	339	3.5070	3.2933	3.5806	3.3740	3.5709
Community School Directors	30	3.9041	3.5601	3.9125	3.6268	3.9296

Subscales are: (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval; (2) Program and Curriculum; (3) Staff and Personnel; (4) Buildings and Facilities; (5) School-Community Interaction.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the analysis of the data were presented relating to the purpose of the study. Empirical data on the attitudes of Black parents

¹⁴⁰ Rating Scale for Positive and Negative Items-- Positive: Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagree = 2, strongly agree = 1; Negative: Strongly disagree = 5, disagree = 4, undecided = 3, agree = 2, strongly agree = 1.

toward community education and community school directors' perceptions of those attitudes were collected, analyzed, and descriptively presented. The discrepancies of community school director perceptions of Black parent attitudes were grouped according to director personal, positional, and situational demographic variables and tested for significant differences.

TABLE 4.40.--Grand means of community school director perceptions and Black parent attitudes toward community education

Groups	N	Total Mean
Black Parents	339	3.4660
Community School Directors	30	3.7837

Employing the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors, the univariate analysis of variance, and regression analysis only hypothesis 4 was rejected with a probability significance of less than the established alpha level (.05). It was found that community school directors with half-time teaching responsibilities were significantly more congruent in their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education than were released directors. Results of the statistical analysis of hypotheses 6 and 9 appear to indicate a relationship between perception congruence and community school director years of experience and geographical

location of rearing respectively, however, inconclusive evidence does not permit rejection.

Hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2, hypothesis 3, hypothesis 5, hypothesis 6, hypothesis 7, hypothesis 8, and hypothesis 9 were not rejected as stated in their null form.

The grand means of sample Black parents and community school directors were found to be indicative of a relatively positive Black parent attitude toward community education and reasonably congruent community school director perceptions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study which leads to a discussion of the conclusions generated from the analysis of the data. A series of related recommendations and implications follow. Recommendations for further research conclude the study.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of the study was to determine if there exist significant relationships between selected demographic variables of elementary community school directors and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study include:

1. The data collected are based on only one specific geographical location.
2. The study is concerned only with elementary school-community education.
3. The study is concerned only with the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. No attempt is made to evaluate the effectiveness of community education in terms of structure or outcome. No attempt is made to postulate ideal Black parent attitudes toward community education.
4. The description of leadership perceptions and Black parent attitudes is to be taken within the local context in which the research is undertaken.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature on perceptual psychology and perception indicates that human behavior is consensually viewed as a function of perception. Much research substantiates the fact that interpersonal behavior, which is of central importance to education, is significantly mediated by how people view others in relation to their perceptual organization.

The concept of attitude, as suggested by a survey of the literature, can be characterized as existing along a continuum of positivity to negativity, having specific referents, being evaluative in nature, requiring acquisition through learning, being varyingly inter-related, and being relatively stable. Attitudes are defined as a predisposition to react to social object stimuli and can be quantified by a variety of measurement techniques.

A survey of the profusion of books, publications, and articles on community education reveals that, even though the process has recently experienced wide acclaim and development, community education can be traced to the early Greek and Roman civilizations. Further review indicates that community education is defined in philosophical and theoretical terms as a democratic process of school-community self-actualization.

The literature relevant to the professional leadership position peculiar to community education establishes the community school director as the catalytic agent in the school-community development process. With responsibility for organization, supervision, and administration of the community school program, the community school director works toward the ultimate goal of community betterment and problem solving.

Design of the Study

The design of the study, which was descriptive and comparative in nature, sought to analyze the congruence of elementary community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

The instrumentation utilized for purposes of data collection included a parent attitude scale entitled What Do You Think of Your Community Schools and a corresponding perception assessment scale entitled Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes. In addition, the Community School Director Demographic Data Form was employed to gather appropriate data for establishing the independent variables tested.

The What Do You Think of Your Community Schools scale was designed to measure the positivity-negativity of Black parent attitudes toward community education in relation to five interrelated categories:

- (1) General Community School Approval-Disapproval
- (2) Program and Curriculum
- (3) Staff and Personnel
- (4) Buildings and Facilities
- (5) School-Community Interaction

The Community School Directors' Perceptions of Black Parent Attitudes scale was utilized to assess community school directors' perceptions of Black parent

attitudes toward community education. Both measurement devices employed identical attitude statements, however, community school directors were instructed to respond according to their perceptions of the most typical of the Black parents in their respective communities.

The data collected on 339 Black parents and 30 community school directors representing 30 elementary school communities in Flint, Michigan (Winter, 1973) were coded according to school and independent variable commonality and transformed onto data processing cards. These cards were subsequently utilized in an analysis of variance and a regression analysis program through the C.D.C. 3600 Computer System at Michigan State University.

Findings of the Study

An amplified discussion of the findings of the study follows.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant relationship between age and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

The results of the data indicate that community school directors' age is not significantly related to the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes

toward community education ($P = .1324$). An additional analysis excluding potentially contaminating data reaffirmed the initial findings ($P = .3422$).

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant relationship between race and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

There is no evidence in the data indicating that one group of community school directors displayed significantly more congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education than another when race was utilized as a variable ($P = .3883$).

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant relationship between academic degree and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 3 was not rejected.

Data results indicate that no one group of community school directors displayed statistically significant differences in perception congruence when grouped according to academic degree ($P = .3968$).

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant relationship between job level and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 4 was rejected.

There is evidence in the data indicating that there was a statistically significant difference between mean perception discrepancy scores for community school director job level groupings of (1) released director and (2) teaching director ($P = .0151$). The significant differences between the two job level groups suggest that teaching community school directors displayed more congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education than did released community school directors. Further examination of the data revealed that the instrument subscales of staff and personnel ($P = .0077$) and school-community interaction ($P = .0820$) appear to be most accountable for the overall significant differences in group mean perception discrepancy scores.

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant relationship between job location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 5 was not rejected.

The results of the data revealed that no one group of community school directors displayed statistically significant differences in perception congruence than other groups when job location was utilized as a variable ($P = .8461$).

Hypothesis 6

There is no significant relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 6 was not rejected.

There is no evidence in the initial data results indicating that community school directors' years of experience are significantly related to the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education ($N = 30$; $P = .1553$). Secondary results (excluding potentially biasing school-community data) however, indicate a statistically significant relationship between years of experience and congruity of community school directors' perceptions ($N = 29$; $P = .0035$). The significant relationship suggests that, as community school directors' years of experience increase, their perception congruence increases accordingly. Although the instrument aspect of general community school approval-disapproval appears to largely

account for significance ($P = .0550$), the inconclusiveness and contradiction of the data results do not permit rejection of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant relationship between residential background and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 7 was not rejected.

The results of the data analysis indicate that no one group of community school directors displayed greater statistically significant differences in perception congruence than other groups when residential background was used as a variable ($P = .6427$).

Hypothesis 8

There is no significant relationship between father's occupational status and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8 was not rejected.

There is no evidence in the data indicating that significant relationships exist between any community school director grouping of father's occupational status and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education ($P = .1414$).

Hypothesis 9

There is no significant relationship between geographical location and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 9 was not rejected.

The initial results of the data analysis indicate that a statistically significant relationship exists between community school directors' geographical location of rearing and the congruence of their perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education ($N = 30$; $P = .0449$). Further examination of the data reveals that perceptions of community school directors reared in the Southwest and Southeast appear to be more congruent than the other groups.

Because two groupings of community school directors included only one respondent school-community (Southeast and Midsouth), and thereby, potential for distortion of the results, an additional analysis was computed which indicated an insignificant relationship ($N = 28$; $P = .3169$). The contradictory and inconclusive results do not permit rejection of the hypothesis.

Further Findings

There is evidence in the data which suggests that Black parent attitudes toward community education are relatively positive. Computation of the grand means

($\bar{X} = 3.4660$) for the total sample of Black parents ($N = 339$) is indicative of such generally positive responses to attitudinal scale components.

In addition, the results of hypothesis testing and a comparison of the grand means of Black parents ($N = 339$; $\bar{X} = 3.4660$) and community school directors ($N = 30$; $\bar{X} = 3.7837$) appear to indicate that, while directors perceived parents' attitudes to be higher than was actually recorded, their perceptions were reasonably congruent.

Conclusions

The following conclusions appear to be justified on the basis of the findings in this study.

Hypothesis 1

Age was not a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 2

The variable of race was not influential in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 3

Academic degree status was not a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 4

Job level was a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. It was found that teaching directors were more congruent in their perceptions than were released directors.

Hypothesis 5

Job location was not an essential variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 6

Contradictory evidence prohibits the declaration of years of experience as a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. However, there appears to be a relationship between years of experience and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions.

Hypothesis 7

Residential background was not an influential variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 8

Father's occupational status was not a significant variable in determining whether or not community school directors have congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education.

Hypothesis 9

Geographical location of rearing, while exhibiting somewhat of a relationship, cannot be regarded as a key variable in determining whether or not community school directors hold congruent perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education. Inconclusiveness of the findings does not permit a declaration of variable significance.

Although this study was only indirectly concerned with the specific evaluative nature of sample Black parent attitudes toward community education, it can be concluded that such attitudes are relatively positive. In addition, while community school director perceptions of Black parent attitudes were for the most part more

positive than actual attitudes, it is concluded that such perceptions are reasonably congruent.

Implications and Recommendations

While being limited and modest in scope, the findings of this study have significant implications for several groups of individuals in particular: school district administrators, community school principals, directors, teachers, and community development agents. If interpersonal perceptions and their behavioral consequences are considered to be important, all efforts to determine those factors and forces which affect congruent perceptions should be extended.

The following implications and recommendations are derived from the findings of the study.

1. Structural differentiations of the position of community school director should be continuously and extensively evaluated. While most evaluation in education is concerned with personnel or clientele, there exists a need for determining the parameters of position effectiveness. In addition, alternative positional structures relating to the leadership and administrative function in community education should be experimentally developed, practiced, and accordingly employed.

2. This study seems to reaffirm the long established assumption that there exists somewhat of a relationship between years of experience and occupational effectiveness. The fact that perception congruency increases concomitantly with years of experience is more than coincidental. Considering this finding, a concerted effort should be extended by personnel officials to employ experienced community school directors in school communities which have been characterized by community disapproval regarding the school and minimal school-community interaction.
3. Personnel officials should give consideration to the demographic variables of father's occupational status and geographical location of rearing when screening and selecting prospective community school directors for positions in school communities which have a minority population. Such information, as implied in the findings of this study, could serve as indicators of perceptivity in relation to Black parent attitudes toward the school. Implicit in this recommendation is the fact that some prospective community school directors are not equipped or prepared to work in minority communities.

4. There should be continuous assessment of community parent attitudes toward community education. Survey techniques and instrumentation methods, including those applied in the present study, should be employed periodically for purposes of determining the general community school approval-disapproval concerning various aspects of the community education process. Such information will indicate areas of strength and weakness and provide community educators with an empirical base for operation and decision making.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Replicate the present study in one year in Flint, Michigan to determine the stability of both Black parent attitudes toward community education and the congruence of community school directors' perceptions of those attitudes.
2. Replicate the present study in another urban school district which employs the concept of community education. Further research would not only provide a guide for understanding community school directors' perceptions of Black parent attitudes toward community education in another

setting, but would test the credibility and generalizability of the findings in the present study.

3. Develop an in-depth study, based upon the present review of the literature and results, to determine the effects of in-service education, workshops, seminars, colloquia, academic courses, and home visitations upon the nature and congruency of interpersonal leadership perceptions. Utilization of the One Group Pretest-Posttest Design¹⁴¹ would, perhaps, serve to identify treatment measures which positively affect perception congruency and, thus, interpersonal behavior.
4. Develop a study designed to provide further knowledge concerning the focus of Black parent attitudes toward community education or education in general. Perhaps by determining those factors or aspects of education which significantly contribute to such attitude formation and development, a clearer understanding of the behavioral consequences can be derived.
5. Develop a case study examining the importance of understanding community attitudes toward

¹⁴¹Donald T. Stanley and Julian C. Campbell, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), p. 8.

education and their implications for educational administrators. As the role of the community in American education becomes more widespread and critical, such information should prove invaluable.

6. Develop a study designed to specifically determine the relationship between community school director years of experience and positional competence. Such a study could have implications for the hiring of community school directors and provide insight into the widespread assumption that experience determines effectiveness.

Reflections

The following reflections pertinent to the field of community education emanate from the selected review of the literature, collected data, and observations of the researcher.

1. Community school directors need to understand the importance of community attitudes toward community education as an indirect and informal aid to decision making. Mechanisms for community evaluative input can provide a realistic guide to administrative and leadership deliberations. Ignoring such information is a luxury community educators cannot afford.

2. Because the community school is often the center of community social, cultural, and educational activity, all community school personnel should be cognizant of parent attitudes toward education. There is a large body of research which indicates that a significant relationship exists between the attitudes of children and attitudes held by their parents. Therefore, it seems appropriate that thorough knowledge of parental attitudes would provide insights into the behaviors of their young. Such data could have practical implications for teaching strategies, curriculum development, and program implementation.
3. Professional educators should be exposed to experimentally manipulated experiences and situations which permit critical examination of their perceptual organizations. Inasmuch as individual perceptual organization assessment is seldom incorporated into professional preparation, it is of critical importance that such experiences be provided, thus creating an awareness of internal behavior motives.
4. (While community education is often considered and developed as an educational program, more emphasis should be given development of a process which embodies community life.) The attitudes

of community residents toward community education, whether they are positive or negative, provide one of many references for channeling interests and concerns toward constructive community ends. The ultimate goal of community education, that of community self-actualization, can only be accomplished through a continuously evolving process, not a series of superficial and optional programs.

5. Personal qualifications and requirements for the position of community school director should include skills in interpersonal, intergroup, and community relations and training in human communication and psychology.
6. Continuous in-service education programs should be developed for community school directors emphasizing community dynamics and an understanding of the human elements of community development. Social change and community betterment must be founded in a clear and comprehensive understanding of all forces which impinge upon the lives of people.

1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allport, Gordon W. Becoming. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- American Association of School Administrators. Judging Schools with Wisdom. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1959.
- Ardmore, Sydney J. Introduction to Statistical Analysis and Inference for Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Argyris, Chris. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, Inc.
- _____. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Biddle, William. The Community Development Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Borg, Walter. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.
- Brubacher, J. S. Henry Barnard on Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1931.
- Bruner, Jerome S.; Goodnow, Jacqueline J.; and Austin, George A. A Study of Thinking. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Bruner and Krick. Perceptions and Personality. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1949-50.
- X Bullock, Robert P. School-Community Attitude Analysis for Educational Administrators. Columbus: Ohio State University.

- Campbell, Donald T., and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
- Campbell, Roald F., and Gregg, Russell T. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Cantril, Hadley. The Morning Notes of Adelbert Ames. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1960.
- Clapp, Elsie. Community Schools in Action. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.
- Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1960.
- Combs, Arthur W. Florida Studies in the Helping Professions. Gainesville, Florida: The University of Florida Press, 1969.
- _____. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.
- _____. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- _____, and Snygg, Donald. Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach to Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Cox, Peter R. Demography. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Dean, John P., and Rosen, Alex. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Deutler, Robert A.; Mackler, Bernard; and Warshauer, Mary E. The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Company, 1967.
- Dewey, John. The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- Doll, Ronald. Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.

- Drucker, Peter R. Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- English, H. B., and English, A. C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms. New York: McKay Publishing Company, 1958.
- Everett, Samuel. The Community School. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1938.
- Giddings, F. H. The Principles of Sociology. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1896.
- Goslin, Willard E. Organizing the Elementary School for Living and Learning. ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1947.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Collier-Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Hamachek, Donald E. Encounters with the Self. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.
- Hand, Harold C. What People Think About Their Schools. New York: World Book Company, 1945.
- Hart, Joseph K. Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities. New York: McMillan Company, 1913.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Henry, Nelson B. Community Education, Principles and Practices From Worldwide Experience. 58th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Henry, Nelson B. The Community School. 52nd Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1953.

- Institute for Community Education Development. Needed Research in Community Education. Muncie, Ind.: Ball State University, 1971.
- Johoda, Marie, and Warren, Neil. Attitudes. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966.
- Keisler, Charles A.; Collins, Barry E.; and Mills, Norman. Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Kerensky, Vasil M., and Melby, Ernest O. Education II--The Social Imperative. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.
- King, Irving. Education for Social Efficiency. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1913.
- Krech, D., and Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and Problems in Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.
- _____; _____; and Ballachey, E. L. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- Maslow, Abraham H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.
- McGrath, J. E. Social Psychology. New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1964.
- Moustakas, Clark E. Self. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Murchison, Carl A. Handbook of Social Psychology. New York: Clark University Press, 1935.
- Murphy, Gardner. Personality Through Perception: An Experimental and Clinical Study. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- _____; Murphy, L. B.; and Newcomb, T. M. Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1937.

- Newcomb, T. M.; Turner, R. H.; and Converse, P. E. Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction. New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1965.
- Olsen, Edward G. School and Community. New York: Prentice Hall, 1945.
- _____. School and Community. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- _____. The Modern Community School. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1953.
- Prestwood, Elwood L. The High School Principal and Staff Work Together. New York: New York Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1957.
- Proshansky, Harold, and Seidenberg, Bernard. Basic Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Purkey, W. W. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Rosenthal, Robert. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Schein, Edgar H., and Bennis, Warren O. Personality and Organizational Change Through Group Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Seay, Maurice. The Community School and Community Self-Improvement. Lansing, Mich.: Office of Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954.
- Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1967.
- Sherif, M., and Sherif, C. W. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Row Company, 1956.
- Spencer, Herbert. First Principles. New York: A. L. Burt Publishers, 1862.
- Taguiri, Renato, and Petrullo, Luigi. Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958.

- Thomas, W. I., and Znaniecki, F. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. New York: Alfred E. Knopf Publishers, 1927.
- Thurstone, L., and Chane, E. J. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Totten, W. Fred, and Manley, Frank J. The Community School: Basic Concepts, Functions, and Organization. Galien, Mich.: Allied Education Council, 1969.
- Turabian, Kate. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers and Dissertations. Revised. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.
- Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Chicago: G & C Merriam Co., 1970.
- Whitt, Robert L. A Handbook for the Community School Director. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.

Journals and Periodicals

- Anderson, L. R., and Fishbein, M. "Prediction of Attitude from Number, Strength and Evaluative Aspect of Beliefs About the Attitude Object." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology II (September, 1965).
- Bruner, Jerome S., and Postman, Leo. "Tension and Tension Release as Organizing Factors in Perception." Journal of Personality, XV (1947).
- Buehring, Leo E. "New Patterns-Community Schools." Nations Schools, LXI (1958).
- Campbell, Clyde M. The Community School and Its Administration, XI (October, 1972).
- Campbell, D. T. "The Indirect Assessment of Social Attitudes." Psychology Bulletin, XLVII (1950).
- Cardno, J. A. "The Notion of Attitude." Psychological Reports, I (1955).

- Christensen, C. M. "Relationship Between Pupil Achievement, Pupil Affect-Need, Teacher Warmth and Teacher Permissiveness." Journal of Educational Psychology, XI (1960).
- Conant, James B. "Community and School Are Inseparable." The School and Community Reader. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.
- Harris, Sydney. "We Don't See What Is There." Detroit Free Press, January 4, 1966.
- Lange, L. "Neue Experimente." Philosophical Studies, IV (1888).
- Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes." Archives of Psychology, No. 140 (1932).
- Minzey, Jack. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (November, 1972).
- _____. "Community Education in the 70's." The Community School and Its Administration, IX, No. 8 (April, 1971).
- Olsen, Edward G. "City, Suburb, and Education." The Community School and Its Administration, VIII, No. 8 (April, 1970).
- "Research Notes." Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (September, 1972).
- Stern, George. "Measurement of Non-cognitive Variables in Research on Teaching." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.
- Thurstone, L. L. "The Measurement of Social Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XXVI (1931).
- Truax, C. B., and Dickenson, W. "Group Counseling With College Underachievers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, VL (1966).
- Van Voorhees, Curtis. "The Definition Issue." National Community School Education Association News. Flint, Michigan (May, 1971).
- Yourman, Julius. "Community Coordination The Next Movement in Education." Journal of Educational Sociology, IX (February, 1936).

Unpublished Materials

- Becker, William E. "A Study of the Leadership Effectiveness of the Community School Director." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.
- Blue, Fermin Keith. "The Flint Community School Director." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Clancy, Peter L. The Flint Community School Concept. Flint, Michigan: Board of Education, 1969.
- Community Education Concept. Center for Community Education Development, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1971.
- Cowan, Alton W. "The Building Director: A Critical Study of Expectations Held for the Position by Principals, Adult Education Coordinators, Teachers and Building Directors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Crosby, Jerry D. "A Study of the Expectancies Which Community School Directors and Related Others Have of the Community School Director's Roles in Serving Neighborhoods of Eight Inner-City Schools in Flint, Michigan." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Facts and Figures About the Flint Community Schools. Flint: The Board of Education, 1972.
- Job Description--The Flint Community School Director. Flint, Michigan: Board of Education, 1971.
- Loving, Alvin D. "Crystallizing and Making Concrete the Community School Concept in Michigan Through Study of Ongoing Community School Practices." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1954.
- Manley, Frank J. Private papers.
- The Community Education Bulletin. Regional Center for Community Education Development. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, II (January, 1971).

The Role of the Community School Director in the Flint
Community Schools. Flint, Michigan: Board of
Education, 1969.

Interviews

Pappadakis, Nick. Executive Director, National Community
School Education Association, November, 1972.

Van Voorhees, Curtis. Professor of Education, University
of Michigan, November, 1972.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

It is hoped that the following instructional steps will be used in survey administration and retrieval.

STEP I SURVEY ASSISTANCE

1. Directors who have access to supportive service personnel (Home School Counselor, Community Service Officer, etc.).
 - a. Utilize the services of supportive personnel.
 - b. Thoroughly explain the survey and its purpose.
 - c. Discuss the value of the results in terms of your school operation.
2. Directors who do not have access to supportive service personnel.
 - a. Make temporary schedule adjustments to administer survey instruments.

STEP II SURVEY DELIVERY

- a. Deliver the survey and white envelopes to addresses listed.
Arrangements for pick-up should be made at this time. Pick-up should be scheduled for no more than 2-3 days later.
- b. Do not influence responding parents, however, encourage frankness and honesty.
- c. Instruct parents to seal envelope containing completed surveys and await pick-up.

STEP III SURVEY PICK-UP

- a. Collect sealed envelopes and retain in original manila packet.
- b. Do not open returned envelopes.

STEP IV SURVEY DEADLINE

- a. All completed surveys must be returned to the school office by February 16, 1973. At this time surveys will be picked up for compilation.

NOTE--In the event that parents have moved since September 5, 1973, or if address listed finds no one at home, please notify the Office of Elementary Community Education.

Also, parents who cannot read should have the survey instrument administered individually (orally) and their responses recorded.

Inasmuch as the survey concerns parent attitudes toward community education, results of the survey will be available to you upon request.

APPENDIX B

MEMO RE: COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY

APPENDIX B

February 2, 1973

To: Elementary Principals
From: Office of Elementary Community Education
Re: Community Attitude Survey

During the next two weeks, John Fallon, a Mott Intern, will be conducting a Community Attitude Survey in your school-community. The survey, done in conjunction with our office, will provide valuable data concerning parent attitudes toward their community school. We are asking for cooperation with the study from you and your Community School Director.

The survey instruments and instructions will be discussed and handed out at the Community School Directors' meeting on February 6, 1973. While each school has a maximum of 15 visits involved, your directors will be encouraged to administer and retrieve the questionnaires, from the pre-designated addresses, in conjunction with your Community Service Officers and Home-School Counselors. In the event that your school does not have these supportive personnel, your Director will be asked to administer and call for completed instruments.

The deadline for retrieving the Community Attitude Surveys will be February 16, 1973, at which time they will be picked up from your school. Participating schools will receive composite results upon request.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Dr. Richard Ehrbright
Associate Director of
Elementary Community Education

RE/sa

APPENDIX C

LETTER REGARDING SURVEY INSTRUMENT DISTRIBUTION
TO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

APPENDIX C

Flint Community Schools

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • 923 EAST KEARSLEY STREET • FLINT, MICHIGAN 48502

February 1, 1973

Mr. John Fallon
National Center for Community
Education
1017 Avon
Flint, Michigan 48503

Dear John:

Having read carefully your doctoral proposal and survey instruments, "A Study of the Relationship Between Demographic Variables and the Accuracy of Community School Directors' Perceptions of Minority Parent Attitudes Toward Community Education," the Office of Elementary Community Education concurs that up-to-date data is necessary concerning the perceptions of minority parents' attitudes toward community education and the accuracy of those perceptions by elementary school community school directors.

Hopefully, the collected data and subsequent interpretation will be of great value in future decisions pertinent to community education components such as participation, programs and involvement, particularly of those citizens who happen to be members of minority groups.

As to communicating with each community school director and the mechanics involved in such an undertaking, I would recommend to you that you speak to the total group, with full rationale for such a study; a set of clear directions as to their role in the study and other procedures to be followed with your survey instruments, collection and return to you. Their next meeting is Tuesday, February 6, 1973.

I would be happy to introduce you, your proposed study and provide this office's endorsement to the study at that time.

In return, we ask only that a copy of the computer print-outs from survey instruments by school-community and, if not a copy of the finished dissertation, at least a copy of Chapter III, IV and V in the completed form.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Respectfully,


Richard Ehrbriht
Associate Director, Elementary Community Education

RE:sa

APPENDIX D

SURVEY: WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT
YOUR COMMUNITY SCHOOL

APPENDIX E

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK PARENT ATTITUDES

This survey will give you the opportunity to indicate how you, as a Community School Director, perceive Black parent attitudes concerning the community school. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU INDICATE RESPONSES REFLECTING HOW THE TYPICAL BLACK PARENT IN YOUR SCHOOL-COMMUNITY WOULD RESPOND.

Be frank and honest in your responses as there are no right or wrong answers.

Please do not put your name on this survey or omit any items.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether the typical Black parent in your school-community would: strongly agree, agree, be undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

If the typical Black parent would:

Very Strongly Agree, circle SA.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
Agree, circle A.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
Be Undecided, circle U.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
Disagree, circle D.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
Very Strongly Disagree, circle SD.....	SA	A	U	D	SD

- | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Most of the kids in our neighborhood seem to like our community school..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. Our Community School Director seems to know our community well..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. I believe that our community school program helps people to better themselves... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. I think that our community school should be the center of activity in our neighborhood..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. I wish more youth programs would be offered at our community school..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. I think that schools should include facilities for community use..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. There seems to be a good relationship between our community and the community school..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. In my opinion, schools could do much more to inform the community of programs and activities..... | SA | A | U | D | SD |

9.	Community school staff members seem to care more about money than people.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	Our community school administrators usually try to make parents feel at home in the school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
11.	I am proud of our city's community school system.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	The community school does little to involve community agencies with its program.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
13.	The community school never seems to offer programs that interest me.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
14.	Volunteers seem to do a better job than paid staff members at our community school..	SA	A	U	D	SD
15.	Our community school system does not seem to represent our community well.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
16.	In my opinion, our community school has plenty of space and rooms for adult use.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	I believe that schools should only be used for teaching children.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	Because of our Community School Director, our school really cares about community problems.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
19.	Programs about art and music are not offered often enough to suit me.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
20.	Our community school is one of the best in the city.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
21.	It seems hard to get involved at our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
22.	I am sold on the after-school program for kids at our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
23.	The cost of our community school system seems too high for its worth in the community.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
24.	I am satisfied with our community school's recreation facilities.....	SA	A	U	D	SD

24

25

26

37

38

39

40

APR
AVG

25.	The most important concern of our community school seems to be people.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
26.	Our Community School Director does not seem to care about making our community a better place to live.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
27.	Many changes should be made to improve our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
28.	I am satisfied with the health services provided at our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
29.	In my opinion, the community room is an important part of our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
30.	I feel that planning community school activities should include community people..	SA	A	U	D	SD
31.	I think our community school should offer more programs for older people and adults...	SA	A	U	D	SD
32.	My family is satisfied with our community school.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
33.	In my opinion, we have a good community school staff.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
34.	I don't think that our community school is helping to make our community a better place to live.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
35.	Our community school does a poor job in helping people to get along with others..	SA	A	U	D	SD
36.	The library at our community school is one of the best in the city.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
37.	I believe that schools should be actively involved in solving the problems of the community.....	SA	A	U	D	SD
38.	I think that the program in our community school is better than most other schools....	SA	A	U	D	SD
39.	The community school staff seems to be interested in the people of the community...	SA	A	U	D	SD
40.	Programs for adults are, generally, a waste of time.....	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX E

SURVEY: COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS ' PERCEPTIONS
OF BLACK PARENT ATTITUDES

APPENDIX F

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

APPENDIX F

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

Instructions: Please provide an appropriate answer for each statement.
All answers will be held strictly confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ years
2. What is your ethnic identity?
White _____
Black _____
Chicano _____
Oriental _____
Other _____
3. What is your marital status?
Married _____
Single _____
4. What is the highest degree you presently hold?
Associate _____
B.A. or B.S. _____
M.A. or M.S. _____
Specialist _____
Doctorate _____
Other _____
5. What was your undergraduate major field of study? _____
6. What type(s) of specialized training have you received for your role as Community School Director?
2 week workshop _____
6 week workshop _____
Mott Internship _____
Trainee program _____
University degree program _____
School district inservice _____
Other _____
7. What is your job level? (Released Time Director or Teaching Director)

8. How long have you been a Community School Director?
(Include total years of experience) _____
9. How long have you worked as a Community School Director in your present community school? _____ years
10. Do you reside in the school-community in which you are employed?
_____ yes _____ no

11. How would you describe the community in which you are presently employed?
 Mostly Black _____
 Roughly equal Black and White _____
 Mostly White _____
12. How would you describe the community in which you grew up?
 Urban _____
 Suburban _____
 Rural _____
13. How would you describe your geographical location of rearing?
 Northeastern United States _____ Mid-Western United States _____
 Southeastern United States _____ Northwestern United States _____
 Mid-Southern United States _____ Southwestern United States _____
14. How would you describe your father's occupation?
 Unskilled and skilled
 blue collar _____
 Salaried professional,
 upper level manager _____
 or official _____
 Self-employed business
 man or professional, _____
 farm owner, or operator _____
 White collar clerical,
 sales, or public service _____

APPENDIX G

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR I, II, III

APPENDIX G

MOTT PROGRAM DIVISION COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR I

A. DUTIES

This is a dual staff position. Under assignment to the building principal, the Community School Director I will teach half time and coordinate the Community School Program of the school to which he is assigned. In this capacity, he performs the following functions:

1. Performs all duties of a half-time teacher.
2. Programs, with the assistance of the school principal, all community activities relating to the school, including:
 - a) elementary, youth, and adult enrichment activities;
 - b) organization of school-related clubs, such as Teen Club, Women's Club, and Men's Club. (These examples are not intended to be all-inclusive nor are they meant to be restrictive.)
3. Promotes, publicizes, and interprets existing and planned programs to the school staff and community.
4. Accepts responsibility for all activities normally designated as community related.
5. Establishes rapport with lay leaders of the community (business, religious, and social).
6. Becomes familiar with the social and economic structure of the community and applies this knowledge to program development.
7. Establishes, in cooperation with the principal, a community advisory council for the purpose of community program development and evaluation.
8. Assists in a constant evaluation of activities for the purpose of upgrading existing programs and implementing new ideas.
9. Establishes budget necessary for operation of the community school program.
10. Prepares and submits reports required by the Regional Coordinators' Office.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR I (cont'd.)

11. Establishes and operates a summer program to meet the needs of the community.
12. Performs such other related duties and responsibilities as assigned or as appropriate.

B. QUALIFICATIONS

1. Education: Bachelors' degree and Michigan certification.
2. Experience: Two years of teaching experience desirable. Previous experience as Trainee I or II or internship preferred.

MOTT PROGRAM DIVISION
COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR II

A. DUTIES

This is the staff position of a full-time Community School Director released from teaching responsibilities. Under assignment to the building principal, the Community School Director II performs the following functions:

1. Programs, with the assistance of the school principal, all community activities relating to the school, including:
 - a) elementary, youth, and adult enrichment activities;
 - b) organization of school-related clubs, such as Teen Club, Women's Club and Men's Club. (These examples are not intended to be all-inclusive nor are they meant to be restrictive.)
2. Promotes, publicizes, and interprets existing and planned programs to the school staff and community.
3. Accepts responsibility for all activities normally designated as community related.
4. Establishes rapport with lay leaders of the community (business, religious, and social).
5. Becomes familiar with the social and economic structure of the community and applies this knowledge to program development.
6. Establishes, in cooperation with the principal, a community advisory council for the purpose of community program development and evaluation.
7. Assists in a constant evaluation of activities for the purpose of upgrading existing programs and implementing new ideas.
8. Establishes budget necessary for operation of the community school program.
9. Prepares and submits reports as required by the Regional Coordinators' Office.
10. Establishes a summer enrichment and recreation program to meet the needs of the community.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR II (cont'd.)

11. Performs such other related duties and responsibilities as assigned or appropriate.

B. QUALIFICATIONS

1. Education: Master's degree in Community Education or a Bachelor's degree plus a minimum of 15 semester hours in Community Education, and Michigan certification.
2. Experience: Minimum of 2 years as Community School Director I. Recommendation from the principal desired. Exceptionally successful past effort in community programs.

MOTT PROGRAM DIVISION
COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR III

A. DUTIES

Same as Community School Director II with the addition of administrative duties and responsibilities as determined jointly by each building Principal and Regional Coordinator.

B. QUALIFICATIONS

1. Education: Master's degree or equivalent.
2. Experience: Five years of teaching or administrative experience in the Flint School System. Four of five years as Community School Director I or Community School Director II preferred.

Recommendation by Associate Superintendent for the Mott Program.

4



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102136631