Western Michigan University

ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations        Graduate College

8-1978

# A Descriptive Study of Community Education Models According to Selected Dimensions

Dale L. Cook
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons

### Recommended Citation

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION
MODELS ACCORDING TO SELECTED DIMENSIONS

by

Dale L. Cook

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate School
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1978

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION
MODELS ACCORDING TO SELECTED DIMENSIONS

Dale L. Cook, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1978

The purposes of this study were to describe each of
three models of community education along selected dimensions,
and to describe how the models were similar and/or different
from each other.  The three models were defined according to
the way community education organizations are financed.
Model I represented those organizations in which the commu-
nity education effort was totally financed through public
schools.  Model II represented those organizations in which
the community education effort was jointly financed through
public schools and other community resources.  Model III
represented those organizations in which the community educa-
tion effort was financed through community resources other
than that of the public school.  The dimensions selected to
describe each of the three models, and also their similarities
and differences, included history, finance, programs/services,
governance/staffing, structure for community involvement, and
future.

Two organizations were selected for investigation which
represented each of the three models.  The data were procured
through interviews with the directors of the selected

organizations. The dimensions noted above served as the framework for the interview schedule.

The major findings of the study were: (1) organizations which were represented by Model I reported less cooperation with other agencies when compared with Models II and III; (2) the goal of promoting school/community relationships was reported as primary to Model I and II organizations, but not to Model III organizations; (3) Model III organizations reported more involvement in community development and community action activities than did Model I and II organizations; (4) Model I and II organizations reported that their programs and/or services emphasized the young adult age group over all others; (5) most members of the governing boards of organizations represented by any one of the three models lacked training in group process skills, and most governing board members of organizations represented by Models I and II lacked formal training with respect to the goals of their organizations; (6) volunteers represented less than 10 percent of the part-time staff of organizations represented by all three models; (7) the directors of Model II and III organizations made more active use of their advisory councils than did directors of Model I organizations; and (8) directors of Model III organizations are more optimistic about the future success of their organizations than are directors of Model I and II organizations. Implications of these findings were discussed in the study as were recommendations for further study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to committee members Dr. Donald C. Weaver, Dr. Uldis Smidchens, and Dr. Edsel Erickson for their advice and time given to me throughout the writing of this dissertation. A special note of thanks to Dr. Weaver for helping me to appreciate another side of community education, and also to Dr. Smidchens for his friendship and continuous encouragement.

To my wife, Marsha, my appreciation for the many sacrifices made during the program, particularly those made during the final stages of this dissertation.

Also to my parents, Patsy and Harold Cook, my most sincere thanks for instilling me with self-confidence and an appreciation for work.

Finally, to our closest friends, my thanks for their comradeship and for enhancing the development of our faith.

Dale L. Cook

ii

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

7821930

COOK, DALE LEE
   A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION
   MODELS ACCORDING TO SELECTED DIMENSIONS.

   WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, ED.D., 1978

University
   Microfilms
International    300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii

iv

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Although the current conception of community education as a process is a relatively new concept and continues to become more fully developed, it has basically evolved from a concept known as the community school, which was first formally introduced in the early 1930's in Flint, Michigan (Seay, 1974). The current conception of community education as a process to utilize all available resources to improve the quality of life in a community represents a basic longitudinal change in community education philosophy. Generally, the change has involved a conceptual transition from the school-centered program referred to above as the community school concept toward emphasis upon a more comprehensive community-centered process known as community education (Seay, 1974; Weaver, 1972b).

While the more conventional school-centered, program-oriented model of community education has continued in the practice of community education, other models have come to exist in the field (Parson, 1976). One way in which existing models could be classified would be according to the way community education is financed. Few community educators would disagree that three basic models of community education exist which are in accord with the criterion of finance.

1

The three basic models are those community education organizations which are: (1) totally financed by public schools, (2) jointly financed by public schools and other resources, and (3) financed by resources other than the public schools.

Much of what is known about community education has been limited to the first model which is reflective of the school-centered, program-oriented conception of community education. While early community school programs, most notably those located in Flint, Michigan, received financial assistance from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation--which has continued to play a major financial role in the development of community education--most community school programs became financially dependent on public schools as the fiscal agent.

The conceptual transition from a school-centered program to a comprehensive community-centered process has in many instances resulted in an increase in cooperation among community agencies and other resources with the public schools (Dixon, 1977; Seay, 1974). Dixon (1977) also reported that the increase in cooperation has been, on occasion, accompanied by cooperative governance and financial arrangements between various agencies, other community resources, and public schools. Community education consortia such as those identified by Dixon are examples of the second model of community education identified above.

Because of the confusion which frequently surrounds the

third model, a more detailed explanation is presented than was given above for the previous two models. The third model represents those community education organizations which are not financed by public schools. Rather, such organizations are financed by other resources in the community. When community education was perceived as a school-centered program, commonly referred to as the community school concept, it was almost always based in public schools. As the community school concept changed to a community-centered process, two things occurred of relevant import. First of all, it became conceptually possible for community education to be implemented in a non-school base (Weaver, 1972b). Secondly, many disciplines which were already in existence during the time of the change became "subparts" of community education--at least to the extent to which such organizations were geared toward the goals of community education (Minzey, 1972). Examples of such disciplines include social work, community organization, continuing education, and community development.

Just as the first two models reflect some combination of disciplines, so does the third. Non-school based community education organizations which include a combination of the various aspects of such disciplines and which also meet the criteria set forth in the definition of community education fall within the rubric of neighborhood center, community center, self-help center, neighborhood service center, neighborhood multi-service center, neighborhood associations,

and human resource centers.

While examples of the above may be conceptualized as community education organizations, it is important to note that they may not actually refer to themselves as such. In addition, one must caution against assuming an automatic association between any one of the above names of organizations and the purpose or role they play in communities. For example, an organization given the name of community center may in fact be a recreation center for senior citizens. It should also be realized, of course, that the same could hold true for examples of the other two models. Public schools may, for example, be named community schools and include only adult education programs in addition to the normal K-12 curriculum. Such organizations could be perceived as subparts of community education rather than a community education organization in and of themselves. It should then be recognized that any organization, no matter how it is financed and governed, must have goals consistent with all the criteria specified in the definition of community education if it is to be considered a community education organization.

Although neighborhood centers numbered few in the past and were generally restricted to the centers involved in the Settlement House Movement, there is little doubt that they have recently expanded both in type and number (Davies, 1977; Dixon & Carr, 1976; O'Donnell & Reid, 1971; Perlman, 1976).

Davies (1977) emphasized this notion when, after studying citizen organization in seven large cities, he concluded that "in all the cities that we've visited, there is a very lively, growing movement of neighborhood associations" (p. 8). The term "neighborhood association" should not be interpreted from a very limited perspective, as Davies continued by illustrating the diversity of the term: "Sometimes they take the form of direct action groups and sometimes they take the form of community development corporations. They take on all kinds of different forms" (p. 8).

While several factors may have contributed to the increased number of these organizations, two prime factors emerged as the researcher examined the related literature. The first relates to the need people have to identify with "a sense of community." Morgan (1957) indicated that people find a sense of community "wherever they begin to create limited communities with characteristics of intimate acquaintance, mutual confidence, cooperation, and often a spirit of brotherhood." Weaver (1976) further delineated what is meant by "sense of community" by listing conditions which would be observed in most areas which could be said to have achieved a sense of community:

1. An organizational structure through which collective action involving two or more systems and/or sub-systems is achieved.

2. The presence of a super-coordinating agency which promotes analysis of common area problems and coordinates citizen involvement from all

major community systems in the resolution of those problems.

3. Opportunity for each individual to have membership in and commitment to several communities in which he/she is known and accepted.

4. Substantive involvement of citizens in all major agencies and institutions in the area.

5. Evidence of adoption of social norms and constraints appropriate to the area.

6. Commitment to life-long learning--opportunity for adults to pursue educational endeavors that result in the implicit realization that there exists a society outside their own private worlds.

7. Evidence that the area is committed to a two-way responsibility for education--a school which provides leadership and encouragement for adults to continue their education and a neighborhood which provides school-age children with realistic community exposure.

8. Communication across boundaries of systems and sub-systems--interaction between communities of interest.

9. Superordinate goals which are impossible to reach without cooperation across social systems boundaries.

10. Evidence of accommodation and mediation within and across diverse and conflicting social systems--detente among communities of interest.

11. Access to reliable information and data requiring for the study and resolution of social and environmental problems.

12. Access to state and national systems through which solutions to problems originating outside the local area can be effected.

While the need to identify with a sense of community appears to have been with us a long time, many writers have concluded that people have experienced an increased need to identify with it during the past decade (Coleman, 1966; Keyes, 1975; Parko, 1975; Weaver, 1976). Parko (1975) suggested that organization into neighborhood self-help groups, such as neighborhood centers, has resulted largely from this need.

In addition to the above need, people seem to have an increased interest in gaining control over the institutions and organizations that affect their lives. One need only to reflect on the recent "social revolution of the sixties" to gain evidence of the magnitude of such interest. One of the overriding goals of community education is to improve the quality of community life. Davies (1977) suggested that community educators must give communities the power to control individual lives if they really expect to accomplish that goal. He stated in his presentation to Western United States community education center directors that

> the strongest, most lively and impressive activity
> that relates in any way to the schools in the
> cities is in the form of multi-purpose neighbor-
> hood associations which are dealing with very con-
> crete problems in neighborhoods. . . . Most of them
> don't have anything to do with the schools at all.
> (p. 8)

Two notions seem implicit in the position taken by Davies. First, if community educators are to give communi-ties the power to control individual lives, they must be

willing to risk supporting various issues in the community, many of which may be controversial in nature. Secondly, community educators need to be related to community organizations other than the public school, since it is these organizations which seem to have yielded the most positive results. It should be recognized that both of the above notions reflect a concern about attempts to improve the quality of community life solely through school-based organizations because of the traditional non-political role of the public schools with regard to public position on controversial issues. Changes in the non-partisan, non-political roles of the public schools seems unlikely since to do differently would most probably result in the alienation of a faction of the voting public.

If community educators take the above suggestions seriously, non-public school-governed and -financed models of community education may play an important role in future developments of community education. Therefore, it would seem that such models which currently exist warrant further study.

Since the three models have not been studied along consistent dimensions, it was decided that a broad approach to the study--one including several dimensions--was more appropriate than one limited in scope to one or two dimensions. It was anticipated that subsequent studies would involve a more detailed investigation on a more limited

number of dimensions once the initial groundwork had been set in place. By the same token, it must be realized that not all possible dimensions are included in the study. There may be, for example, many dimensions which have not been identified. Based upon a review of the literature, the following dimensions were selected to provide a framework for the description of each model of community education identified above: (1) finance, (2) governance/staffing, (3) structure for community involvement, (4) programs/services, (5) history, and (6) future. A brief description of each dimension is presented below in order that the reader may more fully understand the scope of the study.

Since the functions of organizations may vary according to the sources from which they draw financial support, investigation of this dimension seemed essential. Information regarding percentage of public and private sources was needed as well as total operating budgets. Fair comparisons could not be made if such information were not included in the investigation. The importance of this dimension is magnified in light of the current scarcity of funds for human services.

Governance and staffing have long been recognized as critical elements of most any organization. Governance and staffing questions which are familiar to community educators generally relate to what agency or agencies should be

responsible, the training of individuals responsible for
governance, and the delineation of an effective proportion
of part-time, full-time, and volunteer staff members.

A number of authors have included the establishment
of a community advisory council--the most frequently cited
structure for community involvement--as an important devel-
opmental step necessary for the effective implementation
of community education.  Since the inclusion of such a
structure was found to be important, the researcher thought
it would be important to determine how such structures vary
from one organization to another.  The method of member
selection, whether the structure had a staff and a budget,
frequency of meetings, and perceived power of the structure
were all areas about which information was sought.

The dimension of programs and services was included
to determine whether the studied examples of the models
differed in the types of programs and/or services provided,
and whether emphasis was placed on any one type or age
group.  While many writers (Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Seay,
1974; Weaver, 1972b) have de-emphasized the program aspect
of community education in favor of other, more process-
oriented facets of community education such as community
involvement, the program-service component remains as an
important contribution in most all areas where the community
education concept has been implemented.

The historical component was considered vital to the study because the researcher believed that an investigation into the history of the organizations studied would unveil the roots of many of the problems experienced by the organizations. In addition, very little has been written with regard to the evolution of the third model of community education.

The final dimension included in the study relates to perceptions with regard to the future of each of the organizations studied. The suggestions made by Davies (1977), which are discussed above, are one indication of the importance of coming to a better understanding of the future of each of the three models. Information about perceived goal changes and perceptions of future problems was considered to be of primary importance in this dimension.

While the study of each dimension makes a significant individual contribution to this document, it should also be realized that they are interrelated and information yielded about each frequently combines to assist in the understanding of the other dimensions.

## Rationale

While few community educators would disagree that the three basic finance models of community education discussed above exist, examples of the models have not been systematically described along the selected dimensions. Little

is actually known about how community education varies from one model of finance to another. By depicting differences and similarities among examples of each model along consistent dimensions, the study would add new knowledge to the field of community education.

Of the three models, community educators clearly know the least about the non-school financed model. It would therefore seem that additional knowledge regarding that model is of particular interest and importance. The need for increased attention to non-school community-based models has been amplified most recently by Davies (1977) and Dixon (1977). Davies (1977) stated that community educators must give communities the power to control individual lives if they expect to improve significantly the quality of community life. He also indicated that community educators may be in a better position to give communities the power they need if they utilized a broad support, non-school base for community education. Dixon (1977) also noted a need for increased attention to the non-school financed model. He concluded his study of community education consortia by specifically indicating a need for investigation of community education consortia arrangements in which the school is not involved.

Knowledge yielded by the study with regard to the description of each model and the depiction of differences and similarities among them would seem to have positive implications for community educators at all levels. There

appears to be wide disagreement among community education leaders about how community education should be financed. In addition, practitioners are faced with limited financial resources and are therefore forced to operate more cost-efficient organizations. The study will then provide knowledge and insight which will--through the depiction of differences among models and descriptions of each model--lend a more thorough understanding of alternative finance/governance models of community education for the practitioner and theorist alike.

## Objectives

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is totally financed by public schools.

2. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is jointly financed by public schools and other resources.

3. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is financed by resources other than those of the public schools.

4. To describe, according to selected dimensions, the differences and similarities between those community education organizations which are (a) totally financed by public schools, (b) jointly financed by public schools and other resources, and (c) financed by resources other than the public schools.

## Definition of Terms

Community education.--Community education is a process designed to meet the educational needs of all persons within a community so that the ultimate goals of community problem-solving and individual self-improvement may be realized.

Community.--Any geographical or social constituency.

Education.--The process of changing behavior, individually or collectively.

Process.--A continuous-involvement phenomenon marked by gradual changes that lead toward the goals of community problem-solving and individual self-improvement.

Program.--Courses and activities which are maintained to promote the goals of community problem-solving and individual self-improvement.

## Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters:

Chapter I presented the introduction to the study, rationale, objectives, definition of terms, and organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a selected review of related literature.

Chapter III presents the research methodology and description of the research instruments.

Chapter IV presents a report of the findings.

Chapter V presents conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future study.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter II of this study presents a discussion of three aspects of community education models and is followed by a brief summary concerning the similarities and differences found between the models. The three aspects of the models reviewed in the literature were as follows: (1) history of each of the three models, (2) goals of each of the three models, and (3) problems frequently associated with each of the three models.

### Model I:  Organizations Totally Financed Through Public Schools

The reader will remember that the first model represents community education in organizations which are totally financed by public schools. This model represents the type of community education organization with which community educators are most familiar. This traditional type of community education organization has been termed by Weaver (1972b) to be the "conventional model" of community education. Since this model was found to be the more traditional model of community education, it was not surprising to find that most research in community education related to this model.

16

## History

Seay (1974) has undoubtedly produced the most complete account of the history of community schools in his book Community Education: A Developing Concept. The reader should refer to the Seay book for detailed information with regard to the historical developments of community schools. However, the writer has summarized the findings of Seay below.

According to Seay, the community school largely grew out of a need for community leadership, which was amplified during the tragic times of the history of our nation. Seay indicated that the first community schools began as far back as the early 1930's. The reader will remember that it was at about that time that our country was suffering from "the Great Depression." Seay described how the schools came to play a leadership role in communities, thus giving signs of how schools became community schools during that time of crisis.

Many communities turned to the schools for leadership during the emergency. The schools had buildings and equipment which were centrally located for the convenience of families; they also had a staff of teachers and administrators, some of whom were acquainted with innovation. The results were varied, but the pattern was being worked out by individual schools and communities as they cooperated in planning and using their combined resources to solve

community problems.  The pattern appealed to leaders of communities throughout the nation.

Many school-community cooperatives were developed during the thirties including among others those located in Washington, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Illinois (Seay, 1974).  It was also toward the end of this period of time that the nationally known community schools in Flint, Michigan, had their early developments.

Another national emergency occurred during World War II.  Once again, communities engaged in school-community cooperation, taking advantage of the leadership of school administrators and teachers.  According to Seay, many communities began to look to the school for the rationing of scarce food-stuffs and gasoline, for adult evening classes, volunteer and service projects, and library services.  The concept of community schools became more widely recognized and began to take hold during the early post-war years.  Seay confirmed this notion when he stated that "the immediate post-war years of the late forties saw a development of interests in the community schools which justified references to a 'community school movement'" (p. 24).

It was during that time that many professional organizations of educators began to devote both time and money to extensive research on the community-school role.  The National Society for the Study of Education and the Educational Policies of the National Education Association were

two such groups. The 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, published in 1953, represents the first substantive work in the field of community education. The definition given to the community school concept by Seay in that yearbook is of particular interest since it defines the concept as being process-oriented. According to Seay, "A Community School . . . involves an educative process by which the resources of a community are related to the needs and interest of the people" (p. 8). An article written by McClusky (1953) typified many of the attitudes with regard to proponents of school-community cooperation at that time. McClusky indicated his support of the community school when in this article he stated:

> The school may well be the most important single agency in society to improve the community, but the primary function of the school should be that of helping the community to help itself. The community school then becomes the instrument whereby the superior resources of the community are mobilized for self-improvement. It becomes a catalytic agent and coordinator. It would help the community discover, funnel its power into extra-school agencies. Thus the school must work in and with the community and only for the community; then it can contribute some unique service which no other agency possesses. (pp. 150-151)

Problems covered by what Seay (1974) characterized as a "polarization of educational viewpoints" eventually gave rise to the aforementioned philosophical transition from the Community School concept to the Community Education process. According to Seay, the extreme positions of the views held by many American people were "(a) human needs subordinated

to technological needs; and (b) technological needs sub-
ordinated to human needs" (p. 27). Accompanying this
polarization of viewpoints was the establishment of many
educational agencies in communities geared toward meeting
what became recognized as diverse educational needs. As
these agencies became more firmly established, the school
came to be viewed as only one of many educational agencies
in several communities. This change from school-centered
concept to a more community-centered notion of community
education required close cooperation between the community
schools and other educational agencies to avoid unnecessary
duplication of effort, and eventually gave rise to the
second and third models of community education referred to
in this report.

<u>Goals</u>

The goals reported in this portion of the study reflect
those goals which have been researched by community educators
using individuals representing the first model as subjects
of their investigation. Community education goals which
reflect the second and third models follow in subsequent
sections of this report.

There have been two major studies, Weaver (1972b) and
DeLargy (1974), which have tried to pinpoint the goals of
community education on a national scale. Cwik, King, and
Van Voorhees (1975) indicated that with the exception of

these two efforts, "most of the literature 'talks around' community education goals or explains that the goals are stated implicitly or explicitly in the definitions given to community education" (p. 48). However, DeLargy noted, "One may doubt the significance of goals stated in definitions of community education. The community education concept . . . suffers from a lack of common understanding as to its basic definition" (p. 38). Minzey and LeTarte (1972) suggested that the evolution of community education has left community educators with many different attitudes and beliefs about community education.

As the first attempt to identify the goals of community education on a national scale, Weaver (1972b) made a tremendous contribution to the field of community education. The study included interviews with 245 community educators. The population included close to an equal number of practicing community educators in local school buildings, coordinators of community education involving a number of schools, and personnel involved in community education activities at the college level. The 40 goals identified in Weaver's study are presented in Appendix A. The following goals of community education were reported as primary by 50 percent or more of the respondents:

1. Coordinates efforts of community agencies.

2. Provides effective communication.

3. Eliminates duplication among agencies.

4. Assists residents to secure educational services.

5. Provides forum for community problems.

6. Identifies community problems.

7. Surveys attitudes and interests.

8. Identifies required resources.

9. Demonstrates humanistic approach to education.

10. Demonstrates methods of social change.

11. Provides model for community living.

12. Demonstrates principles of educational leadership.

13. Extends use of school facilities.

14. Increases multi-age and cross-cultural contacts.

15. Provides programs for senior citizens.

16. Provides teen-age enrichment and recreation.

17. Provides recreation programs.

18. Provides high school completion program.

19. Improves educational opportunity for minorities.

20. Develops leadership among lay citizens.

21. Increases participation in existing school program.

22. Promotes school as primary educational agency.

23. Improves public image of the school.

Weaver reported that many of the goals reported as primary were process goals. He explained what he categorized as process goals when he stated: "They are concerned with

specific structures, interactions, and sentiments which build common community interest and goals. That is, they are processes for solving community educational problems" (pp. 6-7). The process nature of the majority of the primary goals led Weaver to conclude that community educators aspired to a more community-based, process-oriented notion of community education as opposed to the frequently practiced school-based, program-oriented concept of community education. Weaver (1972b) in fact stated:

> Even though both goals and activities reported were similar from one community to another, activities tend to confirm the assumptions underlying the conventional model while goals reported tend to reflect a desire to break out of this model. . . . It's as if the community educators were saying we're practicing based on the conventional model but we aspire to an emerging model which is quite different from the old one. (p. 5)

The Weaver investigation was followed by the DeLargy study in 1974. DeLargy included the goals identified by Weaver in the first step of his study, which identified 75 goals through the use of the Delphi technique. He classified the goals into 11 categories based on the Weaver study, his review of literature, and his polling of 22 centers and directors.

The DeLargy study confirmed the conclusions drawn by Weaver. DeLargy determined the relative importance of the identified goals by requiring respondents to judge the "present" and "ideal" values of the goals. The "present" goals described community education programs as they existed

in practice.  The "ideal" goals described the kinds of
community education programs that were desired.  He reported
a large difference between what community educators wanted
their programs to be like and what they actually were.  When
the 10 "ideal" and "present" goals were rank-ordered, DeLargy
(1974) suggested that, ideally, community education goals
were process-oriented, but the 10 highest ranking "present"
goals indicated that the schools were used primarily to pro-
vide recreational programs.  More recent studies by Lott
(1976) and Cook (1976) also found differences between per-
ceptions of what community education should be and how it
was implemented.  In addition to the problems associated with
variances between the real and ideal, studies by Bojorquez
(1975) and Cook (1976) suggested differences between groups
of decision-makers as to the relative importance of commu-
nity education goals.

    While both the Weaver and DeLargy studies indicated that
community educators aspire to process- rather than program-
oriented goals, it is important for the reader to note that
the process-oriented, community-based notion is not new to
the concept of community education.  Most of the early devel-
opments of community education described by Seay (1974) were
more process- than program-oriented.  Relating to that mat-
ter, Weaver (1972b) made the following comment:

> The most exciting aspects of one of our earlier
> models--the Flint, Michigan, program--was its
> process emphasis. . . . What happened to cause

that model and others like it to become primarily
school program models is a matter of record. Suf-
fice it to say, there now appears to be a nation-
wide interest in recapturing the excitement
involved in the development of the early programs.
And that excitement came primarily as a result of
process, not program. (p. 7)

## Problems

The previous section of this report, which examined the

literature relating to the goals of the first model of com-

munity education, identified one of the major problem areas

in the field from which many others stem, that is, the prob-

lems associated with the variance between what is currently

being practiced and what community educators seemingly want

their programs to be. Several writers in the community edu-

cation field support the studies examined in the previous

section of this document in their writings (Greiner, 1974;

Hetrick, 1976; Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Seay, 1974; Von Voor-

hees, 1975; Warden, 1972). Community educators, therefore,

seem to be in consensus with respect to the existence of

major problems in this area.

Each of the primary process goals of community education

identified by Weaver (1972b) and listed below reflects prob-

lem areas in the field:

1. Coordinates efforts of community agencies.

2. Provides effective communication.

3. Eliminates duplication among agencies.

4. Assists residents to secure educational
   services.

5. Provides forum for community problems.

6. Identifies community problems.

7. Surveys attitudes and interests.

8. Identifies required resources.

9. Demonstrates humanistic approach to education.

10. Demonstrates methods of social change.

11. Provides model for community living.

12. Demonstrates principles of educational leadership.

13. Develops leadership among lay citizens.

14. Increases participation in existing school program.

15. Promotes school as primary educational agency.

16. Improves public image of the school.

The program goals are excluded because the examination of the literature did not reveal major problems associated with the meeting of those goals.

In his report on the goals of community education, Weaver (1972b) made the following comment about the lack of practice with respect to the primary process goals of community education:

> I think that LeTarte and Minzey have accurately described our intent as community educators in their book From Program to Process. That is precisely what happens--we develop a program and hope that eventually we will be involved in the processes of organizing the community to meet its educational needs. However, when LeTarte and Minzey describe as a natural evolutionary step the transition from program to process they are,

I think, describing a <u>theoretical</u> <u>possibility</u> but not a <u>practical</u> <u>reality</u>. Most community educators with whom I'm familiar get so heavily involved in programming that they never become meaningfully involved in community process. (p. 9)

Hetrick (1976) recently supported the above statement indicating lack of problem resolution and then proceeded to list what he considered to be underlying causes for the "state of the art":

Many Community Educators have theorized that Community Education is a concept that, as it is implemented, focuses initially on the overt activities, or "program" aspects and ultimately evolves into "process." We have used this rationale for quite a number of years to justify our lack of community process development. Yet it is the two process components that are needed most by society today. As one visits the various Community Education programs across our nation, it soon becomes obvious that the development of community process has not yet evolved to the degree one might expect, and that some obvious deterrents are present. Closer scrutiny reveals some of the following as underlying causes:

...."Community process" has not been considered a priority by Boards of Education and administrators.

...Evolution of Community Education has focused on "progress," i.e., number of participants, extent of facility use, etc.

...Many Community Education programs must be financially self-supporting.

...University programs for training Community School Coordinators and Directors have focused on the nuts and bolts of programming with little or no attention devoted to developing community process.

...Most educators and agency heads are uncomfortable working with community groups and tend to avoid the slowness of decision-making associated with involving community members.

> ...In many instances coordination of community
> services is fragmented and lacks continuity
> because of personality differences and inter-
> agency jealousy. (pp. 2-3)

Weaver (1972a), in an article entitled "A Case for Theory Development in Community Education," indicated that a lack of theory development—that is, a lack of a systematized framework of beliefs—was needed if community educators expected to meet the process goals of community education and thus solve many of the problems prevalent in the field. Weaver indicated that while all community educators operate based on some theory of community education, they most always fail to organize their beliefs into a systematized framework which would allow them to analyze what they believe. The establishment of sound theory through the collaborative efforts of theorists and practitioners alike would seem to add clarity to the concept—another problem in the field—as well as improve the chances for the realization of using process goals. While the inherent value of theory development seems readily apparent, the writer was somewhat surprised to find an article by Nance, Dixon, and Terrell (1973) which included the following statement:

> Community Education has moved in the wrong direc-
> tion throughout the country. Some community edu-
> cators are still in an ivory tower looking at
> things like curriculum development, theoretical
> models, and K-12 programs. (p. 50)

Attitudes such as that given above would certainly seem to hamper the development of theory in community education.

The first of the reasons Hetrick (1976) gave for the lack of process goal attainment specifically related to the public school setting. Chapter I indicated that much of the basis for the development of the second and third models as alternatives to the first model related to the difficulties experienced in many public school community education programs. Weaver (1972a) supported this idea further when he stated that "increasing public criticism of the schools and their alleged inability to relate to the community has caused many to seek alternative models" (p. 155).

### Model II: Organizations Partially Financed Through Public Schools

The reader will remember that the second model of community education represents community education organizations which are financed through public school systems and other resources in the community. Unlike the first model, this model has only recently appeared in the community education field. Dixon (1977) stressed this point and indicated that because the implementation of the model was so recent there was no literature in the area. Such also continued to be the case when community education literature relating to community education consortia was reviewed for this study, the only exception being the recently completed study by Dixon. The study by Dixon represents the first and only study which attempted to ascertain the history, goals, and problems of community education consortia. Hence, the

literature cited in this portion of the literature review was largely restricted to the Dixon study.

Dixon defined community education consortium as "an agreement among three or more agencies including the school in which the school agencies voluntarily relinquish some decision-making prerogatives in order to reach certain goals and to provide educational activities and/or services that each member could not realistically provide independently" (p. 4). Since all community education consortia studied by Dixon had budgets which included funds from community resources other than those provided by public school systems, the consortia studied by Dixon were considered to be examples of the second model of community education as it has been defined in this study.

Due to the total void of literature relating to community education consortia, Dixon's literature review consisted of a description of consortia, literature related to the higher education scene, the public school scene, and the public and/or private agency scene. He then proceeded to study community education consortia in the State of Michigan based on the commonalities found in the consortia literature. This section of the study will therefore summarize the literature findings discovered by Dixon as to the history, goals, and problems of consortia and then discuss the conclusions drawn by Dixon with respect to the history, goals, and problems of community education consortia. First, we will look

at the history of consortia and the conclusions drawn by
Dixon with regard to the history of community education
consortia in the State of Michigan.

## History

A review of literature by Bailey and Mosher (1968),
Hughes and Others (1971), Molloy (1973), and Terry and Hess
(1975) led Dixon (1977) to conclude that consortia arrange-
ments on the local education scene basically evolved from
federal and/or state legislation. Essentially, enactments
by those governmental units were purported to have provided
the incentive for local schools and agencies to become
involved in cooperative efforts. According to the reports
examined by Dixon, open implementation of such cooperative
activity really began to realize its potential during the
year 1965. It was at about that time that much of the
federal legislation which was of primary importance in the
promotion of cooperation in education was enacted.

The specific legislation referred to above in general
terms was identified by Dixon as Titles I and III of the
Higher Education Act of 1965; Titles I, III, IV, and V of
the Higher Education Act of 1965; the Office of Economic
Opportunity Act of 1964; and the 1968 amendments to the Voca-
tional Education Act of 1963. In addition, further incentive
for cooperation was provided through federal programs spon-
sored by U.S. Office of Education, HEW, and HUD. Primary

promotion of cooperative agreements given by state depart-
ments began through school consolidation efforts and was
followed by the creation of intermediate educational service
units which were designed for the decentralization of educa-
tion in many states.

While Dixon emphasized that agreements between schools
and community agencies were in existence for some time,
incentive for their continuing expansion and development
was primarily due to federal and state encouragement.

When Dixon attempted to determine the history of commu-
nity education consortia by studying community education con-
sortia in the State of Michigan, a discrepancy was revealed
between the literature findings with respect to the history
of consortia and the findings determined from his investiga-
tion of Michigan community education consortia. While the
literature review suggested that educational consortia were
stimulated by federal and/or state legislation, his study
of Michigan community education consortia indicated that
federal and/or state legislation did not provide the primary
incentive for the development of community education con-
sortia. Rather, the bulk of the initiation of the develop-
ment of community education consortia was provided through
the efforts of local governmental agencies.

Also primary in the organization of community education
consortia were local school systems. Dixon attributed the
extent of their involvement to a response of directors to one

of the basic tenets of community education in interagency
cooperation. In addition to the impetus provided by local
governmental agencies and local school systems, community
colleges, in conjunction with local school systems, also
proved to be a factor in the organization of community educa-
tion consortia. The final factor contributing to community
education consortia development was provided through the
combined efforts of a group of social agencies and a relig-
ious organization. It was interesting to note the comments
made by Dixon with respect to this factor particularly if
the primary role played by local governmental agencies in
providing incentive for the development of community educa-
tion consortia is kept in mind. Dixon (1977) stated:

> These agencies developed a cooperative planning
> and action program to alleviate community prob-
> lems. This was accomplished when the agencies
> developed and implemented a community needs
> assessment. After identification of a need, the
> consortium identified the agency most likely to
> meet that need. This consortium continued to
> grow in size as it became a referral office for
> other agencies. . . . It was the only instance
> in the study of Michigan community education
> consortia where the school was not a major factor
> in the growth and development of the consortium.
> The above is an illustration of what a group of
> concerned agencies can do for the welfare of the
> community. It is possible that more examples of
> this nature should be encouraged and more models
> of this quality promoted by community educators.
> (pp. 91-92)

It should be noted that much of Dixon's statement sup-
ports the potential of the third model of community education
which was examined for the production of this document and

is presented in a later section of this literature review.

Goals

This section of the literature review presents the consortia goals which were determined by Dixon to be the common goals of consortia cited in the literature, and a discussion of Dixon's findings with respect to the study of Michigan community education consortia.

While the goals of consortia cited in the literature were identified as being as diverse as the consortia themselves, there were certain commonalities among the goals which Dixon (1977) specified as being:

1. To utilize efficiently and effectively the various resources the cooperative arrangements have at their disposal.

2. To increase the quantity and quality of communication among the consortium members and their clientele.

3. To provide or expand upon services that each unit could not provide independently.

4. To provide the impetus for innovation, research, and change in education.

5. To promote interagency cooperation in order to achieve educational advancement for the community. (p. 28)

The investigation of Michigan community education consortia attempted to determine the goals that consortium directors viewed as primary. The findings yielded by the investigation produced wide agreement with the common goals identified in the literature relating to consortia. However,

three additional goals were added to the goals found to be common in the literature and were concluded to be unique to community education consortia. The three additional goals reported as primary and unique to community education consortia were:

1. To develop an awareness and understanding of the community education philosophy within the community.

2. To develop a more effective planning scheme through a needs assessment.

3. To develop credibility for the director among community agencies. (p. 86)

A brief discussion regarding the findings of the study with respect to the eight primary goals of community education consortia is given below. The first five goals discussed are identical to those found to be common in the literature. They appear in the order in which they were listed above. The final three goals discussed are those which were added as a result of the investigation, and also appear in the order given above.

With respect to the efficient and effective utilization of various resources at the disposal of consortia, the directors seemed to agree that the effective and efficient use of funds was the initial concern in this area. Other initial concerns in this area were the effective and efficient use of human resources and facilities.

The second goal found to be primary among directors of community education consortia related to increasing the

quantity and quality of communication among consortium members and their clientele. While the directors indicated various methods of procuring open communication, Dixon indicated that the methods generally fell into two categories: agency councils or advertising and promotion. About half of the directors indicating that the goal was primary utilized some variation of the first category and the remaining half the second.

The directors reached the highest degree of consistency in their agreement as to the importance of the next goal--the provision or expansion of services not available independently. The directors indicated that the consortium afforded them an opportunity to expand services in the following areas: (1) adult high-school completion and adult basic education; (2) enrichment programs; (3) recreation programs; (4) vocational programs; and (5) special service programs, e.g., senior citizen, preschool, etc.

The directors were found to respond to the goal of providing the impetus for innovation, research, and change in education with the least amount of consistency with respect to its primary nature. However, Dixon concluded that the degree of agreement was sufficient to be included among the primary goals of community education consortia. One innovation supported was the development of a single facility to house all aspects of social services.

The final goal to be reported as primary to community

education consortia which was also listed as common to goals of consortia in the literature was that of promoting inter-agency cooperation. Four sub-goals were reported by directors which were considered to be primary to the implementation of the above goal. Dixon identified those goals as: (1) avoiding duplication of services, (2) developing a cooperative effort between all community agencies, (3) acting as a facilitator for community agencies and their resources, and (4) providing a better quality of educational services to the community.

The remaining three goals represent those which were identified by the directors as primary to community education consortia which were not included in the goals identified as common to consortia in Dixon's literature review. He suggested that the first of those three goals--the goal of developing an awareness and understanding of the community education philosophy within the community--related to a problem of a lack of awareness by the community of the philosophy in which the consortium was operating. While he indicated that the directors who listed this goal as primary appeared to be alert to key factors affecting their positions, he was concerned that many may not take the steps necessary for the achievement of the goal.

Dixon suggested that the directors who agreed with the goal of developing a more effective planning scheme seemed to be concerned about the welfare of their communities when

they planned programs.

The final goal area found to be primary in community
education consortia was the development of credibility for
the director among community agencies. Dixon suggested that
this goal also related to a problem experienced by many com-
munity education consortia. He concluded that the attention
given to this goal by Michigan consortium directors indicated
that they were aware of the importance of the above problem,
and thus demonstrated a willingness to resolve it. He also
indicated that a cooperative working relationship with other
components in the community served to alleviate the problem.

## Problems

This portion of the literature review first presents
the problems identified by Dixon's review of literature as
common to consortia and then discusses the problems which
were identified as common to community education consortia.

The problems consistently identified in the literature
were:

1. The allocation of limited resources.

2. The role and scope of the administrator
   and/or the central office.

3. The organization and maintenance of the
   consortium.

4. The heterogeneity of member agencies
   attempting to develop common goals.

5. The establishment and maintenance of an
   effective communication system.

The problems identified through the investigation of Michigan community education consortia were in agreement with the problems found to be common in the consortia literature. However, the investigation of community education consortia revealed two problems not identified in the literature. Dixon categorized those problems as follows:

1. The awareness of community people and school personnel of the community education philosophy.

2. The credibility of the director with various components of the community. (p. 99)

The findings relating to the above seven problem areas are briefly discussed below. They appear in the order given above, beginning with the findings which were congruent with Dixon's literature review.

The consortium directors who indicated that the allocation of limited resources was a problem frequently experienced by community education consortia generally attributed the problem to a lack of sufficient funds. It was also suggested that the lack of funds affected the status of programs and maintenance of the consortium. Only two of the directors identified the shortage of facilities and staff as a major concern.

The next problem identified by Michigan consortia directors as a major problem related to concerns associated with the role and scope of the administrator and/or central office. According to Dixon, the major concern in this area

was with teacher and administrator perceptions of the director's role. In addition, a few of the directors thought that they were often used as scapegoats by other personnel in the consortium

While the organization and maintenance of consortia was identified as a problem area, it received the least amount of support by directors. The chief concern issued by those who believed that the maintenance of consortia was rooted in misunderstandings between the day supervisor and the evening supervisor regarding the supervision and maintenance of programs held at school facilities.

Those directors who indicated that the heterogeneity of member agencies trying to develop common goals was not a problem indicated that the consortia were originally established because the agencies had congruent goals. Most of the directors who claimed that the establishment of goals for the consortium was a problem had been involved in "competitive struggles among member agencies" (Dixon, 1977, p. 80).

The problem which the greatest number of directors considered an area of concern related to difficulties associated with the establishment and maintenance of an effective communication system. The communication problems identified by directors included difficulties in keeping the community informed of the goals and objectives of the consortium and competition between or among various agencies.

The first of the two problems identified in the investigation of community education consortia which supplemented those found in the literature relates to difficulties experienced in developing an awareness of community people and school personnel of the community education philosophy. Dixon concluded by indicating that attention was needed in this critical area in order to reduce defensiveness frequently demonstrated by those not aware of the community education philosophy. Dixon contended that a reduction in defensiveness would promote more effective communication and thus improve the status of community education consortia.

The final problem area identified by consortia directors relates to the credibility of the director with community people. Generally, Dixon found that the directors who claimed this as a problem thought that community people lacked trust in the director. The lack of credibility was attributed to the director not being known to certain components of the community.

To conclude, it is important to note that while the above problems were reported, according to Dixon, with sufficient frequency to become labeled problems of community education consortia in the State of Michigan, directors seemed less concerned about the problems which related to the allocation of resources, organization and maintenance, and development of common goals than they were about the remaining problems.

This section of the literature review has investigated the history, goals, and problems of the second model of community education. The next section of the review will examine literature relating to the history, goals, and objectives of the third model, the most recent model to arrive on the community education scene.

### Model III: Organizations Not Financed Through Public Schools

Much of the manner in which the third model came to be recognized in the field of community education was described in Chapter I of this report. To reiterate, basically it became recognized as one of two alternative finance models when the conceptual thinking of community education changed from the school-centered, program-oriented idea known as the community school to the community-centered, process-oriented notion of community education. Writers in the field have noted that community education is not limited to school-based organizations (Nance et al., 1973; Weaver, 1970).

The examination of the literature determined that the earliest account of the idea suggesting that community education organizations could be based in non-school organizations was in an address made by Weaver (1970) at a Community School workshop. Included in the address was the following:

> I would suggest that those of you who are serious
> about the development of theory in the field of
> Community Education consider the possibility of
> so defining Community Education that it is not
> restricted to the school as its prime focus. To

build a conceptual framework which depends upon
an institution as it now exists limits the pre-
dictive value of the model. I submit, it is
altogether possible that the school as it now
exists may not be the focal point of organized
education in our society during the professional
tenure of the young people training for leader-
ship in Community Education at this time. Sup-
porting such a possibility is the fact that at
the present time there is more organized educa-
tion carried on in this country outside the
school than in it. (p. 4)

Nance et al. (1973) also recognized that the school need

not necessarily be the focal point of community education:

The community school . . . is one of the agencies
in which the process of community education is
facilitated. Community educators must broaden
their thinking to improve the idea that the
entire community is the educative community and
that the school may or may not be the focal point.
Whether we use the school or some other agency is
not really important. It is important that all
resources, both human and physical, are marshalled
to provide services where and when needed to com-
munity people. (p. 49)

While investigation of the literature revealed that

there are those who promote the school as the best organiza-

tion for the implementation of community education (Minzey

& LeTarte, 1972), most all would agree that non-school-based

models of community education currently exist.

Having described how the third model came to be recog-

nized in the field of community education, the writer will

now part from the time in which the model came to be recog-

nized in the field of community education and turn to the

literature relating to the history, goals, and problems

associated with the model.

## History

It was mentioned in Chapter I that community education organizations which are included in the third model were generally found to be called a neighborhood or community center. Evidence of the neighborhood center emerged long before it was recognized by writers in the field of community education. In order to get a clear understanding of the history of the third model, the reader must be taken back to the turn of the century and the early beginnings of the neighborhood center concept.

Mogulof (1971) credited the beginning of neighborhood centers to the Settlement House movement. The Settlement House movement began in London with the opening of Toynbee Hall in 1884 (Davis, 1967). The movement soon found its way to the United States in the year 1886 when the Neighborhood Guild (later University Settlement) was established. According to Jane Addams (1910), founder of the well-known settlement of Hull House in 1889, the movement was prompted by "first, the desire to interpret democracy in social terms; second, the impulse beating at the very source of our lives, urging us to aid in the race progress; and thirdly, the movement toward humanism" (p. 125). Addams continued by defining the settlement: "The Settlement, then, is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of

life in a great city" (p. 125).

The use of neighborhood centers was basic to the Settlement House movement. In fact, the national organization for the movement (which continues to exist) was named the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. Initially, the movement used houses as centers geared toward giving assistance to immigrants. However, as the number of immigrants coming to the United States decreased, the centers broadened their focus to include most all disadvantaged persons, particularly those located in the inner city (Hillman, 1960). The centers were originally manned by upper middle-class citizens dedicated to helping immigrants adjust to American ways of life. This too changed as the centers were later manned by persons of most all socioeconomic classes.

Through the use of neighborhood centers, ambitious leaders were among the first to demonstrate activities in their local communities which later became a permanent social resource including, among others, well-baby clinics, playgrounds, kindergartens, day care for children of working mothers, public health nursing, and mental health clinics (National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1958). In the field of education, settlements worked for the development of adult education, vocational education, and guidance in the schools, hot lunch programs, and education for the retarded and handicapped (Cox & Garvin, 1974).

During the later years of the settlement movement, the neighborhood centers began to take different forms, some more attractive than others. Perlman and Jones (1967) illustrated this in their following account of the more recent history of settlement houses:

> With respect to the settlement house, many, though not all, came to concentrate on serving youth and providing group work and recreational programs. Some have been engaged over the years in what is being undertaken by the new neighborhood centers. Certain settlement houses, indeed, are now developing new centers of the type described in this report usually with funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. (p. 9)

However, according to a book by Hillman (1960) entitled Neighborhood Centers Today, the centers (which numbered nearly 800 in 1960) continued to be located in a geographic neighborhood or district and aimed "to understand that neighborhood, help develop its potentialities, provide or aid in obtaining the services its people need, and relate that neighborhood to the wider community" (p. iv).

It should be recognized that the neighborhood center concept used by the Settlement House movement bears a striking resemblance to early developments of the community school concept. Deshler and Erlich (1974) gave credence to this notion when they stated that the settlement house "also served . . . to reduce the negative associations about the school for both children and parents. As a linking technique, it is most closely associated with locality development and,

to a lesser degree, with social planning strategies. It might be noted that this particular procedure is closely associated with the community school model developed in the Flint [Michigan] program sponsored by the Mott Foundation" (p. 385).

The financing of neighborhood centers has experienced quite a change over the years. During the early days of the settlement movement, funds were secured from private donations and the "community chest" primarily. There soon came to be a high degree of competition for those monies, however, and many centers previously attached to the settlement began to rely heavily on public support. The public support referred to was most often in the form of funds through the federal government. The centers which developed as a result of federal funding represent the next important development in the evolution of the neighborhood center.

The federal incentive for the development of neighborhood centers was provided as a part of President Johnson's "War on Poverty." Included in that effort was the Community Action Program. It was through this program that the neighborhood center experienced its greatest growth (Kirschner Associates, 1966). Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 broadly defined the Community Action Program to mean a program which:

1.  Mobilizes and utilizes public and private resources of an area in an attack on poverty.

2. Provides services, assistance and activities
   of sufficient scope and size to give promise
   of progress toward elimination of poverty or
   a cause or causes of poverty through develop-
   ing employment opportunities, improving human
   performance, motivation, and productivity, or
   bettering the conditions under which people
   live, learn, and work.

3. Which is developed, conducted, and adminis-
   tered with maximum feasible participation of
   residents of the areas and members of the
   groups served. (p. 516)

Several writers (Clark, 1968; Cox & Garvin, 1974; O'Donnell

& Reid, 1971; Perlman & Gurin, 1972) have commented about

the vagueness of the above definition. However, one of the

primary ideas behind the initiation of the concept was local

initiative and control through "maximum feasible participa-

tion" (Clark, 1968). Monies for the program were dispersed

to local Community Action agencies which were established

throughout the country. This process, of course, bypassed

the more frequent federal practice of passing funds through

state and local government channels. Included with the

effort to establish local initiative and participation was

the development of neighborhood centers.

Kirschner Associates (1966), in the only study conducted

on the centers, indicated that the federal government gave

no clear direction with respect to the actual operation of

the centers. In fact, according to Kirschner Associates, the

federal government actually attempted to encourage diversity

much the same as they did in other areas of the Community

Action Program. Accordingly, policies adopted to direct the

centers were developed by individual Community Action agencies. It was those agencies to whom the centers were held accountable. While several reports from the operations of the local agencies were required by the Office of Economic Opportunity, no such reports were required of the centers. Hence, much information is available with regard to Community Action Programs on the whole, but very little about community centers.

The study conducted by Kirschner Associates (1966) entitled A Description and Evaluation of Neighborhood Centers concluded that neighborhood centers were critical to the efforts of the Community Action Program, but also indicated that much was needed to ensure the success of the centers. The recommendations made by Kirschner Associates were:

1. To continue neighborhood centers as prominent features of the anti-poverty program.

2. To clarify the principal role of neighborhood centers as enhancing the power of the poor to help themselves.

3. To emphasize intensive and continuing training programs for both professional and non-professional staff for board members.

4. To modify existing organizational arrangements so that centers are relatively autonomous and so that they are small and informal.

5. To develop special programs to select and train persons for positions of leadership in centers. (p. 59)

The emphasis placed on training in the recommendations is noteworthy. Both Clark (1968) and Kirschner Associates

(1966) suggested that many of the problems encountered in the Community Action Program were due to a lack of training, particularly in the leadership areas. Further attention to the training problem is given in the problem section of this discussion of Model III.

Perhaps due to a lack of prepared leaders, the Community Action Program encountered difficulties in the early 1970's. The federal government reacted to these problems with the passage of the Green Amendment which took much of the power away from the local agencies and gave it to local governments (Clark, 1968). The transition of power was accomplished by giving local government a majority vote on Community Action boards. In addition to the transfer of power, the federal government became more specific about the programs it would fund. According to Clark, the bulk of the budget allocated for Community Action Programs in the 1970's was spent on programs which were designed by the federal government. Little remained for community-designed programs. Clark referred to the programs designed by the government as "canned programs."

As the funding of Community Action agencies became stagnated, many of the neighborhood centers began to seek alternative funding sources. The acquisition of supplemental funds resulted in an expanded scope for neighborhood centers. Services were made available to persons of all social classes (Kahn, 1974).

The only study conducted which included neighborhood centers in a general sense, that is, without specifying the centers involved in the Community Action Program, was authored by O'Donnell and Reid (1971). In addition to determining that there were 2,518 multi-service neighborhood centers in the United States, the nationwide study concluded that such centers had the following features:

1. They were established since 1965 (62 percent).

2. They operate with annual budgets falling between $20,000 and $200,000 (67 percent).

3. They receive some support from the federal government (65 percent). They report a rise in their operating budgets for the past 2 years (56 percent).

4. They are located predominantly in metropolitan areas (83 percent), especially in areas of 250,000 or more population (68 percent).

5. They serve areas with populations between 5,000 and 100,000 (64 percent).

6. They are located in areas where most families earn less than $4,000 a year (57 percent).

7. They offer programs of referral (95 percent), information (95 percent), outreach (92 percent), follow-up (86 percent), social action (77 percent), and client advocacy (76 percent).

8. They provide a combination of direct service, social action, and client advocacy programs (67 percent).

9. They offer between three and nine direct services (74 percent).

10. They provide counseling (82 percent), educational (74 percent), recreational (69 percent), and employment services (57 percent).

11. They offer combinations of counseling and educational services (72 percent).

12. They served between 500 and 15,000 persons in 1969 (74 percent).

13. They report an increase in the number of persons served over the last 2 years (82 percent).

14. They employ between 3 and 24 full-time professional and semiprofessional workers (71 percent).

15. They are staffed predominantly by full-time workers (80 percent) and by professionally trained workers (52 percent).

16. They have policy-making boards of directors (75 percent) with 10-34 members (74 percent).

17. They have at least 25 percent of their professional staff members living in the neighborhood (67 percent).

18. They have at least 25 percent of their board members living in the neighborhood (71 percent).

While more recent studies are needed to update the findings given above, the conclusions drawn by O'Donnell and Reid have made a tremendous contribution to the field. The findings were presented here to bring the reader up to date with neighborhood center development, thus completing their evolution at least as it currently stands. Later discussions in the goal and problem sections of this literature investigation of Model III will attend to many of the above listed conclusions. With the evolution of the neighborhood center from the early Settlement House movement to the more current trends in center development, the next portion of the review presents an examination of the goals of the neighborhood center.

## Goals

Neighborhood centers have two basic orientations with respect to goals, service, and community mobilization--also known as community action (Kirschner Associates, 1966; Mogulof, 1971). Kirschner Associates (1966) explained the difference between these two different orientations:

> Service activity refers to client control by a more or less specialized functionary who tries to meet some need of the client. It suggests the idea of an individual with particular problems who needs help. This concept is distinguished from that of community action which involves efforts to mobilize people in the community . . . to engage in collective action aimed at resolving some problem or issue. In short, service has an individualized focus; community action a collective focus. (p. 13)

The importance given to goals related to each of the above orientations varied in the literature. Perlman and Jones (1967) envisioned the goal of compensating for the adequacy or inadequacy of community services as the most important function of the center. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity (1966) adopted an entirely different approach:

> The goals of the center are to promote and facilitate effective involvement of neighborhood residents in the solution of neighborhood problems. . . . The Neighborhood Center's most important function is to provide the people of the neighborhood with a structure and a program designed to enable them to act. (p. 1)

Neighborhood centers associated with settlement houses also deemed community action to be their most important

goal. Those centers placed little emphasis on the activity aspect of their operation and practiced the settlement principle of "holding activities lightly" which referred to a willingness to relinquish functions (National Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers, 1958). Center activities were typically initiated as experiments and turned over to other agencies after positive results were produced.

While many neighborhood centers may have stressed the importance of one orientation of goals over the other, most all goal statements include goals which reflect both delivery of services and community action. The goal statements cited in the literature generally fall within three categories of centers: (1) centers associated with settlement houses, (2) centers associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity, and (3) neighborhood centers in general. Most all of the statements recorded in the literature emphasized the difficulty of stating goals of neighborhood centers because of the extreme amount of diversity which they perceived to exist in the way individual centers functioned. The diversity of the centers was frequently cited as one of the more positive aspects of the organizations as it was suggested to indicate attention to individual community needs, which were, of course, also diverse (Hillman, 1960; Kirschner Associates, 1966; Mogulof, 1971; Perlman & Jones, 1967).

According to Hillman (1960), a neighborhood center

associated with the Settlement House movement has the

following goals:

1. It aims to understand that neighborhood, help develop its potentialities, provide or aid in obtaining the services its people need, and relate that neighborhood to the wider community.

2. It aims to afford opportunities for each to find and develop his potentialities for a satisfactory life in the home, neighborhood, and wider community and nation. In doing so, it supports the conviction that human beings have a capacity for self-direction and growth.

3. It crosses lines of race, religion, national origin, and economic status, seeking consciously to improve relationships among individuals and groups with different backgrounds. To this end it provides opportunity for a variety of individual, group, and inter-group experiences.

4. It is experimental and flexible, developing methods and programs to meet specific needs, often demonstrating the value of an activity and later transferring it to a specialized organization or local government.

5. It gives an early warning signal of changes in community and national life which affect the lives of neighbors who have few social and financial resources. It marshalls evidence of these changes, which is used to improve living conditions.

6. It is an instrument for the cultivation of citizenry in a neighborhood, providing a service that is indispensable if a large and bureaucratic society is to function as a democracy. (pp. iv-v)

It should be noted that while the above bears a striking

semblance of the younger years of the Settlement movement,

Hillman (1960) noted that unlike the first years of the move-

ment which directed most all of its efforts in neighborhoods

of great economic and social need, the centers have been used more recently, and effectively so, in neighborhoods of varying economic levels.  In addition, it should be realized that most goals (specifically, goals 1, 2, 5, and 6) relate to community mobilizations as opposed to delivery of services. Hillman indicated that the community action role of the centers was "regarded not as extraneous but an outgrowth of their program of service and their identification with the neighborhood" (p. 183).  The effectiveness of settlement centers may be at least partially due to the freedom they have, as voluntary private agencies, to deal with contro-versial issues.  While Hillman recognized that some centers have failed to progress beyond the program of service stage, he concluded that "these are exceptions to the flexibility and outreach characteristic of many neighborhood centers" (p. 183).

The statement of goals issued by the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (1958) included one goal which was not included in the list given by Hillman, of particular import because of its attention to developing a "sense of community":

> . . . To help give people roots, a sense of iden-
> tification with a place, other people, existing
> agencies of their society and, if they stay long
> enough, with the ongoing goals and traditions and
> obligations of that society.  (p. 13)

As was mentioned before, the Office of Economic Oppor-tunity did not give directions to the Community Action

agencies as to the specific goals of neighborhood centers;
rather, they stressed that such roles would be determined by
the local agencies through the participation of neighborhood
residents--"maximum feasible participation." Thus, the
direction given to these local agencies as to the goals of
the centers by the Office of Economic Opportunity was:

> The goals of the center are to promote and facil-
> itate effective involvement of neighborhood resi-
> dents in the solution of neighborhood problems,
> and to improve the quality of programs which are
> designed to aid the elimination of poverty.
> (p. 1)

It can be seen that the statement issued by the federal
government was clearly divided into categories of community
action and service. However, it should be remembered that
emphasis on the goals was placed on community action. In
the only evaluation conducted which was specific to the Com-
munity Action Program neighborhood centers, little evidence
was found that verified effective work in the area of commu-
nity action. However, failure to find such evidence may be
explained in part by the fact that the centers investigated
had been in existence only a short time--1-1/2 years at most--
when the study was conducted. A later study by O'Donnell and
Reid (1971), which included all types of neighborhood centers
(62 percent of which were partially supported through the
Office of Economic Opportunity), did find increased activity
in the area of social action, outreach, and client advocacy.
Examination of the Community Action literature also revealed

that of all the activities sponsored by the Office of Eco-
nomic Opportunity, programs categorized as educational
services were in the majority (Clark, 1968; Levitan, 1969).

It has been noted that the O'Donnell and Reid (1971)
study was the only study available which categorized neigh-
borhood centers in a general sense. The fact that the last
study conducted on neighborhood centers considered the
centers as a general category is noteworthy. It has been
suggested that as needs for neighborhood centers increased
in our society, and as support by the Office of Economic
Opportunity stagnated, many centers began to lose close
identification with the Community Action Program and/or the
settlement movement. The scarcity of funds coupled with
increased need forced many centers to seek additional funding
sources. According to O'Donnell and Reid, only 17 percent of
the centers studied which received any federal money (of all
65 percent) were totally funded by the federal government.

While the O'Donnell and Reid (1971) study did not
attempt to identify the specific goals of the total group of
neighborhood centers in the nation, their findings listed
above strongly suggest the presence of goals in the direct
service, social action, and client advocacy areas. Emphasis,
however, was given to the areas of social action and client
advocacy. The authors noted that "three-fourths said they
were placing more emphasis on social action . . . ; nearly
two-thirds on client advocacy" (p. 4).

The only other document located which treated neighborhood centers in a general sense was written by Perlman and Jones (1966). Included in the report was the following list of goals which clearly follow the community action--service goal-oriented--of the previous categories:

1. It provides information and referral services to assist people to use established agencies.

2. The Center acts as an advocate to protect a client's interests and rights with respect to another agency.

3. Concrete services are provided directly to individuals and families.

4. The Center organizes and mobilizes groups for collective action on behalf of the residents of the neighborhood. This ranges from facilitating two-way communication between residents and local institutions to assisting groups to confront and challenge those who make decisions affecting conditions and services in their neighborhood. (p. 1)

Attention is referred to an aforementioned suggestion by Davies (1977) with respect to goal 4 above. Davies' comment was summarized as suggesting that community educators needed to give communities the power to control individual lives if they really expected to make an impact on improving the quality of life in a community.

## Problems

As the reader surveys the following problems associated with neighborhood centers, it must be remembered that at the time of this report the last attempt to analyze centers was

made in 1970 (O'Donnell & Reid, 1971). Therefore, conclusions regarding the current problems of neighborhood centers can only be intuitive.

The examination of the limited writings relevant to problems frequently experienced by neighborhood centers revealed six basic problem areas: (1) lack of financial security, (2) lack of training, (3) bureaucratic development, (4) community action/community service role conflict, (5) unmet need in small cities and towns, and (6) agency-center representation.

In the area of finance, centers seem to lack a secure funding source. Nearly two-thirds of the centers studied by O'Donnell and Reid (1971) received federal support. The federal support given to centers is usually allocated for a limited amount of time and the programs involved are almost always subject to a yearly review. Therefore, federal support for the centers remains questionable from year to year. Even so, the federal government seems to be the source which centers rely on most for continued support. The aid received by the early centers from philanthropic organizations and "community chests" is not as easy to secure, since the demand for such monies has increased dramatically during recent years. However, many centers continue to operate solely from such aid, or use it to supplement the federal monies they receive (O'Donnell & Reid, 1971). Kirschner Associates (1966) suggested that problems relating to a lack of training

constituted one of the most critical areas of centers in need of attention. Two of five recommendations made as a result of the Kirschner Associates study concerned the need for concentrated efforts in the development of training programs. The two training recommendations identified by Kirschner Associates (1966) were:

1. To emphasize intensive and continuing training programs for both professional and nonprofessional staff and for board members.

2. To develop special programs to select and train persons for positions of leadership in centers. (p. 59)

The need to develop special efforts to train center employees was further exemplified in the following suggestions, made also by Kirschner Associates (1966):

Unquestionably there is a need and basis for developing a wide variety of training programs for center employees. It is suggested that a major investment in the development and use of such programs is essential to the success of all aspects of the neighborhood center concept. No other investment appears to offer such great possibilities for significant rewards. (p. 56)

Finney (1977), currently director of the Woodlawn Organization, recently addressed a group of Michigan community education directors and indicated that one of the most important areas of concern in his organization was the maintenance of grassroots development--problem area 3. According to Finney, as the Woodlawn Organization grew it became increasingly difficult to maintain a feeling of being "in touch" with the local people, yet he emphasized that the value of

the organization would be significantly decreased without it. The Woodlawn Organization is not alone in their concern with this problem. Many centers located in large urban areas throughout the nation suffer from the bureaucracies they have grown to become (Clark, 1968).

Fourth, there seems to be a problem in the area of community action versus community service. According to Kirschner Associates (1966), there was quite a difference in the way center administrators and board members perceived the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity-approved neighborhood centers as opposed to client perceptions. Clients of a center believed that the center existed to help people by providing them with the services they needed. The idea of community organization was not a prominent function of the center in the thinking of the clients. However, when the perceptions of administrators and board members were examined, the community action function became more conspicuous, and the service function view declined in importance (Kirschner Associates, 1966). The actual role of the centers proved to be more in line with client perceptions of the center role than the administrator and board member perceptions. In fact, Kirschner Associates concluded:

> Perhaps the most general statement to be made about
> community action . . . is that clear evidence of
> effective work in this phase of center programming
> is simply not to be found. What does appear to the
> field investigation is a pot pourri of rather fitful
> actions which are often ill-timed and unplanned.
> (p. 15)

While the above statement offered information with regard to the actual role of the centers, it also indicated the need for training programs for center administrators and board members, referred to earlier in this report.

Even though Mogulof (1971) agreed that a problem of differences between the goals and practice of community action existed, he recongized that many centers have attempted to reconcile the problem. Mogulof identified two factors which contribute toward a synthesis of community action and service goals in practice: (1) the dominance of the more community-oriented Office of Economic Opportunity as a source of funds for centers, and (2) the increasing control that non-white neighborhood residents are beginning to wield over center direction. Thus, according to Mogulof (1971):

> Instead of having one set of service-oriented centers responsive to the established agencies and another set of centers responsive to neighborhood leadership and interested in community organization, the synthesis is a center under neighborhood direction, interested in community organization, and offering services of those established agencies that have been able to accommodate themselves to neighborhood influence. (p. 360)

It is interesting to find that while the centers concentrated on the service role, the services for which the most funds were allocated were educational (Clark, 1968; Levitan, 1969).

Although neighborhood centers have begun to attend to needs outside of the core city (Hillman, 1960; Kahn, 1974),

O'Donnell and Reid (1971) found that the needs in small areas have not been adequately addressed. O'Donnell and Reid noted that "neighborhood centers are reaching and serving more people than ever, but they are not available in sufficient number to people living in small cities and towns and rural areas" (p. 7).

The final problem area relates to the failure of many centers to attract employees from other agencies. While neighborhood centers are often thought of as conveniently located places where people can go for services in preference to the centralized agency located at a greater distance, the thought lacks empirical evidence. The above notion implies that workers of various agencies are assigned to such centers. However, O'Donnell and Reid (1971) found that only one out of three centers had workers employed by other agencies. Mogulof (1971) recognized this problem and presented the following factors as a partial explanation:

1.  School systems may be unwilling to place resources in centers, partially because of the assumption that schools are already among the most decentralized of public resources.

2.  In some instances, independent agencies are unwilling to "out station" their staff to a center where they would have nonagency supervision.

3.  Agencies whose resources are sought are sometimes unwilling to adopt new modes of operation that the center seems to require of them.

4. Some established agencies have ideological conflicts about the wisdom of "institution-alizing the ghetto" as a result of estab-lishing a separate neighborhood service system.

5. On occasion, legal services reject inclusion in the center to protect the confidential nature of the legal relationship.

6. Some agencies balk at submitting their ser-vices to the evaluation procedures of the center.

## Summary

Chapter II of this report presented a review of the literature related to the history, goals, and problems of each one of the three models of community education identi-fied in Chapter I. The literature examination revealed cer-tain trends of difference and similarity among the models, which have been summarized below.

All three models have evolved in response to community needs and were initially process-oriented. While all models encountered at least some degree of change from a process to a program emphasis during later stages of development, the school-based Model I has apparently emphasized the pro-gram component more than the other models have. In addition, the community-based Model III appears to have emphasized it the least. Additionally, Model I has typically been a public organization, where organizations which fall in the second or third model are private and/or public. Finally, the development of both the second and third models has coincided

with the availability of government funds, which has not in
the past made a significant impact on the development of the
first model. Incentive was provided predominantly by local
government in the second model, according to Dixon (1977),
and by the federal government in the third model.

The goals of the models include those of a program
orientation as well as those which are process-oriented.
However, representations from each of the models have indi-
cated stronger emphasis in the process goals. Within the
process goal area, the third model included a greater empha-
sis on community action than did either of the other two
models. Although difficulties were experienced in the imple-
mentation of community action goals, similar problems were
encountered by the first model and to a lesser extent the
second with respect to the implementation of process goals
in general. The third model was hampered by a lack of ade-
quate resources, while the other models did not appear to
experience this problem to as great a degree. Both human
and fiscal resources were needed in organizations included
in Model III. The need of fiscal resources was primarily
viewed as a need for secure funding sources.

Attachment to the public school was frequently seen as
a limitation to the first model, and the source of many
problems, specifically those relating to the implementation
of process goals. Generally, problems encountered by the
second model seemed to be experienced to a lesser extent

than those experienced in other models.

The following chapter of this report, Chapter III, presents a discussion of the methodology used to investigate examples of each of the three models.

# CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

### Review of Purpose

The focus of this study has been to systematically investigate three models of community education. More specifically, the purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is totally financed by public schools.

2. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is jointly financed by public schools and other resources.

3. To describe, according to selected dimensions, two organizations where the community education effort is financed by resources other than those of the public schools.

4. To describe, according to selected dimensions, the differences and similarities between those community education organizations which are (a) totally financed by public schools, (b) jointly financed by public schools and other resources, and (c) financed by resources other than those of the public schools.

### Selection of Organizations

In accordance with the above purposes, two organizations were selected for investigation which represented each of the three models of community education. Hence, a total of six

68

organizations were selected for investigation.

The selection of organizations to be investigated which would represent Models I and II was similar to the process used to select the organizations which would represent Model III. However, the uniqueness of Model III made the process sufficiently different to warrant separate discussions. The selection of organizations which would represent Models I and II generally involved a 5-step process. The steps are given below and are followed by a more detailed discussion of the process:

1. Identified organizations which were members of the Southwest Michigan Adult and Community Education Association (SMACE).

2. Telephoned the director of each organization which was a member of SMACE to ascertain which model represented their organization.

3. Compiled a list of potential organizations which would represent Model I and also a list of potential organizations which would represent Model II.

4. Designated two community education experts to select two organizations for investigation which would represent Model I and two organizations which would represent Model II from the two respective lists of potential community education organizations for investigation.

The SMACE Association provided a convenient base for the selection of organizations. It was decided that there was nothing particularly different about community education organizations which were members of SMACE as compared to those which were not. Therefore, the use of community education directors who represented the organizations which

were members of SMACE seemed justified.  The organizations which were members of SMACE were identified through the SMACE membership directory.  Once identified, each of the directors was telephoned.  The writer had previous acquaintance with all members of the SMACE organizations, as he had attended several of their meetings as a field representative of the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center.  One week prior to telephoning the directors, the writer attended a SMACE meeting and presented a general overview of this study and indicated that he would be telephoning each of them during the following week.  When telephoned, an effort was first made to establish cooperation by renewing established relationships.  Secondly, each director was reacquainted with the purpose of this study.  The three models were then defined using the identical order given above.  Next, each director was asked the following question: Which one of these three models represents your community education organization?  Finally, each director was asked whether they would be willing to cooperate in the study. The directors indicated, in all 13 cases, that their organizations were represented by either Model I (4 cases) or Model II (9 cases).  Hence, no community education director contacted indicated that his organization was represented by the third model.  While each director indicated a willingness to cooperate, three representing the first model and three representing the second model indicated a strong

willingness.

Following the telephone conversation with each of the directors, the results were compiled to form two separate lists of organizations:  one for those which were represented by Model I and one for those which were represented by Model II.  The two lists were then identified as including potential community education organizations for investigation.

The final steps necessary for the selection of organizations to be investigated involved the judgment of two experts in the field of community education:  Dr. Donald C. Weaver, Director of the Community Education Development Center at Western Michigan University; and Dr. Lee Vaught, Associate Director of the Center.  Both of these individuals are natives of southwest Michigan and have been involved with the development of community education organizations, specifically in the geographic area of southwest Michigan.  The experts were presented with both lists of potential organizations for study (which included descriptions of organizations most willing to cooperate) and were asked to select two organizations from each list of potential selections.  The selections were based on four predetermined criteria:

1.  The experts' knowledge of community education.

2.  The experts' experience with the potential selections.

3. The experts' division of the selections into rural and urban categories (one of each per model).

4. The willingness of the organizations to cooperate as determined by this writer.

As was mentioned above, the selection of the two organizations which would represent the third model was similar to, and yet different from, the process described above, even though they generally took place at the same time. The steps are delineated below:

1. Identified organizations which were members of SMACE.

2. Telephoned each organization which was a member of SMACE and requested them, or knowledgable experts familiar with their communities to suggest organizations for investigation which would represent the third model.

3. Telephoned each organization suggested by SMACE members as being representative of the third model for investigation.

4. Compiled a list of potential organizations to be studied, all of which represented the third model.

5. Designated two community education experts to select two organizations for investigation from the list of potential selections.

During the organizational period of the selection process, problems were experienced concerning the selection of organizations which were more representative of the third model. The problems were anticipated given the diverse nature of the third model and the understanding that the inclusion of the non-schools-based model in the field of community education is a fairly recent development. Such

being the case, a somewhat different strategy was employed
for the identification of organizations which represented
the third model.  The strategy was identified in the second
and third stages of the above selection process.  It was
decided that the directors of the organizations which were
members of SMACE were knowledgable experts in the field of
community education.  It was additionally assumed that the
directors were familiar with their communities.  These com-
bined factors led to the decision to request suggestions as
to the existence of one or more organizations which repre-
sented the third model of community education.

Of the 13 directors polled (the total number of direc-
tors whose organizations are members of SMACE), 10 made
suggestions.  Three of the suggestions were duplicates, and
two were found to be invalid during the validation process.
The validation step involved a telephone conversation with
the director of each organization suggested by the directors
of the organizations which were members of SMACE.  The con-
versation content included four sequential phases:  First,
an attempt was made to establish a positive, cooperative
relationship with the director, which included the mention
of referral.  Second, the director was familiarized in
greater detail with the purpose of the study.  Third, each
of the three models of community education was defined, and
the directors were asked if their organizations represented
any one of the three models.  Finally, the directors were

asked if they were willing to cooperate in the study. As was the case in the previous two models, there were three organizations which indicated a strong enthusiasm for the study and were very much interested in being a part of it.

The remainder of the steps included in this model were followed in the same manner as those previously described for Models I and II. Following the selection of all six organizations to be studied, the director of each organization was contacted by telephone and informed of their selection. All of the organizations agreed to participate and indicated their continued interest in the study in their response. Each director was told that they would be contacted within 2 weeks to set a date and time for the interview.

## Instrument Development and Design

As noted in the purposes of the study, each of the organizations was to be described according to selected dimensions. The six dimensions selected as a framework for description were presented and discussed in Chapter I of this report. As was mentioned in both Chapters I and II, the dimensions were selected after a careful review of the literature. Since this study represents the first attempt to describe the three models on consistent dimensions, the instrument was designed according to a broad as opposed to a limited scope of dimensions in order to provide as much

information as possible within the limitations of a single report.  In addition, it was felt that a scope of broad attention would unveil important questions within each dimension which could be addressed in subsequent studies. Hence, the dimensions selected to serve as a framework for the study were:  (1) history, (2) governance/staffing, (3) structure for community involvement, (4) programs/services, (5) finance, and (6) future.

The instrument used in the study (see Appendix) was in the form of an interview schedule.  The instrument was moderately structured.  That is, many of the questions were open to receive most any response from the interviewer. However, the instrument was sufficiently structured to accommodate the depiction of differences and similarities among the models.  Specific questions included in the interview schedule are listed in the Appendix.  Special care was taken with respect to the placement of each dimension in the schedule, the wording of each individual question, and in the placement of each question within each dimension to ensure optimum results.  In addition, particular attention was given to the content of the face sheet, partly due to a concern about the consistency and initial atmosphere of the interviews.  More specifically, the face sheet included: (1) allocation of space for identification purposes; (2) greeting; (3) reacquaintance with study, including emphasis on its importance; and (4) assurance of confidentiality.

One note on confidentiality: Confidentiality of responses is a requirement of the Research Policies Council at Western Michigan University. The purpose of the council is to protect the human subject from harm as a consequence of research participation.

After the instrument had been constructed, it was field-tested through interviews with the directors of organizations representing each of the three models. Those directors interviewed for the pilot were among those not selected for study from the original list of potential selections. A few changes were made as a result of the pilot study. With respect to the question: Do you believe the organization will expand, retard, or maintain its current role in the community in the future? the suggestion was made that the word "retard" had a negative connotation. Hence, during the interviews conducted for this report, interviewees were asked if they believed their organizations would expand, regress, or maintain their current role in the community in the future. The interviews conducted during the pilot study also revealed that the average length of time taken to complete the interview schedule was 1-1/2 hours. The final implication drawn from the pilot study was related to the number of possible responses for several of the questions included in the interview schedule. Two of the three directors interviewed for the pilot study experienced difficulty in remembering the possible choices of responses for several questions.

This problem was corrected during the interviews conducted for this study, and will be discussed below.

## Data Collection and Examination

Each director of the organizations studied was contacted between February 1, 1978, and February 3, 1978, for the purpose of setting a date and time for the interviews. When contact was made, it was mentioned that the interview would require approximately 1-1/2 hours of their time. The interviews were scheduled and subsequently conducted from February 15, 1978, to February 24, 1978. During an 8-day period, the data were collected in a series of interviews that ranged in time from 1 hour and 15 minutes to 2 hours.

It was mentioned above that difficulties were experienced during the pilot study with respect to interviewee recall of responses. To remedy this problem, the interviewees were each given a copy of the interview schedule to use as a reference during the interview. Each interviewee was instructed to use a cover sheet to conceal questions not yet addressed, to eliminate the possibility of bias resulting from referral to those questions. Giving the interviewee a copy of the instrument also seemed to assist in putting the interviewee at ease. Notes resulting from the interviews were transcribed within 2 hours of their completion.

The data were examined according to the aforementioned dimensions of history, programs/services, governance/staffing,

finance, structure for community involvement, and future. Commonalities were determined between the two organizations within each model and were used first to describe each of the three models according to each of the six dimensions, and then to describe similarities and differences between the models. Commonalities existing among all models were also presented. It should be noted, also, that wide disparity within models was given appropriate recognition as well.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

## Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present a discussion
of the data obtained during the interviews with directors of
organizations representing each of the three models of commu-
nity education.

The data presentation is organized in accordance with
the original purposes of this report.  Therefore, the first
portion of the presentation describes each of the models
along the selected dimensions.  The remainder of the data
presentation summarizes the description given for each indi-
vidual model through the depiction of similarities and
differences found among them.

## Description of the Models

The models are primarily described according to the
commonalities found between the two organizations studied
for each of the three models.  The description is organized
along the dimensions of history, programs/services, finance,
governance/staffing, structures for community involvement,
and future.

79

Model I:  Organizations totally
financed through public schools

History.  It was anticipated that the reader would want
to relate the history of the organizations studied to their
goals.  Therefore, the goals of the organizations are pre-
sented here to facilitate convenient reader referral.  Subse-
quent history sections are presented in the same manner.

The goals of the two organizations studied for Model I
were nearly identical as reported.  Those found to be common
to both organizations were reported as follows:

1.  To enable adults to receive a high school
    diploma.

2.  To enable adults to improve their basic
    educational skills.

3.  To provide and/or facilitate for recrea-
    tional and enrichment activities.

4.  To promote cooperation among community
    agencies.

5.  To improve the relationship between school
    and community.

Both of the directors interviewed for Model I indicated
that the organizations they administered were formed during
the sixties through the efforts of a public school system.
When asked about the basic community problems and/or issues
which had been addressed during the past development of their
respective organizations, the directors both reported that
they had given attention to the dropout rate, made public
school facilities available to the community, and had

effectively dealt with the problem of empty school buildings. One of the two directors added that when the school facilities were made available to the public, other agencies in the community were among the first to take advantage of the service. It was also reported that most of the agencies which had begun to use the facilities frequently used them as a means to address members of the community.

The directors both reported three major problem areas which had historically blocked or limited progress toward the above-mentioned goals. First, as time passed, they had both been given increased responsibilities without also being given additional staff. And, according to the directors, the added responsibilities were frequently not in line with their perceived role. The planning and implementation of a bond levy campaign and the management of building maintenance were among the examples cited. The second major problem area which had historically restricted goal attainment was reported as being the lack of support from public school staff. Both directors agreed that the traditional attitudes of school staff members with respect to education and a general lack of understanding with regard to the community education process represented the primary sources of the problem. The third and final problem which received support from both directors related to the goal of community development. The directors indicated a general lack of achievement in that goal area and believed that, in addition to the

reasons given above for the second problem, their staffs were not skilled in the community development process.

The only event or circumstance which both directors considered to have historically facilitated progress toward goal achievement was the designation of a vacated K-12 building as a center for community education. The directors reported that the buildings had been turned from a public liability to an asset.

Programs/services. The programs and/or services provided by both organizations representing Model I included: adult education, enrichment, recreation, senior citizen, day care, public relations for the school system, and supervision of building maintenance for the school system. When asked whether the organization emphasized any one program and/or service over all others, they reported a strong emphasis on adult education. It was alos indicated that the programs and/or services provided emphasized the adult between the ages of 16 and 25.

Financial. In accordance with the funding criteria set forth for Model I, all funds received by the two organizations were channeled through the school system. According to the directors, funds received by both organizations included state reimbursement for adult education, local taxes, and collected fees. While the operating budgets of the organizations varied from $199,000 to $1,139,000, neither organization received funds from private sources.

Governance/staffing. The directors interviewed for
Model I both reported that their organizations were governed
by their respective boards of education. Hence, all policy-
making was conducted by the boards of education. Both direc-
tors reported that a relatively small number of the members
of their governing bodies held vocational positions without
some degree of management responsibility, but few held high
management positions.

Responses to the question about the experience and/or
training of persons responsible for governance in the organ-
ization generally fell into two categories: experience and
training in group process, and experience and training in
community education. Over one-third of the board members
had received either undergraduate, graduate, or workshop
training which had some relevance to the area of group
process. However, in the community education training area,
less than one-fourth of the members had formal training or
experience. Experience in either of the two areas was
limited to that received as teachers or managers. The inter-
viewed directors did mention that informal discussions with
individual board members and reports made to the board did
improve the board's understanding of community education.

With regard to their respective staffs, the directors
reported that their part-time staff constituted about 85 per-
cent of their total staff including volunteer workers. The
volunteers involved about 10 percent of the part-time staff.

Structures for community involvement.  Neither organiza-
tion had an active structure for community involvement,
although both directors indicated that they had an advisory
council "on paper."  One of the directors voiced a concern
about community power and loss of control.  He stated that
"some directors have a problem--communities take power."

Future.  Both directors perceived that their organiza-
tions would maintain their present states rather than regress
or expand in the future.  Most of the concerns voiced about
the future centered around financial security.  Current
changes in state aid for adult education in the State of
Michigan and the increasing scarcity of public school monies
were specifically mentioned.  Neither director was particu-
larly optimistic about the chances of going directly to their
communities for financial support should it become necessary
for the survival of their organizations.

## Model II:  Organizations partially financed through public schools

History.  The goals found to be common in both organiza-
tions were reported as follows:

1. To enable adults in the community to receive
   a high school diploma.

2. To enable adults to improve their basic
   educational skills.

3. To provide and/or facilitate for recrea-
   tional and enrichment activities.

4. To improve the relationship between school
   and community.

5. To promote cooperation among community agencies.

6. To be active in the community development process.

Public school systems were involved in the initiation of both organizations studied for Model II, one of which was founded in 1968 and the other in 1970. In addition to the public schools, other resources were involved in the original planning of the organizations. Among those resources were a municipal recreation board and the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center. The origin of the organization which involved a municipal recreation board was rather unique. The initial planning of that organization resulted in a written agreement between the public school and the municipal recreation board. According to the director interviewed, and the reviewed agreement, the combined governing bodies of these two resources are actually responsible for the governance of community education. The director indicated that the agreement originated because the recreation board wanted to expand from a summer program to a year-round effort, and the school board wanted to establish a community education program. Additional findings reported below indicate that the agreement has made both positive and negative impacts on the development of the community education organization.

Three community problems and/or issues were identified which both organizations had addressed. First was a school

dropout-rate problem. Second was a lack of a facility open to the use of community groups. The third problem related to the need for additional monies in the school system. The directors responded to those respective problems by establishing high-school completion classes, opening school facilities to community groups, and assisting in campaigns for additional school funds. According to the director of the organization governed by the school board and the city commission, the organization administered had addressed the additional problems of substance abuse, poor student-parent communication, lack of retirement preparation, and health.

Among the problems which had historically blocked or limited progress toward the goals of their organizations, the directors reported two in common. Both indicated that they had experienced frustration when working with school administrators and teachers, and attributed the difficulty to the traditional educational attitudes of these persons. The second problem related to the lack of physical facilities available for community use. Although both directors used school and other community facilities, the demand for recreation activities led to a need for additional facilities. One director reported that the increase in female participation in school sports had resulted in a decrease in the community's use of school facilities. The director of the organization with the combined resource governing board also reported a problem relating to the way the community views

the organization he administers.  He indicated that, since the organization was an outgrowth of the city recreation program, many people in the community equated community education with community recreation.  While the tendency to perceive the organization as a recreation program has more recently decreased, it remains, according to the director, as a major problem area.

The directors interviewed had only one event or circumstance in common which was to have historically facilitated progress toward goal achievement.  Both organizations had received a substantial grant from the federal government. The grants were received through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Natural Resources. The director of the organization which involved the city commission in its governance also indicated that the nature of the agreement between the two organizations had resulted in an increased amount of cooperation with other resources.

Programs/services.  Both directors reported programs in the following areas:  adult education, enrichment, recreation, senior citizen, day care, and pre-retirement.  It was interesting to find that, while the two directors reached high agreement with respect to the above programs/services and goals, one organization emphasized recreation above all other programs/services, while the other emphasized adult education.  Both programs, however, emphasized the adult age group of 18-30 in their programs/services.

Financial. In accordance with the funding criteria set
forth for Model II, funds for the operation of both organiza-
tions were received from the public schools and other
resources in the community. The directors reported the fol-
lowing funding sources in common: state reimbursement for
adult education, local taxes, program/service fees from com-
munity residents, federal grants, United Way, municipal or
village council, and private donations. The budgets of the
two organizations varied from $186,000 to $300,000. The
directors also indicated that approximately 75 percent of
the funds received were from public sources. The remaining
25 percent was, of course, private.

Governance/staffing. As indicated earlier, there was
a difference between the organizations with respect to gover-
nance responsibility. While one organization was governed
by a public school board of education, the other was governed
by the city commission as well. Both directors reported that
relatively few members of their governing bodies held voca-
tional positions without some degree of management responsi-
bility, but few held high positions of management.

Responses to the question about the experience and/or
training of persons responsible for governance in the organ-
ization generally fell into two areas. The first area
related to group process skills and the second related to
knowledge of community education. A discussion of the train-
ing relating to both areas precedes the findings relating

to experience. The training in group process skills was reported to have been received during graduate or undergraduate study and varied between organizations. One director reported that 3 out of 16 individuals had experience and/or training in that area. The other reported that 5 out of the 7 individuals responsible for governance had such training and/or experience.

The directors were more consistent in their responses in the second area mentioned. The responses in the area of training in community education were easily classified into two categories, formal and informal. Formal training was recorded as undergraduate, graduate, in-service, seminar, or workshop. Neither of the two directors reported individuals who had formal training in community education through undergraduate, graduate, or in-service study. However, approximately one-third of the individuals responsible for governing the organizations had received training through seminars and workshops. Agreement was also found among the responses in the informal training category. Both directors indicated that informal training with respect to community education had been maintained with all members of their governing bodies. This type of training was usually provided through individual conversation or by informal presentations at regular meetings.

The directors reported that their governing bodies had little experience which related to group-process skills, or

to community education other than that mentioned above as training experience. One director indicated that 2 of 7 members had experience in either area. Of the 16 governing members of the other organization, 3 had experience in community education or in group-process techniques. The type of experience recorded was normally encountered through prior advisory council membership in the fields of community education or recreation.

It should be added that during the interview both directors acknowledged that they needed to give more attention to the training of the members of their governing bodies.

Concerning the staffs of the organizations, approximately 85 percent of the total staff, including volunteer workers, were part-time. Thus, 15 percent of the staff were full-time employees of the organization. Volunteers represented 10 percent of the part-time staff.

Structures for community involvement. The directors were fairly consistent and straightforward in their responses to the question relating to community involvement. Both of the directors made active use of advisory councils as their structure for community involvement. Members of the councils of both organizations are appointed. In one organization they are appointed by the governing body. In the second organization the members are appointed by the director. Both councils meet on a monthly basis and have advisory, as opposed to policy-making, power; however, neither structure

has a staff or budget. In addition, neither one of the two
councils is incorporated. A finding concerning the advisory
council of the organization which had two parties responsible
for its governance was of particular interest. The director
of that organization reported that the advisory council con-
sisted of representatives from each of the two resources
responsible for governance (public schools and municipal
recreation) in addition to other agency representatives and
community persons. He noted that there seemed to be a ten-
dency for the municipal representatives to dominate certain
council meetings, particularly those relating to program
development. According to the director, such domination
sometimes led to a recreation emphasis on programs.

Future. The only agreement found in the directors'
responses about the future was that additional facilities
were needed, more than anything else, to insure the continued
development of their respective organizations. One director
additionally mentioned that more awareness about community
education was also needed. The same director perceived his
organization as expanding in the future and de-emphasizing
adult education goals while placing additional emphasis on
providing for leisure time activities and community develop-
ment. However, he also indicated that a lack of facilities
and a stifled population growth may hinder its future devel-
opment. The other director reported that the organization
he administered would maintain its present level in the

future and did not foresee a change in goals.

## Model III:  Organizations not financed through public schools

History.  The common goals reported by the directors of the two Model III organizations are listed below:

1. To provide and/or facilitate for services in the following areas:  adult education, recreation, senior citizen, transportation, health, and employment.

2. To enable people to move toward independence.

3. To serve as a host agency for other community agencies.

4. To encourage inter-agency cooperation.

5. To provide informal education about how "the system" works.

6. To be a viable force in community development activities.

7. To include private institutions, public institutions, and local people in efforts to meet community-identified needs.

Both of the organizations studied for Model III originated as a part of the federally sponsored Community Action Program and were first originated during the late sixties. As community centers, the organizations localized efforts of the Community Action Program and were responsible to community action agencies which had a larger focus and were responsible to the Office of Economic Opportunity.  As funds for the operation of Community Action Programs were decreased, both of the organizations studied were forced to seek other

funds for survival. Both of the centers currently receive less than one-fourth of their budgets from the federal government. While one of the centers continues to be attached to a local community action agency, both of them enjoy a high degree of autonomy and generally function as independent community centers. When questioned about the effect of the decreased monies available from the federal government for Community Action Programs, both directors indicated that the commitment to the goals of the center led to a spirit of "we'll do it on our own."

In addition to the above-stated goals, one director indicated that the organization he administered also played an advocate role on issues identified by the community. The other center also reported an additional goal, which was to provide learning activities for after-care patients.

Both organizations reportedly addressed the problem of insufficient services in their respective communities. The directors commented that while many people needed services, they did not and sometimes could not travel the distance necessary to get them. The problem was attended to by localizing many of the needed services in the community centers. The problem of insufficient services was the only one identified as having been addressed by one of the directors. However, the other director interviewed produced a rather extensive list of additional problems which were addressed by the organization he administered. The additional problems

and/or issues reported by that director are noted below:

1. Dilapidated housing.

2. Youth delinquency.

3. Graduated income tax.

4. Problem pregnancies.

5. Drug abuse.

6. Crime.

7. Planned parenthood.

8. Insufficient traffic signs.

9. Lack of transportation for seniors.

10. The selling of alcoholic beverages to minors.

11. Lack of educational activities and programs for native Americans.

12. Poor quality of meals for school children.

13. Poor bus supervision of school children.

Of the problems reported which had historically blocked or limited progress toward the goals of the organizations, only one was reported by both directors. According to the directors interviewed, when decreased federal support necessitated the procuring of additional funding sources, both organizations experienced difficulties--and still do to a much lesser extent. One additional significant problem was reported by each director. The organization which had totally severed its relationship with the Community Action Program encountered a problem when they tried to change the community's perception of the center. The center had

previously acquired a poor reputation as an arm of the Community Action Program and people initially perceived the "new" center in much the same light. The other director was the administrator of the organization which included advocacy for community-identified issues as one of its primary goals. The director mentioned that the organization lost a few supporters during early advocacy efforts. But he also reported that the risk assumed by the advocacy role soon evolved into one of the most important assets of the center and came to be supported by most all people in the community.

When asked about the major events or circumstances which had historically facilitated progress toward the goals of the organizations, the directors both agreed that much of the goal attainment they enjoyed was due to the effective participation and cooperation of individual community members and organizations.

One of the directors responded with an additional answer to the above problem which bears mention. The director attributed much of the center's success to the effective development of a community council. It became apparent during the interview that the community council was the backbone of this organization.

Programs/services. The common programs and/or services reported by the directors included: adult education, recreation, enrichment, senior citizens, transportation, health, outreach, employment, counseling, and host-agency services.

According to the directors, one of the organizations empha-
sized outreach for human services.  The other organization
did not emphasize any one of the programs and/or services
over the others.  Neither director indicated that the pro-
grams and/or services of their organizations emphasized any
one age group.  However, both agreed that the most "visable"
program was designed for senior citizens.  The visual empha-
sis was due to the regular meals provided for seniors in the
center.

Financial.  In accordance with the criteria set forth
in the beginning of this study, none of the funds received
by the organizations representing the third model came from
public schools.  The revenue sources which contribute to the
function of both organizations are:  federal (Community Ser-
vice Administration, CETA), municipal, county, state, United
Way, private donations (philanthropic and individual), and
fees.  In addition to the above sources, one organization
reportedly received a substantial amount of funds from its
incorporated community council.  The operating budgets of
the centers varied from $45,000 to $200,000.  The directors
also reported that approximately 70 percent of the total
budget came from public sources, leaving 30 percent from
private sources.

Governance/staffing.  With respect to governance, both
directors indicated that a board of directors was responsible
for policy-making decisions.  They also reported that the

full-time vocations of governing board members almost equally represented low, middle, and high levels of management, as well as nonmanagement.

It was found that the directors reach a high degree of consensus in answer to one aspect of the question which concerned the experience and/or training of board members. They reported that nearly all of the board members had received both seminar and workshop training. The training generally involved familiarization with center goals, although one director also mentioned that several members of the organization he administers had received leadership training as well. Both directors indicated that approximately one-half of their board members had received undergraduate training. However, only two members of both boards had received graduate training. With respect to job-related experience, the directors cited that vocational experience with United Way, a local bank, a personnel office, and community councils had assisted board members in meeting their governance responsibilities.

Approximately 70 percent of the total staff at each center (19 of 24 in one, and 5 of 16 in the other) included part-time employees. Under 10 percent of the part-time staff was comprised of volunteer workers.

Structures for community involvement. While the directors noted that they both made active use of community councils, they were found to be quite different in many respects. In one organization both the council members and officers are

elected. The other council is quite different. Membership in that council is open to anyone in the geographic community, as defined by the center. Attendance at one meeting permits voting privileges at subsequent meetings. There are currently nearly 400 members in the council, almost 50 of which attend every meeting. Officers of the council are elected by council members. The director interviewed indicated that 63 council members participated in the past election. The differences between the two councils are further recognized by the fact that the council specifically described above was incorporated, and had a budget and staff. The other council was not incorporated, nor did it have a staff or budget. The two councils were similar to some extent, however. According to the directors, both councils held advisory power, members of both councils could serve indefinitely, and both held monthly meetings. It should be added that, while both directors reported that their councils held advisory power, the director whose council was incorporated mentioned that his council represented a political entity which was respected by the larger community.

Future. The directors predicted that their organizations would expand in the future. Neither director could foresee any substantive changes in the current goals of the organization he administered. When asked what was needed to insure the continued existence of the two organizations, the directors responded by indicating that they needed secure

funding sources, continued accepted input from political

entities (local and otherwise), and, finally, continued

support from community people.

## Similarities and Differences

The similarities and differences of the models are given

below and are described along the dimensions of history,

programs/services, finance, governance/staffing, structures

for community involvement, and future.

### History

The goals found to be common to each of the models were

as follows:

1. To provide and/or facilitate for programs
   designed to improve the basic educational
   skills of people in the community.

2. To provide and/or facilitate for educational
   programs designed to enable adults to com-
   plete high school.

3. To provide and/or facilitate for recreational
   and enrichment activities for persons of all
   ages in the community.

4. To promote interagency cooperation among
   community agencies.

5. To be an active participant in the community
   development process.

While all organizations had the above goals in common,

Models II and III stressed agency cooperation, more than

Model I. Organizations which represented Model III also

placed more emphasis on community development goals than did

the other two models. One goal common to Models I and II which was not found in Model III was related to the improvement of school/community relationships. In regard to the schools, the directors of the organizations representing Model III mentioned that they attempted to improve the conditions and/or services in the schools, which did not always result in an improved relationship between the school and community. Generally, there was no difference in the goals reported by directors of organizations representing Models I and II, but directors of Model III organizations reported more goals than those reported for Model I and II organizations.

A public school system was involved in the initiation of each organization studied for Models I and II, but not in Model III. The federal government, through its Community Action Program, was the agency responsible for the founding of the organizations which represented Model III. While both Model I and Model II evolved primarily through the efforts of a single agency, one organization studied for Model II was through the combined efforts of two major community resources. All of the organizations studied for each of the three models were formed between the years of 1960 and 1970.

Not one of the basic community problems and/or issues addressed the organizations was common to all. However, directors of organizations representing both Models I and II reported that they had addressed the problems of a high rate

of high school dropouts and the restricted use of school facilities for community groups. The poor availability of community services was addressed by Model III organizations, but not by the others. Their centers localized services by becoming a host for other agencies.

A problem which had historically blocked or limited progress toward goals was reported by directors representing both Model I and Model II. The problem reportedly related to the traditional K-12 attitude which many public school personnel acquiesce. Such an attitude, while traditional, is limited in the eyes of the community educator. The directors indicated that the conflict of attitudes frequently restricted the development of the community education process. The directors interviewed for Model I reported the additional goal-restricting problems as: increasing degrees of responsibility in areas not frequently regarded as community education duties, and lack of staff knowledge with respect to the community development process. The directors interviewed for Model II reported one problem not reported by the other directors. That problem was a lack of a sufficient number of physical facilities available for community use. The only problem restricting goal attainment in both organizations studied for Model III was the procurement of funds after the retardation of funds for the operation of community action programs.

The only similarities among the events or circumstances

which were reported to have historically facilitated good achievement were found to exist between the organizations which represented Models II and III. The directors of those organizations all indicated that positive cooperative relationships with community agencies had assisted them in meeting the goals of their respective organizations. Those directors also agreed that the obtainment of federal grants was a factor in enabling them to progress toward their stated goals. According to the directors who represented Model I, the event which facilitated goal attainment was the designation of vacated public school buildings as community education centers.

## Programs/services

A high degree of agreement was found between the models with respect to the dimension of programs and/or services. The directors interviewed for all of the models indicated that the organizations they administered provided or facilitated for services in the following areas: adult education, recreation, enrichment, and senior citizen. However, differences were also found between the models. The directors of organizations studied for both Model I and Model II involved day care in their list of services, while the organizations studied for Model III did not. In addition, programs and/or services were reported in each model which were not reported in either one of the other two. For example, the

organizations studied for Model I included public relations for the public school and supervision of building maintenance as services which were not found in Model II or Model III. Likewise, only organizations in Model II reported a pre-retirement program. Similarly, the Model III organizations were the only organizations to include health, outreach, transportation, employment, counseling, and host-agency services.

According to both directors of the organizations included in Model I and one director of the two organizations represented in Model II, the adult education program is emphasized more than any other program and/or service provided by their respective organizations. Such was not the case in Model III, as one director reported that his organization did not emphasize any one program or service over another. The director of the other Model III organization emphasized outreach services. The director of the Model II organization who did not emphasize adult education indicated that his organization emphasized recreation. Model I and Model II directors were also in close agreement with respect to age group emphasis of programs and services. The Model I directors indicated that their programs and services emphasize the participation of adults between the ages of 16 and 25. Responses from Model II directors were fairly close to the age group indicated for Model I, as they reported an emphasis of adults between the ages of 18 and 30 years. The

Model III directors did not report an age group emphasis
with respect to the programs and/or services provided.

## Financial

The basic similarities and differences found within this
dimension were predetermined by the funding criteria set
forth for the selection of the organizations studied. Essen-
tially, then, the funding of the organizations representing
the first model differed from those of the second and third
because they were totally financed through public schools.
The funding of organizations representing the second model
differed from those selected to represent Models I and III
because they received part of their funds through public
schools and part from other resources. The funding for
Model III was unique because it was totally funded by
resources other than the public schools. Therefore, by
definition of the models, organizations representing Models
I and II are similar in that they both receive funds through
public schools. Similarly, organizations representing Models
II and III are similar in that they both receive funds from
non-school sources. The non-school funds received by the
organizations represented in both Models I and II included
those obtained from United Way and municipalities. The
budgets of the organizations ranged from $199,000 to
$1,139,000 for Model I; $186,000 to $300,000 for Model II;
and $45,000 to $200,000 for Model III. While the directors

of the organizations which represented Model I reported that
they did not receive any private funds, the Model II direc-
tors reported that their organizations received 25 percent
of their funds from private sources. Similarly, those organ-
izations representing Model III received 30 percent of their
funds from private sources.

## Governance/staffing

A public school board of education was the only govern-
ing body reported for either organization studied for Model I.
An independent board of directors was the only body respon-
sible for the governance of the Model III organizations.
However, directors of Model II organizations reported differ-
ent governing boards. One organization was governed by a
public school board of education. The other Model II organ-
ization was governed by a composite of the local city commis-
sion and public school board of education. The members of
the governing bodies of all organizations had vocational
positions which represented low, middle, and high levels of
management, as well as nonmanagement. Less than one-fourth
of the persons responsible for the governance of the organ-
izations studied for Models II and III had some training in
the area of group process. Slightly more than one-third of
the persons responsible for the governance of Model I organ-
izations had such training. All directors interviewed indi-
cated that training received in group process skills was

encountered during undergraduate and/or graduate study. Experience related to the duties of governance was limited in all organizations, and took the form of teaching, administrative, or community council when reported. With regard to training related to the goals of the organization, less than one-fourth of the persons responsible for the governance of Model I organizations received goal-oriented training; approximately one-third of the persons for Model II organizations and almost everyone responsible for the governance of Model III organizations had received goal-oriented training. The directors all reported that goal-oriented training was usually provided in the form of workshops or seminars. It should also be mentioned that directors representing all organizations also indicated that they intermittently informed governing boards concerning the development of the organizations, both by formal and informal means.

Concerning the staffs of the organizations studied for each model, the directors interviewed for Models I and II reported that approximately 85 percent of their staffs were part-time, including volunteers. The directors of the organizations which represented Model III reported a lower proportion of part-time staff (75 percent). Volunteers represented less than 10 percent of the part-time staffs of all organizations.

## Structures for community involvement

The most prominent difference found among the models with respect to structures for community involvement was that the organizations studied for Model I did not make use of such a structure, although the directors of those organizations did mention that they had designed advisory councils "on paper." Since Model I organizations did not use these advisory councils, the remainder of the discussion concerning structures of community involvement includes only Models II and III.

The directors of organizations representing the other two models indicated that they made active use of advisory councils. Advisory council members from Model II organizations were appointed, while those from Model III were elected in one organization. In the other Model III organization, the council membership was open to anyone. The council with the open membership policy was incorporated and also had a budget and staff. The director of the other organization studied for Model III reported that his council was not incorporated, nor did it have its own staff or budget. Model II organizations were not incorporated, nor did they have a staff or budget. The councils of organizations which represented Models II and III were, however, similar in that members of both councils held only advisory power; they could serve indefinitely; and they held regular monthly meetings.

## Future

During the interviews, all directors were asked the question: "Do you believe the organization will expand, regress, or maintain its current role in the community in the future?" In response to the question, only three of the six directors interviewed indicated that their organizations would expand. Two of those directors represented Model III organizations, and one was interviewed for Model II. The directors who represented Model I organizations voiced a concern about the future financial security of their organizations. Current changes in state aid for adult education in the State of Michigan and the increasingly scarce state of public school monies were mentioned as the primary sources of their concerns. Directors of Model III organizations also drew attention to the need for secure funding sources and added that they were depending on the continued accepted input from political entities and continued support from community people. The directors of Model II organizations reported that they needed, more than anything else, additional facilities to ensure the continued development of their respective organizations.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss
the conclusions and implications of this study. The discus-
sion given below serves to introduce the conclusions and
implications of the study by discussing the genesis of the
study and by a brief overview with respect to the purposes
of the study.

The decision to conduct this study was initially based
on the writer's experience as a public school community edu-
cation director. It was sometime during the last 2 years
of that 5-year experience that the writer came to realize
that community organizations not financially related to
public schools were involved in the business of community
education. Coincidentally, that (now common) realization
occurred at about the same time that emphasis shifted from
community schools to community education. However, it soon
became clear that, while the approach to community education
used by the non-school financed organizations referred to
above was somewhat different from that used by the writer in
his school-financed organization, the goals and objectives
of both types of organizations were the same. Subsequent

109

study of community education literature revealed that leaders
in the field considered non-school financed organizations as
alternatives to traditional school-based community education
organizations.  Further literature investigation revealed
that no writer had investigated such alternatives along con-
sistent dimensions.  It quite naturally followed, then, that
the writer's curiosity would lead to such an investigation.

The purposes of this study were to describe each of
three models of community education along selected dimensions
and to describe how the models were similar and/or different
from each other.  The three models were defined according to
the way community education organizations are financed.
Model I represented those organizations in which the commu-
nity education effort was totally financed through public
schools.  Model II represented those organizations in which
the community education effort was jointly funded through
public schools and other community resources.  The last
model, Model III, represented those organizations in which
the community education effort was funded through community
resources other than that of the public school.  The dimen-
sions selected to describe each of the three models, and
also their similarities and differences, included history,
finance, programs/services, governance/staffing, structure
for community involvement, and future.  To accomplish the
above-stated purposes of the study, literature related to
the history, goals, and problems associated with each of

the three models was examined, and organizations representing
each of the models were studied. The interview technique for
the procurement of data was used to study the organizations.
The results of the interviews are reported in Chapter IV of
this document.

## Conclusions and Implications

In drawing conclusions about this study, one should
understand that, while the conclusions have evolved from
the findings, subjective judgment was used to discuss their
implications. As was frequently mentioned, the interview
investigation was limited to two organizations for each model.
Therefore, one must exercise caution in drawing conclusions
from the study. In addition, the generalizability of the
conclusions is also limited by variances in such factors as
state funding procedures, director skill level, and socio-
economic standards of communities. Assuming that one under-
stands the tentative nature of the conclusions, the following
are offered:

    1.  Organizations which are represented by Model I
       report less cooperation with other agencies
       when compared with Models II and III.

By definition of the models, one would naturally expect that
the above conclusions would have been drawn from this study.
Model I organizations are financed through one agency--the
public school. Models II and III are financed through any
number of agencies. Since more than one agency usually has

a financial commitment to organizations represented by Model II or III, it is only natural to expect that Model II and III organizations would experience a higher degree of agency cooperation than Model I organizations.

In addition, Model III (non-school financed community education) organizations have, according to the literature reviewed and organizations investigated for this study, typically assumed a host-agency role. That is, Model III organizations frequently house employees of other agencies which localized the programs and/or services offered by the agencies. The host-agency role is obviously quite conducive to agency cooperation.

Since Model II and III organizations have "built in" mechanisms which provide a foundation for cooperation among community agencies, and Model I organizations do not, the directors of community education organizations which are totally financed through the schools may need to make a more conscious effort to establish a means for cooperation. Such efforts require a willingness on the part of directors to take the initiative to establish cooperative relationships with other agencies. Failure to do so would logically lead to an increased amount of duplication among agencies.

2. While the goal of promoting school/community relationships is primary to Model I and Model II organizations, but not to Model III organizations, Model III organizations are usually more involved in community development and community action activities than Model I and Model II organizations.

Indeed, one would expect to find Model III organizations so involved inasmuch as the literature indicates that the prime goals of Model III organizations are "to promote and facilitate effective involvement of neighborhood residents in the solution of neighborhood problems . . . to provide the people of the neighborhood with a structure and a program designed to enable them to act." Such goals are not conducive to the promotion of school/community relationships. The literature indicates that when community members voice a need for changes within the public school, Model III organizations often advocate for the changes. Additionally, the literature indicates that such organizations evolved from the need for community development and from an interest in community action.

Further, one would expect more commitment to community development and community action on the part of Model III organizations and emphasis on the promotion of school/community relationships on the part of Model I and II organizations because of their financial accounting base. Most Model III organizations are accountable primarily for the education and training of the young in basic skills. The continued support of public schools depends upon how well they accomplish that goal, not how well they develop community or community-action activities.

It must be realized, however, that there is a growing awareness of the need for Model I and II type organizations (school-centered) to make increased efforts to relate to

community.  Indeed, Minzey (1974) who has written and spoken widely about community education organizations which are totally financed through public schools (Model I) includes "community development" as a component of his school-based model of community education.

The discussion given above implies that if directors of Model I and Model II organizations are to increase their attention to the development of community and/or community-action activities, public school officials together with members of the community must begin to perceive the goals of community development and community action as goals of public schools.  In the opinion of this writer, the likelihood of that occurring in the near future is extremely remote.  Further, it would therefore seem that community education organizations which are financially accountable to public schools will continue to emphasize the same goals in the future that they emphasize today.

3.  Model I and Model II organizations' programs and/or services emphasize the young adult age group over all others.

While interesting because of its inherent implications, the above conclusion will not surprise many readers knowledgeable in the field of community education.  One factor which undoubtedly contributes to the above conclusion is that Model I and II organizations are reimbursed by states for adult education, and Model III organizations are not.  While a valuable service is no doubt provided to young adults through

such programs, when those programs come to represent the major portion of the effort made toward the development of the community education process, other aspects of that process can be expected to suffer. The emphasis placed on the young adult age group does not appear to have the support of writers in the field of community education inasmuch as the literature did not suggest that any one age group was in greater need of the community education process than any other.

If it can be assumed that other age groups are in need of more attention than they presently receive from Model I and II organizations, two comments seem readily apparent. First, such organizations must garner financial and philo-sophical support from its governing body to accommodate addi-tional attention to other age groups. Second, if organiza-tions representing Models I and II cannot meet the needs of other age groups as defined by the goals of those organiza-tions, they should facilitate for the needs of those individ-uals by referring them to other organizations that can.

> 4. Most members of the governing boards of organ-izations represented by any one of the three models lack training in group process skills, and most governing board members of organiza-tions represented by Models I and II lack formal training with regard to the goals of their respective organizations.

Clark (1968) has indicated that many of the problems encoun-tered with governing boards stem from a lack of training in group process skills. It often seems that when governance

responsibilities are given to persons, it is automatically assumed that they are skilled in the process of groups. The above conclusion suggests that such is not necessarily true.

The writer was somewhat surprised to find that only members of governing boards of organizations represented by the third model had almost all received formal training pertaining to the goals of their organizations. It may be that no one assumed that the governing board members were oriented to the goals of the organizations, since they have only recently been developed. Additionally, the governing bodies of Model I and II organizations are responsible for the governance of the entire school system, whereas the governing bodies of Model III organizations are only responsible for the governance of the community education organization. However, the lack of Model I and II governance members' instruction with respect to the goals of community education organizations is alarming. Many problems encountered by Model I and II organizations may be rooted in this area. If practicing community educators expect efficient and informed board members, they would do well to orient those who are not knowledgeable of the goals of community education and to provide training for those members who are not skilled in the process of groups. The above conclusion also implies a need for the development of training packages in the area of group process.

5. Volunteers typically represent less than 10 percent of the part-time staff of organizations represented by all three models.

This conclusion would seem to be consistent with what one would expect to find in organizations which do not include community education goals in their organizations. However, the goals of community education are conducive to the use of volunteer staff, whereas others may not. Hence, the writer was surprised to find that such a small percentage of the staffs of organizations representing all three community education models were volunteer. Most of the directors interviewed for this study indicated that they had tried to use volunteers but found that they could not depend on them.

Since all of the directors interviewed for this study indicated that they were concerned about the future financing of their organizations, it may become necessary to rely more heavily on volunteer staff in the future. If goal-oriented instruction and non-monetary incentives were provided, the directors may find volunteers more dependable.

> 6. Directors of Model II and III organizations usually make more active use of their advisory councils than do directors of Model I organizations.

The above conclusion is supported by the findings of this study and by the literature. With respect to the investigation conducted for this study, the directors interviewed for Model I organizations reported that they had not actively used their advisory councils. In fact, one director reported that his council existed only on paper. Literature related to Model I organizations indicates that such councils are

important features of school-centered community education organizations primarily because they provide a structure for community involvement. However, the literature also indicates that practitioners have frequently failed to make effective use of the councils (Minzey, 1974).

Indeed, one would expect to find directors of Model III organizations making more active use of community councils because of the importance they have given to community action and community development goals. Many of the programs provided through Model I organizations, however, are easily scheduled without the aid of community residents. Community action and community development goals are naturally conducive to the use of advisory councils inasmuch as the degree to which they are realized greatly depends on citizen involvement. Additionally, the goals of community action and community development involve concrete objectives--lighting unsafe streets, building a health clinic in the community, or stopping a freeway from being put through the community (Davies, 1977). The purpose of community councils is not nearly as clear, however, in Model I organizations. The writer has found that many Model I community councils cease to actively function because of a loss of interest on the part of council members--they come to sense a lack of purpose.

Since community councils are mandated for school-centered organizations receiving state funds for community education,

those councils will likely continue to exist, even if in some cases only on paper. However, in light of the way many school-centered community education directors implement the community education process, such councils are, in this writer's opinion, a waste of time for the directors of such organizations and for the members of their councils.

> 7. While directors of organizations representing all three models are concerned about the future financial security of their organizations, directors of Model III organizations are more optimistic about the future success of their organizations than are directors of Model I and II organizations.

When viewed in light of above-discussed conclusions and implications relating to the areas of community action and community development goals, age group emphasis, and citizen participation, the optimism expressed by directors of Model III organizations seems justified.

With regard to community action and community development goals, it was suggested above that if directors of Model I and II organizations really expected to develop community and community action activities, public school officials and members of the community must begin to perceive those goals as goals of public schools. Since the odds are heavily against such a change in attitude with respect to public schools, it would seem that community education organizations which are financially accountable to public schools will likely continue to orient themselves away from community development and community action goals. However, Model III

organizations hold community development/community action goals close to heart and implement processes related to those goals accordingly. Fortunately for Model III organizations, there is an increased public interest in community action and community development. Model III organizations are generally free to assist in the meeting of such interest and need. Community action and community development needs have given no indication of waning in the near future.

Organizations represented by Models I and II have also emphasized a single age group over all others--the young adult--as was previously discussed. If emphasis on the young adult age group continues to accelerate in school-financed models of community education, those models may become known as models of adult education which contribute to the community education process, rather than community education models per se.

Furthermore, many organizations financed through the schools are not as actively involved in structures for citizen involvement as the more community-based organizations are. The existence of structures for community involvement in Model I organizations seems to exist for reasons other than need. It would not surprise the writer if most advisory councils in Model I organizations ceased to exist in the future. On the other hand, the implementation of community development and community action processes resulted in a tremendous amount of citizen participation reported by Model

III organizations, which seems likely to be continued in the future.

The above discussions all seem to suggest that directors of school-financed organizations are expected to accomplish unrealistic goals--given their relationship with public schools. One would expect that frustrations resulting from this failure to realize goals of the community education process would ultimately lead to doubts about future success. Additional comments with respect to the effectiveness and futures of the respective organizations are given below.

Thanks to the cooperative, relaxed atmosphere that prevailed throughout all interviews, it is possible to relate a general comment about the attitudes communicated by the directors with regard to their perceived present level of effectiveness (volunteered information) and their thoughts about the future of their organizations. The attitudes are mentioned here since they are perceived as being important to any implications drawn from the study.

Generally, the directors of the organizations receiving funds from public schools were dissatisfied with their present level of effectiveness in any of the process-oriented goal areas. They communicated their frustrations about not implementing goals in line with the philosophy of community education. In addition to being shackled with responsibilities not normally associated with community education, they were being evaluated according to how much state aid they

qualified for through their adult education programs.  This poor state of affairs provides the reader with at least a partial explanation for the findings reported earlier which indicated that all organizations studied for Model I and Model II emphasized their adult education programs over all other programs and/or services.  The directors of these school-financed organizations further related that their positions would be lost and the community education organization would cease to operate if state aid for adult education were terminated or severely cut back.  Add the increasing scarcity of public school funds (witness the recent property tax cutbacks in the State of California [Clymer, 1978]) and the resultant cutbacks in or elimination of non-K-12 programs and an appreciation for the frustrations and future concerns of directors of school-related community education organizations can be shared.

Admittedly, the directors of Model III organizations also mentioned a concern about obtaining consistent funding sources in future years; however, an air of extreme optimism prevailed when discussing the future of their organizations. The contrast between the attitudes expressed by directors of Model III organizations and those expressed by other directors with respect to the future were remarkable.  Additionally, the findings show that Model III directors were indeed implementing process-oriented goals.

The above-mentioned attitudes, expressed during the

interviews, are supportive of many other findings identified
in Chapter IV of this study. Such findings led the writer
to question whether it was appropriate to reword Weaver's
statement referring to there being more education going on
outside the school than in it, to read that there is also
more community education going on outside of the school than
in it (Weaver, 1972b). There is, however, a very rational
reason for there being more community education going on
outside of the school than in it. That reason is that public
schools and community education are not compatible by
definition.

The implication, then, is that since it can be concluded
that non-school funded community education organizations are
currently implementing more process goals associated with
community education than are organizations which are depen-
dent on public school funds for their operation, and that
directors of Model III organizations are more optimistic
about the futures of their organizations than are directors
of organizations funded through public schools, then the
community education theorist and practitioner alike would do
well to give the non-school financed model of community edu-
cation a more thoughtful look as a viable alternative to
other models described in this study.

The study also implies that not all organizations
involved in the process of community education are labeled
as such. Less attention should be directed toward the labels

assigned to organizations and more toward what organizations are actually doing. What is most important of all things considered is whether the community education process is realized or not.

Also, the present societal malaise indicates that there is a sufficient amount of work to be done to make appropriate an attack on improving community by all three models described in this study.

Finally, the description of each model of community education along the dimensions of history, programs and/or services, governance/staffing, structure for community involvement, and future yielded information which will assist practitioners in determining how the community education process could best be implemented in their particular communities.

## Recommendations for Further Study

This study represents the first systematic attempt to describe the three models of community education along consistent dimensions, and depicts the similarities and differences among them. As such, the study represents the foundation upon which further research can be conducted. Each of the conclusions mentioned earlier requires additional research for verification. In addition, each dimension selected for this study needs more detailed investigation. Also warranted are replications of this study in different

areas of the country: to determine if relationships exist between community education dimensions and effectiveness of the organizations represented by each of the three models; to determine if a relationship exists between organizations represented by the three models when two or more are found in the same communities; and, finally, to determine if a relationship exists between various demographic characteristics of communities and the effectiveness of each of the three models.

# REFERENCES

Addams, J. *Twenty years at Hull House*. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Bailey, S. K., & Mosher, E. K. *ESEA: The Office of Education administers a law*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Bojorquez, S. E. *Acceptance of community education's preferred role for the school and its relationship to exemplary community education programs in Southwest Michigan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975.

Clark, K. B. *A relevant war against poverty: A study of community action programs and observable social change*. New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center, 1968.

Clymer, A. California voters appear to back proposal to slash property taxes. *The New York Times*, June 7, 1978. p. 1.

Coleman, J. S. Community disorganization. In R. K. Merton & R. A. Nisbet (Eds.), *Contemporary social problems* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966.

Cook, D. L. *Decision maker perceptions of priorities and performance of community education components*. Unpublished master's thesis, Colorado State University, 1976.

Cox, F. M., & Garvin, C. Community organization practice: 1865-1973. In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman, & J. Tropman (Eds.), *Strategies of community organization: A book of readings* (2nd ed.). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1974.

Cwik, P. J., King, M. J., & Van Voorhees, C. Community education: Issues and answers. *Community Education Research Monograph*, 1975, $\underline{1}$(3).

Davies, D. *Citizen participation in education*. Address presented at the meeting of the Western United States Community Education Center Directors, San Diego, May 1977.

Davis, A. F. *Spearheads for reform*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

126

DeLargy, P. G.  Identification of community education goals by use of the Delphi technique.  Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1974.

Deshler, B., & Erlich, J. L.  A new intervention approach: The school-community agent.  In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman, & J. Tropman (Eds.), Strategies of community organization:  A book of readings (2nd ed.).  Itasca, Ill.:  F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1974.

Dixon, M. F.  A descriptive study of selected community education consortia in Michigan.  Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1977.

Dixon, M. C., & Carr, T. H.  Perceptions of community life which distinguish between participants and nonparticipants in a neighborhood self-help organization.  American Journal of Community Psychology, 1976, 4(4), 357-366.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964:  Title II, Part A, Sec. 202.  United States Code, Congressional and Administrative News, 88th Congress, Second Session, 1.  St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1964.

Finney, L.  Community education and community development.  Address presented at the Western Michigan University Interdisciplinary Seminar, Kalamazoo, November 1977.

Greiner, J. C.  Cooperation--Or--Conflict.  Community education Journal, 1974, 4(5), 14-16; 62.

Hetrick, W. M.  Community process:  Community education's promise (An occasional paper).  Unpublished manuscript, Florida Atlantic University, June 1976.

Hillman, A.  Neighborhood centers today.  New York:  National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1960.

Hughes, L. W., & Others.  Interpretive study of research and development relative to educational cooperatives.  Knoxville:  University of Tennessee, 1971.  (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 059 544)

Kahn, A. J.  Service delivery at the neighborhood level: Experience, theory, and fads.  New York Symposium on Neighborhood Society, October 1974.  (Available from Project Share, Rockville, Maryland)

Keyes, R.  In search of community.  National Elementary Principal, 1975, 54(3), 9-17.

Kirschner Associates. A description and evaluation of neighborhood centers. Albuquerque, N.M.: Clearinghouse, 1966.

Levitan, S. A. The great society's poor law. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1969.

Lott, P. V. Perceptions of community education goals for the states of Utah, Idaho, Nevada, and Wyoming. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1976.

McClusky, H. Y. The school in the community. Community Service News, 1953, 11, 149-153.

Minzey, J. D. Community education: An amalgam of many views. Phi Delta Kappan, 1972, 54, 150-153.

Minzey, J. D. Community education--Another perception. Community Education Journal, 1974, 4(3), 7; 58-61.

Minzey, J. D., & LeTarte, C. Community education: From program to process. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972.

Mogulof, M. B. Neighborhood service centers, encyclopedia of social work, 1. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971.

Molloy, T. Community/school: Sharing the space and action (Report). New York: Educational Facilities Labs, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 084 643)

Morgan, A. E. The community of the future. Yellow Springs, O.: Community Service, Inc., 1957.

Nance, E., Dixon, J., Jr., & Terrell, R. Community education goals for black Americans. Community Education Journal, 1973, 3(3), 49-52.

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood goals in a rapidly changing world. New York: Author, 1958.

O'Donnell, E. J., & Reid, O. M. The multiservice neighborhood center. Welfare in Review, 1971, 9(3), 1-8.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Community action: The neighborhood center. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Parko, J. E.  Re-discovery of community:  Neighborhood move-
    ment in Atlanta.  Journal of Community Development
    Society, 1975, 6(1), 46-60.

Parson, S. R.  Emerging models of community education.
    Midland, Mich.:  Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.

Perlman, J. E.  Grassrooting the system.  Social Policy,
    1976, 36(6), 4-20.

Perlman, R., & Gurin, A.  Community organization and social
    planning.  New York:  John Wiley & Sons, 1972.

Perlman, R., & Jones, D.  Neighborhood service centers.
    Washington, D.C.:  U.S. Government Printing Office,
    1967.

Seay, M. F., & Associates.  Community education:  A develop-
    ing concept.  Midland, Mich.:  Pendell Publishing Co.,
    1974.

Terry, J. V., & Hess, R. D.  The urban/rural school develop-
    ment program:  An examination of a federal model for
    achieving parity between schools and communities.
    Stanford, Calif.:  Stanford University, Center for
    Research and Development in Teaching, 1975.  (ERIC
    Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 022)

Van Voorhees, C.  Project in community education research.
    Ann Arbor, Mich.:  Office of Community Education
    Research, 1975.

Warden, J. W.  Citizen participation:  What others say . . .
    What others do.  Charlottesville:  University of Vir-
    ginia, Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education,
    1977.

Weaver, D. C.  The role of the university in defining commu-
    nity education.  Address presented at the Eastern Mich-
    igan University Community School Workshop, Ypsilanti,
    April 1970.

Weaver, D. C.  A case for theory development in community
    education.  Phi Delta Kappan, 1972, 54, 154-157.  (a)

Weaver, D. C.  The emerging community education model.  Pres-
    idential address at the meeting of the National Commu-
    nity School Education Association, Flint, 1972.  (b)

Weaver, D. C.  Making sense out of community.  Unpublished
    manuscript, Western Michigan University, 1976.

APPENDIX

FACE SHEET

Respondent's Name _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone _____

Model Classification _____

Name of Organization _____

## Introductory Statement

Hello, how are you today?  You probably remember from our earlier telephone conversation that I'm working on a study of various models of community education.  While most of us realize that different models of community education exist, we really haven't studied community examples for each of them.  I think, and hope you do too, that this study is really important and could make a significant contribution to the field of community education.

I want you to know that whatever you say in this inter-view will remain confidential.  You should know, too, that Western has a Human Subjects Protection Board which oversees students who are doing studies in such a way that confiden-tiality is a must.  Any questions before we start? . . . O.K., then let's get started.

130

Respondent's Name _____

Organization _____

Model Classification _____

### Interview Schedule Format

#### HISTORY

1. When was the organization originally formed?

   _____

2. Did the organization originate through the efforts of

   a. Concerned private citizen(s)?

   b. Community agency(ies)?

      1) Please name agency(ies):

         a) _____

         b) _____

         c) _____

3. What do you see as the primary goals of the organization?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

   f. _____

131

HISTORY (Continued)

4. What major problems have historically blocked or
   limited progress toward organizational goals?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

5. What major events or circumstances have historically
   facilitated progress toward organizational goals?

   a. _____

      _____

   b. _____

      _____

   c. _____

      _____

   d. _____

      _____

6. What basic community issues and/or problems come to
   mind which have been addressed by the organization?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

PROGRAMS/SERVICES

1. What types of programs and/or services does the organization provide?

_____ a. Adult Education

_____ b. Enrichment

_____ c. Recreation

_____ d. Senior Citizens

_____ e. Day Care

_____ f. Other _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Do the programs and/or services emphasize any one type over all others?

_____ a. No

_____ b. Yes (please specify) _____

3. Do the programs and/or services emphasize any one age group over another?

_____ a. No

_____ b. Yes (please specify) _____

FINANCIAL

1.  What are the revenue sources contributing to the
    function of the organization?

    a.  _____

    b.  _____

    c.  _____

    d.  _____

    e.  _____

    f.  _____


2.  What is the total operating budget for this organization?

    _____


3.  Approximately what percent of the revenue comes from
    public sources?

    _____ a.  0-9              _____ f.  50-59

    _____ b.  10-19            _____ g.  60-69

    _____ c.  20-29            _____ h.  70-79

    _____ d.  30-39            _____ i.  80-89

    _____ e.  40-49            _____ j.  90-100


4.  Approximately what percent of the revenue comes from
    private sources?

    _____ a.  0-9              _____ f.  50-59

    _____ b.  10-19            _____ g.  60-69

    _____ c.  20-29            _____ h.  70-79

    _____ d.  30-39            _____ i.  80-89

    _____ e.  40-49            _____ j.  90-100

GOVERNANCE/STAFFING

1.  What agency(ies) has responsibility for the governance
    of the organization?

    a. _____    d. _____

    b. _____    e. _____

    c. _____    f. _____

2.  What position does the person(s) representing the
    agency(ies) having responsibility for the governance of
    the organization hold in the hierarchy of their primary
    agency?

    Agency a:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

    Agency b:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

    Agency c:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

    Agency d:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

    Agency e:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

    Agency f:    _____ Non-management
                 _____ Low management
                 _____ Middle management
                 _____ Upper management

3.  What experience and/or training does the person(s) who
    represents the agency(ies) having responsibility for
    the governance of the organization have which relates
    to responsibilities of current position?

Agency a: _____ Undergraduate training
          _____ Graduate training
          _____ In-service training
          _____ Seminar training
          _____ Workshop training
          _____ Job-related experience (please specify)

          _____ Other (please specify) _____

Agency b: _____ Undergraduate training
          _____ Graduate training
          _____ In-service training
          _____ Seminar training
          _____ Workshop training
          _____ Job-related experience (please specify)

          _____ Other (please specify) _____

Agency c: _____ Undergraduate training
          _____ Graduate training
          _____ In-service training
          _____ Seminar training
          _____ Workshop training
          _____ Job-related experience (please specify)

          _____ Other (please specify) _____

Agency d: _____ Undergraduate training
          _____ Graduate training
          _____ In-service training
          _____ Seminar training
          _____ Workshop training
          _____ Job-related experience (please specify)

          _____ Other (please specify) _____

Agency e: _____ Undergraduate training
          _____ Graduate training
          _____ In-service training
          _____ Seminar training
          _____ Workshop training
          _____ Job-related experience (please specify)

          _____ Other (please specify) _____

GOVERNANCE/STAFFING (Continued)

      Agency f:   \_\_\_\_\_   Undergraduate training
                    \_\_\_\_\_   Graduate training
                    \_\_\_\_\_   In-service training
                    \_\_\_\_\_   Seminar training
                    \_\_\_\_\_   Workshop training
                    \_\_\_\_\_   Job-related experience (please specify)
                                    _____
                    \_\_\_\_\_   Other (please specify) _____

4. Approximately what percent of the organization's staff
   (volunteer and paid) is part time?

    \_\_\_\_\_  a.  0-9              \_\_\_\_\_  f.  50-59

    \_\_\_\_\_  b.  10-19           \_\_\_\_\_  g.  60-69

    \_\_\_\_\_  c.  20-29           \_\_\_\_\_  h.  70-79

    \_\_\_\_\_  d.  30-39           \_\_\_\_\_  i.  80-89

    \_\_\_\_\_  e.  40-49           \_\_\_\_\_  j.  90-100

5. Approximately what percent of the organization's staff
   is volunteer?

    \_\_\_\_\_  a.  0-9              \_\_\_\_\_  f.  50-59

    \_\_\_\_\_  b.  10-19           \_\_\_\_\_  g.  60-69

    \_\_\_\_\_  c.  20-29           \_\_\_\_\_  h.  70-79

    \_\_\_\_\_  d.  30-39           \_\_\_\_\_  i.  80-89

    \_\_\_\_\_  e.  40-49           \_\_\_\_\_  j.  90-100

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

1. Does the organization have an organized structure for community involvement (i.e., Community Council)?

_____ a.  Yes

_____ b.  No (if no, skip to section entitled FUTURE)

2. How are members of the structure selected?

_____ a.  Director

_____ b.  Election

_____ c.  School board

_____ d.  Other (please specify) _____

3. Does the structure have a staff?

_____ a.  Yes              _____ b.  No

4. Does the structure have a budget?

_____ a.  Yes              _____ b.  No

5. How frequently does the structure meet?

_____ a.  Weekly

_____ b.  Bi-weekly

_____ c.  Monthly

_____ d.  Bi-monthly

_____ e.  Quarterly

_____ f.  Other (please specify) _____

6. Is the structure incorporated?

_____ a.  Yes              _____ b.  No

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (Continued)

7. How much power does the structure have?

   _____ a.  No power

   _____ b.  Advisory power

   _____ c.  Policy decision-making power

8. How long do members of the structure serve?

   _____ a.  Semiannually

   _____ b.  Annually

   _____ c.  Indefinitely

   _____ d.  Other (please specify) _____

FUTURE

1. Do you believe the organization will expand, retard, or
   maintain its current role in the community in the future?

   _____ a.  Expand

   _____ b.  Retard

   _____ c.  Maintain

2. Do you predict a change in the goals of the organization
   (i.e., different from those indicated under #3, page 1)?

   _____ a.  Yes          _____ b.  No

   If yes, what changes do you anticipate?  _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. If goal changes are predicted for the future, what basic
   problems exist which may block or limit acquisition of
   those goals (i.e., if problems are different from those
   indicated under #4, page 2)?

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. What is needed most to insure the continued existence of
   the organization?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____