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CHAPTER I

Description of the Study

The surfacing of common aims for community education is an important part of the community education process. These aims, the ideals for community education, are the conceptual foundation upon which goals, objectives, and, in turn, programs are based. To identify these aims the community education staff seeks widespread community input. But the involvement by members of diverse community groups does not ensure that the agreed upon aims for community education shall be congruent with the aims for community education held by the total community. For example, the input from a significant group in the community may be overlooked or the group's idea may be altered in order to achieve a consensus among groups. In either case, the agreed upon aims may not be congruent with those of the total community of which that group is a part. Therefore, the aims for community education pursued by the staff may not be those held by the total community.

The purpose of this study was to determine if disparities exist in the meaning of aims for community education as perceived by the total community, the community education staff, and other selected groups within the school and community.

The Community Education Process and the Concept of Community

Although the word community is used to denote a geographical unit, political unit, or commercial unit, a community is foremost a social unit whose members of necessity interrelate during the conduct of their daily lives. This social unit is not limited by geographical, political, or commercial boundaries. It is a social entity which exists independently of the structures which it serves.
of life (Stout, 1944). For example, one speaks of the world community, the Detroit community, or even the theater community. It is the community as a social unit that is addressed by such writers as Dewey (1963), Coleman (1971), and Keyes (1975). Thus a community is comprised of people having common problems, interests, and goals.

But to understand the essence of a social unit to which the word community has been applied, one must focus on the relationships among the people. The relationships in a community are, in general, voluntary and active relationships even if the choice of membership in the community is not voluntary. In this manner, one can distinguish a difference in the focus of meaning in the phrases the Detroit community and the people of Detroit even though the social unit being denoted is the same. To call a social unit a "community" is to stress by connotation the relationships that result among the people because of their common problems, interests, and goals.

Dewey states that in order for people to be living in a community they must possess particular things in common. Those things are aims, beliefs, aspirations, and knowledge (in the sense of a common understanding or likemindedness). And the institutions of a community, according to Mott (1963), are the means by which the people express their aims, beliefs, and concerns for their fellow human beings.

Among the institutions of the community through which the people can express their aims are the community schools. The community schools then attempt to act as catalytic agents to bring to bear community resources on the attainment of those aims (Minzey & LeTarte,
Such organization of educational institutions, not limited to the community schools, to "rebuild" the social unit by involving the members in the identification and attainment of their aims is called the community education process (Weaver, 1970).

The community education process impacts upon the community in a way additional to the attainment of aims. Bringing to bear the community education process on the active and voluntary relationships of people in the community results in what Minzey and LeTarte call a "feeling of relationship" between community members. To say that a feeling of relationship exists is not the same as saying that the relationships exist. The feeling of relationship is more than the mere existence of relationships; it is an awareness of the relationships and a sensing of unity as a result of the relationships.

Minzey and LeTarte explain this feeling of relationship as a "sense of self-good among the members of a community which will lead to a sense of belonging" (p. 36). What they have described is the concept of community. The concept of community is that which is referred to in phrases such as a sense of community, lack of community, and erosion of community. The enhancement of community, the concept, is an integral part of community education.

Dubay (1973) writes of the uniqueness of the concept of community. He emphasizes a basic principle of community: "Community without shared vision is as impossible as a triangle with two sides . . . Community happens only when men and women have a vision together and together pursue it. The more consuming the vision, the deeper the community" (p. 30). Put in another way, it is not enough that there
simply be a vision for the community; if a sense of community is to result, the vision must be shared and pursued by the community as a whole.

It is for this reason that the aims, the ideals, for community education as perceived by the total community should be congruent with the aims for community education as perceived by the community education staff and other decision makers. The community education process can result in a sense of community only to the extent that the community members share the aims to which the community education process is applied.

This study examined the aims for community education as a conceptual ideal held by members of the community and the community education staff in a local school district. A local school district in southwestern Michigan was selected for study. The concept aims for community education was studied by measuring its meaning as a mental image or idea, including all that is associated with or suggested by the term. The meaning of aims for community education as perceived by the total community and by selected school and community groups was examined for disparities.

Significance of the Study

The Problem of Community Representation

In order that community education have its intended impact, the institution which uses the community education process must be representative of the total community. The experiences in this regard by the C. S. Mott Foundation has led them to emphasize that,
when the community school becomes improperly exclusive in fact or spirit, when it is viewed as being reserved for only certain community elements, it does not serve the purposes of democratic education nor does it serve the purposes of community education. ("Desegregation Challenge," 1970, p. 7)

There are two ways in which such prejudice toward parts of the community might come about or appear to be present. First, the program could be conducted with the input of the professionals, the school administrators, only. Davies (1977) advises community educators that they should not define "healthy school" or "healthy community" for the people and should not set their priorities. "If you give them the resources and the power, then it is their problem and they should do it" (Davies, 1977). The input of community members through advisory committees is a primary means by which community educators seek to avoid this sort of criticism. Davies states that there are approximately one million citizens on advisory committees in the United States, many of them serving community education directly.

Second, even the existence of an advisory committee does not ensure that the community education program will reflect the desires and needs of the total community. There are many factors contributing to this, but the basis for many of these factors is that the aims, the ideals, for community education held by the committee members may not accurately reflect the aims for community education held by the community as a whole. This would likely occur if the advisory committee were in part comprised of or influenced by certain groups in
disproportion to the influence of other groups within the community.

When such a group seeks to exercise power over the community to advance or protest a particular educational interest, it acts as a "veto group" (Riesman, 1958). In order to determine if a community group is acting as a veto group which has disproportionate influence, the community educator needs to know two things: (a) the viewpoint of the total community, and (b) what other groups with diverse interests exist and whether any of them have been alienated from the community education process.

**Identification of Community Groups**

The task of identifying alienated groups is an important one for the community educator who seeks to use "all institutional forces in the education of the people--all of the people--of the community" (Seay, 1974, p. 11). Not to do so might lead to what Coleman (1971) terms community conflicts of asymmetric character. This sort of conflict represents an outburst from an alienated group against the administrative structure toward which the group has built up hostility. The accumulation of unexpressed hostility can impede the community education process in two ways: (a) by becoming a basis for conflict in the community by existing as hostility, and (b) by preventing common action when the need for common action arises (Coleman, 1971).

The identification of these groups is, however, a complex problem. Coleman notes that even in one of the closest communities in American society, the high school, whereas the "out-cliques" can often detail the school's social structure, the powerful "in-clique" members are often unaware of even the existence of the other groups.
Coleman asserts that this is because the powerless "out-cliques" constitute no problem for the structure. It follows that for community educators, perhaps not long-term members of the community yet powerful, to identify alienated interest groups would be difficult, at best.

Weaver (1976) addresses a further complication. He asserts that,

in any geographical area there are probably many communities and most residents of the area probably belong to more than one community. Hence, community educators who purport to study the dynamics of community must deal with many communities and numerous social systems and sub-systems as well as the interrelationships among those communities, systems, and sub-systems. (p. 9)

Furthermore, the relative intensity of an individual's membership in a geographical community is affected by that person's identification with other social units. As an example of this, Coleman relates that, for some parents, suburban residential communities are only living places, since parents often choose to interrelate with colleagues and friends who share likemindedness and common concerns but who live in other geographical areas. But their children live in total community with their geographical living place. Thus even the closest social units may not be in community with the same people.

Such varied and often unnoticed differences in community groups
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suggest that it may be unreasonable to expect that the community educator could assemble an advisory committee that is truly representative of the total community. This is because there is no adequate measurer of the aims, the ideals or visions, and interests that the community as a whole, and that community groups, have for community education. If such a measuring device were available, it would be a powerful tool for the community educator and advisory committee to use as a means of guiding both their actions and the composition of the advisory committee itself.

**Community Education in the Future**

The identification of the community's "mental image" of the aims for community education also has implications for the future. Nordberg, Bradfield, and Odell (1962) have stated their belief that the values held in America will govern the future of the schools. When the American philosophy changes, the schools' organization, purposes, and procedures will change. Moreover, as Weaver (1976) notes, if one part of a community acts in a certain way, the other parts will be affected. Therefore, as the values of one or more groups in the community change, thereby changing the operation of the schools, the effect can be expected to alter the composite ideals of the total community. Davies (1977) notes that citizen advisory committees are now the predominant mode of community expression to the schools. As a result, the community educator can expect to be either a pilot ship or a driven vessel in the face of educational forces of the future. How well the community educator will fare in enhancing community in the future will depend to a large degree on how well he
or she can gauge the forces, chart a purposeful course, and properly set the sails.

Implications from the Research Literature

If community educators were achieving their purpose of enhancing community in the recent past, the ensuing relationships between them and their respective communities should have been evidenced in the national study of community education goals conducted and reported by Weaver (1972). The explanation draws upon a second work by Weaver (1976). In the latter work, the author posited that several conditions would be observed in most areas which had achieved a sense of community. Two of those conditions were (a) communication across boundaries of systems and subsystems, which Weaver called "interaction between communities of interest," and (b) accommodation and mediation across diverse and conflicting social systems, which he termed "detente among communities of interest" (p. 7).

The findings of the national study confirmed that these conditions were not met. The goals reported by 245 community educators showed no significant differences in the primary goals reported based on several demographic factors. In other words, the diversity of the individual communities was not reflected in the community education goals reported by their respective community educators. The community educators, in formulating goals, apparently related not to the foundational aims of the communities which they served, but rather to some hypothetical model of aims held in common by other professionals. Weaver (1972) concluded,
It's almost as if we had a standardized, conventional model of community education which has been exported wholesale to all communities.

It would seem that if there had been regular and open communication between the community and the community educator such interaction should have resulted in some variation of the goals reported from one community to another. (p. 4)

The study indicates that, on a national level at least, community educators as a group have different goals for community education than would be expected to be held by their respective communities.

O'Donnell's (1977) findings also bear on this theme. In a study of one local school district, she found that while the district's "professionals" agreed with participants as to the importance and state of achievement of community education goals, the professionals as a group were more homogeneous than were the participants in their feelings of goal importance. To give a stated value to importance of a goal, a respondent must have in mind a mental image or concept to which the respondent feels community education should aspire. In other words, the participants in the community education program were shown to vary in their aims for community education to a greater degree than was represented by the professionals. This study suggests that even in a community in which professionals and the community agree upon goals for community education, the community members can be expected to vary in their aims for community education.
education to a greater degree than the professionals, the community education process notwithstanding.

Combined, these studies lead to the conclusion that, in a given community, the underlying foundation for community education goals, i.e., the aims for community education, varies more than will be reflected by the community education staff. Furthermore, the community education staff which has interactions with colleagues beyond its own community may expect that its aims for community education will be different than those of its community. Should the community, or groups within the community, feel alienated from the process which uses those aims to formulate goals and objectives, a situation of latent conflict will exist which will later affect the success of the community education efforts. If the aims for community education as perceived by community groups could be measured, there would be an opportunity to make the program more accountable to the community as a whole.

**The Problem of Perceptions**

Even if the community education staff and advisory committee recognised that the aims for community education which they collectively pursued were disparate from the aims held by the total community, they might not have sufficient information with which to respond to the community. This is because groups respond to things as they are perceived, not as they actually are. Thus the staff and advisory committee would respond not to the community's aims, but to their collective perception of the community's aims. That perception might well be inaccurate, in which case any response to it would be
ineffective in promoting a sense of community.

Furthermore, the members of the community will respond not to the aims for community education held by the staff and advisory committee, but to the members' perceptions of those aims. It is therefore possible that the groups might make responses to each other that would not only be ineffective but also in opposition to each other.

If a measure of the conceptual aims for community education could include the perceptions that groups have of each other, an indication of the possibility that inappropriate responses could result would be available. Groups would then have knowledge that might enable them to respond to each other's concerns directly rather than responding to a perception of those concerns.

Summary of the Significance of the Study

In order that community education has its intended impact, i.e., that community is enhanced, the institutions which use the community education process must be representative of the entire community. If a part of the community has aims for community education which are disparate from those held by the community education staff and the advisory committee, the potential exists for conflict which would at the least impede the enhancement of community. The identification of such groups is, however, complex. And while there are implications for both the present and the future, the literature reveals that a measure of the aims for community education held by various community groups has not yet been tested. Without such a measure, the community education staff and advisory council can at best only
respond to their perceptions of the community's aims.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to determine if disparities exist in the meaning of the concept aims for community education as held by a total community, its community educators, and certain community groups. Measurements were made of the group consensus meanings held by the community education administrative staff, the district-wide advisory committee, and the total community in a local school district. For purposes of this study, the total community was not only studied as a whole, but also subdivided into age groups. Additional measures were made of the staff's and of the advisory committee's perceptions of the meaning of aims for community education held by the total community. Measures were also made of the advisory committee's and community members' perceptions of the aims for community education held by the community education staff. The meanings were analyzed for disparities.

**Explanations of Certain Terms**

Certain terms used in the description of this study are discussed in this section. Two of these terms, meaning and disparity, are further discussed within the context of the procedures of the study in Chapter III.

The "total community" refers to all persons, 14 years of age or older, who reside within the school district boundaries for at least six months of each year. The community age groups selected for study were: (a) "older-aged adults", the subgroup of the total community whose members are no less than 41 years of age;
(b) "younger-aged adults", the subgroup whose members are no less than 18 years of age and no more than 40 years of age; (c) "youth", the subgroup whose members are no less than 14 years of age and no more than 17 years of age.

The other groups selected for study were: (a) the "community education administrative staff", which comprises those school district personnel who are assigned or share responsibility for administrative decisions within the community education department; and (b) the "district-wide community education advisory committee". That committee is hereafter called the advisory committee.

A "disparity" is a quantitative difference or dissimilarity in some condition, here, meaning. Disparity is operationally defined in Chapter III.

The "meaning" of some thing, such as a concept, is that which it is designed or intended to express. Meaning, as used in this study, is the relational or process concept defined by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) as:

that process or state in the behavior of a sign-using organism which is assumed to be a necessary consequence of the reception of sign-stimuli and a necessary antecedent for the production of sign-responses. Within the general framework of learning theory, we have identified this cognitive state, meaning, with a representational mediation process. (p. 9)

"Aims" are the purposes toward which behaviors are directed.
Aims are more precise than intentions, which are what one proposes or means to do, and more precise than purposes, which are less definite and less directly sought. Aims are more abstract than goals, which are the ends of designed behavior, and more abstract than objectives, on which behaviors are specifically focused. Aims are similar to ends, but aims are connotative of processes rather than of products.

An assumption used in the analysis of the study is that the meaning a group ascribes to aims for community education is, in fact, an expression of the aims themselves, and therefore can be discussed as being the group's aims for community education.

Questions to be Answered

This study examined the aims for community education as a conceptual ideal pursued by members of the community and the community education staff. The concept aims for community education was studied by measuring its meaning as a mental image or idea, including all that is associated with or suggested by the term. Specifically, the study was designed to make comparisons of the adjudged meanings of the concept aims for community education in three general areas.

To conceptualize the general areas studied, consider two groups, the community education staff and the total community. Both groups have their own consensus meaning of the concept. Each group also has a perception of the concept's meaning to the other group. Four meanings of the concept, then, have been designated, and there are six comparisons that can be made:

A. The staff's meaning with the community's meaning.
B. The staff's meaning with the staff's perception of the community's meaning.

C. The staff's meaning with the community's perception of the staff's meaning.

D. The community's perception of the staff's meaning with the staff's perception of the community's meaning.

E. The community's meaning with the community's perception of the staff's meaning.

F. The community's meaning with the staff's perception of the community's meaning.

Comparisons B and E are reciprocals of each other, as are comparisons C and F. Therefore, there are four types of areas of comparisons possible. Generalizing from specific groups to any groups, the four areas are:

A. Relationships among all the groups' own consensus meanings of the concept.

B. Relationships between a group's own consensus meaning of the concept and that same group's perception of the concept's meaning to other groups.

C. Relationships between a group's own consensus meaning of the concept and other groups' perceptions of the concept's meaning to that group or to some related group used as a reference group.¹

¹For example, a researcher may desire to study the relationship between the meaning to principals of the concept principal and the perception of the school board of that concept's meaning to the community.
D. Relationships among the groups' various perceptions of the concept's meaning to other groups.

These four general areas of comparisons are shown in Table 1. In this study, comparisons are made in areas A, B, and C. Within those three general areas are ten questions the study was designed to answer. These questions are listed below under their respective general areas and the question numbers are also shown in Table 1.

**Area A**

Relationships among all the groups' own consensus meaning of the concept.

**Question one.** Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept aims for community education as adjudged by the total community, certain community age groups, the community education administrative staff, and the advisory committee?

**Question two.** Are there differences in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, the advisory committee, and the total community?

**Area B**

Relationships between a group's own consensus meaning of the concept and that group's perception of the concept's meaning to other groups.

**Question three.** Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept aims for community education as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with that group's
Table 1
Matrix of Comparisons of Groups' Consensus Meanings for Any Two Groups in the Study Showing the Four General Areas of Comparisons and the Numbers of the Ten Questions to be Answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Any group-I</th>
<th>Any other group-II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Own meaning</td>
<td>No comparison</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of meaning of own</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perception to other group-II</td>
<td></td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>No comparison</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Own meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of meaning to group I or to a reference group</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>Area D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>No comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community?

**Question four.** Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff and to the total community?

**Question five.** Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of that concept to the community education administrative staff?

**Question six.** Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by each of the community age groups, as compared with their respective perceptions of that concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff?

**Area C**

Relationships between a group's own consensus meaning of the concept and other groups' perceptions of the concept's meaning to that group (or a reference group).

**Question seven.** Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept aims for community education as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the advisory committee, the total community, and the community age groups?

**Question eight.** Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community?
Question nine. Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the total community as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee?

Question ten. Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by each of the community age groups, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of that concept's meaning to the total community?

Summary

This chapter has provided the significance and purpose of the study, explanations of certain terms, and the questions that the study was designed to answer.

Chapter II will further review the literature pertaining to the questions and present the research hypotheses.

Chapter III will present the design of the study, including the survey techniques utilized, the design of the instrument, operational definitions, and the techniques of data analysis.

Chapter IV will include an analysis of the data collected and the results of the findings of the study.

Chapter V will contain a summary of the study, along with conclusions and implications based upon the results.
CHAPTER II

Context of the Study

This study examined the aims for community education as a conceptual ideal pursued by members of the community and the community education staff. Chapter I presented the significance and purpose of the study, and the questions that the study was designed to answer. Chapter II provides a review of related literature and the research hypotheses in order to provide the context of the study.

Consensus of the Educational Aims of the School and Community

The schools have long been responsible for preparing students to live, and to help others to live, with satisfaction and sufficiency in the concentric communities enveloping them. To carry out that responsibility, the schools have looked to society for the guidance of its resources, and the call of its needs. The community has looked to the schools for the transmission of its past and its preparation for the future. The synergistic relationship between the schools and the community has been readily apparent in the development of community education from the influence of Hart—"The democratic problem in education is not primarily a problem of training children; it is a problem of making a community" (Hart, 1924, p. 382)—through the landmarks of Seay—"A community school... involves an educative process by which the resources of a community are related to the needs and interests of the people." (Seay, 1953, p. 8)—to the current leadership of Weaver.
Community education is the process which utilizes all the resources of the community to meet the educational needs of all the people and which brings the school and community into a relationship which enhances the contributions of both.

(Weaver, 1978)

As the above statements illustrate, the success of community education, and education in general, is determined by the school district's ability to ascertain and pursue the community's educational aims. In other words, the congruency or disparity between the aims for community education held by the community and those held by the school is a major determinant of a program's potential for success. Several studies have dealt with various aspects of aims or goal congruency and disparity between the school district and community. The researchers have not agreed in their conclusions.

Wilder, Friedman, Hill, Sandis and Sieber were led to comment, "It is obvious from our findings that if the continued existence of schools were dependent upon consensus on educational goals among teachers and their constituencies of mothers and students, the schools would not survive" (Wilder, et al., 1968, p. 97). Closer inspection of the findings reveals that the comment is based upon mothers' own goals for the school while, in actuality, the mothers recognize, and perceive as legitimate, a number of school goals which are not necessarily their own personal school goals.

Franklin (1974), studying two Indiana school districts, and Orten (1976) and Weber (1977), each studying one Wisconsin school
district, all found agreement between educators and non-educators on goal priorities. But George (1976) did find significant differences in the ranking of goals among citizens, educators, and students of a Kansas school district.

The findings from these studies suggest that, generally, a community and its educators pursue the same aims and goals. Wilder's et al. study implies that there are important differences between researching the schools' aims in relation to individuals' personal aims, or in relation to the consensus aims of the community. A respondent may believe that the schools are not pursuing his or her own aims, but believe the schools are pursuing the community's aims. This problem can be resolved either by explicitly stating that the comparison is to be between the schools' aims and the community's aims, or by actually discerning what are the schools' and the community's aims, then comparing the results.

Research into community education goals essentially began with the national study conducted by Weaver (1972). The respondents were 245 community educators, roughly 1/3 each of whom were building level directors, district-wide coordinators, and university personnel. Forty goals, identified from the literature, were categorized by the respondents during interviews. Twenty-three goals were found to be primary goals, i.e. identified as such by at least fifty percent of the respondents. As was discussed in Chapter I, the diversity of the individual communities was not reflected in the goals reported by their respective community educators. Weaver suggested that,
It would seem that if there had been regular and open communication between the community and the community educator such interaction should have resulted in some variation of the goals and activities reported from one community to another. (p. 4)

DeLargy (1973) conducted a national study of 356 community education directors. DeLargy's study identified 75 goals. It also confirmed the finding from Weaver's study that there is, nationally, a consensus among professionals as to community education's goals. Again the question is raised of how much community educators set their goals with their own community's needs in view. Cwik, King, and Van Voorhees share this concern that a problem exists. "Given a convergence of opinion on community education goals, one worries about the 'goodness of fit' between agreed upon goals and the needs/objectives of the population Community Education serves" (Cwik et al., 1975, p. 49).

Fadusky (1974) studied community education objectives as perceived by involved citizens, elementary teachers, elementary principals and central office staffs. Respondents indicated whether a statement was a primary or secondary objective, or was not an objective. No difference in the perceptions of the four groups was found. O'Donnell (1977), in the study discussed in Chapter I, surveyed community education professionals and participants in an urban school district. She concluded that the two groups basically shared a common perception of the importance and achievement of community education goals.
These studies support the general finding of the previously mentioned studies. Specifically, community educators and their communities in the school districts studied pursue the same aims and goals. The community education studies cannot be conclusive, however, because of the appropriate caution by Weaver. If there was wide-spread attention to community aims, why was no variation found in the goals and activities reported from one community to another? The implication is that the question of community and community educator goal congruence should continue to be investigated in a variety of communities with varying methodologies.

The next section presents some of the findings concerning demographically-based differences in educational goal opinions.

Demographic Variables and Goal Opinions

 Oliver (1976) contends that a sense of community cannot be met within the school because small communities and neighborhoods characteristically include a diversity of persons "who interact within relatively fluid contexts to allow for the natural evolution of interdependent coalitions" (p. 9). Whether or not the contention is true, certain demographic variables have been found to exist which affect educational aims and goals among communities. Four demographic factors appear to have emerged from the goals opinions literature: (a) age-related variables; (b) education-level variables; (c) occupational variables and (d) geographic variables.

Several studies (Klaeser, 1975; Dargan, 1977; Venable, 1977) reported age was a factor in goal-related opinions. Downey (1960) and Wilder et al. (1968) both found age to be somewhat of a factor,
although Wilder et al. found it to be less so. Downey, and also Weber (1977), found age to be less of a factor than educational background but Greco (1976) concluded the converse was true. Two local-level investigations of the importance of Wisconsin's statewide educational goals also reached opposite opinions. Orten (1976) found age not to be a factor; Weber found it to be a factor for elementary goals more than for secondary goals. Age was not a significant variable in Fallon's (1973) study of perceptions toward community education, but Venable found persons over fifty years of age rated community education as less effective than did the younger persons. Venable also found that parents of school-aged children rated community education less effective than did persons without children in school. Wilder found that some variance in school goal preference of mothers was accounted for by the school level of the child. Klaeser found more concern for "basic skills" among older respondents as opposed to a "world of work" goal favored by younger respondents.

Educational background was the clearest distinguishing factor in Weber's study of educational goal ranking, and Wilder et al., found it a factor in mothers' goal preferences. Klaeser found that it was a factor which influenced local purposes for education. Downey reported that educational background and occupation were the best predictors of educational belief.

While occupation proved to be a good predictor for Downey, income was not closely associated with educational viewpoint. Neither occupation nor income were factors in Weber's study on Wisconsin goals; however, income level was related to community satisfaction in Dargan's
study and related to effectiveness of community education in Venable's study.

Downey reported that "interestingly, geographic region appeared to be a determiner of educational viewpoint. Just as there are regional political preferences, apparently there are also regional educational philosophies" (p. 65). Wilder et al. found less variance by region, but that type of community was a factor. George (1976) reported distinctions in educational goal-ranking by attendance area members. Both Orten and Dargan found length of residence to be a factor in their studies.

Finally, Klaeser reported that years of teaching experience influenced goals and motives of teachers in Milwaukee. Together, these studies suggest that age, educational level, geographies, and occupational variables may affect the aims and goals reported by community members. Age and educational level are perhaps the more important factors. It would appear that researchers investigating consensus or disparity of aims and goals, or related topics should extend the efforts made thus far.

The implications for community educators are easily seen when considering advisory committees. In theory, these committees are, by some means, composed to be representative of the total community. But if the age group distribution of the advisory committee is disproportional to that found in the total community, and if age is a factor related to educational goals, the advisory committee might not act in a representative manner.

The above sections have presented research findings concerning
consensus and disparity between various groups. The next section presents research findings concerning the variances within the groups' opinions regarding aims and goals for community education and education in general.

**Variances in Goal Congruency**

Several studies in the educational literature reported intergroup and intragroup differences in goal opinions. The study of Wilder et al. (1968) demonstrates the complexity of educational goal congruency. The main finding was that teachers, mothers, and students differ in preferred types of schools as categorized by Downey's taxonomy. A deeper consideration of the findings reveals that mothers and teachers connected with elementary schools share more goal consensus (i.e., they prefer the same type of schools) than do those connected with high schools. In both elementary and high schools, mothers were more united in their preferences than teachers. However, between communities, teachers' preferences were virtually identical while mothers share less congruency.

Three studies showed the community to vary more as to educational goals and norms than do other groups. Foskett (ca. 1967) found agreement as to elementary teacher's roles to be least among lay populations and highest among school personnel. Franklin (1974) studied ranking of educational goals in two Indiana school districts. There was little difference among community, teacher, and student groups as to agreement. But within each community group there was a tendency to vary as to the relative importance of goals. Fadusky (1974) found that, when compared with all the other groups, involved citizens per-
ceived the greatest number of objectives of community education in different ways.

Related to variance of responses is the situation in which a respondent, for a usually unspecified reason, chooses to not respond at all.

Three studies reported that community residents were apparently less able to respond with opinions toward the school than were professional groups. Venable (1977) found that 33% of the community residents did not opine how effective the community education program was. In contrast, only 25% of teachers could not give an opinion. Over all groups, community education questions often contained 47 more missing responses than questions concerning the traditional program.

Comparing the number of responses from teachers, students, and parents, Jenkins and Lippitt (1951) found greater percentage differences than did Venable. While 73% of teachers (N=26) and 48% of students (N=58) answered all 12 questions of the form "What teachers/parents/students do that teachers/parents/students like/dislike," only 16% of parents answered them all. Jenkins reported that parents felt they had fewer ideas to express. "A rather frequent statement, especially when parents were asked about how the teacher feels about student behavior, was simply, 'I don't have any idea.'" (p. 36). Jenkins also noted that for each situation, more parents failed to give responses to "dislike" items than failed to respond to "like" items.

The Pennsbury (Pennsylvania) School District (1976) provided
respondents with "free input cards" during a community education survey of 566 residents. It was found that persons currently without children in school found it difficult to comment not only about the schools, but also about the district as a whole. There were persons in all categories who related that they had not given much thought to their schools or community, and therefore, could not respond.

Three studies suggest that once beyond the primary or most important items, response variance can increase. In the Pennsbury study, for four items ranked of high importance by both the staff (N=267) and community (N=566), there was a mean rank-order difference between groups of 2.2; for medium-important items, the rank-order difference was 2.9, for low-importance items, the rank-order difference was 3.38.

In the Fadusky study, while six objectives were reported as primary by all subgroups, there was no one objective reported as secondary by all four groups; there was no consistent pattern among subgroups when choosing secondary goals.

The DeLargy (1973) study contained a variation of this effect. DeLargy used a Delphi technique to determine goals held under "present" conditions and under "ideal" conditions. DeLargy reported that the trend of convergence over successive Delphi steps (CEGI-1 to CEGI-2; CEGI-2 to CEGI-3) was significant for both the "present" and the "ideal" conditions from CEGI-1 to CEGI-2, but was significant only for the "present" condition from CEGI-2 to CEGI-3.

In summary, the studies suggest that community members may vary more in their opinions on school-related matters than professionals.
They may also give a higher percentage of non-responses to specific questions. Goal congruence may fall off as relative importance decreases, at least in terms of what goals actually are rather than in terms of what they should be.

The DeLargy study also raises a methodological issue. Since the variance pattern was different for "present" than "ideal" goals, were both questions soliciting the same kind of "goals?" Were, in fact, respondents under the "present" condition using their own stated goals, i.e., ends of designed behavior, as a conceptual base, but under the "ideal" condition using their ideals, their aims, i.e. the relatively abstract purposes toward which their behaviors were directed? This question points out the need in measuring aims to carefully choose the key words and their frame in the stimulus (question) such that neither denotation nor connotation directs attention toward stated goals or objectives. Further consideration of that problem and other semantic issues are the topics of the next section.

**Semantic Considerations**

Reviewing the literature related to educational aims, a researcher quickly recognizes a semantic problem. What is one writer's aim is another's goal. And that writer's goal is another's objective. Certain terms, among them aims, goals, objectives, and purposes, are used to denote indistinct preciseness of intent. Often, no guide to the writer's connotation is found; moreover, even when it is found, it well may be different from the next writer using the
same term.

The problem is of more significance when conducting research than when stating one's own views. In Chapter I, comparative connotative meanings of these terms, based upon unabridged dictionary discussions, were presented. In addition to those general connotations, the discussion of these terms by Brown (1970) is illuminating for the researcher studying aims as ideals, mental concepts and images.

Although Brown was not concerned in his writing with research, after careful analysis of the alternative terms used by authors in his anthology, Brown chose aim as the generic term of choice. In particular, Brown asserts that aim, while including within it both the "ideal" and the "objective," is a word sometimes distorted by emotion, persuasiveness, and irrelevence. This implies that an aim expresses an opinionated concept, and therefore, is sufficiently abstract to allow the subjects' expressions of connotative meanings resulting from personal experiences and beliefs, yet is precise enough to elicit ideal directions for education.

A second consideration is the problem of knowing whether respondents answer questions concerning goals or objectives from a present or future view. Fadusky (1974) volunteers that his study design did not differentiate between the perceptions of the respondents as to whether they were perceptions of the objective as it was then or as they would have liked it to be. He states that such a differentiation could be very important.

In the previous section it was posited that in the DeLargy study
a similar problem was a factor. DeLargy himself suggests an improvement on his terminology, which researchers should heed. He comments that in order to reduce misunderstandings, the words in his headings should be changed from present to is and from ideal to should be.

Perceptual Stances and Educational Opinions

Wilder et al. (1968) summed the well-established major findings on perceptual stance that are relevant to the study of opinions when they wrote,

The question of the accuracy of mutual perceptions is germane to all social research and is a fundamental issue of social organization.... It is well known that our senses may deceive us into believing things congenial to our predisposition. But perhaps most important, we base our behavior on our beliefs regardless of whether they are correct....

Whenever role partners interact, it is problematic whether they actually agree upon or share norms and whether they perceive that they agree upon specified norms. (p. 16)

Foskett (ca. 1967) writes that to completely study any normative structure from the standpoint of one group (the actor), three things must be known: (a) the opinion of the group itself; (b) the perceptions that the group has of the views of other populations within the community; and (c) the actual views of each of the populations of others.

Wilder et al. consider that there are three distinct relevant
questions that can be addressed by research studies (p. 17):

1. Do role partners actually agree or do they think they agree?

2. Under what conditions do role partners agree or think they agree?

3. What differences does it make whether role partners agree or think they agree?

It follows, as Wilder et al. note, that the actor may perceive either goal congruence with another group, or the actor may perceive disparity. It also follows that the actor's perception may be accurate or inaccurate. The result is that there are four possible actualities of goal opinion. These four possibilities are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2
Possible Errors of Perception of Consensus and Disparity of Goal Opinion for Two Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A perceives</th>
<th>Group B actually</th>
<th>Consensus with Group B</th>
<th>Disparity with Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrees with Group A</td>
<td>No error</td>
<td>Type I error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees with Group A</td>
<td>Type II error</td>
<td>No error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two things become clear from the presentation in Table 2. First, an investigator, gathering all data from only Group A, may report finding goal disparity based upon Group A's opinion and discuss it as such, when in actuality there is consensus and Type I error. Conversely, if Group A perceived consensus when there were in actuality disparity, a Type II error would result.
Second, to investigate whether Group B actually agrees with Group A is a different investigation than finding if Group B members perceive that they agree. Whichever is of immediate interest to the investigator, it is probably quite worth the added investment of resources to measure both the actual stances of each group (i.e. their perceptions as self) and their perception of congruence or disparity (or their perception as the other group, which provides equivalent information).

Several studies have found perceived disparity related to educational goals among groups. Foskett found that as regards teacher norm roles, teachers regarded principals and the superintendent to have a set of views common to their own but different from the community. In fact, teachers perceived twice as much disparity between their own opinions and the community's opinions than they perceived between their own opinions and those of other school personnel. In many instances the community groups were perceived as being more "conservative" than they actually were.

Since teachers perceived disparity between their opinions and the opinions of the community groups, and since there was disparity, their perception was in one sense accurate. However, when the degree of perceived disparity is considered, teachers are found to slightly overestimate the disparity. More importantly, the errors in teacher's perceptions of the views of community groups are, from a reference point of the teacher's own opinions, in the wrong direction for one quarter of the perceptions.
The main finding is that teachers "have some difficulty" in perceiving the opinions of principals, the community, community leaders, and parents. Moreover, the actual views of the community are more similar to the teacher's opinions than to the teacher's perceptions.

Two other investigators have studied educator norm roles. Jenkins (1951) found that teachers, students, and parents in three junior high schools all gave inaccurate perceptions of the behaviors and relationships that the other respective groups liked or disliked.

Crosby (1965) studied expectations held by Mott program administrators, community leaders, community school directors, and parents in Flint, Michigan. Respondents indicated if they were of the opinion that the community school director should or should not do what was described in 68 situations. In Crosby's study, the directors' expectations were more congruous with the expectations of parents than were the director's perceptions. The directors made both Type I and Type II errors of perception. Perceptions of community leaders' expectations were more accurate. In actuality, there was relatively high consensus, more than was perceived.

In the Wilder et al. study, 54% of teachers were in consensus with mothers of their students as regards educational goals (measured by preference of school type); however, only 47% of the teachers perceived consensus. In actuality, 46% of teachers were in disparity with mothers of their students as regards educational goals, but 53% perceived disparity to exist. Wilder found that 33%
of teachers correctly perceived consensus; 32% correctly perceived disparity. Type I error, perceiving disparity where none existed, occurred 21% of the time; Type II error, perceiving consensus where there was disparity, occurred 14% of the time. The teachers, then, gave correct perceptions 65% of the time and incorrect perceptions 35% of the time. These results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers Actually</th>
<th>Percent of Teachers Perceiving</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
<th>Actual Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=224


These results also indicate that teachers have only a tendency to be accurate in perceiving both consensus and disparity. Table 3 shows that there was consensus 54% of the time, but only 33% of the time was there consensus that was accurately perceived. The percentage of consensus that was accurately perceived was, then, 33% \( \div 54\% \) or 62% accuracy in perceiving consensus. Disparity, in comparison, was perceived with slightly more accuracy, 32% \( \div 46\% \) or 69% accuracy.
The discussion and research results presented in this section indicate that to fully study the aim or goal consensus between groups, the researcher must gain measures not only of the actual consensus, i.e., groups' perceptions as self, but also measures of perceived consensus, i.e. groups' perceptions as others. Groups may accurately perceive goal consensus or disparity, or they may inaccurately perceive goal consensus or disparity. The rate for teachers of correctly perceiving the state of goal consensus or disparity was rather low, 65%. If community educators cannot fare better, then it is unlikely they will be able to efficiently and effectively pursue aims which lead to the community achieving a sense of satisfaction and sufficiency.

Attention has been given to two of the questions posed by Wilder et al. The third question, "what differences does it make if there is consensus or disparity?" is addressed in the next section.

The Effects of Disparity

Wilder et al. (1968) obtained measures of job rewardance for teachers and satisfaction with schools by mothers. The findings summarized in this section are all from the Wilder et al. study of educational goal preference as measured by schooltype choice, where school types were representative of the four categories of educational task dimensions synthesized by Downey (1960)—intellectual, social, personal, and productive. The authors concluded that a widespread belief that the school was not emphasizing certain goals would be a potential source of disruption whether that belief were
to be held by mothers, teachers or students. The extrapolation from this is that the general goal orientations of each major role partner have relevance for the integration of the system.

Further, Wilder et al. state that their findings consistently show that perceived goal disparity is far more disruptive than is actual disparity. While actual goal consensus was low in many cases, the majority of mothers and students perceived consensus. Majorities of mothers, students, and teachers perceived that their school was, in fact, of the type they preferred. Perceived disparity was found to be more disruptive when importance was high, and more tolerable when importance was low.

Foskett (ca. 1967) discusses further implications. He assumes that individuals will tend to modify their behaviors in accordance with their perceptions of the opinions of others, or at least make some compromises. Foskett speculates that when the perceptions are accurate, the shift is toward consensus and has resultant benefits. Should, however, the perceptions be inaccurate, behavior shifts would be toward some view that does not exist and could contribute to disharmony.

To summarize, perceived goal disparity is more affective than actual goal disparity. This limits the group integration stress in schools since, although goal consensus is often low, it is usually perceived to be high by teachers, parents, and students. Disruptive effects of disparity are related to the level of importance.
Summary of the Literature Review

While the generic term "goals" is most commonly used by writers, the term "aims" seems to permit the connotative meanings of writers to be expressed regarding the ideal directions for education.

Research studies have indicated that, generally, the community members, both educators and non-educators, agree upon the relative importance of educational goals, but that exceptions are not uncommon.

Research studies have identified seventy-five goals for community education. The national consensus on goals does not appear to mean that individual community educators do not address needs of their respective communities.

Opinions of educational goals and their importance may have greater variance among community members than among educators, and the community's ability to respond to goal-related education questions may be less than that ability of educators.

Age, educational level, geographics, and occupational factors may be related to educational goal responses by the community. Age and educational level are perhaps the more important factors.

The study of aims or goal consensus must include measures of two perceptual stances to be complete—perception as self and perception as others.

Goal consensus has commonly been perceived when, in fact, disparity exists. But the perceived goal consensus or disparity appears to be the potent force rather than the actual consensus or
Further Comments

Simon (1945) wrote that an individual can be rational in terms of the organization's goals only to the degree that a particular course of action can be pursued, and that conditions surrounding the course of action are made known. The community educator's organization, more often than not, is the school. And the school is responsible to the community. The ability of the community educator to act rationally toward the school is ultimately measured against tasks prescribed by the community--tasks which are based upon the collective community's aims for community education.

The community educator must, then, be a student of both education and community opinion. As Downey (1960) argues, "expertise will carry educational policy making only so far as public opinion will permit. To be right is not good enough for the leader of public education; he must also be recognized as being right by the power-wielding public" (p. 72).

The error has been, according to Brown (1970), to focus on the end of the process without due consideration for the beginning. The beginning is the aimers and their aims. Brown asks if an educator can set up aims for others, if an educator can "show the aimer how to aim and what to aim at" (p. 185). Brown's own answer is:

What is to be aimed at is subjective, made by the learner himself, though perhaps influenced by models or examples or even exhortations....
No one can aim for the learner, no one can give him an aim, no one can show him precisely what to aim at. These can be no more than influences bearing on him. (p. 185).

If Brown's observation is correct, then in order to bear influence on the collective community, the community educator must observe the community's aims. Questions need to be answered such as those listed by Minzey and LeTarte (1972). Is there a set of common aims, understandings, beliefs and values held by the community? How much unity exists in the community? Are there large, conflicting sub-groups which might develop with opposing aims and values?

This study was designed to enhance further understanding of the community education process by examining the aims that are brought into that process by the community members and the community education staff. Several research hypotheses address those questions raised by Minzey and LeTarte. The first three hypotheses address consensus in the community regarding aims for community education. Those hypotheses also investigate whether community age-groups act as conflicting community sub-groups with opposing aims.

The second three hypotheses relate to the "unity" that exists in the community relative to the unity of the community education administrative staff and to the unity of the district-wide advisory committee. The remainder of the hypotheses are concerned with various aspects of perceived disparity as regards aims for community education.
The research hypotheses of this study are listed in the following section of this chapter according to their respective areas of investigation.

**Hypotheses**

**Area A**

Relationships among the groups' own consensus meanings of the concept aims for community education.

**Question one.** Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the total community, certain community age groups, the community education administrative staff, and the advisory committee?

\[ H_1 \]  There are disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education staff, the advisory committee, older-aged adults, younger-aged adults, and youth.

\[ H_2 \]  There are disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee, as compared with the meaning of that concept as adjudged by the total community.

\[ H_3 \]  There are disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with older-aged adults, younger-aged adults, and youth.

**Question two.** Are there differences in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, the advisory committee, and the total
community?

$H_4$ There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee.

$H_5$ There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the total community.

$H_6$ There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee and by the total community.

**Area B**

Relationships between each group's own consensus meaning of the concept aims for community education and that group's perceptions of the concept's meaning to other groups.

**Question three.** Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community?

$H_7$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community.

**Question four.** Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff and to the total community?
There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community.

Question five. Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of that concept to the community education administrative staff?

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.

Question six. Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with their respective perceptions of that concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff?

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by older-aged adults, as compared with that group's perception of the concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff.
There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by younger-aged adults, as compared with that group's perception of the concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff.

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by youth, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.

Area C

Relationships between each group's own consensus meaning of the concept aims for community education and other group's perceptions of the concept's meaning to the group (or to a reference group).

Question seven. Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the advisory committee, the total community, and the community age groups?

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the advisory committee.

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's
meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the total community.

$H_{16}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by older-aged adults.

$H_{17}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as judged by younger-aged adults.

$H_{18}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as judged by youth.

**Question eight.** Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community?

$H_{19}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.

**Question nine.** Are there disparities in the meaning of the
concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee?

H₂₀ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the total community, as adjudged by the community education administrative staff.

H₂¹ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the total community, as adjudged by the advisory committee.

Question ten. Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of that concept's meaning to the total community?

H₂² There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by older-aged adults, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.

H₂³ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by younger-aged adults, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.

H₂⁴ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by youth, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.
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education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Review of the Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine if disparities existed in the aims for community education that were held by members of the community and the community education staff in a local school district. The concept aims for community education was studied by measuring its meaning as a mental image or conceptual idea, including all that is associated with or suggested by the term.

In Chapter I, based upon the community education process and the concept of community, the rationale for the study was discussed. Ten questions to be answered were presented. A review of the related research literature led to specific research hypotheses related to the ten questions. The context for this study, including those research hypotheses was presented in Chapter II. Chapter III reports the design used to investigate those hypothetical propositions.

Selection of Subjects

This study was conducted in the Lakewood (Michigan) Public Schools district. The Lakewood school district is a rural area containing four towns--Lake Odessa, Woodland, Sunfield and Clarksville. The Lakewood Community Education administrative staff consists of the director, one assistant, two coordinators, five community
service aides and an office manager.

Six groups were selected for study. These groups were (a) the community education administrative staff, (b) the district-wide community education advisory committee, and (c) the total educational community, i.e., the total school district, which for purposes of this study was subdivided as older-aged adults (operationally defined as persons at least 41 years of age), younger-aged adults (operationally defined as being at least 18 years of age but no more than 40 years of age), and youth (operationally defined as being at least 14 years of age but no more than 17 years of age).

Two of the groups were of such size that the data-gathering instrument could be administered to all members of the groups. Those groups were the community education administrative staff, hereafter designated as the staff, and the district-wide advisory committee. The rest of the community was studied by sampling techniques.

The total school district was sampled by means of a systematic sampling of households and a random respondent-selection procedure. The sampling frame used was a list of school district households compiled by a door-to-door demographic survey conducted in the Spring of 1977 and updated for the study. The list had been assembled into four geographic sections, which centered around the four towns in the school district, and had been alphabetized by family name. The list was examined for periodicities; none were found.

The households list numbered 2866 households. The size of the
sample was set at 239 based upon a chosen confidence interval of 95% and a chosen sampling error or tolerance of 7%. Backstrom and Hursh (1963) indicate that a sample size of 196 is necessary for the chosen confidence interval and sampling error. That number was inflated by 22% based upon non-response estimates, thereby yielding a sample size of 239 for the total school district. The sample size of 239 represents a selection of one out of every 12 households in the school district. In order that the 239 interviewees would not be a biased selection due to demographic factors such as age, sex, occupation or education, a random respondent-selection procedure was used within households. The procedure found in Backstrom and Hursh was used. These authors state that their random respondent-selection procedure chooses the persons to be interviewed in the same proportion as their age and sex relationship is found in all community households of a similar composition. The procedure is one of several revisions of the procedure developed by Kish (1949).

The last three groups studied were age-range subgroups of the total educational community or school district. These groups are older-aged adults, younger-aged adults, and youth. The interviewees were the age-range subgroups of the 239 interviewees in the sample of the total school district.

**Selection and Design of the Instrument**

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were disparities in the meaning of **aims for community education** as perceived by the total community, and selected school and community groups.
The meaning of **aims for community education** was measured as a concept, i.e., an idea or mental image which includes all that is associated with or suggested by the term. A review of the tests and measurements literature led to the conclusion that the **semantic differential** technique is the appropriate technique for measuring the meaning of concepts. Concepts studied by means of the semantic differential technique include public attitudes (Crumpton, Weinstein, Acker, and Annis, 1967), time concepts (MacKay and Brown, 1970), Rorschach Inkblots (Zax and Loiselle, 1960), and educational concepts (Smith, 1973).

**Description of the Semantic Differential**

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) originated this technique of combined controlled association and scaling procedures as a means of measuring the meaning of a concept to an individual or group. The term **concept** as used by Osgood et al. refers to any stimulus to which the subjects respond by check-marking on the semantic differential instrument. Since Osgood et al. use the term **concept** differently than is used elsewhere in this thesis, the word **stimulus** is used hereafter to denote the word or phrase on a semantic differential instrument which elicits the check-marking response. Such stimuli may or may not be concepts in the sense of an idea or mental image.

In general, subjects rate a stimulus by check-marking against a series of seven-point bipolar adjective scales. The collection of checkmarks against the bipolar scales is the raw datum obtained.
The assigned values of the checkmarks are summed and averaged over the scale dimensions, or factors, to obtain dimension scores (factor scores). The meaning of a concept, within the operational limitations of the dimensions investigated, is defined as the set of dimension scores representing that concept. The meaning of a concept to a group is operationally defined as the set of averaged dimension scores of subjects in that group.

Selection of the Stimulus

In order that the meaning of a concept be measured by the semantic differential technique, a stimulus must be selected which encompasses all that is to be associated with or suggested by the concept. Secondly, the stimulus must not be ambiguous in the sense that respondents are doubtful or uncertain as to which of any alternatives is meant.

To satisfy the criteria, first a dictionary and thesaurus review was done to determine if another term or more than one term would enrich the meaning of the conceptual idea of aims. It was determined that the word aims itself was the most satisfactory choice.

Second, several colleagues suggested that a stimulus aims for community education might well not be sufficiently meaningful to elicit meaningful responses in a semantic differential process. Therefore, a frame was sought in which to place the concept aims for community education. The frame would have to relieve doubt or uncertainty as to what was the concept on which to focus, yet at the same time not distort the meaning of the concept.
The semantic considerations discussed in Chapter II were taken into account; moreover, it was noted that three aspects of the meaning of aims stand out: Aims result from conceptualizing -- forming ideas about things. Aims are prospective in nature. Aims are determined by the exercise of one's volition. These aspects are apparent in the chosen frame, What should be the ...?

Finally the phraseology was changed to make the stimulus vernacular. The result was the stimulus selected to elicit responses about the meaning of the concept aims for community education. The operational stimulus for studying the meaning of the concept was: "What should the aims for community education be?"

Selection of the Scales

The scales for the measurement instrument were selected from two sources. Nineteen scales were selected from the lists in Osgood et al. and in Heise (1965). Scales were selected from these lists on the basis of two criteria. The first criterion was a dimension (factor) loading of at least .50 on the Evaluative dimension, .50 on the Activity dimension, or .40 on the Potency dimension. Second, the scales could not have a connotation which, when the scales were presented to the respondents, would question the integrity of the schools. For example, the scale, honest-dishonest, was rejected although its listed dimension loading on the Evaluative dimension is .85 (Osgood et al.).

Four more scales were selected from Heise on the basis of the polarity (non-neutrality) and dimension loading of one of the words.
Those word pair scales had a polarity of at least .90 and a loading of at least .80 on the listed word.

The resulting list of 23 adjective pairs was then submitted to three judges who were familiar with both the semantic differential technique and community education. The judges independently rated the word pairs on a three-step scale using eight criteria as a guide (Appendix A). Two judges were instructed to be conservative in their judgments.

Points were assigned to the steps as follows:

3 points There is little or no doubt that the pair would be good to use.

1 point The pair could be used, but there is some doubt about it.

0 points It is recommended that the pair not be used.

In order to be selected, an adjective-pair scale had to receive at least four total points. This process resulted in ten adjective pairs being selected for use as scales in the measurement instrument. The selected adjective pairs were good-bad, ours-theirs, lively-still, valuable-worthless, large-small, active-passive, popular-unpopular, fair-unfair, pleasant-unpleasant, and strong-weak.

Design of the Instrument

In order to test the hypotheses, it was necessary for three forms of the instrument to be designed. One form was administered to all respondents. That form elicited each respondent's own
opinion of the meaning of aims for community education. A second form was administered to members of the community education administrative staff and of the advisory committee only. That form elicited their perceptions of the total community's opinion of the meaning of aims for community education. The third form was administered to members of the advisory committee and of the total community sample. The third form elicited those persons' perceptions of the community education administrative staff's opinion of the meaning of aims for community education. These three forms are replicated in Appendix B. The various stances of perception to be used by the respondents were initiated by a "tag" or instruction at the top of the form.

Except for the tag at the form's top, each form was identical. The stimulus was centered and capitalized. Below it were guide words (extremely-quite-slightly-equally-slightly-quite-extremely) used for the seven-step scales. Osgood et al. state that those particular guide words are linguistic qualifiers associated with roughly equal degrees of intensity.

Below the guide words appear the adjective pairs separated by a seven-step scale. Osgood et al. state that generally, while there are differences according to the populations studied, over a large number of studies and a variety of subjects, with seven alternatives the frequency of use of all steps tends to be roughly equal.

The order of the ten adjective pairs was randomly selected and the left - right presentation of the words in each pair was also
determined at random.

Preceeding the semantic differential questions was a page containing instructions and an example.

**Meaning and Disparity**

In semantic differentiation, the meaning of a concept is specified by the results of a series of differentiating judgments. Each judgment is a selection among a set of given alternatives on a scale. In the study, the meaning of a concept was operationally defined as the set of two dimension scores representing that concept. Disparity was operationally defined as a distance between the points in the semantic space representing meanings of the concept aims for community education:

where $d_{i,j}$ is the linear distance between the two points in the semantic space representing any two meanings $i$ and $j$, $E_{i,j}$ is the linear distance between the two points in the semantic space representing any two meanings $i$ and $j$, $P_{i,j}$ is the linear distance between the two points in the semantic space representing the same meanings $i$ and $j$ considering dimension $E$ only, and $P_{i,j}$ is the linear distance between the two points in the semantic space representing the same meanings $i$ and $j$ considering dimension $P$ only.

The linear distance between the two points representing any two meanings $i$ and $j$ on one dimension (i.e., $E$ or $P$) is operationally defined as:

$$D_{i,j} = \sqrt{d_{i,j}^2}$$

where $D_{i,j}$ is the linear distance on one dimension between any two
meanings $i$ and $j$ and $d_{ij}$ is the algebraic difference between the dimension scores of the two meanings $i$ and $j$ on the same dimension.

For two dimensions $i$ and $j$, there are two methods of calculating the $d_{ij}$ and therefore the $\Delta_{ij}$ when measuring groups. The two methods will result in different values for the disparity of the meanings. One method is to average the $d_{ij}$ of each individual of the group to get the group's $\bar{d}_{ij}$, which could be notated as $\bar{d}_{ij}$. The second method is to use the average dimension scores of the group, $\bar{x}_i$ and $\bar{x}_j$, to calculate the group's $\bar{d}_{ij}$, which could be notated as $\bar{d}_{ij}$. The second method is used in this study. Conceptually, it better represents the disparity between the group consensus meanings. It does so because it yields a $\bar{d}_{ij}$ which is the algebraic difference between the consensus meaning of the concept on dimension $i$ and the consensus meaning of the concept on dimension $j$. The first method, on the other hand, yields a $\bar{d}_{ij}$ which is the mean algebraic difference of the dimension meanings to the group's individuals. In other words the first method is based upon the differences of individuals' meanings on dimensions $i$ and $j$; the second method is based upon the group's consensus meanings on dimensions $i$ and $j$. Since the study is concerned with group consensus meanings rather than meanings to individuals, the measures of disparity also should be based upon group consensus meanings. It also is consistent with the method of data analysis, later discussed in this chapter, used to test the hypotheses regarding disparities in meaning.
Reliability and Validity of the
Semantic Differential

Osgood et al. (1957) cite scale test-retest reliability of .85. Jenkins (1958) reported test-retest reliability as high as .97. Hecht (1975) found items had an internal consistency of .86 and substantial stability for up to one year. Norman (1959) found that from test to retest, 75% of the scale ratings either do not shift at all or shift by only one scale unit. Concepts which have only one meaning, e.g., tornado as opposed to star, have more stable ratings.

Norman also found that dimension scores' test-retest reliability are increased by adding additional scales, but for practical purposes the gain is accomplished by averaging just three or four scales.

Heise (1969) concludes that biased error can enter semantic differential studies when the concepts to be rated have a social desirability factor. Heise also states that exaggeration bias may affect ratings; the saliency of concepts, however, does not affect ratings.

Concept-scale interaction (Osgood et al., 1957; Heise, 1969) is a factor arising in two ways. First, an adjective pair may have different degrees of relevance for different concepts. Meaningful variation is proportional to relevance, according to Heise. Therefore, the pair sweet-sour may be highly relevant in rating the concept French pastries, but provide little meaningful variation in
rating an abstract idea such as school goals.

Second, semantic shifts in the word-pair adjectives can develop because of the "environment" connoted by a concept to the group or to individuals. Osgood et al. found that *sharp* as applied to concepts like *boulder* or *knife* had its ordinary denotative meaning, but when applied to other concepts, *cars, me* etc., had a "dynamic, favorable" meaning of slang origin (p. 178).

While these problems give the experimenter cause to carefully select the concepts and scales for the instrument, they are not insurmountable. Nor is there excessive need for conservatism. Kerlinger (1973) ponders:

> There is a subtle point here that is puzzling. Certain adjective pairs may seem irrelevant to concepts judged.... But one cannot always be sure of relevence. Meanings are rich and complex and an apparently irrelevant adjective pair may turn out to be relevant. (p. 571)

Semantic differential techniques rely primarily on face validity since there is a lack of commonly accepted quantitative criteria of meaning (Osgood et al.). Rowan (1954) found support for the semantic differential representation of concepts being a "natural" one in the sense that the scales do represent semantic dimensions actually used by persons in judging the meaning of concepts. Butzow and Williams (1973) and Hecht found specific semantic differential instruments to have construct validity.
In summary, as Kerlinger states, the semantic differential technique has been shown to be "sufficiently reliable and valid for many research purposes" (p. 579).

**Semantic Space Dimensionality**

Popularly considered to have proposed just three dimensions of semantic space, Osgood et al. (1957) actually allotted that several more do contribute a small portion of variance collectively. But across subjects, concepts, and scales, the authors state that three dimensions—the familiar Evaluative, Potency and Activity dimensions—have emerged and are predominant. Some studies, however, have shown a tendency for the Activity dimension to collapse (DiVesta, 1966; Suci, 1960; Wiggins and Fishbein, 1969), and it has been combined with the Potency dimension in the study of attitudes (Jaffe, 1967).

Since the Evaluative, Activity, and Potency dimensions are extracted by orthogonal rotations in factor analyses, the combining of two dimensions would yield a two-dimensional space with the dimensions still orthogonally related. Such a transformation would be a problem if the metric assumptions upon which semantic space is built were not met. In particular, if the center point of one or more scales were not true zero and if the intervals of adverbial quantifiers were not respectively proportional between scales, combining dimension scales to intentionally collapse a dimension would introduce distortion. Studies by Cliff (1959), Messick (1975), and others led Heise to conclude,
The information available suggests that the basic metric assumptions for the SD are not quite accurate, but also that violations of the assumptions are not serious enough to interfere with many present applications of the SD. Furthermore, some metric errors would be expected to counteract one another when ratings on several different scales are added together to form factor scores. (p. 406-407)

The problem resulting from a collapsed dimension, whether or not experimentally controlled, lies not in validity of measurement but in interpretation of results. Lynch (1972) compares the use of one dimension independently of other dimensions as an interpretation of meaning to the description of a person's size by only height or weight.

The analogy is apt and can be further extended. Suppose two persons are described by three measures of dimension—height, weight, and girth—and that the dimension score sets for them are (6'2", 200 lb., 36") and (5'2", 200 lb., 52"). To describe them by only height or weight leaves out pertinent information. On the other hand, the use of both height and weight, or height and girth, provides the salient information. (The analogy also illustrates the problem of violating metric principles in combining factors. One cannot sum and average the weight and girth since the scale intervals are not equivalent.) Finally, Lynch suggests that the functional use of meaning in a semantic differential study must
combine the dimension scores into some multi-dimensional measure—such as this study's disparity.

**Design of the Data Collection**

The instrument was administered to the community education administrative staff and the advisory committee by the investigator. In order to survey the community sample, the instrument was made Part A of a needs assessment survey questionnaire.

The needs assessment survey was conducted by Lakewood Community Education. The investigator served as Project Advisor for the survey. The interviewers were school personnel and volunteers who were trained by the investigator. Interviewers were also given the review notes and instructions found in Appendix C. The interviews were conducted during the period of March 13 through May 6, 1978. Households selected for the survey were sent a letter of introduction informing them to expect an interviewer to call at their home. The letter was mailed the week of March 6, 1978 (Appendix D).

Previously, the survey had been announced in the Lakewood Community Education Newsletter, which is sent to all district households. The initial design required that all contacts with the household be face-to-face, with two call-backs allowed to complete the interview. It was found that such a design was not sufficiently efficient to complete the survey. Therefore, after the first 151 interviews were completed, the design was changed to allow the initial contact and respondent selection to be made by telephone. The remainder of the survey was conducted under the revised design. The survey
questionnaire Part A and questionnaire material preliminary to Part A are found in Appendix E.

Interviewers were instructed to read the questions to respondents exactly as they appeared. The interviewers were to seat themselves in such a way that respondents could read along with them. First, certain demographic information was obtained from the respondent and the semantic differential example was discussed. Then, the semantic differential questions were read aloud to the respondent, through the stimulus. Interviewers were not permitted to answer questions during the check-marking procedure. When the respondent finished check-marking the first semantic differential question, the interviewer turned the page and read the second question through the stimulus. The respondent then check-marked the scales for that question. The survey continued directly from that point.

**Data Analysis**

**Meanings of the Concept**

The meaning of a concept to a group is the set of two dimension scores representing that concept. Two dimensions suggested by the factor analysis discussed by Osgood et al. (1957) and represented by the selected scales are (a) an "Evaluative" dimension, and (b) an "Activity/Potency" dimension. The adjective-pair scales representing the Evaluative dimension measures are the scales good-bad, valuable-worthless, fair-unfair, and pleasant-unpleasant. The adjective pairs representing the Activity/Potency dimension measures are the scales lively-still, active-passive, strong-weak, and large-
Each of the alternative points on a bi-polar adjective scale is assigned an ordered value ranging from seven to one inclusive. Seven is assigned to the alternative representing the greatest quantity of the more "positive" adjective in the pair, e.g., good, lively, valuable. A dimension score of a group is the grand mean of the check-mark values, summed and averaged over the group members and dimension scales.

Disparities in the Meanings

Hypotheses $H_1 - H_3$ and $H_7 - H_{214}$ were investigated by testing appropriate null hypotheses against their respective alternate hypotheses. Hypotheses $H_1$ and $H_3$ were tested by means of a one-way analysis of variance. Hypotheses $H_{14} - H_{214}$ were tested by means of the $t$ test for independent sample means. Hypotheses $H_7 - H_{13}$ were tested by means of the $t$ test for dependent samples. Each hypothesis was tested on each dimension. These various procedures are discussed by Glass and Stanley (1970). The .05 significance level was used as a basis for rejecting or not rejecting the null hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Review of the Purpose and Procedure of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine if disparities exist in the meaning of the concept aims for community education as held by members of the community and the community education staff in a local school district. Measurements were made of the meanings of that concept to the community education administrative staff, the advisory committee, the total community and three selected community age groups. Measures were also made of the staff's and the advisory committee's perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the total community and the community age groups' perceptions of the aims for community education held by the staff. The meanings were analyzed for disparities.

The rationale for the study was discussed in Chapter I, in which were also presented the questions to be answered by the study. A further review of the literature pertaining to educational and community education aims led to specific research hypotheses related to the questions. That literature review and the hypotheses, forming the context of the study, were presented in Chapter II.

The concept aims for community education was studied by measuring its meaning as a mental image or conceptual idea, including all that is associated with or suggested by the term. The technique selected for the measurements was the semantic differential.
technique. The study was conducted as Part A of a needs assessment survey directed by the researcher for the Lakewood Public School District (Lake Odessa, Michigan). The instrumentation, procedures, and methods of data analysis were detailed in Chapter III.

The meaning of the concept aims for community education was operationally defined as the set of two dimension scores representing that concept. The Evaluative dimension was represented by the adjective pair scales, good-bad, valuable-worthless, fair-unfair, and pleasant-unpleasant. The Activity/Potency dimension was represented by the adjective pair scales, lively-still, active-passive, strong-weak, and large-small. Chapter IV reports the results of the study.

**Organization of the Chapter**

Measures of the meanings of the concept aims for community education were completed for each group perceiving as itself, for the staff and the advisory committee perceiving as the total community, and for the community and the advisory committee perceiving as the staff. Each meaning is the set of two dimension scores for the respective group and perceptual stance. Disparities between meanings were calculated by the generalized distance formula of Euclidean geometry.

The results of the hypotheses tests are presented for each hypothesis on each dimension. The discussion of a hypothesis includes (a) the location of the tabular sets of meanings and disparities relative to the hypothesis, (b) the range of meanings on each dimension, (c) interpretive expressions of selected meanings, (d) the range of disparities, and (e) the statistical significance.
of the disparities.

The reader is duly cautioned that the interpretive expression of a meaning is, while not at all capricious, nevertheless arbitrary on the part of the interpreter. To express a meaning in terms of only one dimension is to lose no less than half of the adjudged meaning. So, to express a dimension score in fewer words than represent the dimension scales and the preciseness of quantity on the scale, is to further beg imprecision of adjudged meaning. The meaning is best interpreted by the set of two dimension scores, keeping in view the scales making up the respective dimensions and the numerical assignations to alternative spaces along the scale.

These cautions notwithstanding, it seems less than considerate to make no attempt at interpretation. Accordingly, with a view for parsimony, the words "good and worthwhile" have been used to express the positive quality of the Evaluative dimension and "active and potent" have been used to express the positive quality of the Activity/Potency dimension. The quantity of a dimension's quality is expressed by the guide words on the instrument. The words and respective numerical ranges used in the discussions are:

- extremely 6.50 - 7.00
- quite 5.50 - 6.49
- slightly 4.50 - 5.49

For example, on the Evaluative dimension the staff consensus was that the aims should be "6.65." The interpretation given in the discussion is "extremely good and worthwhile." A more precise, but
cumbersome, interpretation could be "more quite than slightly good (as opposed to bad), valuable (as opposed to worthless), pleasant (as opposed to unpleasant) and fair (as opposed to unfair)."

Two additional adjective pair scales, popular-unpopular, and ours-theirs, were included in the instrument as a result of the scale selection process. Following the results reported concerning the hypotheses, the results concerning those two adjective pairs will be presented. Before the report of the results, however, is a discussion of the representativeness of the respondents in the community sample.

**Characteristics of the Sample Respondents**

The total school district was sampled by means of a systematic sampling of households and a random respondent-selection procedure. The procedure found in Backstrom and Hursh (1963) and based upon the procedure of Kish (1949) was used. Backstrom and Hursh state that their random respondent-selection procedure chooses the persons to be interviewed in the same proportion as their age and sex relationship is found in all community households of a similar composition.

The sampling frame was a list of school district households that had been assembled into four geographic sections and alphabetized by family name. The list was examined for periodicities; none were found. Sudman (1976) states that a systematic sample will have the same precision as a simple random sample when no periodicities exist. Moser and Kalton (1971) suggest that a systematic sample from a frame such as the one used may even result in greater
precision. Since the households selected are representative of the total community and the four geographic areas, and since the respondent-selection technique selects respondents in proportion to their age and sex relationship in similarly-composed households, the individuals selected can be seen to be representative of the community; however, the question remains of the representativeness of those individuals who actually responded.

It was anticipated that the sampling frame list would contain some households that were inappropriate for study. First, since it was basically a door-to-door census of the school district, the list contained households of summer-only residents. Second, it contained households in which persons had participated in community education enrichment programs and, for reasons unspecified, declared themselves to be district residents when they perhaps were not. Third, some households, especially trailer lots, which were listed were expected to be vacated. Of the 239 households selected, 22 were deleted for such reasons. The remaining 217 households composed the study sample.

Within those 217 households, there were non-respondents. A total of 187 persons (from 187 households) responded to the survey for a response rate of 86.2%. The rate of response as considered by geographic areas ranged from 76.9% to 92.5%. The four geographic areas each contributed respondents in the same proportion as the areas were represented in the sample. This analysis is shown in Table 4.
### Table 4

Percentages of Survey Response by Individuals in the Four Geographic Areas and in the Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>Percentage rate of response</th>
<th>Percentage of the total individuals responding</th>
<th>Percentage of the total individuals in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarksville</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Odessa</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfield</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n^a = 187\]
\[n^b = 217\]

There were three reasons for persons not responding to the survey:

1. The selected person was indisposed or otherwise unable to communicate with the interviewer \((n=6)\).
2. The selected person was not available for interview when the interviewers made calls \((n=10)\).
3. The selected person refused or avoided the interview \((n=14)\).

When the interviewers were not able to complete the interview, they did, in all cases, learn and record the number of persons in the household who were 14 years of age or older, and the number of those who were males. On the basis of that information, further comparisons of respondents to non-respondents can be made. Table 5
shows that the households of respondents, non-respondents and the total sample essentially have the same mean number of persons 1/4 years of age and older. The equality is retained for males and for females. In addition to the data loss of non-respondents, the responses of one respondent were lost bringing the effective number of survey respondents to 186. This is also shown in Table 5 and in subsequent tables.

Table 5
Mean Number of Persons 1/4 Years and Older
Per Household of Survey Respondents, Non-Respondents and the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Persons 1/4 years and older</th>
<th>Males 1/4 years and older</th>
<th>Females 1/4 years and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was found by other researchers, community residents did not always respond to questions relating to community education goals. In this study, 10 respondents did not answer the pertinent question or gave unusable responses. This may have been due to the type of question, i.e., the semantic differential technique, as was verbally expressed by a few of these respondents; however, the cause may have been difficulty in responding to community education goal-related questions, as others of the ten expressed. Most likely both of
these were causes independently and in interaction with each other.

In Table 6 it can be seen that as a non-responding subgroup of the survey respondents, the individuals introduced a bias away from one of the communities, Clarksville. Noting from the survey records that Clarkville's relatively low (76.9%) rate of response to the survey was due to a high refusal rate (19.2%), nearly double that of the next highest community and triple the refusal rate for the survey overall (6.5%), the data suggest that either an interviewer-related or geographic-related factor is involved. Since two of the five refusals were made to the most successful interviewer, the geographic-related factor would appear to be the cause of both survey refusals and semantic differential refusals.

Table 6
Percentages of Semantic Differential Response by Individuals in the Four Geographic Areas and in the Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>Percentage rate of response</th>
<th>Percentage of the total individuals responding(a)</th>
<th>Percentage of the total individuals (b) in the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarksville</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Odessa</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfield</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) \(n = 176\)

\(b\) \(n = 216\)
Table 7 illustrates that while the 10 semantic differential non-respondents are an age-biased group themselves, consisting of no youth, three younger-aged adults, and seven older-aged adults, their deletion from the study respondents does not introduce an age bias.

Table 7

Percentage Age Group Distribution of Semantic Differential Non-respondents, Semantic Differential Respondents, and Total Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Younger-aged adults</th>
<th>Older-aged adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic differential non-respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic differential respondents</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the respondents to the questions used to study the meanings of aims for community education appear to be representative of the total community with the exception of an underrepresentative of one geographical area, Clarksville. That bias appears to be due to geographic-related factors beyond the control of the researcher. Moreover, the addition of the eight respondents necessary to remove that geographical bias, even if the additional respondents as a group averaged a factor score of two, would not significantly affect any of the factor scores observed for the total community.
Testing of the Hypotheses

For each hypothesis, the unit of statistical analysis is the respondent; the respondent is also the experimental unit. The alternative hypotheses—that there is a disparity in the meanings, for $H_1 - H_3$ and $H_7 - H_{24}$, or that there is a difference in the variances of the meanings, for $H_4 - H_6$—are tested against the respective null hypotheses—that there is no disparity in the meanings, for $H_1 - H_3$ and $H_7 - H_{24}$, or that there is no difference in the variance of the meanings, for $H_4 - H_6$. The chosen level of significance is the .05 level.

Question One

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the total community, certain community age groups, the community education administrative staff, and the advisory committee?

$H_1$ There are disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education staff, the advisory committee, older-aged adults, younger-aged adults, and youth.

The meanings of the concept to the groups are found in Table 8. The dimension scores on the Evaluative dimension range from 6.65 for the staff to 6.08 for the youth. On the Activity/Potency dimension the dimension scores range from 5.73 for the staff to 5.44 for the advisory committee. In terms of the guide words, the staff adjudged that the aims for community education should be "extremely good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent." All other groups adjudged
## Table 8

Meanings of the Concept **Aims for Community Education**—
the Sets of Paired Mean Dimension Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Own opinion</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Potency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>175a</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>65b</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Dimension score means for tests of significance found in later tables are sometimes different by .01 or .02 as compared with these respective means due to computer-programmed calculations.

Sample sizes for tests of significance found in later tables are sometimes different by 1 or 2 as compared with these respective sample sizes due to missing data.

- a\textsuperscript{n} = 17\textsubscript{i} for the staff perceptual stance
- b\textsuperscript{n} = 6\textsubscript{i} for the staff perceptual stance
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that the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" and also "quite active and potent" except the advisory committee, which selected "slightly active and potent."

The disparities of the meanings are found in Table 9. The disparities range from .70 between the staff and younger-aged adults to .06 between the younger-aged adults and the older-aged adults; however, the analysis of variance indicates that there is no evidence that these disparities are sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis of no difference using $\alpha = .05$. The null hypothesis that there are no differences between any pairs of the group means cannot be rejected on either the Evaluative dimension, $F(4, 197) = 1.105$, $p = .36$, or on the Activity/Potency dimension, $F(4, 197) = .20$, $p = .94$. The analyses of variance are reported in Table 10.

Failure to reject the null hypotheses can be better interpreted if the probabilities associated with the $F$ tests are further considered. There is a moderate probability, .36, that the differences between the Evaluative dimension group means could have been found by chance if indeed there were no differences between any pairs of group means. That probability for the differences found on the Activity/Potency dimension is very high, .94. These probabilities indicate that it is not improbable that there are in fact no disparities among the population groups' aims for community education.

$H_2$ There are disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and the advisory committee, as compared with the meaning of that concept as adjudged by the total community.
Table 9
Disparities* in the Meanings of the Concept as Adjudged by Each Group Perceiving as Itself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Community education staff</th>
<th>Advisory committee</th>
<th>Older-aged adults</th>
<th>Younger-aged adults</th>
<th>Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*None of these disparities are significant using .05 as α.

The meanings of the concept are tabulated in Table 8. The meaning dimension scores on the Evaluative dimension are 6.65 for the staff, 6.34 for the advisory committee and 6.26 for the total community. On the Activity/Potency dimension, the scores are 5.73 for the staff, 5.44 for the advisory committee, and 5.56 for the total community. The staff adjudged that the aims should be "extremely good and worthwhile"; the other groups adjudged the aims "quite good and worthwhile." The advisory committee adjudged that the aims should be "quite active and potent." The range of disparities can be seen in Table 9.

The total community is composed of three age groups, none of...
which differed significantly in group dimension scores from the staff (see Table 10). Since none of the component parts of the total community sample have dimension scores significantly different from the staff, it follows that the total community itself does not have dimension scores significantly different from the staff. The null hypothesis that there are no mean differences in dimension scores between the staff and total community is not rejected.

The same logic applies to the disparity between the advisory committee and the total community. The null hypothesis that there are no mean differences in dimension scores between the advisory committee and the total community is not rejected.

There are disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with older adults, younger-aged adults, and youth.

The meanings of the concept to these groups are found in Table 8. On the Evaluative dimension, the meanings' dimension scores range from 6.30 for the younger-aged adults to 6.08 for the youth. On the Activity/Potency dimension, the dimension scores range only from 5.59 for the younger-aged adults to 5.54 for older-aged adults. All groups adjudged the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent" although the dimension scores on the Activity/Potency dimension very nearly approach the "slightly active and potent" designation.

The disparities among the meanings are found in Table 9. Disparities range from .22 between the youth and both the total community and the younger-aged adults, to .02 between the total...
Table 10

Analyses of Variance for Meanings of the Concept
as Adjudged by the Staff, Advisory Committee,
and Community Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative Dimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>p = .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>93.34</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.43</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity/Potency Dimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>p = .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>159.12</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.76</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community and older-aged adults. The analyses of variance in Table 10 showed that there were no significant differences in the dimension score means between the age groups. Since those groups are the component parts of the total community, it follows that none of them have significantly different dimension scores from the total community. The null hypothesis that there are no differences in mean dimension scores between the total community and any of the age groups is not rejected.

Question Two

Are there differences in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, the advisory committee, and the total community?

H₄ There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee.

On the Evaluative dimension, the variance of the concept's meaning to the staff is .13. The variance of the concept's meaning to the advisory committee is .38. The F ratio (see Table 11) formed by these variances, with the numerator determined by coin flip, is .33. On the Activity/Potency dimension, the variances are .78 and 1.09 respectively. The F ratio formed by these variances, with the numerator determined by another coin flip, is 1.40. Since neither of these F ratios is significant at the .05 level, according to a variance test for independent samples, the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the variances of the meanings is not rejected.
Table 11
Variance Tests for the Meanings of the Concept as Adjudged By the Staff, Advisory Committee, and Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$n_1$</th>
<th>$n_2$</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9,16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$p = 0.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>$p = 0.31$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>174,9</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>$p = 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$p = 0.43$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>16,174</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>$p = 0.72$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>16,173</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>$p = 0.14$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numerators for the $F$ ratios were determined by independent coin flips.
There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the total community.

On the Evaluative dimension, the variance of the concept's meaning to the staff is .13. The variance of the concept's meaning to the community is .50. The $F$ ratio formed by these variances, with the numerator determined by coin flip, is 3.90. According to the variance test for independent samples (see Table 11), the $F$ ratio is significant at the .05 level. On the Activity/Potency dimension, the variance of the concept's meaning to the staff is .78. The variance of the concept's meaning to the community is .77. The $F$ ratio formed by these variances, with the numerator determined by another coin flip, is 1.02. The variance test for independent samples shows this to be non-significant at the .05 level. Since the variances were found to be significantly different on one dimension at the .05 level, the null hypothesis is rejected. The variance of the concept's meaning to the community is greater than the variance of the concept's meaning to the staff.

There is a difference in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee and by the total community.

The variances of the concept's meaning to the advisory committee are .38 on the Evaluative dimension and 1.09 on the Activity/Potency dimension. The variances of the concept's meaning to the community are .50 on the Evaluative dimension and .77 on the Activity/Potency dimension. The $F$ ratios, with the numerators determined by
independent coin flips, are .77 for the Evaluative dimension and 1.42 for the Activity/Potency dimension (see Table 11). Neither of these values is significant at the .05 level as determined by a variance test for independent sample means. The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the respective group variances cannot be rejected.

Question Three

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community?

H₇ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community.

The meaning of the concept aims for community education held by the staff is the set of dimension scores (6.65, 5.73). The staff's perception of the meaning of that concept to the total community is the set (5.85, 5.13). These meanings are recorded in Table 8. On both dimensions, the staff perceived that the community would have lesser aims than the staff itself did. The staff said the aims should be "extremely good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent." They perceived that the community's ideal aims would be "quite good and worthwhile" and "slightly active and potent." The disparity between these meanings is 1.00. This disparity is significant on the Evaluative dimension, t (9) = -3.49, p = .001,
and tends toward significance on the Activity/Potency dimension,
\( t(9) = -1.922, p = .10 \). The null hypothesis that there is no dis-
parity between the means on either dimension is rejected; the alter-
nate hypothesis, that there is a difference of at least one of the
dimension means is accepted. The \( t \) tests for dependent sample means
are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

\( t \) Tests for the Comparison of the Meaning of the Concept
to the Staff and the Staff's Perception of the
Concept's Meaning to the Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>( p = .007 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>( p = .09 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the disparity approached significance on the Activity/
Potency dimension, the power of the test was calculated to determine
what was the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if the
sample means were equal to the population mean. The power of the
test under these conditions, \( \alpha = .05 \), was only .57. Therefore, the
tendency toward significance of the disparity on the Activity/Potency
dimension must be given serious consideration. Were it a true dis-
parity, the probability of its being detected would be only .57.
**Question Four**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee as compared with that group's perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff and to the total community?

H₀ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.

The meaning of the concept held by the advisory committee is the set of dimension scores (6.34, 5.44). The advisory committee's perception of that concept's meaning to the staff is the set (6.34, 5.82). These meanings are displayed in Table 8. The advisory committee holds that the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" and "slightly active and potent." The advisory committee perceives that the staff feels the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent." The disparity shown in Table 13 between these meanings is .38. The t tests for dependent sample means, reported in Table 14 do not support the hypothesis that the meanings are different on either dimension. The null hypothesis that the mean dimension scores between perceptual states are equal cannot be rejected.

H₉ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community.
Table 13
Disparities in the Meanings of the Concept to the Advisory Committee as Compared to that Group's Perception of the Meaning to Other Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
$t$ Tests for the Comparison of the Meaning of the Concept to the Advisory Committee as Compared to the Advisory Committee's Perception of the Concept's Meaning to the Staff and the Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>p=.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>p=.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>p=.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meaning of the concept to the advisory committee is the set of dimension scores \((6.34, 5.44)\). The advisory committee's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community is the set \((6.06, 5.22)\). These meanings appear in Table 8. Both the meaning of the concept to the advisory committee and the advisory committee's perception of the concept's meaning to the staff can be interpreted as "quite good and worthwhile" and "slightly active and powerful." The disparity between the meanings is .36. The disparity is tabulated in Table 13. The t test for dependent sample means found in Table 14 indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no disparity between the meanings cannot be rejected.

**Question Five**

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of that concept to the community education administrative staff?

\[ H_0 \quad \text{There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.} \]

The meaning of the concept aims for community education held by the total community is the dimension score set \((6.26, 5.56)\). The community's perception of that concept's meaning to the staff is the set \((6.18, 5.65)\). Both meanings can be interpreted as the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile," and "quite active and potent." These meanings are tabulated in Table 8. The disparity between these
meanings is .12. The \( t \) tests for dependent sample means (Table 15) indicate that there is no support for the hypothesis that the mean dimension scores are different between perceptual states.

**Table 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Six**

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with their respective perceptions of that concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff?

\( H_{11} \) There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by older-aged adults, as compared with that group's perception of the concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff.

The meaning of the concept to the older-aged adults is the dimension score set \((6.27, 5.54)\). That group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the staff is the set \((6.17, 5.68)\). These
meanings can be found in Table 8. Both can be interpreted as meaning the aims for community education should be "quite good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent" although, on the Activity/Potency dimension of the older-aged adult group's own perception, the meaning nearly approaches "slightly active and potent." The disparity between the meanings (Table 16) is .17. The t-tests for dependent sample means (Table 17) indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no disparity between the meanings cannot be rejected.

Table 16
Disparities in Meanings of the Concept to the Community Age Groups as Compared to Their Respective Perceptions of the Concept's Meaning to the Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by younger-aged adults, as compared with that group's perception of the concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff.

Younger-aged adults adjudged the meaning of the concept to be the dimension score set (6.29, 5.59) and their perception of the concept's meaning to the staff is the set (6.20, 5.65). These meanings are recorded in Table 8. The interpretation is that the
Table 17

*t* Tests for the Comparison of the Concept's Meaning to the Community Age Groups With Those Groups' Respective Perceptions of the Concept's Meaning to the Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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aims should be "quite good and valuable" and "quite active and potent." The disparity (see Table 16) between these meanings is .12 which is not shown to be significant by the $t$ test for dependent sample means conducted on the group's mean dimension scores (see Table 17). The null hypothesis is not rejected.

$H_{13}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by youth, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the community education administrative staff.

The youth age group's adjudged meaning of the concept aims for community education is the dimension score set $(6.08, 5.55)$. The youth perceive that the meaning to the staff is $(6.27, 5.53)$. Table 8 permits comparison of these meanings with the concept's meanings as adjudged by other groups.

Both meanings can be interpreted as "quite good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent" although both meanings closely approach "slightly active and potent" on the Activity/Potency dimension. The disparity between these meanings is .19 (see Table 16). The $t$ tests for dependent sample means do not show that the disparity is significant since the group's mean dimension scores are not significantly different from each other. These $t$ tests are found in Table 17. The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of the perceived meanings on either dimension is not rejected.

**Question Seven**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the
perceptions of that concept's meaning to the staff as adjudged by the advisory committee, the total community, and the community age groups?

\[ H_{14} \] There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the advisory committee.

The advisory committee's perception of the concept's meaning to the staff is the set of dimension scores \((6.34, 5.82)\), as opposed to the actual staff's meaning of the concept \((6.65, 5.73)\) (see Table 8). The staff's meaning can be interpreted that the aims should be "extremely good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent." The advisory committee's perception of that meaning is "quite good and worthwhile" and "quite active and potent." The disparity between these meanings is .32. This disparity is presented in Table 18 for comparison with the similar disparities between other groups' perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the staff and the staff's actual meaning. However, \(t\) tests for independent sample means for each dimension do not indicate that the disparity exists using .05 as \(\alpha\). These \(t\) tests are presented in Table 19 for comparison with the \(t\) tests on the disparities between the mean dimension scores of other groups in relation to the mean dimension scores of the staff's actual meaning of the concept. The null hypothesis for \(H_{11}\) cannot be rejected on the basis of these \(t\) tests.
Table 18

Disparities in the Meaning of the Concept Held by the Staff As Compared With the Other Groups' Perceptions of the Concept's Meaning to the Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supports the hypothesis. See Table 21.

H15 There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the total community.

The community's perception of the concept's meaning to the staff is the dimension score set (6.18, 5.65) as opposed to the actual meaning to the staff (6.65, 5.73). The staff adjudged that the aims for community education should be "extremely good and worthwhile" but the community's perception of the staff's ideal aims is "quite good and worthwhile." Both meanings include the aims being "quite active and potent." The disparity between the actual meaning to the staff and the community's perception of that meaning is .48. The t-test for independent sample means shows that the staff tends
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>p = .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>p = .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>p = .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>p = .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>p = .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>p = .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>p = .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>p = .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>p = .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>p = .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to have aims that are more "good and worthwhile" than the community perceives, \( t (182) = 1.69, p = .09 \); however, the disparity is not significant on either dimension at the .05 level. The meanings are found in Table 8; the disparity is recorded in Table 18; the \( t \) tests for independent sample means are presented in Table 19.

\( H_{16} \) There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by older-aged adults.

The older-aged adults' perception of the aims held by the staff is the dimension score set \((6.17, 5.68)\), contrasted with the actual aims of the staff which is the set \((6.65, 5.73)\). As was found for the previous groups, the older-aged adults perceive the staff's aims for community education to be "quite good and worthwhile" whereas the staff's actual aims are interpreted as "extremely good and worthwhile." Both meanings express aims that are "quite active and potent." The disparity between these perceived and actual meanings is .498, which is not shown by \( t \) tests for independent sample means to exist on either dimension using .05 level as \( \alpha \). The null hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean dimension scores between groups is not rejected. The meanings (see Table 8), the disparities (see Table 18) and the \( t \) tests for independent sample means (see Table 19) are presented for comparison for respective statistics of other groups.

\( H_{17} \) There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative
staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by younger-aged adults.

The younger-aged adults' perception of the aims for community education held by the staff is the dimension score set (6.20, 5.65) as compared to the actual aims of the staff, expressed as (6.65, 5.73). (see Table 8) The disparity between these meanings is .48 which approaches significance, \( t (72) = 1.87, p = .07 \), on the Evaluative dimension (see Table 18). On the Evaluative dimension, the older-aged adults perceived the staff's aims to be "quite good and worthwhile" but in actuality, the staff adjudged their own aims to be "extremely good and worthwhile." The \( t \) tests for independent sample means indicate that the null hypothesis that the respective mean dimension scores between groups do not differ cannot be rejected (see Table 19).

\( H_{18} \) There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by youth.

The youths' perception of the staff's aims is represented by the dimension score set (6.27, 5.53). Compared with the staff's actual dimension scores of (6.65, 5.73) there is a disparity of .43. A \( t \) test for independent sample means shows this disparity to be significant on the Evaluative dimension, \( t (24) = 2.18, p = .04 \). On that dimension, the staff's aims are "extremely good and worthwhile" while the youths' perceptions of the aims can be interpreted
as "quite good and worthwhile." On the basis of the $t$ tests for independent sample means (see Table 19), the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis, that there is a difference in mean dimension scores on at least one dimension, is accepted. The actual meaning to the staff of the concept aims for community education is different from the youths' mean perception of that concept's meaning to the staff. The meanings are presented in Table 8 and the disparity is presented in Table 18.

Question Eight

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community?

$H_{19}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.

The advisory committee's adjudged meaning of aims for community education is (6.34, 5.44). The staff's perception of the meaning of that concept to the community is (5.85, 5.13). The disparity between these meanings, .58, approaches significance on the Evaluative dimension, $t (25) = 1.77, p = .09$. The specified meanings for both groups can be interpreted as meaning the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" but the advisory committee's aims tend toward the quantifier "extremely" while the staff's perception of the community-held
meaning tends toward "slightly." Both groups' specified meanings can be interpreted to express aims that are "quite active and potent." The *t* tests for independent sample means do not give evidence that the null hypotheses of no disparity between the specified mean dimension scores should be rejected. The meanings are tabulated in Table 8 and the *t* tests for independent sample means are presented in Table 20. Assuming the values of Table 20 to be accurate representations of the population measures, the power of the Evaluative dimension *t* test is .78, which supports not rejecting the null hypothesis.

Table 20

*t* Tests for the Comparison of the Concept's Meaning to the Advisory Committee as Compared With the Staff's Perception of the Concept's Meaning to the Total Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Perceptual state</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Nine**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the total community as adjudged by the community...
education administrative staff and by the advisory committee?

H_{20}: There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the total community, as adjudged by the community education administrative staff.

The meaning of the concept to the community is the set of mean dimension scores (6.26, 5.56). The staff's perception of that meaning is the dimension score set (5.85, 5.13) (see Table 8). Both meanings can be interpreted that the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile" although the staff's perception of the meaning to the community tends toward the quantifier "slightly" while the community's actual adjudgment tends toward "extremely." This difference approaches significance, $t(183) = -1.78, p = .08$. On the other dimension, the community's actual adjudgment is that the aims should be "quite active and potent" while the staff's perception of that adjudgment has the quantifier "slightly." The disparity between the concept's meaning to the community and the staff's perception of that meaning is .60 (see Table 21). The disparity is not significant at the .05 level according to the $t$ tests for independent sample means (see Table 22). The null hypothesis that there is no disparity in the between group mean dimension scores is not rejected.

H_{21}: There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community, as compared with the perception of the concept's meaning to the total community, as adjudged by the advisory committee.
Table 21
Disparities in the Meaning of the Concept to the Community as Compared to the Perceptions of the Community-Held Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
$t$ Tests for the Comparison of the Concept's Meaning to the Community as Compared With Group Perceptions of the Community-Held Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>p = .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>p = .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>p = .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>p = .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advisory committee's perception of the concept's meaning to the community is expressed by the set of dimension scores (6.06, 5.22). The actual meaning as adjudged by the community is (6.26, 5.56). These meanings are found in Table 8. Both meanings can be
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interpreted that the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile." The community also feels the aims should be "quite active and potent," but the advisory committee's perception of that meaning is only "slightly active and potent." The disparity (see Table 21) between these adjudgments is $t = 0$. $t$-tests for independent sample means performed on the respective mean dimension scores between groups indicate no support that the disparity is significant. These $t$-tests are presented in Table 22. The null hypothesis that there is no disparity between the meanings cannot be rejected.

**Question Ten**

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of that concept's meaning to the total community?

$H_{22}$ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by older-aged adults, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.

The older-aged adults adjudged the concept's meaning as $(6.27, 5.54)$. The staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community is $(5.85, 5.13)$. The disparity between these meanings is $.59$. The older-aged adults' meaning is interpreted as "quite (and tending toward extremely) good and worthwhile" and "quite (but tending toward slightly) active and potent." The staff's perception of the meaning to the total community is interpreted as "quite (tending
toward slightly) good and worthwhile" and "slightly active and potent."

The disparity between these meanings is .59. t tests performed on the independent sample means indicate that the disparity is not significant on either dimension. The null hypothesis that there is no disparity in the respective mean dimension scores between groups is not rejected at the .05 level. The meanings are tabulated in Table 8; the disparities are found in Table 23; the t tests are presented in Table 24.

Table 23
Disparities Between the Staff's Perception of the Meaning of the Concept to the Community as Compared With the Concept's Meaning to Each Community Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supports the hypothesis. See Table 26.

H23 There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by younger-aged adults, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.
Table 2b

_t_ Tests for the Comparison of the Staff’s Perception of the
Meaning of the Concept to the Community as Compared
With the Concept’s Meaning to Community Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>p = .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>p = .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>p = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>p = .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>- .85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>p = .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Potency</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>p = .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The younger-aged adults adjudged the concept’s meaning to be (6.30, 5.59). The staff’s perception of the concept’s meaning to the total community is the dimension score set (5.85, 5.13). These meanings are found in Table 8. While both meanings can be interpreted to include that the aims for community education should be "quite good and worthwhile," the younger-aged adults tend toward the quantifier "extremely" while the staff’s perception of the total
community's meaning of the concept tends toward "slightly." This disparity, the Evaluative dimension disparity, is significant, \( t(73) = -1.98, p = .05 \). Also, the disparity tends toward significance on the Activity/Potency dimension, \( t(73) = -1.74, p = .09 \). The staff's perception of the community's aims can be interpreted as "slightly active and potent" while the younger-aged adults' adjudgment is "quite active and potent." The disparity between the meanings (see Table 23) is .64, which is shown by \( t \) tests on the independent sample means of the dimension scores to be significant at the .05 level. The \( t \) tests are presented in Table 24. The null hypothesis of no disparity between the respective group dimension scores is rejected. There is a disparity between the meaning of the concept aims for community education to younger-aged adults and the staff's perception of that meaning to the total community.

\[ H_{24} \text{ There is a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by youth, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community.} \]

The youth age-group adjudged the meaning of the concept to be (6.08, 5.55) as compared to the staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community of (5.85, 5.13). Both meanings can be interpreted that the aims should be "quite good and worthwhile." The staff perceives that the total community believes the aims should be "slightly active and potent" while the youth adjudged the aims should be "quite active and potent." The disparity between the two meanings is .48. \( t \) tests for independent sample means performed on
the respective between group mean dimension scores (see Table 24) show no evidence that this disparity is significant. The meanings are reported on Table 8 and the disparity is in Table 23.

**The Popular-Unpopular Scale**

The group mean adjudgments on the popular-unpopular adjective-pair scale are reported in Table 25. The groups indicated that the aims should be "quite popular," when giving their own opinions, with one exception. The exception, the youth groups' mean score, is midway between "slightly" and "quite" popular ($\bar{x} = 5.50$). *t* tests for independent sample means show that, at the .05 level, the youths' mean score is not significantly different from either the mean score of the total community or the mean score of the staff (see Table 26).

The staff's perception of how the total community would respond to this scale is also midway between "quite" and "slightly" popular ($\bar{x} = 5.50$). A *t* test for dependent sample means, also in Table 26, indicates that this difference is not significant at the .05 level.

Two aspects of results regarding this word pair bear further discussion. First is the use of a *t* test for independent sample means to test for differences in group mean scores between the total community and a subgroup of that sample, the youth age group. This will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Second is the meaning of ratings on a single scale. Does a rating of "quite," 6.0, by an individual really mean that the individual believes the aims for community education should be "quite popular"? While that is a simple and tempting conclusion, if made, it must be made with caution. Lynch (1972) holds that, "each
Table 25
Mean Group Scores for the Popular-Unpopular Adjective-Pair Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>Own Opinion</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>65b</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a \( n = 172 \) for the staff perceptual stance.
b \( n = 63 \) for the staff perceptual stance.

scale is not uniquely meaningful in its own right although it may sound as if it is and it should be interpreted as one index of the dimension of meaning it represents" (p. 3). As a check to determine if this scale (or the ours-theirs scale next to be considered) was an index of a factor common to either of the dimensions used in the tests of the hypotheses, a factor analysis was conducted on the scales by perceptual stance for the community sample, and for all groups combined. The word pair popular-unpopular was not consistently related to any particular scales when more than one factor was retained in the factor analyses.
Table 26

\[ t \] tests for Comparisons of Group Adjudgments on the Popular-Unpopular Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>p = .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>p = .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>p = .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (perceiving as total community)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intragroup comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (own opinion)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>p = .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (perceiving as total community)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even with those cautions in mind, it is still not improbable that ratings on this scale are interpreable as adjudgments of the quality of "popularity." Community education is a public event occurring at a time when opinions on school programming are often made known through informal and formal communications networks. To suggest that the term popular as it is related to educational aims means something other than "popular" strains credulity.
The Ours-Theirs Scale

Examination of Table 27 shows a pattern of mean scores far different than any other scale in the study. The staff's adjudgment of 2.70, "slightly theirs" is significantly different than the total community's rating of 4.77, "slightly ours," and it approaches significance when compared with the rating of the advisory committee, 4.00, "equally ours and theirs." However, one should assume that, from the perspective of a staff member, the theirs on the scale would mean "the community's." In that case, the staff's adjudgment of 2.70, "slightly theirs," means "slightly the community's." The total community's adjudgment of 4.77, "slightly ours," also means "slightly the community's." In other words, both groups, the staff and the total community, indicated the same thing -- the aims for community education should be "slightly the community's."

In order to properly compare these adjudgments statistically, it is necessary to transform the value assigned the staff's adjudgment so that all checkmarks expressing "slightly the community's" are accorded a value of 5.0, those expressing "quite the community's" are accorded a value of 6.0, and so forth along the entire scale.

The appropriate transformation of the staff's consensus rating yields a dimension score of 5.30. (Note that 5.30 and 2.70 are equidistant from the midpoint of the scale, 4.00.) A new test for significance shows no support that there is a difference between the staff's and community's ratings. These t-tests are presented on Table 28.
Table 27
Mean Group Scores for the Ours-Theirs Adjective-Pair Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual stance</th>
<th>Own opinion</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own opinion</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older-aged adults</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger-aged adults</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of this scale for perceptual stances other than persons perceiving as themselves, i.e., giving their own opinion, is impossible. One cannot know which is meant by a community member, perceiving as the staff, who marks the space for "quite ours":

1. I believe the staff would say the aims should be (quite) ours, the community's.

2. I believe the staff would say the aims should be (quite) "ours, the staff's."

This problem of interpretation is reciprocal for the staff's ratings when perceiving as the community, and further confusing when the rating group is the advisory committee.
Table 28

\textit{t} Tests for Comparisons of Group Adjudgments on the Ours-Theirs Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-3.78</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>( p = .0002 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>( p = .07 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( p = .08 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total community</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>- .97</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>( p = .33 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (transformed rating)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further note on this scale results from the factor analysis referred to in the last section. This scale consistently either appeared at the opposite extreme of a factor from the factor's scale cluster, or it was a distinct factor in itself. It appears then, to measure in an entirely different way than the other scales in the instrument.

Consideration Due Parametric Test Usage

The hypothesis tests in this study utilized parametric tests: one-way analyses of variance, \( t \) tests for independent sample means, \( t \) tests for dependent sample means, and variance tests for independent
samples.

Both \( t \) tests and the analysis of variance have been shown to be resistant to effects of non-normality and heterogeneity of variance (Glass & Stanley, 1970; Winer, 1971; Kerlinger, 1973). Kerlinger concludes, "In brief, in most cases of education and psychology, it is probably safer—and usually more effective—to use parametric tests rather than non-parametric tests" (p. 288). For the group measures tested in this study, it was uncommon for there to be more than a moderate departure from homogeneity of variances. In the cases this did occur, the group with a larger variance had a larger sample size, a situation which Glass and Stanley state shifts the probability of Type I error to less than the stated (.05) level of \( \alpha \).

One \( t \) test for independent sample means actually tested for differences between group mean scores between a group and a subgroup of that same group. As previously mentioned, this was done when testing for differences in mean group scores on the popular-unpopular scale between the total community and youth. As Glass and Stanley point out, when \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) are positively correlated, as is the case in point, significant differences will be considered insignificant. That may have occurred here since \( t (188) = 1.80, p = .07 \).

A further consideration is that the design of this study necessitated the use of several \( t \) tests as the means of testing many of the hypotheses. When this is done, a researcher can expect to reject a correct null hypothesis a small number of times.
Summary

This chapter presented the meanings of the concept aims for community education as adjudged by the groups and presented the results of the tests of the hypotheses selected to investigate disparities in the meaning of the concept aims for community education.

Disparities were found between the concept's meaning to the staff as compared with the staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the community, and as compared with the youth's perception of the concept's meaning to the staff. A disparity was also found between the concept's meaning to the younger-aged adults as compared with the staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community. Additionally, the community as a group was found to vary more in their expression of the concept's meaning than did the staff.

Also discussed were group mean responses to the two adjective word-pairs not contributing to the concept's meanings as operationally defined. No differences were found in the group mean adjudgments on either the popular-unpopular scale or the ours-theirs scale. Interpretation of the ours-theirs scale for perceptual stances other than persons perceiving as themselves proved to be impossible.

Demographic characteristics of the population and respondents were discussed before the results were presented. The respondents appear to be slightly a biased sample, biased away from one geographic area. Apparently this is due to a relevant characteristic of that area, but the bias is not sufficient to impact upon the results presented. Discussion of the findings was reserved for Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

In this chapter, after a summary of the context, purpose, and procedures of this study, the findings reported in Chapter IV are discussed. The findings are discussed first in relation to the questions the study was designed to answer, then collectively as they relate to the groups studied. Conclusions based upon the findings are then presented, followed by implications of the study.

Summary of the Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to determine if disparities exist in the meaning of the concept aims for community education as perceived by the total community, the community education administrative staff, the district-wide advisory committee and selected community age groups.

The aims, the ideals for community education, are the conceptual foundation upon which goals, objectives, and, in turn, programs are based. The consummation of the purpose of community education, the achievement of a sense of community, can only come about if the community members share and together pursue a vision for the community. It is for this reason that the aims, the ideals, for community education as perceived by the total community should be congruent with the aims held by the community education administrative staff. The community education process can result in a sense of community only to the extent that the community members share the aims to which the community education process is applied.
There is no lack of writing of opinions, judgment, and normative pronouncements of aims and goals for education in general and community education specifically. The amount of actual research in this area has been extremely sparse, but certain findings from the literature have received general support:

1. Generally, with exceptions, community members and educators agree upon the relative importance of stated educational goals.

2. Community educators have identified some 75 goals which can be dichotomized into process goals and program goals. Community educators appear to aspire to process goals, but to actually direct their energies toward program goals.

3. Community member input to the community education process may have a more varied base than the input of professional educators. Further, community members may have a low response rate on such input items.

4. Age and occupational level are perhaps two factors which affect educational aims of the community.

5. To fully study aim or goal consensus between groups, the researcher must measure whether the groups perceive congruence or disparity, as well as measure for actual congruence or disparity. Perceived disparity is more affective than is actual disparity, i.e., perceived goal disparity is far more disruptive to inter-group relations than is actual goal disparity.

In order to investigate the aims for community education which are input for the goal-setting phase of the community education
process, the community members of a local school district were sampled by means of a systematic sampling of households and a random respondent-selection procedure. As part of a community education needs assessment survey, respondents (n=175) adjudged the meaning of the concept aims for community education on a semantic differential instrument developed for the study. Trained interviewers gathered the data.

The instrument was developed with regard for contextual considerations discussed in Chapter II and with regard for methodological considerations discussed in Chapter III. The respondents responded to the stimulus, "what should the aims for community education be?" by check-marking against a series of seven-point bipolar adjective scales. Responses were gathered for two perceptual states (a) perceiving as self, and (b) perceiving as the community education staff.

The checkmarks were summed and averaged over two scale dimensions, independently for both perceptual states, to give dimension scores (factor scores). The meaning of the concept was operationally defined as the set of dimension scores representing that concept as adjudged. Measures of disparity, operationally defined by a formula derived from the generalized distance formula of Euclidean geometry, were calculated between meanings, and those related to the hypotheses were tested for significance.

Measures were also gathered of the adjudgments of the community education staff and the advisory committee. Both groups responded perceiving as self and perceiving as the total community. The advisory committee also responded perceiving as the staff.
The results of these measures as they relate to the questions that the study was designed to answer are discussed in the next section.

**Findings Related to the Questions of the Study**

**Question One**

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the total community, certain community age groups, the community education administrative staff, and the advisory committee? \((H_1 - H_3)\).

While there is a tendency for the staff to have aims for community education that are more "good and worthwhile" than has the community, there was no actual disparity found. Moreover, the probabilities associated with the hypotheses tests suggest that there is no disparity in the aims for community education among the staff, advisory committee, and the rest of the community. This finding is in agreement with the general conclusions of researchers regarding stated community education goals. It can be said then, with caution, that the groups studied all have similar mental images of the aims for community education. Therefore, if a group perceives there to be a disparity between its aims and those of another group, the perception will be a "Type I" error—perceiving disparity where none exists—as was discussed in Chapter II.

**Question Two**

Are there differences in the variances of the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, the advisory committee, and the total community? \((H_4 - H_6)\).

The variance in the concept's meaning to the community is
greater than that variance for the staff on the Evaluative dimension. This supports the hypothesis generated by findings of previous research. The community varies more in its aims for community education than does the staff. The advisory committee was not found to vary in their aims significantly from either the staff or community.

**Question Three**

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of the concept to the total community? ($H_7$).

There is a disparity. The staff underestimates the aims of the community on at least the Evaluative dimension. They adjudge that the community is "more conservative" as regards community education aims. This finding agrees with similar findings discussed in Chapter II.

**Question Four**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee as compared with that group's perceptions of the meaning of the concept to the community education staff and to the total community? ($H_8$-$H_9$).

No disparities are found between the aims of the advisory committee and that group's perceptions of the aims of the other groups. The advisory committee does not perceive that its aims are different than those of either the staff or the community.

**Question Five**

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged...
by the total community, as compared with that group's perception of the meaning of that concept to the community education administrative staff? \( (H_{10}) \).

There is no disparity between the aims held by the community and their perception of the staff's aims. They perceive the staff to be pursuing the same ideals which they themselves are, as regards community education.

**Question Six**

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with their respective perceptions of that concept's meaning to the community education administrative staff? \( (H_{11}-H_{13}) \).

As was found when the total community was considered, there is no disparity found between these groups' own opinions regarding the aims for community education and their respective perceptions of the staff's aims.

**Question Seven**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the community education administrative staff, as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the staff, as adjudged by the advisory committee, the total community and the community age groups? \( (H_{14}-H_{18}) \).

There is a disparity related to the Evaluative dimension between the staff's aims and the youths' perception of the staff's aims. Since none of the other groups' respective disparities were significant, an age factor may be acting here. However, none of the
t test results on the Evaluative dimension had associated probabilities greater than .13, which suggests that the effect may have been due only in part to age and in part to another factor common to the groups.

To investigate this further, the powers of the t tests on the Evaluative dimension for $H_{14}$ through $H_{17}$ were calculated. If the powers of those tests were shown to be high, then the likelihood that an age factor was the agent causing the disparity would be supported. Under the conditions that the measured values reported in Table 19 accurately represent the respective population values, the powers of the t tests ranged from .99 to .88. This supports non-rejection of the null hypothesis for all groups except the youth-aged group. Therefore, there is support for consideration of an age-related factor as the affective source of difference in the community groups' relative ability to correctly perceive the staff's aims. With the exception of the youth, the groups appear to correctly perceive the staff's aims.

**Question Eight**

Is there a disparity in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the advisory committee, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of the concept's meaning to the total community? ($H_{19}$)

The advisory committee's aims tend to be, but are not in disparity with the staff's perception of the community's aims. Thus there is no evidence that the advisory committee is non-representative of the staff's perception of the community as regards aims for
community education.

**Question Nine**

Are there disparities in the meaning of the concept as adjudged by the total community as compared with the perceptions of that concept's meaning to the total community as adjudged by the community education administrative staff and by the advisory committee? \( (H_{20} - H_{21}) \)

There are no differences found between the aims actually held by the community and the perceptions of those aims held by the staff and by the advisory committee.

Both groups appear to correctly perceive the community's aims. On the Evaluative dimension, the staff's perception approaches a significant disparity, but the power of the test was .88 which does not clearly cast doubt on the findings.

**Question Ten**

Are there disparities in the meanings of the concept as adjudged by the community age groups, as compared with the community education administrative staff's perception of that concept's meaning to the total community? \( (H_{22} - H_{24}) \)

The staff's perception of the aims for community education held by the community is an accurate perception of the aims held by the community's older-aged adults and youth, but not accurate as a perception of the younger-aged adults. There is an age-related factor which affects perception of aims held by community age groups as estimated by a perception of the aims of the total community.
Findings Related to the Groups Studied

The Community Education Administrative Staff

The actual aims for community education pursued by the staff are essentially the same as those of the other groups studied. They do, however, tend to be more directed toward the Evaluative qualities (goodness, worthwhileness, pleasantness, and fairness) than are the aims of the total community. The importance of this finding is that the community educators, the advisory committee, and the community, all desire that community education pursue the same general purpose. For example, if the advisory committee or staff talk of the aims or ideals they have for community education, they do mean the same things as are meant by each other and the community groups.

Research reviewed in Chapter II generally supports this finding. Moreover, the finding supports the idea that while community educators have a "standardized model" of community education, it does reflect the model preferred by citizens in such areas as the Lakewood School District.

It was also found that the staff vary less in their adjudged aims than does the community. This finding is important as it confirms a relationship indirectly suggested by comparing findings of other studies. While the staff and community seek the same aims overall, there is more diversity among the community members than among the staff. This finding means that views disparate from the community consensus will be more widespread than might be anticipated by the staff.

The aims for community education held by the staff tend to be
directed more toward Evaluative efforts than is perceived by the
total community; they are more directed in that manner than is per­
ceived by the youths and the tendency appears with the younger-aged
adults. Some age-related factor causes a more accurate perception
of this dimension of aims--i.e., worthwhileness as opposed to
activity--as community members grow older. This is not surprising
considering that the youth would be very aware of school-building
activities and less aware of the other aspects of community education.

The staff's aims are also different than they perceive to be the
community's aims. They perceive a disparity where none exists, since
the community's aims actually are in consensus with the staff's aims.
This finding indicates the importance for future researchers to con­
sider all the discussed aspects of goal congruency and perceptual
stance when conducting research in community education.

The perception that the staff has of the total community's aims
for community education is accurate, more so in terms of "activity"
than "worthwhileness"; the latter tends to be underestimated. The
perception of the total community's aims will cause a misperception
on the staff's part if applied to the younger-aged adults as a group,
since their actual aims are different than that perception.

Finally, in spite of concern that community education profes­
sionals nationally seem to have aims based upon some "national model"
of community education as opposed to aims based upon their own com­
munities' actual situations, there is no evidence to support concern
that this is an operational factor in communities such as the one
studied. The question could be readdressed with more direct
methodology.

The District-wide Advisory Committee

The findings relative to the advisory committee can be summed up in one sentence. They agree with everyone and they perceive that they do so. Moreover, they accurately perceive the aims of the staff and the community both. Their aims do not vary to a different extent than do the aims of the older groups. It appears that they are a representative, mediational group whether relating as a school group toward the community, or toward the staff as a community group. Since the advisory committee serves a representational purpose in the community education process, it appears that this one is well-constructed and capable of meeting its purpose.

The Total Community

The aims for community education held by the community are congruous with those of the staff, advisory committee, and the age groups within the community. There is, however, a tendency toward the aims being more conservative on the Evaluative dimension than are the staff's aims. The community's aims are also of greater variance than are the staff's. The community also tends to underestimate the staff's aims on the Evaluative dimension.

The fact that the community's aims vary more than the staff's aims has importance for goal-setting processes. Should the staff and the community come to a consensus on goals or objectives, there will be a greater feeling of non-consensus proportionately among individual community members than among staff. This suggests the need for some process to allow such persons either actual or
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perceived input into the goal-setting process.

The Community Age-range Subgroups

There is support for the findings that an age-related factor or factors affect the aims held by community members for community education.

The older-aged adults' aims are in agreement with the other groups' aims, and these adults accurately perceive the staff's aims. A perception of the total community's aims accurately perceives this group's aims, which is not surprising considering that they represent over 50% of the district population.

The younger-aged adults also agree with other groups as to community education aims and they perceive the staff's aims accurately. Their aims, however, are inaccurately predicted by the staff's perception of the total community. This suggests that the staff needs to consider them as a distinct subgroup.

The youth's aims are also in agreement with those of other groups. They inaccurately perceive the staff's aims, but are not aware of it since they, like the other age groups, hold aims that are congruous with their perception of the staff's aims. This finding illustrates the complexity of goal consensus: There is actual consensus between the staff's aims and the youth's aims. The youth misperceive the staff's aims but this does not result in a perceived disparity since the youth believe the staff's aims to be in consensus with their own.

Patterns in Group Responses

An understanding of the findings related to the groups can be
enhanced by observing the adjudged meanings of the concept when they are cast into a two-dimensional graph. Figure 1 and subsequent figures present this information. Figure 1 shows all the measured meanings. The possible range of dimension scores is 1-7 on each dimension. The graph omits semantic space not utilized by the groups in their consensus meanings. The reader is cautioned that the effect is to make disparities seem more significant than is supported by the analysis of the data. For reference purposes, the meanings are also shown in Figure 2, which includes the entire scale size.

A great advantage gained by using the semantic differential technique to investigate relationships among the aims of various groups is this ability to present findings in graphical format. Two findings of this study are plainly aided by such presentation. First, best seen in Figure 2, is the relatively small area of semantic space in which all the meanings exist. The general consensus among groups as to the aims for community education is quite evident.

Second, best seen in Figure 1, the meanings are clearly bounded on the upper and lower limits by the staff's meanings. Their own perception of the aims has the highest values and their perception of the community's aims, the lowest.

The observation and analysis of patterns in group responses has greatest potential for examining a single school district (or community), since the entire staff and advisory committee can be measured. Therefore, the disparities among the meanings adjudged by the advisory committee and the staff are not dependent upon tests of significance for interpretation.
Figure 1. Meanings of the concept as adjudged by the staff, advisory committee, total community, and community age groups.

Subscripts indicate the perceptual stance.

Groups are coded:

S Staff          O Older-aged adults
A Advisory committee  M Younger-aged adults
C Total community   Y Youth
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Figure 2. Relationship of the adjudged meanings of the concept to the full two-dimensional semantic space.
For the purpose of illustration of that potential, the following discussion assumes that the meanings held by the group populations are accurately represented by the dimension score sets given in Table 8. Since the analysis of the data in this study did not in most cases lead to acceptance of the hypotheses that there were disparities among the meanings, the discussion is presented not to draw conclusions for this study, but to illustrate the potential that such pattern analysis has for examining the relationships among aims or goals held by groups.

First, as was previously mentioned, the meanings are bounded on the upper and lower limits by the staff's meanings. At two points roughly on a line between the staff's meanings are the respective meanings as adjudged by the advisory committee. The other meaning of the advisory committee, their perception of the staff's aims is isolated from all other meanings.

Another isolated meaning is the youth's adjudgment of their own aims. While the other community groups all cluster in their own aims and cluster again in their perceptions of the staff's aims, the youth do not share that pattern.

Considering the community group clusters, it is interesting to note their respective "directions of perceived disparity" from each other. Perceived disparity is denoted by the line between a group's own meaning and their perception of another group. Figure 3 shows these lines. For example, the line $C_cC_s$ is the community's perceived disparity. The line of disparity from the own-opinion cluster to the perception-as-staff cluster shows an increase in Evaluative
Figure 3. Directions of perceived disparity: the disparity between each group's own aims and their respective perceptions of the aims of another group.

Subscripts indicate the perceptual stance. Groups are coded:

- S Staff
- A Advisory committee
- C Total community
- O Older-aged adults
- M Younger-aged adults
- Y Youth
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meaning commensurate to the decrease in Activity/Potency meaning. Furthermore, the direction of disparity is perpendicular to the like direction of disparity of the staff and advisory committee, which also is marked by roughly equal amounts of change in each dimension.

One interpretation for this is that the staff and advisory committee may feel that community education can both be good and worthwhile and be active and potent, while the community adults see the situation as being somewhat "either-or." That is, if the community wants activity, it must give up some worthwhileness, in their opinion. Whatever the interpretation, it is also interesting that the advisory committee's own aims seem to be at the intersection of these two directions of intra-group disparity.

A second possibility is that measurement scales interact with the stimuli to produce dimensions different than the ones used in this study as the measurement dimensions. This possibility will be considered in a later section.

Again considering the directions of perceived disparity, shown in Figure 3, ignoring for now the youth age group and considering only the adults in the community and school groups, another interesting relationship emerges. As noted previously, the direction of perceived disparity of the community groups is perpendicular very nearly to the direction of disparity of the school groups as the later groups perceive the community. Of interest now is the direction of the advisory committee's perceived disparity with the staff. That line of disparity is clearly the vertical (i.e., pure Activity/Potency) bisector of the other directions of perceived disparity.
The direction of disparity shows how the advisory committee perceives the staff's aims relative to its own aims. Similarly, the adult age groups' directions of perceived disparity show how they perceive the staff's aims relative to their own aims. It is seen that the advisory committee's perception of the staff's aims is directed more accurately than are the perceptions stated by the other community adults. This suggests that the advisory committee has been influenced by the staff in such a way that it is better able to perceive the staff's aims than are the rest of the community adults.

Another aspect of pattern analysis is to observe the types of disparity present. These types originate from errors in perceiving consensus or disparity accurately. Consideration of errors of perception will aid the graphical presentation of types of disparity.

Types of Errors of Perception

Wilder, et al. (1968), in the study reviewed in Chapter II, proposed that there are two possible errors of perception of consensus and disparity for any two groups: (a) disparity is perceived when, in actuality, there is consensus, and (b) consensus is perceived when, in actuality, there is disparity. The first error type has been termed Type I error in this study, and the second termed Type II error.

Since all groups were in consensus regarding the aims for community education, there was only opportunity to observe Type I error. The 15 possible combinations of any two groups allowed potentially for 30 observations of error, one for each combination from each group's viewpoint. Of those 30, seven were investigated \( (H_7 - H_{13}) \).
In those seven observations there was one error observed—the staff's perception that there was disparity between its aims and the community's aims.

Two other null hypotheses were rejected, however, leading to the conclusion that there are other forms of errors in perceiving consensus and disparity. The two perceived disparities were between (a) the staff's aims and the youth age-group's perception of the staff's aims, $H_{18}$, and (b) the younger-aged adults' aims and the staff's perceptions of those aims (as estimated by the staff's perception of the total community's aims), $H_{23}$.

The general format of these disparities is disparity between a group's actual aims and another group's perception of those aims. This study observed 10 possibilities for such errors, $H_{14} - H_{18}$ and $H_{20} - H_{24}$.

This type of error does not contribute to perceived congruence or disparity, nor does it contribute to actual congruence or disparity. To contribute to perceived congruence or disparity, a disparity must be between the aims of a certain group and that same group's perception of another group's aims. To contribute to actual congruence or disparity, a disparity must be between the actual aims of groups. The general format of the found disparities in $H_{18}$ and $H_{23}$ do not meet either of these qualifications.

What has been found, then, is the potential for a type of error of perception not considered in the studies found in the literature. The relevance of this type of error is that it constitutes a major component of what shall be termed "disparity forms."
The concept of disparity forms emerged from studying the patterns of responses. The disparity form is a graphical display of the disparity present in a system of groups. Consider any two groups to be a system. The total disparity can be analyzed into three components: Total disparity $\Delta_t$ is the sum of the actual disparity $\Delta_a$ plus the disparity perceived by one group $\Delta_{p1}$, the disparity perceived by the second group $\Delta_{p2}$.

$$\Delta_t = \Delta_a + \Delta_{p1} + \Delta_{p2}$$

This study contains one complete disparity form—the disparity form of the staff and total community. It can be stated that the actual disparity in the staff-community system is the line $C_cS_s$, the disparity between the aims of the staff and the community. Table 9 showed this disparity to be .42.

It can now be seen that the disparity $\Delta$ referred to in Equation 1 of Chapter III is that part of the total disparity $\Delta_t$ which is now referred to as $\Delta_a$. Symbolically,

$$\Delta_a = C_cS_s = .42$$

When the dimension scores of any two meanings are known, the disparity between them can be calculated by the Pythagorean Theorem:

$$c = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$$

Where $c$ is the disparity, $a$ is the distance between the meanings of the concepts measured on one dimension, and $b$ is the distance between the meanings of the concept measured on the other dimension.
The total disparity $\Delta_t$ in the staff-community disparity form is:

$$\Delta_t = \Delta_a + \Delta_{p1} + \Delta_{p2} = C_s C_s + C_s C_s + S_s S_s = .42 + .12 + 1.00 = 1.54$$

(6)

In Figure 4 the component disparities of the disparity of the disparity form are indicated by solid lines. The perimeter of the form is the quadrilateral polygon $S_c C_c C_s S_s$ (see Figure 5).

From a theoretical viewpoint, the formula derived for total disparity (equation 3) is actually incomplete. There are actually two other types of disparity in the system. Line $S_c C_c$ is the disparity between the community's aims and the staff's perception of those aims. Line $S_s C_s$ is the disparity between the staff's aims and the community's perception of those aims. These disparities are not actual "events" operating in the system since neither group is aware of both points in either line. When discussing the effective disparities in the system, these two additional components can be ignored. But they do have a part to play in theory because of their role in forming the disparity system's geometrical form.

This disparity form, i.e., the polygon $S_c C_c C_s S_s$, contains in its area the total space of the disparity in the system. Arbitrarily setting the area equal to one, it is then possible to calculate the percentage decrease in system total disparity that would result from a decrease in any of the component disparities.

By visualizing the disparity in meanings in this manner, it becomes plain that the greatest contributor to disparity in this system is the staff's misperception of the community's aims for...
Figure 4. Component disparities of the staff-community disparity form.

\[ \Delta_a \] Actual disparity

\[ \Delta_{p1} \] Community perceived disparity

\[ \Delta_{p2} \] Staff perceived disparity
Figure 5. Staff-community disparity form.

\[ \Delta_a \quad \text{Actual disparity} \]
\[ \Delta_{p1} \quad \text{Community perceived disparity} \]
\[ \Delta_{p2} \quad \text{Staff perceived disparity} \]
\[ \Delta_c \quad \text{Community aims disparity} \]
\[ \Delta_s \quad \text{Staff aims disparity} \]
community education. But note that this is not due to the quantity of that disparity alone, but is a function both of the quantity and the direction relative to the meaning held by the community and its perception of the staff's aims. The effect of perceived disparity on the total disparity is determined by its quantity and direction relative to all meanings in the system.

Discussion of the area in the disparity form space is, as mentioned, of theoretical use. For practical use, the formula of equation 3

\[ \Delta_t = \Delta_a + \Delta_{p1} + \Delta_{p2} \]  

(3)

is sufficient to provide the framework for reducing disparities. Disparity can be reduced by intervening to change the loci of meaning points \( S_s, C_c, S_c \) or \( C_s \). But determining which meanings should be changed involves referring to a distinction of affective forces in the system. Actual disparity is real and does exist in the form under study. (Recall, however, that the results of this particular study showed it to be only tending toward significance.) But perceived disparity is the affective force. The disparity form shows that there are two independent sources of perceived disparity, \( S_s C_c \) and \( C_c C_s \). To reduce the disparity perceived by the staff, change must be made of either the staff's aims or its perceptions of the community's aims. Neither change will affect the disparity perceived by the community. To reduce the disparity perceived by the community, change must be made of either the community's aims or its perception of the staff's aims. Neither of these will affect the disparity.
perceived by the staff.

In summary of this section, to fully study aims and goals, the community educator must identify the system to be studied and then measure all the pertinent perceptual stances of all groups in the chosen system. The disparity form permits optimum use of the results of these measures. This study has been a model for such an investigation.

The Factor Analysis of the Measurement Scales

It was suggested in a previous section that the measurement scales and stimuli used in this study may have interacted to produce different dimensions than were used in the measurement of meaning and disparity. As was discussed briefly in Chapter IV, the scales were subjected to factor analyses by perceptual stance. One set of analyses was done on the community sample only; the other set was performed on the data for the combined groups--staff, advisory committee and total community.

Two factors were retained. Systematically deleting the least-loaded scales one at a time and reanalyzing, led to two factors of well-loaded scales when respondents were giving their own opinions of the aims for community education. Both sets of analyses yielded identical results with almost no difference ($+ .02$) in factor loadings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>valuable</th>
<th>.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>active</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis is significant since four community education experts have agreed that the factors seem to represent the "process" aspect (Factor I) and the "program" aspect (Factor II) of community education. If that is a valid interpretation, reanalysis of this study's data would be in order, since those factors are in agreement with the program and process goal dichotomy found by Weaver (1972), DeLargy (1973), and Langs (1974). If that dichotomy is now found among lay persons as well as community educators, the implications could be vast.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of the data analysis, certain conclusions can be readily made regarding the aims for community education in districts similar to the one studied.

1. There is no disparity in the aims for community education pursued by the community education administrative staff, the district-wide advisory committee, and the total community. The staff, however, does perceive that a disparity exists.

2. The community members' aims for community education vary more about the consensus of the community than the staff members' aims vary about the staff consensus.

3. The advisory committee in the district is an accurate, representative, mediational force as it represents the community to the staff and as it represents the staff to the community.

4. The advisory committee accurately perceives that there is no disparity among the aims for the community education of the community, the staff, and themselves.
5. Although no age-range subgroup has aims for community education which are distinct from the aims of the other groups studied, including the staff and advisory committee, there is an age-related factor which causes perceived disparity to exist between certain age groups and the staff.

6. There are two identified directions of perceived disparity suggested by pattern analysis. The community's perceived disparity from the staff, in relation to their own aims, is toward increased program "activity and potency" and toward less "goodness and worthwhileness." The staff's and advisory committee's perceived disparity from the community, in relation to their own aims, is toward less "activity and potency" and less "goodness and worthwhileness."

Implications of the Study

The implications of the study fall into three general categories: (a) implications for community education in general, (b) implications for the school district studied, and (c) implications for further research.

Implications for Community Education

The first implication for community education is that to understand fully the goals or aims for community education held by the community, by the advisory committee, and by the professional staff, in relationship to each other, perceptions must be gathered from all relevant perceptual stances—each group perceiving as itself and as each of the other pertinent groups.

A second implication for community educators stems from the fact that agreement upon identified goals does not mean that the underlying
aims are congruous with the stated goals. This study has developed
a means of studying those underlying aims. The method is feasible
for field work and permits direct analysis.

A third implication is that the methodology can be used to
study the effect of the community education process. Periodic study
of reference groups in the community can indicate the success of the
staff in reducing disparities.

Fourth, the methodology can be used to study the representative­
ness of advisory committees, both as they represent the community to
the staff and as they represent the staff to the community. Because
of the current emphasis on advisory committees in education today
this implication bears further detail. As mentioned, there are two
ways in which an advisory committee can be said to be representative:
(a) representative of the community to the staff, and (b) representa­
tive of the staff to the community.

The ideal advisory committee would be representative both ways.
But how does the community educator know whether or not the advisory
committee is representative? Usually an attempt is made to form a
committee of community members which yields a cross-section of
geographic areas, ages, socio-economic strata, etc. Another method
is to form a committee of recognized community leaders. Neither of
these techniques permits any guarantee that the committee formed is,
in fact, representative of the community except on those factors
alone. Moreover, there is no way of knowing by the selection process
if the committee is representative of the staff.

The methodology of this study permits determination of an
advisory committee's representativeness directly upon the basis of
the community's and the staff's ideals for community education. It
also permits easy re-examination of the committee as necessitated by
changing membership.

Fifth, the data in this study were gathered by means of asking
only one primary question, "What should the aims for community educa-
tion be?" The realm of results is vastly increased by adding one
more question, "What do you think of community education in ______
as it is now?" Both questions, of course, need to be answered from
all pertinent perceptual stances. This was done in the Lakewood
needs assessment survey. The results are now being analysed.

Implications for the Lakewood School District

Certainly the fact that no actual disparity was found among the
aims for community education is satisfying to a community. So is the
finding that the advisory committee is representative. Generally,
the implication for Lakewood's staff is that it should move with
assurance that the community shares with it aims that are indicative
of concern not only for programs that are beneficial in the short
term, but also those that are valuable and worthwhile--programs that
have benefit beyond the actual participation time limits. A second
finding with implications for the school district is that the staff
vary less in their adjudged aims than does the community. As dis-
cussed in previous sections, this means that views disparate from the
community consensus will be more widespread than might be anticipated
by the staff.

One implication of that finding is that if a subgroup of the
community held aims which were not congruent with those of other community groups and were not given opportunity to have either actual or perceived input into the community education processes, especially the goal-setting process, that subgroup might well feel alienated from the community education program. This could cause latent conflict to build within the community.

A second implication is that if such a subgroup were to be politically active and powerful, the staff might make concessions to the subgroup which would have adverse effects for pursuing the consensus community aims. Moreover, there may be some opposing countervailing group which would then be alienated.

The methodology of this study has implications for addressing the problem of alienated subgroups. If it is suspected that a subgroup is alienated from the rest of the community, the instrument might be administered to that group. If it were a demographic subgroup, a reanalysis of the data to determine the aims of the group would likely be possible.

One other implication deals with methodology. If a community, in this case a school district, uses the methodology described in this study, it is not necessary to test each hypothesis as was done for inferential purposes in this study. Since the staff and advisory committee studied were represented by all their respective members, the exact mean dimension scores and meanings of the concept to those groups are accurate representations. The community and its subgroups were, of course, sampled. To determine if disparities exist within the specific community, a confidence interval could be
constructed around the sample consensus. If the staff and advisory committee consensuses fall beyond that confidence interval they are different. This modification results in a presentation that for most people would be more clear and meaningful, since it could be clearly presented graphically.

Implications for Further Research

The semantic differential technique is a good alternative for researchers who anticipate the common problem of "I don't have any idea." responses from community members. Of the 186 respondents to the overall needs assessment survey, only 10, less than 6%, failed to answer the semantic differential questions. Solicitation of opinion on other questions in the survey was far less successful. Another benefit is the large amount of data gathered. 3720 responses were gathered, 20 per respondent. The total time necessary to introduce the survey, select the respondent, gather demographic information, explain the semantic differential technique, and complete the semantic differential questions was about 15 minutes per interview.

Further research using this technique that is recommended includes:

1. A study to determine the relationship between semantic differential judgments and statement aims or goals.

2. Replication of this study in a variety of community education settings.

3. Investigation by factor analysis to test the dimensions used in this study, the standard three dimensional format (Evaluative, Activity and Potency), and the "process" and "program" factors which were suggested by this study.
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APPENDIX A

Criteria for the Final Selection of Word Pairs
for the Measurement Instrument Scales
Criteria for the Selection of Word Pairs
for the Measurement Instrument Scales

1. People generally know what each word means in its adjective form.

2. The paired words are truly opposite in meaning.

3. When used as an adjective, each word in the pair has only one opposite meaning. Further, that opposite meaning is expressed by the other word in the pair.

4. When paired with the other word in the pair, each word has only one meaning.

5. The paired words, taken together, are meaningful when applied to the question, "What should the aims for community education be?"

6. Each word has only one meaning as paired and applied to the question, "What should the aims for community education be?"

7. Both words could not, at the same time, "be felt" or "thought to hold true" when applied to the question, "What should the aims for community education be?" For example, a person might express feeling "happy" and "sad" at the same time.

8. The words do not have a specific meaning to some community group, that is not shared generally in a community. Especially, the words do not have a special or specific meaning to these designated community groups:
   --persons aged 41 years and older --the community education staff
   --persons aged 18-40 years
   --persons aged 14-17 years --the community education advisory committee
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APPENDIX B

"Own opinion" form of the semantic differential question

"Perception of the community's opinion" form of the semantic differential question

"Perception of the staff's opinion" form of the semantic differential question
7. We want to know your opinion on this question. Using the following words, indicate:

WHAT SHOULD THE AIMS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION BE?

extremely-quite-slightly-equally-slightly-quite-extremely

good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____bad

still _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____lively

worth-less _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____valuable

active _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____passive

fair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____unfair

unpleas- _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____pleasant

ant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____

strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____weak

popular _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____unpop-

ular

large _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____small

ours _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____theirs
8. Now, what do you think is the opinion of the total community? Respond to each pair of words in the way you think the community as a whole would answer.

**WHAT SHOULD THE AIMS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION BE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Equally</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. Now, what do you think is the opinion of the Community Education Department? Respond to each pair of words in the way you think the Lakewood Community Education Department members would answer.

**WHAT SHOULD THE AIMS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION BE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>equally</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX C

Notes to the Interviewer

Instructions for Interviewers
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Notes to the Interviewer

This survey is organized so that you are allowed two "call-backs" to complete each interview. That means there will be no less than, and no more than, three attempts to complete each interview. This is a very important part of the survey technique being used.

Remember, your first contact with the household must never be by telephone. The first contact must be made in person at the household. This prevents comments being made which would prejudice the responses given later.

If the respondent you need is not at home, make an appointment to interview him/her, or arrange to call by telephone to make an appointment. Always keep that appointment! If there is some emergency, call the Community Education Department and explain the problem. We will try to cover the interview for you.

There will be some households where we do not complete an interview even with three attempts. In this case, it will be important to know two things about the household:

1. How many people, 14 years or older, are living in the household?

2. How many of those people are male?

If you cannot complete an interview after the third attempt, and have not been able to get that information, please try to get it from a neighboring household. Record how you got the information.

Everytime you see capitalized words on the questionnaire, it means that those are directions for you to follow. Take your time...
to do as the directions say; they will make your task easier.

The rest of the words on the questionnaire are the questions that you ask. **Ask the questions exactly as they are worded on the questionnaire.** Record the responses just as they are given.

If you have any questions or run into a problem, contact the Community Education Department office and we will advise you.
Instructions for Interviewers

Before the interview

1. Study all questions until you know what they mean and are familiar enough with them so you can really ask the questions instead of reading them.

2. Interview yourself by answering each question thoughtfully.

3. Re-read your instructions between interviews. You may pick up hints that you missed before or correct errors that you have begun to make.

4. Approach the interview pleasurably and let the respondents enjoy it too. Assume that they want to express their opinions and want to be interviewed. You are giving them the chance to express their opinions on matters that may be important to them.

At the interview

1. Never take a friend or anyone else along to the door when you are interviewing. Respondents will be more inhibited in the presence of "extra persons."

2. Interview only at the households assigned to you. No substitutes. Interview only the proper person at the household. No substitutes.

3. Never allow anyone other than the designated respondent to answer your question. If other persons are present, gently instruct them not to interrupt.

4. Don't, please, unnecessarily reveal personal information about yourself or your job. It is unsafe for you and also causes errors in the responses.
What you should say if a respondent...

...wonders why he/she is being interviewed, or suggests interviewing someone else:

You were selected completely by chance according to procedures worked out. So your opinions are important and interviewing someone else wouldn't be as good.

...insists he/she is too busy:

What would be a better time for me to come back? I'll note down an appointment that would be more convenient for you.

...says he/she doesn't know enough to give good answers:

In this survey, it's not what you know that counts. Rather it's what you happen to think about various topics that is important.

...is afraid to answer some questions or wants to know what will be done with the answers:

Well... many people are being asked these same questions, and what you say is confidential. We are interested in these questions only to see what a lot of people in the Lakewood School District generally are thinking about.

...refuses to answer a question:

Of course you don't have to answer any question you'd prefer not to. I'm only trying to get your opinion because the study is more accurate that way.

(If the respondent still refuses, mark the question "REFUSED" while going quickly on to the next question. Don't comment further.)
Recording the responses

1. Remember, as an interviewer, your task is to soak up information like a sponge without changing it or giving any back. The task is to record information.

2. Don't—by word, action, or gesture—indicate surprise, pleasure, or approval at any answer. Even a slight reaction will be noticed and the rest of the responses will be prejudiced by that reaction.

3. Don't attempt to influence responses in any way. What the respondent thinks or feels about the questions is what is wanted.

4. Never suggest an answer except where the instructions say, "Are there any others?"

5. If the respondent doesn't understand a question, repeat it exactly as written rather than explain it. Otherwise, you are sure to give away the answer you expect or the answer you want. Repeat the question only twice, then go on if the person still does not understand it.

6. If the respondent objects to a question, you are allowed to side with him/her only to the extent that you say (with a smile), "I don't know why, but that's the way the office said the question had to be worded."

7. Always read the questions just as they are written.

8. Always ask all of the questions.

9. Always ask questions in the order that they appear.

10. Record comments accurately. Try to get the exact wording used.
APPENDIX D

Letter of Introduction
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March 6, 1978

Dear Community Member,

Lakewood Community Education, during a three week period beginning March 10 and ending March 30, will be conducting a needs assessment survey.

The survey includes two hundred and forty randomly selected households within the Lakewood school district. The interviewer will come to your home and by a scheduled chart determine which member of your household, 14 years of age or older, to interview. This method of selecting who is to be interviewed is also done by a random selection method.

It is our hope that you will give the interviewer the time necessary to respond to the question.

The purpose of this survey is to assess the general attitude of the community regarding the services offered and the areas to be considered by the Lakewood Community Education Advisory Council and Community Education Staff.

Each person’s responses will be kept strictly confidential. No names will be mentioned in the report, nor the source of any information be revealed. The summary only of the comments of the two hundred and forty people will be compiled and made available through the school newsletter. You personally can have the full report if you let the interviewer know before leaving your home. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Neil De Jongh
President
Lakewood Board of Education

William Eckstrom
Superintendent
Lakewood Public Schools

Helping the community to become the best it is capable of becoming
APPENDIX E

Part A and Preliminary Material of Survey Questionnaire
Hello: My name is _______. I'm an interviewer for the Lakewood Community Education Community Needs Assessment. We are conducting a community needs assessment that will provide us with information for future planning. I would like to come in and conduct an interview in your home. The information is extremely important to us and all answers will be kept confidential.

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: MAKE YOURSELF, AND THE PERSON TO WHOM YOU ARE SPEAKING, AS COMFORTABLE AS POSSIBLE. TURN TO THE PERSON TO INTERVIEW GUIDE ON THE NEXT PAGE AND MAKE SURE YOU CAN BOTH SEE IT. BEGIN INTERVIEW.

IMPORTANT: INFORM INTERVIEWEES THAT THE PAGE CONTAINING THEIR NAME AND ADDRESS WILL BE DESTROYED AS SOON AS THE INTERVIEW IS CHECKED BY A WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR. NO OTHER PERSONS WILL KNOW WHO COMPLETED THE INTERVIEW.
1. How many people, 14 years or older, are living in your household? RECORD RESPONSE: _____

2. How many of these are male? RECORD RESPONSE: _____

DRAW A LINE DOWN THE COLUMN FOR THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE, 14 YEARS AND OLDER, LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD. DRAW A LINE ACROSS THE ROW FOR THE NUMBER OF MALES. INTERVIEW THE PERSON IN THE BOX WHERE THE LINES MEET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF MALES AGES 14 AND OVER</th>
<th>0 males</th>
<th>1 male</th>
<th>2 males</th>
<th>3 males</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the person</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>younger male</td>
<td>oldest male</td>
<td>youngest male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>older female</td>
<td></td>
<td>younger female</td>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAY: According to the survey method, I must interview the (younger female, etc.). Would that be you?  
OR  
Would you please call him/her?

IF THE PERSON TO INTERVIEW IS NOT AVAILABLE, SET UP AN APPOINTMENT:

**1st CALL-BACK APPOINTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>TO SPEAK WITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2nd CALL-BACK APPOINTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>TO SPEAK WITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hello: My name is _______. I'm an interviewer for the Lakewood Community Education Community Needs Assessment. We are conducting a community needs assessment that will provide us with information for future planning. I would like to ask you a number of questions. The information is extremely important to us and all answers will be kept confidential.

The interview is divided in two parts, A and B.

Part A

Section I

3. Which letter corresponds to your age group?
   A. 14 to 17 years   E. 41 to 50 years
   B. 18 to 25 years   F. 51 to 60 years
   C. 26 to 30 years   G. 61 years and over
   D. 31 to 40 years
   
   Circle one letter

4. Which letter and which number best describe your present position?
   A. Married
   B. Single, widowed, separated, divorced
   C. 1. Student
   D. 2. Homemaker
   E. 3. Employed
   F. 4. Unemployed or between employment
   G. 5. Retired, looking for employment
   H. 6. Retired, not looking for employment
   
   Circle one letter and one number
Section II

This section contains 3 questions that will help us understand some of the ideas the community has about Community Education. The questions are answered differently than you are used to, so we will do an example together. Each of the 3 questions is followed by pairs of words. You will answer by placing an "X" in the space where it shows how the words best describe your ideas about Community Education. Look carefully at how the example was done:

WHAT IS THIS WINTER LIKE?

extremely-quite-slightly-equally-slightly-quite-extremely

cold _____: X:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ hot
snowy X:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ not snowy
long ______:_____: X:______:_____:_____ short
fun ______:_____:_____:_____: X:______:_____ not fun

The question was answered that this Winter is: quite cold
extremely snowy
equally long and short
slightly not fun

When you answer the questions, think about both words in the pairs. Don't skip any lines. Mark each pair of words, but don't take too much time puzzling over them--just react to the words. Notice that the "X" is made in the middle of the space, not on the boundaries--

this way not this way
_____: X:_____:_____ X:______:_____

Are you ready to do the next 3 questions ON YOUR OWN, or would you like to go over the example again?
6. We want to know your opinion on this question. Using the following words, indicate:

WHAT SHOULD THE AIMS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION BE?

extremely—quite—slightly—equally—slightly—quite—extremely

good ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ bad

still ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ lively

worthless ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ valuable

active ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ passive

fair ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ unfair

unpleasant ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ pleasant

strong ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ weak

popular ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ unpopular

large ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ small

ours ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ theirs
7. Now, what do you think is the opinion of the Community Education Department? Respond to each pair of words in the way you think the Lakewood Community Education Department members would answer.

WHAT SHOULD THE AIMS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION BE?

extremely-quite-slightly-equally-slightly-quite-extremely

good ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ bad
still ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ lively
worthless ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ valuable
active ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ passive
fair ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ unfair
unpleasant ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ pleasant
strong ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ weak
popular ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ unpopular
large ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ small
our ______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ theirs