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CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes of superintendents about a philosophy of community education in school districts that had community education programs, with the attitudes of superintendents toward a community education philosophy in school districts that did not have community education programs, in the state of Michigan.

Kelly (1975), reporting on the factors necessary to implement the community education concept into a local school district, concluded that an understanding and support for a philosophy by the superintendent was an essential factor.

Having a philosophy of community education seems vital for modern day superintendents, as Lewis et al. (1972) reflected. The school administrator of today is faced with problems of such magnitude and diversity as to stagger the imagination. They suggested that assaults on the staid, traditional school have all but insured to future generations that the traditional concept of the public school is a vestige of the past.

Previously, Griffiths (1966, p. 81) seemed to concur with the above authors regarding change that was warranted in public education and the superintendency when he suggested:
There is little reason to doubt that the future of the school superintendency will change in the future. The position has been undergoing gradual change ever since it was first instituted and, as with all social institutions, forces from within itself and society at large tend to move the superintendency in new directions. The future of the superintendency is tied to changes in public education itself.

Another basic reason modern superintendents should have a philosophy of community education Knezevich (1975) noted, was that while there is general agreement among educators that the board of education sets school policy, it is the superintendent who provides the professional leadership for recommending the type of educational programs that exist in the schools.

It seems that McKean and Mills (1964) established a sound reasoning why school districts should have an educational program that is relevant to the needs of the society it serves. This seemed clear when they pointed out that without students there would be no need for administrators; indeed, there would be no need for schools.

Crews (1975) suggested the urgent need for superintendents to accept a community education philosophy because he visualized the concept as having the greatest educational potential to meet the human needs of the times. He also believed that certain conditions had to exist if community education were to become a reality in a given school district. Crews (1975, p. 45) implied that the key to making this concept feasible was that "the superintendent must be sold on the concept initially. Unless this happens, it is almost impossible in my opinion, to see community education become a reality."
The opinion of Crews relative to the importance of understanding and furthering community education concepts had been supported earlier by Davis (1973, p. 16), who wrote: "The community school, as a latter (sic) development in the total structure not only is less out of date, but may well be providing the vanguard for the future." As superintendents of school districts, Crews and Davis appear to recognize the importance of community education and seem to realize that they are in a position to either endorse or reject implementation of the concept into the overall educational structure.

The endorsement or rejection of a community education philosophy by superintendents is occurring at present in the state of Michigan as well as in other school districts throughout the nation. In Michigan alone, 263 school districts appear to have ongoing community education programs, while another 337 school districts do not. Could the reason for this contrast in educational ideology be caused by a philosophical difference in the attitudes among Michigan's superintendents toward the community education concept?

Need for the Study

Little educational research exists which would explain why some superintendents advocate involvement in community education programs and processes while others reject the concept. In reviewing existing studies about community education in Michigan, this researcher could find no study which would explain attitudinal differences among Michigan superintendents relative to community education. The present study then focused on the matter of
attitudinal differences of Michigan school superintendents to discover if, in fact, philosophical differences did exist between those chief administrators with, and those without, community education programs.

In recent years, it seems that educators specializing in the field of community education have been faced with many practical and theoretical concerns of this nature. The universal confusion appears to stem primarily from the fact that there seems to be a lack of meaningful research available in the field of community education. Perhaps this situation is due in part because of the relative newness of the community education movement.

However, VanVoorhees (1972, p. 203) poses the question "Why this dearth of research?" He continued to give an explanation for his question: "For one thing, community education practitioners are typically, young, action oriented, and suspicious of research and researchers. The suspicion is not without some justification."

VanVoorhees continued to point out that community education research "done by outsiders is generally unreadable or unobtainable" and concluded by saying it "behooves the community educator to carry out his own research."

It appears that some educators have believed that the concept was a mere step-child, an added frill or a stop-gap experiment to be used during a current crisis, then dropped, rather than as a viable educational ideology. As Kerensky (1972, p. 158) stated, to "treat the concept as a first-aid package for an institution that is in need of dramatic and intensive care diminishes its
viability." Perhaps, in a small way that negative attitude displayed by some educators may explain a portion of the suspicions and reluctance some community educators have attained toward educational research and researchers. Yet, it is this very lack of a solid research base which seems to have been frustrating for those educators who have attempted to facilitate the growth and development of the community education movement.

Other writers have agreed with VanVoorhees on the shortage of research in community education. Decker (1972) also concluded that very little research has been done on the subject of community education. Weaver and Seay (1974) elaborated further by pointing out that there was a comparative absence of theory development. But, it seems that the role of the superintendent hasn't escaped the scrutiny of being tested by critical research either. Griffiths (1966) suggested that with improved research, indications are that changes in the superintendence will be necessary and apparent in the coming years to meet the demands of all of the citizens.

Minzey (1975) seems to have explained the importance of active leadership in the community education movement while pointing out the differences between school districts that have community education and those that do not. He suggested that all communities have all of the dimensions of community education in their communities to some degree. However, the major difference between a district having community education as opposed to not being in the mainstream of the movement, according to Minzey (1975, p. 9), is that the administrators of a "school district must first be willing to
accept responsibility for all dimensions of Community Education."
Minzey then concluded by stating that: "Administrators do not pro-
vide all programs or services to the community, but they do agree
that they will provide the leadership necessary to coordinate,
encourage and sometimes initiate the various aspects of Community
Education."

The earlier work by Griffiths (1966, p. 69) seemed to be con-
sistent with Minzey's view of the responsibility of the superintendent
in relation to the community education movement when Griffiths said,
the "administrator must try to build into his organization provisions
for innovation, for change, and for development." Griffiths (1966,
p. 72) elaborated further when he stated:

Once the superintendent considered his task as the in-
school education of children; now he views the task of
education more broadly--as embracing a great variety
of in and out-of-school activities for people of all
ages. The superintendent sees the whole educational
program and its relation to the school district as a
whole.

After acknowledging the lack of research in community education,
this researcher continued by adopting the theory of Ary et al. (1972)
on educational research. The view of research taken by Ary et al.
(1972, p. iii) seemed reasonable when they depicted it as, "research
in education, as in other fields, is a search for knowledge. It is
not a search that yields infallible truth but rather a search that
throws new light on questions that concern educators." With this in
mind, it appears that community educators can begin not only to de-
fine the concept, but highlight the procedures needed to implement it.
Weaver and Seay (1974) explain that the deterrents to research are plentiful in most areas of complex social interaction, and the community education movement has often been beset by such factors. They listed three prominent factors, and explained them, which have helped to thwart community education research. In summary, Weaver and Seay (1974, pp. 389-392) pointed out the three basic factors as:

1. In their efforts to be practical, community educators have often rejected opportunities to contribute significantly to knowledge in the field.

2. Contributing to the lack of research in the field of community education is the comparative absence of theory development.

3. Colleges and universities have contributed relatively little in the way of substantive data based upon systematic study in the field of community education.

Responding to these indictments, it seems appropriate for community educators to search for added knowledge in the field by utilizing sound research techniques. As Ary et al. (1972) advised about educational research, new knowledge should lend additional insights into educational concerns. This seems to be of vital import to community educators who appear to have been somewhat negligent in doing research in the field. Also, it then seems that the nature of this study has a bearing on furthering the needed insights of community educators and administrators seeking to implement the concept into a greater number of school districts.

According to the recommendations of the American Association of School Administrators (1963, pp. 11-12), the progressive superintendent must:
1. Have a deep devotion to the human values which are at the very heart of America's purpose and upon which her destiny rests, and an understanding of the galaxy of relationships and ethical beliefs upon which those values and ethical principles are based.

2. Understand the American public—what it is, what it wants, how it is organized, how it can make itself felt, and who leads it.

3. Possess creative, imaginative, and realistic competence in sensing society's evolutionary and emerging aspirations and needs.

4. Comprehend the educational needs of adults as well as the educational needs of children and youth.

5. Have the vision, courage, and patience needed to plan wisely for the future.

Totten and Manley (1970) suggested that the expression community education could not be defined in specific terms, nor could it be given a dictionary kind of definition. They envisioned the concept of community education as a way of life. Totten and Manley (1970, p. 1) suggested further that when fully understood and implemented: "community education becomes the process by which human beings learn how to solve their individual problems as well as the social problems of the communities in which they live." However, for reader clarification, Seay's (1974) definition of community education could prove to be beneficial. Seay (1974, p. 11) defined community education as "the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people—all of the people—of a community."

It appears that Seay's (1974) definition of community education raises several questions for which community educators should seek answers. For instance, if the concept of community education has the
potential for reaching all of the people as implied in Seay's definition, why then isn't the philosophy embraced by all of the superintendents in each of the nation's school districts? Why does it appear to be a fact that in the state of Michigan some superintendents endorse the community education concept while others reject it? It seems that this diversification of educational ideology does illustrate that superintendents do, in fact, have different philosophical attitudes toward the concept of community education. Questions of this nature appear relevant to the future direction of the community education movement, and answers for them should be sought through a methodical approach of educational research.

Importance of the Study

The concept and eventual implementation of community education seems to have become increasingly more acceptable as an educational practice within school districts throughout the United States. During the early 1960's, a relatively insignificant number of school districts appeared to have embraced the concept. Following this period, it seems that community education began to take on the posture of a movement and it appeared to experience a rapid expansion. According to a report from the Mott Foundation (1973), 528 school districts were in the process of operating under the community education concept. The Mott Foundation's report also included future projections which predicted that by 1977 an additional 2,000 community school districts would be operable across the country.
However, as Minzey (1975) noted, supporters and detractors of the concept emphasize that there is a vast difference between the philosophical claims of community education and the actual programs which are in operation. Minzey (1975, p. 1) was more emphatic when he stated:

More specifically they acknowledge that much of what is called Community Education is, in reality, programs in adult education or recreation, and as such, are neither unique nor capable of accomplishing all that community educators claim can be accomplished by means of the community education concept.

Minzey (1975, p. 1) clarified his position when he pointed out that community education "did not begin at the age that it now exists. It is an idea which has evolved over the years and has only recently taken on the aura of a philosophy of education."

The community education movement received further impetus on July 1, 1975 with the passage of federal legislation providing for legal and financial support for the concept. However, as the growth and development of the concept continues, it seems that little is clear as to the mechanics required to set it in motion. Granted, the concept is growing, as witness the Mott Foundation (1973) report and future projections, but it is difficult to ascertain through related studies how or why the process occurs. It seems that what may be taken for granted today by community educators may not in reality be successful in the future to maintain growth and development of the movement without continued research to support it.

Additional community education research was viewed as imperative by Owik, King, and VanVoorhees (1975) for the survival and growth of
community education when they suggested that the movement depended upon sophisticated and unbiased research. The research team of Cwik et al. (1975, p. ii) suggested that if "community education is to aid in healing society's wounds, then, it must first be thoroughly tested. Intense scrutiny is necessary to see, if in fact, community education does everything or anything it claims to do." In essence they have challenged community educators to investigate every avenue which is researchable within the field to determine the actual need by superintendents to endorse or reject the community education philosophy. However, it seems reasonable to assume that prior to either testing or researching community education programs, they first must be in existence.

It was the primary concern of this study to determine the most appropriate course of action in which to make the existence of community education a reality in the state of Michigan.

On a futuristic note, Weaver (1972, p. 3) pointed out that the "community educator must sell a program to the community." Automatically it seems, Weaver's proclamation might stir questions in the minds of community educators such as, sell the program to whom? What person or group of people should receive an initial approach from community educators? VanVoorhees (1972, p. 203) suggests that in dealing with the initial step for implementation that most "community education is introduced to local citizens by the school's principal officer, the superintendent."

By referring to the important position of superintendent, VanVoorhees (1972) seemed to be suggesting more than a hit or miss
proposition for selling the community education concept. It appears that VanVoorhees was advocating that a strategy be used for initiating the concept into a school district. The idea of a strategy being utilized is supported by Carrillo and Heaton (1972, p. 165) when they suggested that it "is important that some developmental process be followed so that community education is established as a way of life and not just an experimental program." This strategic direction seems reasonable in light of Campbell et al. (1971, p. 260) when they pointed out that the "superintendent of schools accepts final responsibility for the operation of the schools."

Griffiths (1966, p. 103) seemed to solidify this approach when he said, "the essence of leadership is innovation. The superintendent who understands the issues of the day will not change for the sake of change, but he will introduce new ideas as they are generated if they meet the needs of the school system." Certainly it seems that professional educators should realize that change for the sake of change is neither creative nor productive, and, in most cases only causes further strain on the maintenance of a meaningful educational system. But, changing from a limited, traditional school curriculum to acceptance of a community education philosophy seems to be a progressive step in development and might be presented to superintendents in that light.

It appears that some superintendents in Michigan must view the community education philosophy as relevant and progressive, or they wouldn't endorse and implement its concepts in their school districts. Therefore, it seems logical for community educators to seek further
insights into the superintendent's philosophical attitudes toward the community education concepts if the movement is to be initiated into more school districts in Michigan.

In a position paper the South Dakota Department of Education and Cultural Affairs (1975) related that the concept of community education has been in the process of becoming viable for many years. Moreover, they recognized that community education has received wider attention and greater acceptance during the last two decades than at any time in previous history. They perceived the concept as a dynamic and comprehensive approach to public education and a concept which permeated all segments of the community in an attempt to act as the vehicle to meet the needs of everyone.

Extracting evidence supportive of the community education movement from the Mott Foundation, the federal government and state departments, such as South Dakota, it appears that the concept of community education may be in the process of being taken seriously by public educators. Perhaps it is being seen by educators as having more value and educational merit than simply being maintained as a frill or experiment. It seems that this recent evidence of growth supports the notion that community education needs further research to determine how best the concept should be initiated into other Michigan school districts.

While the acceptance of the community education concept seems to be occurring rapidly on local, state and national levels, another group dedicated to its future growth appears to be operating in more than 77 nation-wide centers. They are the Centers for the development...
of community education and are located in colleges, universities, and state departments of education in more than 45 states. These Centers supposedly are responsible for disseminating community education information and for assisting interested communities in initiating the community education process within their school districts. If these Centers are to perform their functions, it seems imperative that they have increased knowledge regarding the most effective and efficient method in which to sell the community education concept in their respective service areas.

Jeffrey (1975) developed and introduced the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI) required for this type of investigation. From his work, Jeffrey made several recommendations for future studies. Included in his recommendations were: (1) the instrument should be further tested in the field and perhaps revised; and (2) future investigations should include school district administrators. Jeffrey (1975, p. 100) also pointed out that the "development of the CEPI represented the first attempt, that the researcher was aware of, to reduce the community education concept to a series of specific philosophical statements."

The CEPI was revised and further tested by this researcher and eventually was modified by excluding repetitious items from the original instrument. The Modified-Community Education Philosophy Instrument (M-CEPI) thus became the adapted tool utilized for the investigation of the philosophical attitudes toward the community education concept of superintendents in Michigan.
Definition of Terms

To facilitate the study, the terms were defined as:

Superintendent

The chief administrator of a given school district in Michigan.

Community education

Community education is the "process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people--all of the people--of the community" (Seay, 1974, p. 11).

Districts with community education programs

The 263 school districts in Michigan identified by the four Regional Community Education Centers located at Alma College and Eastern, Northern, and Western Michigan Universities as having community education programs.

Districts without community education programs

The 337 school districts in Michigan identified by the aforementioned Regional Community Education Centers as not having community education programs.

Community education philosophy

The basic beliefs, principles, and concepts upon which community education is comprised. Community education philosophy is operationally defined as the composites of the statements contained in the M-CEPI.
Community education movement

The extended growth and development of a concept derived from sporadic or isolated experiments and projects to an ongoing philosophy of education with distinct characteristics of continuity.

Community education components

The primary components which comprise a community education program in a given school district. Minzey (1974) identified these six components as: (1) the traditional day school program; (2) extended use of community facilities; (3) additional programs for school-age children and youth; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement.

Summary

This chapter has provided a statement of the problem, background information supporting the need for the study and definition of terms used throughout the study.

Chapter II of this study will review the literature pertinent to the problem as related to the community education concept.

Chapter III will present the design of the investigation, the population studied, the sampling procedure, reliability, validity and adaptation of the instrument, operational definitions, and the treatment of the data.

Chapter IV will include an analysis of the data collected and details of the findings of the study.
Chapter V will include a summary of the investigation, with conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In a study such as this, as suggested by Boles and Davenport (1975), an attempt was made to present a panoramic view of community education and the educational leadership required to make it work. It seemed as though the logical process was to trace the history of American education, leadership and the superintendency from the Colonial period to the present time. This approach appeared pertinent in order to grasp the historical changes, the philosophical content, leadership qualities and evolutionary antecedents necessary to develop from a traditional ideology into a bona fide community education movement. Finally, this chapter hopefully will illustrate the vital importance of leadership, especially that of the superintendent of schools, to insure that community education retains its continuity of purpose.

Evolution of Community Education and the Superintendency

The cultivated mind, according to Hodnett (1963, p. 5), "seeks understanding," and he suggests that the search for this understanding is carried on in many ways, with the most fundamental method being the speculation about experience and arriving at concepts from it. Minzey (1975) seemed in agreement with Hodnett's theory regarding understanding and experiences when he suggested that to best describe
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the current status of community education, one must take into account the dramatic change in the concept over the years. The idea of community education is neither a new nor novel concept according to Kerensky and Melby (1975).

In reviewing the historical literature, it seems that not only has the community education concept evolved through the centuries with the integration of world-wide influences, but it appears that the entire American educational system has grown in a like manner. But as Katz (1973) pointed out, contemporary scholarship has been inadequate when attempting to express the idea of American uniqueness with little or no reference being made to the evolutionary conceptions of change. Katz went on to suggest that colonial settlers adapted European patterns to the New World and the institutions they created underwent profound changes before they assumed their current forms.

While an educational process of evolution seems to have grown out of traditional and progressive concepts into the community education movement and advanced into modern times, it appears the same is true of educational administration. According to Campbell et al. (1967), for most of American history the organization and management of schools had been a function of laymen and not of professional administrators. Campbell et al. (1967, pp. 75-76) stated that "school administration did not evolve as a field of practice until the latter part of the nineteenth century, nor become a field of study until the twentieth century."

According to expert theory previously cited, it seems logical to conclude that the foundations underlying the concepts of American
education and its early leadership were not unique, but appear to be imitations brought from other countries. Therefore, to understand how the community education philosophy and the superintendency of schools came into being and how their impact on modern education will be viewed in the future, it seems essential to determine their evolutionary history in concert with one another.

The importance of understanding the evolution of the community education concepts and the role of the superintendent should be of vital interest to educators concerned with educational futurism. This historical evolution seems reasonable in light of Boles and Davenport (1975), who pointed out that educational leaders in the future may very well have to encompass the creed of the expanding community education movement. They implied that the community education concept utilizes all educational agencies in an effort to help people learn to solve problems, individually and collectively.

Melby (1972) supported Boles and Davenport regarding the necessity for the superintendent to understand the community education philosophy by pointing out that the superintendent should be the educational leader of the community. Melby elaborated further by suggesting the superintendent should be a constant student of the community and its challenges.

According to Gaither (1972), the historical approach required to understand the community education concept and the necessary administrative roles appear to be imperative. Gaither (1972, p. 3) seemed emphatic when he suggested that the most critical issue confronting public education today was student and community unrest,
and the "day is long gone when the superintendents can dictate to the school and community."

Olsen (1975, p. 9) pointed out that the community education philosophy has evolved from many historic contributions and there was no need to re-invent the wheel because "someone may have done so already." Griffiths (1966, p. 81) expressed a similar view involving the emerging role of superintendents when he said, "the position has been undergoing gradual change ever since it was first instituted." Griffiths further suggested that the very future of the superintendency was tied directly to the overall changes in public education.

Totten and Manley (1970) traced a possible origin of the community education philosophy to the Greeks and Romans, pointing out that the basic theory underlying the concept existed from the time people began living in any form of community. Campbell et al. (1967, p. 67) went even further back in history to relate to the origins of administrative leadership when they said that activating "members of a group toward a common objective is as old as history itself."

The cultural as well as the educational foundations found in America were basically adaptations from many of the world's civilizations according to Moehlman (1963). Furthermore, Moehlman seemed to recognize that to understand any system of education added dimensions such as the people who created it, their culture, and their history should also be understood. This seems to lend credence as to why the recognition of the historical milestones in public education should give an illustration of how the concept of community education came into being.
The Founding Fathers of this nation seemed to assume that the democratic experiment could not possibly succeed without an enlightened electorate. Thus, from the first, education became something of an American religion, according to Nevins and Commager (1974). However, while education, religion and the schools have had a profound influence on the lives of Americans, each of their roles has changed from period to period as Decker (1972) reported. He also pointed out that while the philosophy of community education was taking several hundred years to formulate, it was neither a continuous nor orderly process of evolution. The evolutionary process of the superintendency also seems to have the synonomous traits of the sporadic community education history. As Griffiths (1966) pointed out, the hierarchy of administration in American public education existed for almost 200 years without any superintendents of schools.

Moehlman (1963) characterized the early 1600's in American education as being a transplanted mass education program aimed at serving the elite. He described the tempo of the times as being slow and noted that family units for the most part were self sufficient. Nevins and Commager (1974) reported that during this period education was in reality above the reach of the poor and didn't attempt to serve the needs of everyone.

The early school plants were described by Wynn (1965) as one-teacher units and school administration was a simple matter carried on largely by the teacher, subject to some review by a school committee. By tradition, Lewis (1972) pointed out that the school administrator-teacher was concerned chiefly with housing, equipment
and supplies just to get the traditional education concept into a limited form of action.

Knezevich (1975) suggested that the local district embraced a limited geographical area so that all pupils could walk to the one-teacher school. Knezevich pointed out that this social invention had a great significance in American education as the concept of a community school was carried from the colonial states by the people heading westward. Still it seems the clientele were selected only from the elite groups and the poorer masses appeared to be excluded.

According to Decker (1972), the Massachusetts Act of 1642 was the first American educational mandate providing that education fulfill a societal need and was compulsory for all. Decker suggested that the reason behind the mandate appeared to be for the purpose of enabling people to read and understand religious principles such as the Bible along with understanding the laws of the land. It seems that the colonists believed a fear of God and respect for the law was the most important educational aspect which should be transmitted to the students.

The Massachusetts Act of 1642 was typical of other acts which were passed in the other New England colonies according to Solberg (1970) and seemed to be reinforced with the Massachusetts Act of 1647, which required the establishment of elementary and secondary schools. Solberg continued by reporting that these early educational Acts of the colonies were designed basically to maintain class and religious distinctions. He noted that the influx of people into the colonies consisted not only of traders and farmers, but also the new
settlements contained doctors, school teachers, businessmen, craftsmen and ministers. Nevins and Commager (1974) pointed out that New England became a microcosm of old England and suggested that their real wealth existed in their sturdy integrity, self-reliance and energy, but religion and education were closely united.

In 1692, Cremin (1973) reported that the general court of Massachusetts enacted an updated new provincial law requiring that grammar schools be kept by all towns of a hundred families or more and that the law was stringently enforced by the courts. By 1701, Cremin noted that its terms were strengthened to include a full-time teacher–administrator for each grammar school. The various colonial mandates, however slight they may have appeared, seemed to cast a light on the eventual components which can now be distinguished in modern community education as expressed earlier by Minzey (1975).

It appears that some philosophical foundations on which community education has been built were beginning to be woven into the American educational scene during the colonial period as evidenced by Comenius. Comenius, a Moravian educator, was described by Olsen (1975) as the prophet of modern education. Olsen (1975, p. 9) quoted Comenius as proposing:

The education I propose includes all that is proper for a man, and is one which all men who are born into this world should share . . . Our first wish is that all men should be educated to full humanity: not only one individual, nor a few, nor even many, but all men together and single, young and old, rich and poor, of high and lowly birth, men and women—in a word, all whose fate it is to be born human beings; so that at least the whole of the human race may be educated, men of all ages, all conditions, both sexes and all nations.
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Thus, it appears that Comenius planted a philosophical seed which seemed destined to be a major ideal among the community education precepts including educational opportunities for everyone. While community education didn't appear to even closely resemble the beginning of a movement at this point in time, at least it seems that a portion of the philosophy was emerging and appears to continue throughout American educational history.

There was no clear distinction between children and adults in the early colonies according to Zuckerman (1973), who described them as little adults dressed in adult clothes. He pointed out that the main function of education at the time was restraint—direct restraint in the case of discipline and indirect restraint in the case of instruction. From the early colonial days education served to suppress self-expression and promote uniformity. It also should be pointed out that while the components of community education seem to have an early base during the colonial period which carried to modern times, the same appears true of the negative aspects of traditional education.

Zuckerman (1973) seemed to convey an atmosphere of traditional education existent at the time by noting that reading and arithmetic were taught through the techniques of rote memorization with little or none of the emphasis being placed on true understanding. Also, Zuckerman reported that the apprenticeship programs being established were both economic and educational necessities and young boys were placed with craftsmen while some of the girls were sent by their mothers to other women to learn housekeeping. According to Zuckerman, the reason behind these removals from the home to others, including
the schoolmaster, was a notion that a child could learn better manners and obedience in another setting compared to the home atmosphere. But, he pointed out that the traditional concept was a striving for obedience and discipline from the students and as such was repressive. It seems that this archaic notion of educational motivation can be found quite prevalently ranging from modern higher education through local school districts today.

Scanlon (1959) reported that any aspect that might possibly resemble community education was most recognizable in agricultural and rural communities during the early history of education. As an example of community involvement, Scanlon pointed to the Bethesda School in Georgia as a training center for orphan boys that stressed agricultural education as a primary objective. Nevins and Commager (1974, p. 155) stressed that American public education although "somewhat better than any to be found in western Europe at the time, it was still--by modern standards--woefully inadequate."

During this same period Moehlman (1963) noted that apprentice programs also provided for training in literacy as well as teaching a craft or skill. Perhaps this explains the contention of Nevins and Commager (1974) who reported that there was far less illiteracy in America than on the other continents. They also pointed out as further evidence that most people could read the local newspaper, the almanac and the Bible. It appears that the philosophy of traditional education was based on a method of mass conformity to the people whether or not they were interested in conforming to the system.
During the colonial period the American pattern of education began calling for the transfer of school control from religious authorities or private corporations to public or civil authorities according to Butts and Cremin (1953). Knezevich (1975) noted that the American public wanted to get involved in educational planning and public education grew and prospered primarily because it was the strong desire of Americans that it do so. Knezevich emphasized that the growth of the common school for everyone was truly a grass-roots endeavor and expressed the strong feeling of Americans that education was to serve the people and not vice versa, as so often appears the case even in modern educational circles.

Another influence expressing a further impetus toward the foundations of a community education philosophy seemed to appear from the insights of the French philosopher Rousseau, who, according to Olsen (1975, p. 8), stated:

> In the natural order of things, all men being equal, the vocation common to all is the state of manhood; and whoever is well trained for that cannot fulfill badly any vocation which depends upon it. Whether my pupil be destined for the army, the church, or the bar, matters little to me. Before he can think of adopting the vocation of his parents, nature calls upon him to be a man. How to live is the business I wish to teach him.

While the flow of community education still appeared to be unidentifiable as a movement, it is relevant to recognize that the philosophy which much of the modern theory is based upon seems to be weaving its way from the historical roots of public, traditional educational theories. Another pioneer in the theory of community education seems to have been the Swiss educator Pestalozzi, who Olsen (1975, p. 8) quoted as saying:
Lead your child out into Nature, teach him on the hilltops and in the valleys. There he will listen better, and the sense of freedom will give him more strength to overcome difficulties. But in these hours of freedom let him be taught by Nature rather than by you. Let him fully realize that she is the real teacher and that you, with your art, do nothing more than walk quietly at her side. Should a bird sing or an insect hum on a leaf, at once stop your walk; bird and insect are teaching him; you may be silent.

According to Nevins and Commager (1974) the Constitution of the United States was put into effect in 1789 and pointed out that President John Adams insisted on providing education for every class of people down to the poorest in order that the nation would be well governed and united. They further suggested that others shared the views of President Adams and devoted their energies to advancing public and higher education in their respective communities. Thus they reported that Benjamin Rush championed schools for girls, contributed greatly to medical education and advocated a national university. Noah Webster worked ceaselessly for public education by providing the schools with dictionaries, spellers, readers and histories, according to Nevins and Commager.

Another important contribution involving public education and administration during the 18th century seemed important in light of the later progressive educational movement according to Edwards and Richey (1947). They claimed the rise of the district (Massachusetts Law of 1789) was significant because it marked the separation of school administration from general municipal administration, a separation which in most states continues up to the present time.

While not the first leader in the field, Nevins and Commager (1974) suggested that Horace Mann was easily the most effective person...
to display leadership qualities in public education. After being appointed Massachusetts Commissioner of Education in 1837, it appears that Mann enforced existing laws, improved the physical facilities and the intellectual standards of the schools. Mann, it seems, also developed the first program of teacher training and proposed a philosophy of education whose influence was felt in many parts of the world. Nevins and Commager also pointed out that Mann took the lead in the fight for free public schools, nonsectarian, publicly controlled and tax supported. Henry Barnard was also cited by Nevins and Commager during this period for acquainting American school people with educational developments through his *American Journal of Education*. Barnard later became the first United States Commissioner of Education in 1867 according to Nevins and Commager. Decker (1972, p. 37) said that one of "the earliest publications containing much of what is now called community education philosophy was printed in 1845," when Henry Barnard talked of the role of the school in improving community and individual living.

Berridge (1969) implied that a more pronounced component of community education seemed more visible when Providence, Rhode Island utilized school facilities for adult evening classes in 1810. Some thirty years after this progressive venture in Providence, Berridge noted that the Cincinnati Public Schools introduced adult programs that were followed closely by the Cleveland and Chicago school systems. He also cited the Chicago Board of Education as being the first public school system to initiate the spending of public funds for the support of evening adult education programs. Also during
the period 1837-1850, Knezevich (1975) noted that 13 school systems established the position of superintendency, with Buffalo and Louisville leading the way in 1837.

By the time of the American Civil War, 1861-1865, Knezevich (1975) declared that the school superintendency seemed to be well established in many communities and pointed out that the early superintendent was considered mainly an assistant to the Board of Education. He explained that it wasn't difficult to determine whose man the superintendent was while being assigned menial chores with little allowance provided for exhibiting professional skills or leadership ability. However, Knezevich (1975, p. 341) concluded by saying that "the concept of the superintendent as an agent whose prime function is to ascertain what the board hopes to accomplish and then to act accordingly persists in many communities today."

Another philosophy basic to the concept of community education appeared in the writings of the English philosopher Spencer, who was quoted by Olsen (1975, p. 8) as having expressed:

How to live is the essential question for us. Not how to live in the mere material sense only, but in the widest sense... In what way to treat the body; in what way to treat the mind; in which way to manage our affairs; in what way to bring up a family; in what way to behave as a citizen; in what way to utilize all those sources of happiness which nature supplies—how to use all our facilities to the greatest advantage of ourselves and others—how to live completely. And this being the great thing needful for us to learn, is, in consequence, the great thing which education has to teach. To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging any education course is to judge in what degree it discharges such function.
Nevins and Commager (1974) noted that the Civil War retarded educational growth in the South, but greatly stimulated it in other parts of the country. They also noted how the nation was advancing into a more technical and industrial oriented society following the Civil War. They cited the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 as providing the stimulus in which land grant colleges were set up in every state of the union during the Reconstruction years, which seemed to convert what appeared to be academics into real universities. Moehlman (1963) also pointed out that the modern American universities of the period were becoming centers not only for educational ventures but for the scientific study of the problems of American civilization as well. Moehlman noted that with the university's professional colleges, its laboratories, libraries and research centers, they were a major force in the theoretical and actual construction of the total American civilization development.

Griffiths (1966, p. vii) visualized the development of the superintendency as taking place in three stages, although he allowed that the phases overlapped one another the same way as educational ideologies did. The first period, according to Griffiths, took place between 1837 and 1910. He described the development as advancing from a position limited largely to instruction (administrator-teacher period) and advising the board of education into one of becoming the executive officer of the board of education with responsibilities covering the entire spectrum of school activities. Even then it appears the superintendent was being charged with producing a complete range of educational opportunities available to
everyone. From an inauspicious beginning the position has evolved into one of considerable responsibility and authority, though Griffiths (1966, p. 1) contends "there is still doubt as to the actual power held by school superintendents." As the period ended, Griffiths (1966, p. vii) stated that "both business ideology and the reform movement were gathering strength and began focusing upon the schools."

Nevins and Commager (1974) suggested that three developments in higher education after Appomattox signalled the end of the Civil War and were highly significant contributions in American educational history. First was the rapid growth of technological and professional education required to meet the demands of a growing industrial and urban society. Second was the provision for graduate study such as had existed a long while in France and Germany. Third was the provision for more adequate educational opportunities for women and the adoption of coeducation in all the new state universities outside the South. These developments, according to Nevins and Commager, were made possible by the emergence in that generation of the most remarkable group of educational statesmen and leaders in America's history. It seems that much of the community education philosophy was implied in the theoretical and practical concepts of these former educational leaders.

According to Nevins and Commager (1974, pp. 384-385), White conceived the idea of a university where "any student could study any subject." Eliot transformed Harvard from a college to a university and introduced the elective system which gave students a choice of
studies. Angell made the University of Michigan a model for other state universities. Van Hise was responsible for integrating the university with the community in Wisconsin. Nevins and Commager (1974) further pointed out that Harper transformed the University of Chicago into a leading center of learning for the world. And the great Black leader, Booker T. Washington, was cited for having founded Tuskegee Institute in 1882. Even though Washington founded Tuskegee, it does not appear that Blacks were being integrated into the mainstream of American life except on a token basis.

Thus far in American educational history it appears that the traditional school concept with its subject-matter centered curriculum has been deeply rooted. As Manley et al. (1961) pointed out, educational needs were much different in the early days and the basic task of the traditional school was to promote literacy. Also, Manley et al. emphasized that basically the learning was accomplished through rote memorization and the traditional school operated as a specialized institution apart from the community. At this point in time, it appeared that the traditionalists were content to have other agencies in the community such as the family, church, recreational or civic units round out the students' training which was necessary for their personal growth except for the school curriculum, which they maintained completely.

Manley et al. (1961, p. 3) suggested that the traditional school viewed its primary function as teaching children and "that this is best done when children study lessons that provide mental discipline." The three R's seem to be examples of those studies, limited to a
student body primarily of children and set quite apart as an island from the life of the community. As educational ideologies overlap one another, it seems logical to assume the philosophy and concepts of community education also embrace the three R's but allow for a wider scope of curriculum.

It seems that a preview of community education philosophy was put into practice in the late 1800's when Parker established the Cook County Normal School in Chicago. According to Olsen (1975, p. 9), this school was child-centered in the modern sense of the term but it was also within itself "a small community with children, parents, teachers, and administrators all working together." Olsen pointed out that this community of learners included children of 6 and adults of 60 from all parts of the country and there were approximately 600 in all. In relation to Parker's philosophy regarding the experiment, Olsen (1975, p. 9) quoted Parker as stating:

The social factor in the school is the greatest factor of all; standing higher than subjects of learning, than methods of teaching, than the teacher himself . . . the mingling and fusing and blending of each with all, give personal power, and make the public school a tremendous force for the upbuilding of democracy.

Nevins and Commager (1974) noted that there usually were fierce struggles whenever educational reform was called for and the direction of Parker was attacked and termed a failure by many educationists.

By 1893, it was suggested by Decker (1972, pp. 37-38) that the American educational philosophy "took a sharp turn away from the idea of education to serve a community's needs." He reported that
problems concerning curricula came forth and the viewpoint favoring standardization, uniformity, and structured teaching methods prevailed. Supporting the contention advanced by Nevins and Commager, Decker pointed out that the National Education Association appointed what is now termed The Committee of Ten, and with the exception of one, all of the members were selected almost exclusively from the ranks of higher education. It appears the committee concerned itself with teaching methods in secondary schools, the need for uniformity in content, requirement standards, subject units and the admission criteria to enter college.

In fairness to this committee, Mehl (1967) reported that the Committee of Ten held that one set of studies should also be made available to the students whether or not they were college bound. However, Mehl stated that while the committee made some provision for the introduction of commercial and vocational courses, the entire tenor of the report was directed at preserving the academic program mainly for the elite or more fortunate.

It appeared that a precedent had been set by this committee and national committees seemed to be in vogue for examining educational problems and then to submit appropriate or what appears to be self-serving recommendations. According to Mehl (1967, p. 32), The Committee of Fifteen was formed in 1893 to investigate elementary education, and the final report, Mehl suggested, "could be regarded as a defeat for the newer educational ideas of Parker," who advocated community involvement in the schools. Again, there appears to be a conflict of ideals stemming from traditional educators in
higher education and educational idealists interested in keeping pace with the pupils' needs and the tempo of the times.

Mehl (1967, pp. 32-33) pointed out in 1896 that the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, another committee made up primarily of traditionalists from the ranks of higher education, "tacitly opposed the introduction of commercial and vocational courses into the high school." Mehl suggested that because of this emphasis on the limited academic role of both the elementary and high school, many educators broke with the Committees and attempted to open the schools to some of the newer courses and newer ideas. As Boles (1973, p. xv) noted, educators concerned with assisting others in learning the needs required to open minds and systems began "using all of the resources of a community to help all its people learn to solve common problems." He suggested that they had begun to turn towards a more pronounced form of community education.

With the founding of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (P.T.A.) in 1897, it seems apparent that adults as well as children had an interest and were involved with the American educational scene. According to Olsen et al. (1965, p. 510), the purposes of the P.T.A. reflected their interest in community involvement and cited their purposes as:

1. To promote the welfare of children and youth in home, school, church and community.
2. To raise the standards of home life.
3. To secure adequate laws for the care and protection of children and youth.
4. To bring into closer relation the home and school so that parents and teachers may cooperate intelligently in the training of the child.

5. To develop between educators and the general public such united efforts as will secure for every child the highest advantages in physical, mental, social, and spiritual education.

During this time period, Moehlman (1963) credited American educators for their pioneering efforts toward universal education by refining a 6-3-3-4 system of education; with elementary, junior and senior high schools, along with higher education centers. Also, Moehlman noted that the philosophic influence of John Dewey began to prevail American education.

In 1899, Dewey, who was described by Olsen (1975, p. 9) as "America's preeminent philosopher and educator," appeared to have written the first book which stressed the social responsibility of the school to improve the community as well as to educate the child. Olsen (1975, p. 9) noted that Dewey said:

We are apt to look at the school from an individualistic standpoint, as something between teacher and pupil, or between teacher and parent. That which interests us most is naturally the progress made by the individual child of our acquaintance, his normal physical development, his advance in ability to read, write, and figure, his growth in the knowledge of geography and history, improvement in manners, habits of promptness, order and industry—it is from such standards as these that we judge the work of the school. And rightly so. Yet the range of the outlook needs to be enlarged. What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys our democracy.

The progressive educational movement was associated with the philosophy and psychology of James and also with the pragmatist
philosopher Dewey according to Nevins and Commager (1974). From Dewey's professional chair at the University of Chicago and Columbia University, they suggested that hundreds of supporters spread the new educational philosophy much like today's community education movement seems to be. They also noted that progressive education shifted the emphasis from teaching to learning, and from memorizing subject matter to the training of students, making education an essential part of life itself. Nevins and Commager (1974, p. 385) concluded by stating:

Within a generation or so progressive education had conquered the century; after the Second World War it fell into some disrepute, but that was chiefly because—as with so many successful philosophies—its teachings had come to be accepted as the common sense of the matter.

Early in the 1900's other component parts of community education seemed to become more visible and pronounced. Examples appear to include involvement with other agencies in the delivery and coordination of services along with extended school facilities for recreation and leisure time activities. Nashlund (1953) reported that the Playground and Recreational Association was formed in Newark, New Jersey for the expressed purpose of utilizing school facilities for recreation in 1906. Nashlund also noted that New York City was one of the first metropolitan areas to open schools in the evening for adult recreation programs during the same time span and some 55 other cities used schools for similar purposes prior to the 1930's.

Griffiths (1966), who earlier had suggested that the role of the superintendency evolved through three overlapping stages, stressed that the position underwent a complete change during the
second phase. It seems that this change occurred during the transition of traditional education into the more modern progressive education movement. During the period (1910-1945) Griffiths (1966, p. vii) said that the "businessman superintendent emerged as the prototype." Griffiths pointed out that the superintendent became the executive officer of the board of education and made the educational decisions based upon business criteria which satisfied the board.

The superintendents, according to Griffiths (1966, pp. vii-viii), "were reinforced by professors of school administration who provided the rationale for the movement." While school administrators purportedly adopted the tenets of scientific management, Griffiths noted that they did so in a superficial manner. He concluded by suggesting that the superintendent basically was a businessman more interested in the budget than in instruction, and it is a philosophy which has carried over into modern times by many superintendents.

Dewey's progressive education philosophy was powerful, according to Mehl (1967, p. 33), and he pointed out that Dewey conceived that "man was ultimately a purposing animal—a belief held strongly by Ralph Waldo Emerson." Mehl suggested that Dewey objected strenuously with the theory that pitted the individual against society and consequently, rejected the theory underlying rugged individualism which promoted the cause of the successful individual at the expense of social welfare. Further, Mehl added that Dewey also rejected the uniform state of conformity which sacrificed the individual for what was considered the greater good.
"Indeed, the spirit of American compromise was, in Dewey's hands, to become as evident in educational ideas as it was in religion, politics, and social action," Mehl stated (1967, p. 34). Mehl continued by suggesting that today we may smile at the fervor of this idealism of the spirit of compromise but no one can overlook the fact that it appeared to work, although Mehl suggested that may not be enough of an achievement for modern educationists or theorists.

The National Society for the Study of Education published two articles in 1911 that appear to have related to the reform movement of progressive education advocated by Dewey. They were: (1) The City School as a Community Center; and (2) The Rural School as a Community Center. The articles gave accounts of adult lectures in school buildings, vacation use of school playgrounds, evening use of school facilities for recreation, home and school associations, and extension courses. Both articles concluded that the secret behind these successful ventures seemed to have been the ability of educational leaders to bring the school in touch with as many interest points as possible. Also, the article concluded that some of the success appeared to relate to the school programs extending into the communities where they were received appreciatively by the people.

Manley et al. (1961, p. 3) pointed out that following World War I (1914-1918), a shift in the emphasis of education was caused in part by a reaction against the "almost purely academic nature and the frequently repressive discipline of the traditional school." Also, they suggested that there was a re-structuring of society as old values were being discarded and the progressive school, with its
child-centered curriculum, came into being. In the early days, Manley et al. (1961, p. 3) pointed out that the "progressive school was a crusading cause for many educators," and they perceived as the major goals for the students comprehension and self expression that remain today as important themes in American education.

During this period Olsen (1975, p. 9) gave credit to Hart as being the philosophic "father of community education" because Hart viewed the community as a viable educational influence and was quoted by Olsen as stating:

Within the community there is work that educates and provides for life; within the community are the roots of the cosmopolitanism that marks the truly educated man; within the community there is room for a noble and dignified culture and leisure for all. Let us become aware of our community resources, physical, social, moral. Let us recognize the part they play and will always play in the actual education of our boys and girls. Let us consciously extend their powers within legitimate bounds until our modern education within the community shall be, as completely as possible, natural, immediate, and free. Let us organize our socially supplementary institution—the school—until it shall adequately reinforce the work of education where it is weak and supply it where it is wanting.

Olsen (1975, p. 9) further quoted Hart as having said:

The democratic problem in education is not primarily one of training children; it is the problem of making a community in which children cannot help growing up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined to freedom, reverend of the good of life and eager to share in the tasks of the age. A school cannot produce this result; nothing but a community can do so; consequently, we can never be satisfied that we have met the educational problems of our day when we have good schools. We must have good communities.

Community involvement seemed to be highlighted by Ellsworth Collings in 1923, when he told of organizing a rural school curriculum around the problems of the community in his publication of An...
Experiment with a Project Curriculum. Olsen (1975, p. 9) elaborated further when he said, "Collings put into actual practice the concept we call today the 'education-centered community.'" Olsen suggested that in the process, Collings demonstrated that from building the curriculum around the problems in the community that it was academically more effective than the traditional pattern of learning.

An article by Berridge (1969, p. 19) reflected on how the people in the late 1920's became interested in "what the schools could do for them." Berridge reported that as the economic depression worsened in the United States, the schools became the center of community activity by offering programs in home economics, agriculture education and community improvement in an attempt to meet the needs of the people. Manley et al. (1961) pointed out that most men found it difficult to earn even the most meager sustenance to provide for their families. They perceived that the prevailing attitude at that time in the community was a strong desire for education which would have an immediate, practical value in coping with the problems.

Throughout the history and evolution of American education from the Colonial Period through 1928, it appears as though community education components could be identified periodically, but there didn't seem to have been any deliberate or concentrated movement. It seems as though elements of both the traditional and progressive schools of thought were immersed into the total American educational curriculum, and except for variations in philosophies, they appeared to favor the age group of children and youth. Perhaps the rationale for favoring these age groups in school related to the compulsory education laws.
and the increased emphasis on attaining high school diplomas as an instrument for securing employment.

Totten and Manley (1970, p. 5) pointed out that while a philosophy emerged sporadically throughout American educational history with isolated experiments, "much was said about community education but very little was done." Dewey (1939, p. viii) appeared to be critical of the educator's over-emphasis with writing about educational philosophies while being less inclined to put the concepts into practice when he stated:

The reason, I believe, why more is said and written than done about the social function of schools is that "society" is taken as a kind of sociological and academic entity, instead of as the lives of men, women, boys and girls going on right around us. Under such circumstances, writing becomes pale and shadowy—abstractions dealing in remote language with an abstraction. The neighborhood is the prime community; it certainly is so for the children and youth who are educated in the school, and it must be so for administrators and teachers if the idea of socially functioning schools is to take on flesh and blood. There is no occasion for fear that the local community will not provide roads leading out into wider human relations if the opportunities it furnishes are taken advantage of.

Dewey appeared to be heading more toward a community education philosophy than previously when he included adults in his writing. Also, it seems Dewey was pointing out that the neighborhood schools were of prime interest to the local inhabitants and should be viewed as well by teachers and administrators.

In 1929, Clapp, who was "profoundly influenced by John Dewey," introduced into American education one of the very first community schools according to Olsen (1975, pp. 9-10). Clapp (1939, p. 89) suggested that "community education is itself a growing idea, born in
the interaction of thinking and doing" and visualized the community school as being "made with the people whose school it is."

Clapp (1939, p. 89), a public school administrator, asked and then answered her own question: "What does a community school do?"

First of all, it meets as best it can, and with everyone's help, the urgent needs of the people, for it holds that everything that affects the welfare of the children and their families is its concern. Where does school end and life outside begin? There is no distinction between them. A community school is a used place, a place used freely and informally for all the needs of living and learning. It is, in effect, that place where learning and living converge.

Looking into the future, Clapp (1939, p. 89) philosophized that some "means must be had whereby these enterprises can go forward."

She suggested that these means could be made available from a variety of sources if the interest is high. If the need for community education is urgent, ways will be found or invented, according to Clapp. Even with what appeared a progressive and decisive practical exposure to a community school in action, Clapp's pioneering effort didn't seem to create a continuous community education movement. However, it seems she planted a seed and devised a vehicle for implementing a method to deliver the community education philosophy to the people.

During the 1939's and early forties, the evolutionary history of a community education philosophy appeared to be on the threshold of moving from isolated endeavors lacking in continuity toward a more cohesive purpose. At the same time, it seems that the same unity of direction was afforded superintendents of schools. If there was one pivotal point whereby assistance was given in the growth and development of both functions, it seems to have commenced with the
arrival of private American foundations on the educational scene. Seay (1974, pp. 5-6) acknowledged that two Michigan foundations, C. S. Mott and W. K. Kellogg, were "influential in bringing community education to the forefront of the educational scene today." Isolated projects were still being initiated, however, which appear to have had guiding impacts on community education but with the emergence and involvement of private foundations, the implementation of a course of continuous action seemed inevitable. It appeared that a practical application for moving the community education philosophy off the institutional drawing board to the people was closer to becoming a reality.

Leadership was essential, according to Weaver (1972) to move what he described as the conventional community education model from a theory into action. He suggested that early community education leaders possessed personal ingredients such as charisma, loyalty, and dedication, and also that leaders such as Frank J. Manley, Ernest Melby and Maurice Seay had not only the needed technical and conceptual skills but had as well a high degree of human relation skills which seemed vital when attempting to relate to human beings.

As previously mentioned other contributions continued to surface including one from the Michigan Education Association, which published its seventh yearbook, Cooperative Community Leadership, in 1934 which appeared to point out the value and function necessary for community leadership. Also, The Community School edited by Everett (1938) for the Society for Curriculum Study seemed to be the first of its kind to deal with the concept and practice of the community school, however limited it may have been at the time.
Along with the increased writing and entry of private foundations during this period, it seems that the philosophy of community education was gaining increased support from respected university educators. Olsen (1975, p. 12) credited one of them, Melby, with writing what appears to be the first book on community education administration and quoted Melby as stating:

Perhaps it is at the point of building good communities that we have most often failed in the past, and it is here also that creative education has its greatest message for administration. For if, to secure creative education, we must have a creative community, then a first responsibility of creative administration is to exercise creative community leadership. We must apply the process of truly creative education to the entire community . . . And we do this not only to affect the adults of the community along lines of creative development, but because we cannot have a fully creative life for children without a creative community life.

During this period of community education development Griffiths (1966) noted that the superintendency had reached the third stage in their evolutionary process and from 1945 until the 1960's, he described the era as one of unrest. However, Griffiths mentioned that the intervention of the Kellogg Foundation into the field of public education spearheaded a period of intensive self-study. He pointed out that even though little change in practice could be observed, much research had been undertaken and the beginnings of theories for administrative leadership had become apparent.

Moore (1957) reported that since its inception in 1939, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan supported community improvement projects designed to help local citizens improve health standards, education and general community culture. Foundation staff
members had noted that the success of early community improvement endeavors frequently resulted from the degree of leadership exercised through the local school system. However, staff members pointed out that many school administrators were almost completely unprepared for the role demanded of them by the townspeople. That being the viewpoint, it appeared natural at that time for the foundation to concern itself with the problems in the area of school administration.

Prior to that period, in 1926, the C. S. Mott Foundation was established in Flint, Michigan with similar objectives as those mentioned by the Kellogg Foundation according to Young and Quinn (1963). They pointed out that the Mott Foundation maintained a fund and made grants for educational, health, welfare, cultural, civic and for other purposes which might improve individual growth and development to ultimately strengthen society. Young and Quinn suggested that the Mott Foundation had never had a single purpose of intent regarding grants until 1935 when they joined with the Flint Board of Education in a unique partnership which gave birth to a Community School Concept. A concept, which for the first time, seemed to have continuity and longevity, or as Hiemstra (1972, p. 34) said, it was the beginning of the "community school movement."

The founder, Charles Stewart Mott (1963, p. 99) described the basic objectives and philosophy of the Mott Foundation:

... to open for as many people as possible the doors of opportunity for self-advancement in health, education, recreation, active participating citizenship, technical skill, economic knowledge, and successful adaptation to every challenge of modern living. But only the opportunity can be provided, the rest is up to the individual. Our experience gives evidence that the individual responds
eagerly to a down-to-earth implementation of equality of opportunity.

From their previously described objectives, it appears that both the Kellogg and Mott Foundations were interested in improving the quality of life for all people through a process related to public education. It seems that the Kellogg Foundation became quite involved in public school administration research studies in 1946 through the encouragement of Hanna, Tyler and Seay, according to Moore (1957). On the other hand, Young and Quinn (1963) reported that the real beginning of the Mott Foundation Program was in 1935 with Flint's community school concept under Manley's leadership.

Young and Quinn (1963, p. 121) stated that with "thousands of foundations in the United States—more than two hundred of them in Michigan—very few actually operate their own programs on a direct working basis. And no other foundation is known to work with and through a local board of education in the way the Mott Foundation has operated since 1935." Taking a more traditional approach than that of the Mott Foundation, Moore (1957) pointed out that the Kellogg Foundation did provide funds for a series of exploratory conferences that revealed an urgent need to study the changing nature of public school administration in America.

According to Moore (1957), the responsibilities for community leadership had increased at such a rapid pace that most school superintendents felt inadequately prepared to meet them. Techniques for maintaining constructive public relations seemed to be missing from the preparation provided in graduate schools across the nation, a skill Weaver (1972) cited as vital for positive leadership. Moore
pointed out that the Kellogg Foundation launched the program known as the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration through co-operating universities and professional organizations, such as the American Association of School Administrators in 1948.

While the CEPA was not expected to be primarily a publishing venture for the universities, Moore (1957) noted that 303 publications resulted from the effort. Moore (1957, p. 13) said, "On the basis of the evidence, the profession can judge the effectiveness of this venture which had as its goal nothing less than improved leadership in America's schools for decades to come."

From the approximately 303 publications Moore (1957) mentioned as accruing from the aftermath of the Kellogg study of school administrators, a few appear relative to the skills needed by superintendents to interject their leadership into the community education process. The following is a brief review of insights elicited from the study of school administrators by the CEPA:

1. Pierce et al. (1955) reported that the community leadership role of the superintendent is a constantly increasing proposition.

2. According to Luck (1954) school-community relationships can never be completely achieved if reliance is only a journalistic or written type of public relations.

3. Pierce (1954) pointed out that community leadership resides in many persons other than those officially elected or appointed.

4. Ostrom and Agger (1955) noted that interest and participation by the board of education in community needs can in a large part be predicted on information supplied by the superintendent.
5. Several research surveys, Halpin (1956), Moore (1955), and the West Virginia Studies (1956), indicated that communities, teachers, superintendents and the board of education aren't necessarily in agreement with the role of the superintendent.

In the future, Moore (1957) concluded from the contributions of the studies, a summary of the direction school administrators should adhere to in order to reach a quality of sound leadership:

1. A need to translate the information from the studies concerning the community leadership job that has been identified as necessary for school superintendents.

2. In-service activities must be found to assist in the development of administrative skills for the area of community leadership.

3. A synthesis from the findings of the various research projects is needed to understand the inner structure of a community.

4. The profession needs to improve and make available such measuring instruments as attitude scales and community opinion checklists.

5. The administrator should be assured of a firm scholarship in the culture that is peculiarly American. They all have a clear bearing on effective community leadership in the broadest sense of the educational well being for all.

Seay (1974) noted that the CEPA series concluded activities in 1960 and further mentioned that many of the educational leaders trained in such programs in the fifties and sixties are now playing leadership roles in implementing, or at least, it appears heading toward a community education movement.

Historical evidence appears to indicate that the philosophy of community education was derived from a combination of educational sources mixed into a process for public education. The ingredients from which the community education concept grew seemed to evolve.
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through the centuries from isolated, sporadic and shortlived pro-
jects in experimentation and research. This apparent lack of any
historical evidence which might have illustrated that the community
education concept had been a continuous public education movement
seemed to cause Melby (1972, p. 7) to ask, "What was there about
the Flint program of four schools in 1935 that kept it going, that
spread into all Flint schools and that 37 years later spread to
hundreds of schools throughout the nation?"

In search for an answer to his question, Melby (1972, pp. 7-8)
seemed to assess and analyze the leadership situation that existed
in Flint, Michigan when he stated:

Community schools were not new. A ready answer by
many is Charles Stewart Mott with his financial sup-
port. This no doubt helped but cannot explain the
many programs not supported by Mott. Certainly
the idea did not spread because the educational pro-
fession was ready to accept it and get behind it.
Quite the contrary. Michigan schools—even neighbor-
ing ones were slow to follow—even ready to criticize--
and if forced to admit progress—would say, "Well, we
could do it too if we had Mr. Mott." In this case,
and many others, the educational establishment demon-
strated its imprisonment in the status quo.

Melby (1972, p. 7) said: "No, we have to look further and deeper
for the explanation of the success of the community education concept."

In searching, Melby concluded that there were two basic reasons why
the Flint Program succeeded locally and then expanded to provide what
seems to have been the main impetus for the first continuous Community
Education Movement in the United States. Melby (1972, p. 7) listed
his two basic reasons as:

1. The first was the leadership qualities of Frank J.
Manley, whom he described as a "Giant in American
Education."
2. The second is to be found in the development
of American urban life.

Campbell (1972, p. 1) appeared to agree with Melby's assessment
of Manley's leadership skills when he described Manley as a dynamic
educational leader, a creator and a humanist. Campbell also seemed
to concur with Melby's contention that Manley was most responsible
for what grew from a local community education concept into a national
community education movement when he stated:

As most educators know, he and Charles Stewart Mott
initiated, developed, and promoted a Community School
Program beginning with a few basic ideas in 1935,
nursing them along into the 1950's and then, with un-
diminished momentum, plunged into the expanded program
that is extant in many cities. Already their contribu-
tions have gained eminent respectability, not only
with laymen but with renowned educators, as well.

Melby (1972, p. 8) reflected further on Manley's skills by saying,
"I believe it is to the credit of Frank Manley's professional leader-
ship that he made an accurate appraisal of the needs of American
society and sensed what had to be done." He underlined done because
Melby considered Manley a doer. Melby pointed out that talking about
the concept was not enough for Manley. Although the Flint program was
based on sound theory, Manley would not waste valuable time theorizing
according to Melby.

Melby (1972, p. 8) explained Manley's reasoning behind implement-
ing the concept rather than just talking or writing about it when he
stated:

His reasoning was: people, children are living now.
The educational experiences they needed—they needed
today. Tomorrow we would not be able to compensate
for what we failed to do today.
Melby (1972, p. 8) continued to provide further insights into the basic foundations relating to Manley's leadership qualities which seemed to have led to a national community education movement when he explained:

I think his impatience with protracted repetition of theory had something to do with the attitude of university professors toward him. Universities like to theorize—not concerning themselves too much with people. Frank Manley was people oriented. And because he was people oriented he could get things done, he could lead. He suffered little from the current affliction known as "credibility gap." This was because he cared about people—and caring shows through—it's a silent language. The leaders today who have trouble with "credibility gap" have it not only because of dishonesty but more because the silent language tells others they don't care.

Manley's role in American educational history departed from the ordinary in the 1930's during the Depression and at the beginning of the urban revolution and as stated by Melby (1972, p. 8):

Most of his contemporaries believed that the methodology, content, and equipment of schools could be modified so as to make the existing program effective. He knew better. He was convinced the program was obsolete, inadequate, poorly fitted to the needs of the changing society. While others were debating the merits of gadgets and methodological changes he was changing the program. He was operating on new assumptions—new assumptions about children—about people—about the urban community. Not much before the sixties did it become apparent to many educators how right Frank Manley was.

Melby (1972, p. 8) concluded his statements on Manley's leadership involvement in what appears was the motivating factor of the community education movement by saying:

There are now so many community schools in America, so much Community Education going on that this kind of education has for all time become the measuring stick for all education. In other words the school, no matter
how good, cannot compensate for low income, bad housing, general human misery in the community. Therefore, if education is to be changed it is the total environment that must be changed. This is what Frank Manley set out to do and did to a greater extent than any other educator living or dead.

Like Melby and Campbell, Totten (1970, p. xvii) seemed to agree that the beginning of a national community education movement appeared to evolve from the leadership qualities put into action by Frank Manley when he said, "Manley, because of his insight, creativity, energy, and leadership, has more than any other person, caused the power of community education to be released for the betterment of humanity." Kerensky and Melby (1975) emphasized that the leadership ingredient is the key necessary to marshall the nation to mount an education of sufficient power to attack the serious problems of our society.

Kerensky and Melby (1975) suggest that it is a paradox in America where advertising and public relations have been highly developed that so little has rubbed off on educational leadership. They pointed out that American administrative leadership in education is too often hesitant, timid, and lacking in conviction or enthusiasm for the enterprise they supposedly represent. They further agree that educators complain too much about personal and professional obstacles which destroy their effectiveness as leaders. They suggest that the traditional mold remains too solid in the minds of administrators who are cold, distant, withdrawn, and reluctant to open their doors to involve people.

This lack of concern for people didn't seem to be a stumbling block for Mott and Manley according to Young and Quinn (1963). They
suggested that it was the conviction of Mott and Manley that only people are important and the most important building block in a community is leadership, by leaders who care about people. They also pointed out that Mott and Manley believed that given such a nucleus of leaders, all else would follow in a positive, constructive manner. Young and Quinn also noted that Mott and Manley believed that without such leadership, the individual and community objectives were reduced to a negative state of futility and seemed at an impossible distance to correct.

Pendell (1972) pointed out the efforts of the Flint Community School model and the Mott Foundation initiated for the purpose of disseminating the community education philosophy, practice and need for leadership which seems to have led into a national movement. Pendell (1972, p. 42) listed some of the pioneering endeavors which appear to have grown into national goals, objectives and practical systems of delivery under Manley's leadership:

1. A Master's Degree program in Community School administration started in Flint with Eastern Michigan University; and the first State Community School Workshop held in cooperation with the Michigan State Department of Public Instruction was conducted in 1955 in Flint.

2. A leadership training program began in cooperation with the University of Chicago in 1956.

3. A Specialist Certificate for Directors of Community School Administration began with Michigan State University in 1957.

4. Flint's community education Workshop and Visitations Department established a full-time director and explained the community education philosophy and practice to 4,000 visitors from the United States and internationally in 1958.
5. The fourth annual state-wide Workshop in community education for dissemination of the concept was held in 1959 along with the first National Community School Clinic.

Many times it seems that when a leader or a new idea emerges from the traditional role they are often criticized, but apparently Pendell (1972) appeared to see little need to criticize the efforts in the Flint model or the combined work of Manley and Mott. Pendell (1972, p. 42) stated: "It is absolutely amazing what the team of Manley and Mott created, not only for Flint, but for the rest of the world to try and emulate. The more you investigate the activities, philosophies, innovations and programs, the more fantastic their accomplishments appear."

The following items, related to Manley's leadership direction and the Mott Foundation's contributions to the national community education movement, reflecting only the dissemination, leadership and administration portions, were reported by Pendell (1972) as including:

1. Establishment of the Inter-University Colloquium for Educational Administration in 1960 with seven state universities in Michigan.

2. The Third National Community School Clinic—cosponsored by the American Association of School Administrators, and the Sixth State-Wide Community Education Workshop was held in 1961.

3. A grant was given to Michigan State University to develop an Inter-University Intern Program in 1963. This pilot program developed into the present Educational Leadership Program.

4. Awarded the first Mott Foundation scholarship for a public school administrator (a superintendent) in 1963. This originated the Mott Scholarship for Master's and Doctor's degrees in community education.
administration. It was the beginning of a Preparation Program for Educational Leadership and 50 educational leaders from the United States and Europe spent a year in residency in Flint earning advanced degrees from Michigan's seven state universities.

Included in Pendell's (1972) report pointing out the ingredients which seemed to lead to a continuous community education movement under Manley's leadership were:

1. The Fifth National Community School Workshop was held in 1965.

2. The Mott Foundation gave a 10 year grant to Michigan State University to train teachers and administrators to work effectively with persons in urban core areas in 1965.

3. In 1966, grants were made to Alma and Albion Colleges for developing community enrichment and development programs; also, during this year, almost 12,000 visitors from around the world visited the Flint Community Schools to visualize the theory in action.

4. The National Community School Education Association held its first meeting (1967) and organized NCSEA in conjunction with the Seventh National Community School Workshop.

In a conversation with Frank Manley in 1972, he noted the importance of the superintendent's position for the continuation of the community education movement. Without local leadership from the highest administrator in a school district, Manley suggested that the community education movement would ultimately go the way of Dewey's progressive school movement and become staid and traditional. It was also noted that without a belief in the community education philosophy or the leadership to implement such a philosophy in its entirety the movement would revert to the level of traditional education and maintain a plateau of insignificance.
Therefore, prior to his death in 1972, Manley suggested to members of both the Flint Board of Education and the Mott Foundation that the position of General Superintendent of Community Education be established in Flint as another pioneering effort in the community education movement. Less than one month after the death of Frank Manley, his assistant for many years, Peter L. Clancy, was appointed the first Superintendent of Community Education in the nation on July 1, 1972 according to Grant (1972).

Harding Mott (1972) pointed out that the C. S. Mott Foundation was established in 1926 and by the mid-1930's Charles Stewart Mott had realized the capabilities of Manley as a partner needed for developing the Foundation's broad range of activities and projects. In Flint, it was noted that the Board of Education united its Mott Program and Kindergarten-through-12th grade divisions into a single unit for the greater good of each and the community. Mott (1972) also suggested that while there was no lessening of traditional support for programs carried on in the community schools, there was increasing need to address a wider range of urban needs.

However, even with a change in emphasis Mott (1972, p. 4) suggested the character of the Mott Foundation would remain the same when he stated:

Having been a member of the Mott Foundation board since its beginning in 1926, a partner with Mr. Mott and Mr. Manley in the development of community education from its very first days, and having shared my father's office for many years as well as shared with him the Foundation's executive responsibilities, I can attest to the great loss we have all suffered. And because my long and intimate association allows me no other course, I am just as sure the principles of C. S. Mott
will long be extended through the Foundation; and we contemplate those principles will prove as sound and practical in the years ahead as they were in his lifetime.

It appears that the Flint community education model intends to move onward under new leadership and in a manner many seem to advocate as necessary for continued growth and development. Grant (1972, p. 37) quoted General Superintendent Clancy as saying, "We have the opportunity to take the dream of Frank Manley and show that all people can live together in urban America, can have a voice and can improve their quality of living."

Grant (1972) pointed out that the community education concept no longer was considered an appendage to the traditional school program in the Flint model. He suggested that there will continue to be a director of community programs, but everything concerning the schools—including the community education philosophy—becomes the responsibility of the principal. Grant (1972, p. 37) concluded by quoting Clancy as saying relevant to the Flint model of community education, that the "community school program is now as much the principal's responsibility as is the reading program."

Already an emerging model of community education as suggested by Weaver (1972) has been introduced within the national movement. Weaver points out that to continue with the development of community education, leaders should be trained to have a high degree of both technical and conceptual skills along with a more subdued skill in human relations. This trend in the emerging model seems to place more emphasis on theory development rather than on the leadership
practice and quality displayed by Manley. But, as Moore (1957) reported after the Kellogg project ended, only the future results will determine if the new efforts were justified to meet the needs in educational leadership.

It seems that the only way the philosophy of community education can be judged in the future is to study the results of the modern leaders and determine the results they produce. Whether they change or modify the community education movement appears to be in their hands, and it seems, from past experience, that they do in fact have a choice of alternatives, both successful and unsuccessful.

A pattern or model of community education success seems to have been implanted in the educational and cultural field of American history. But as Cremin (1965, p. 35) stated: "In the last analysis, there is no more humane view of education than as growth in understanding, sensibility, and character, and no more noble view of democracy than as the dedication of society to the lifelong education of all its members." It seems the attainment of those goals lies in the minds and abilities of educational leaders that are truly committed to the continuation of the community education movement in America.

Summary

An attempt was made to trace the philosophy of community education through its period of evolution in relationship to the importance of educational leadership. This approach also intended to illustrate how traditional and progressive education seemed to evolve into a
community education movement including the prominent roles that outstanding educational leaders promoted in the changes. Finally, Chapter II appeared to suggest that new leadership in community education, including the key position of superintendent, would be responsible for furthering the aims of the community education movement.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes of superintendents about a philosophy of community education in school districts that had community education programs, with the attitudes of superintendents toward a community education philosophy in school districts that did not have community education programs, in the state of Michigan. Comparisons were made between the two groups of superintendents in terms of attitudes toward the overall philosophy of community education and in terms of attitudes toward the primary components of community education programs. These primary components were identified by Minzey (1974) as: (1) the traditional day school programs; (2) extended use of school facilities; (3) educational programs for school-age children and youth; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement.

To accomplish this study, a form of descriptive research was used. Ary et al. (1972, p. 286) defined such research as follows:

Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. They are directed toward determining the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study. There is no administration or control of a treatment as is found in experimental research.
One way to accomplish descriptive research is to utilize a form of survey methodology. Leedy (1974) identified two types of survey research as the descriptive survey and the analytical survey. For this study, Leedy's (1974, p. 114) explanation of an analytical survey was selected as most appropriate:

In the analytical survey approach, our purpose is . . . to take data that are essentially quantitative in nature (numerical data) and to analyze these data by means of appropriate statistical tools so that we may infer from them certain meanings which lie hidden within them, or at least to discern the presence of potentials and dynamic forces which lie within those data that may suggest possibilities of further investigation. In the analytical survey we are concerned primarily with problems of estimation and situations demanding the testing of a statistically based hypothesis.

To expand the design of this study, the remainder of this chapter covered: (1) operational definitions; (2) population and sample; (3) reliability, validity and adaptation of instrument; (4) data collection procedures; (5) hypotheses; (6) treatment of data; and (7) summary.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions were used in this study:

Superintendent

That individual designated as the chief administrator of a given school district in the state of Michigan. These individuals were identified through the Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide, 1974-75.
Districts with community education

The 263 school districts in Michigan identified by the directors of the four Regional Centers for Community Education as having community education programs as of June 30, 1975. The four Regional Centers for Community Education are located at Alma College, Eastern Michigan, Northern Michigan and Western Michigan Universities.

Districts without community education

The 327 school districts in Michigan identified by the above mentioned directors of the four Regional Centers for Community Education as not having community education programs.

Community education philosophy

The community education philosophy is the composite of the statements contained in the Modified Community Education Philosophy Instrument (M-CEPI).

Community education components

Minzey (1974) identified six basic components that comprise a community education program in a given school district. These six components are: (1) the traditional day school program; (2) extended use of community facilities; (3) additional programs for school-age children and youth; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement.
Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of the superintendents of the 590 school districts located within the state of Michigan as of June 30, 1975. Within the 590 school districts, the directors of the four Regional Centers for Community Education located at Alma College, Eastern Michigan, Northern Michigan and Western Michigan Universities identified 263 school districts with community education programs and 327 school districts without community education programs as of June 30, 1975. Therefore, the two groups which comprised the population were: (1) the 263 superintendents of school districts with community education; and (2) the 327 superintendents of school districts without community education programs.

From each of these two groups of superintendents, a random sample large enough to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance was selected. The table which indicates sample size according to a formula developed by Krejcie et al. (1970) was used to determine the sample size for each of the two groups. On this basis, the sample sizes were: (1) from the 263 superintendents of school districts with community education programs, the sample size was 155; and (2) from the 327 superintendents of school districts without community education programs, the sample size was 178. To determine the specific school districts which were included in each of the two samples, the random number table in Glass et al. (1970) was used. The school districts included in each sample are listed in Appendix A.
Reliability, Validity and Adaptation of Instrument

The data for this study were obtained by using a modified version of the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI). The instrument was originally developed as part of a doctoral dissertation (Jeffrey, 1975) that examined teacher acceptance of a community education philosophy. The author of the CEPI granted his permission (see Appendix B) to use and/or modify the instrument for use in this study.

The philosophy statements developed in the original CEPI were developed by reviewing current literature relative to community education. This instrument contained 63 items, each of which fell under one of the six components of community education identified by Minzey (1974).

The CEPI required the respondent to react to each statement on a Likert-type 5-point scale which measured the extent of agreement or disagreement with the philosophy statement. The scale was: strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; no opinion = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1.

The content and face validity of the original CEPI was determined by feedback from six professors of community education, six directors of university centers for community education, five community education doctoral students and five district-wide coordinators of community education. A test-retest method using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the reliability of the CEPI. Correlation coefficients were determined
for each of the six components. Jeffrey (1975, p. 58) reported these correlations as follows: "Component 1, \( r = .93 \); Component 2, \( r = .99 \); Component 3, \( r = .93 \); Component 4, \( r = .68 \); Component 5, \( r = .85 \); and Component 6, \( r = .96 \)."

In the present study, a number of modifications were made in the CEPI. These modifications were made in an attempt to make the instrument more sophisticated and to reflect a suggestion made by the original author that the CEPI be "further field tested and revised" (Jeffrey, 1975, p. 100). The modifications also reflected suggestions by this researcher's doctoral committee.

The major modification made for this study was to eliminate the excessive number of philosophical statements from 63 to 30. Five statements were retained under each of the six components of community education and the wording in several of the statements was changed after consultation with experts. While the basic scoring system used in the CEPI was maintained, the word neutral was substituted for the word no opinion.

The content validity of the M-CEPI was determined by asking 15 experts in the field of community education to comment as to whether or not they felt the statements reflected the community education philosophy. These experts were directors of Centers for Community Education, personnel from the C. S. Mott Foundation and district-wide directors for community education. As Ary et al. (1972, p. 192) indicated:

Content validity is essentially and of necessity based on judgement. The test maker may ask a number of experts to examine the items systematically and indicate whether or not they represent sufficiently well the theoretical universe from which they were drawn.
In addition, these experts were asked to suggest changes in wording which would make each statement more clear. On the basis of this additional knowledge, a number of minor word changes were made in the M-CEPI.

To determine the reliability of the M-CEPI, a test-retest procedure using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was employed. A group of 21 individuals was asked to respond to the items on the M-CEPI. One week later, these same individuals were again asked to respond to the items on the M-CEPI. A correlation coefficient was determined for the total test as well as each of the six components of community education. The results were:
(1) Total score, $r = .95$; (2) Component I, $r = .84$; (3) Component II, $r = .91$; (4) Component III, $r = .92$; (5) Component IV, $r = .73$; (6) Component V, $r = .97$; and (7) Component VI, $r = .86$.

While these correlation coefficients vary somewhat from those reported for the CEPI (Jeffrey, 1975), they are sufficiently high to judge the M-CEPI as a reliable measure of attitude toward a philosophy of community education. Ary et al. (1972) indicated that satisfactory reliability coefficients are those of .90 and above while reliability coefficients below .70 are unsatisfactory. As can be seen by examining Table I (page 69), the reliability coefficients obtained for the M-CEPI are all within acceptable limits.

A copy of the M-CEPI is in Appendix C while a copy of the statements which fit under each of the six components of community education is also found in Appendix C.
### Table I
Reliability Coefficients, M-CEPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total philosophy</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component I</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component III</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component IV</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component V</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component VI</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Procedures**

Although there are some limitations inherent in the use of the technique of mailing the instrument, this was the only method deemed feasible by the researcher. Ary et al. (1972) indicated that one of the major limitations of the mail technique is lack of control over the respondents. However, the monetary cost and travel time involved in contacting each individual in the two samples would seem to be prohibitive. In weighing the limitations of mailing the instrument against the cost of making personal contacts, the researcher felt that a well-designed instrument and effectively written letter of introduction and explanation would help overcome the lack of control over the respondents.
Once the instrument was modified and a random sample selected, a procedure for distribution was established. A letter stating the purpose and importance of the study and requesting the individual's cooperation, the instrument with appropriate directions, and a stamped pre-addressed return envelope was mailed to each person in the two samples. A tentative goal for returns was set at 70% from each of the two sample groups. In anticipation of the possible need to send a second request for data, each instrument was number coded to assist in identifying which superintendents had returned the instrument on the first request. The instruments mailed to superintendents in school districts with community education programs were printed on blue paper and those sent to superintendents in districts without community education programs were printed on yellow paper. This was done to assist the researcher in determining to which group the returned instruments belonged.

Hypotheses

In order to compare the attitudes toward a community education philosophy of superintendents in school districts with community education programs with the attitudes toward a community education philosophy of superintendents in school districts without community education programs, the following research hypotheses were tested:

1. There is a difference in attitude toward an overall philosophy of community education between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.
2. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as the traditional day-school program, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

3. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as extended use of community facilities, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

4. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as additional programs for school-age children and youth, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

5. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as programs for adults, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

6. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as delivery and coordination of community services, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

7. There is a difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as community involvement, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

Treatment of Data

Once the data were collected according to the procedure described previously in this chapter, a t-test for independent samples (Ary et
al., 1972) was used to determine if a significant difference existed between the attitudes toward an overall community education philosophy of superintendents in school districts with and without community education programs. Similarly, a t-test for independent samples was used to determine if a significant difference existed between the attitudes toward the six components of a community education philosophy between superintendents in districts with and without community education programs. A t test for independent samples was selected because the two samples were chosen from a population without any pairing or other relationship between the two groups.

Summary

The objective of this chapter was to explain the procedures used to collect and analyze data about the attitudes of school superintendents toward a philosophy of community education. Comparisons of attitudes toward a philosophy of community education were between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs in the state of Michigan.

To collect data about the attitude of superintendents toward a philosophy of community education, an instrument known as the M-CEPI was introduced and used. This instrument was mailed to a random sample of the two groups of superintendents, those in school districts with community education programs and those in school districts without community education programs. A tentative goal of 70% return from each of the two groups was set.
To analyze the data, a t-test for independent samples was utilized to determine if a difference existed in attitudes between the two groups of superintendents. This test was appropriate when there was no relationship between the two groups.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to compare the attitudes of superintendents toward a community education philosophy. Comparisons were made between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs in the state of Michigan. These comparisons were in terms of the superintendents' attitudes toward an overall community education philosophy and in terms of the superintendents' attitudes toward six primary components of community education.

To collect the data required for this study, the directors of the four Regional Centers for Community Education in Michigan were asked to identify school districts in their area with and without community education programs. From each of the two groups of superintendents, those in school districts with community education programs and those in school districts without community education programs, a random sample was selected to receive the M-CEPI via the mail. The M-CEPI was developed as a modification of the CEPI and both instruments were designed to measure attitudes toward a community education philosophy. A tentative goal for returns was set at 70% from each of the two groups.
The remainder of Chapter IV is organized as follows: (1) characteristics of the population; (2) attitudes of superintendents toward community education; and (3) summary.

Characteristics of the Population

The population for this study was made up of the superintendents of the 590 school districts in the state of Michigan as of June 30, 1975. The directors of the four Regional Community Education Centers identified 263 school districts with community education programs and 327 school districts without community education programs. The names of the superintendents of each group were identified through the Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide, 1974-75.

From each of the two groups of superintendents, a random sample was selected according to a table which is based on a formula developed by Krejcie et al. (1970). The two sample sizes were large enough to allow the researcher to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. From the 263 superintendents in school districts with community education programs, the required sample size was 155. From the 327 superintendents of school districts without community education programs, the required sample size was 178.

After the first mailing, 257 superintendents had returned the M-CEPI. This was a return of 77.1%. From the sample of 155 superintendents in school districts with community education programs, 121 completed and returned the M-CEPI for a return of 78.0%. From the sample of 178 superintendents in school districts without community education programs, 136 completed and returned the M-CEPI
for a return of 76.4%. Table II provides an overview of the returns from the two groups of superintendents.

Table II
Returns From the Two Samples of Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
<th>Number of Returns</th>
<th>Percent of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Community Education Programs</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Community Education Programs</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerlinger (1973) held that a response rate of 80% represents an excellent rate of return for a study using the mail technique. Since the percent of returns after the initial mailing was greater than the original goal of 70% and approached the 80% suggested by Kerlinger, a follow-up request for data was deemed unnecessary.

While this researcher did not make an official inquiry as to why some individuals did not return the M-CEPI, it seemed reasonable to look at the non-respondents from two views—the numbers who did not respond and the possible conditions which may have contributed to the non-response. From the sample of 155 superintendents from school districts with community education programs, 34 did not respond to the request for data. This was 21.9%. From the group of 178 superintendents from school districts without community education programs, 42 did not respond. This was 23.5%. Table III (page 77) shows an overview in terms of the number of non-respondents.
Table III
Non-Respondents in the Two Samples of Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
<th>Number of Non-Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Community Education Programs</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Community Education Programs</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of conditions which may have led to a superintendent not responding to the request for data. First, the original instrument may have been lost, and there was no second mailing to which the superintendent could respond if he/she had wished to do so. Second, there may have been a lack of interest either in a community education philosophy and/or assisting in contributing to a body of educational research. Third, the superintendent may have been unwilling to take time out from a busy schedule. Fourth, the M-CEPI may never have been received by the superintendent because of incorrect name and/or address or a change in position within a school district.

Attitudes of Superintendents Toward Community Education

To measure the superintendents' attitudes toward a philosophy of community education, the M-CEPI was used. The M-CEPI consists of a series of 30 statements related to a philosophy of community education. Each statement fits under one of the six components of
a community education program, with each component having five state­ments. The six components suggested by Minzey (1974) are: (1) the traditional day school program; (2) extended use of school facilities; (3) additional programs for school-age children and youth; (4) pro­grams for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement.

The M-CEPI required that the respondent indicate on a 5-point Likert-type scale the extent of agreement or disagreement with the statement. The scale used was: strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neutral = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1. In scoring the M-CEPI for each superintendent, a total score for the entire instru­ment was determined as well as a score for each of the six components. The higher an individual's score, the more the respondent was in agree­ment with the overall philosophy of community education as stated on the M-CEPI. A score of 150 would indicate total agreement with the philosophy. Similarly, the higher an individual's score on a com­ponent, the more the respondent was in agreement with the philosophy expressed by that particular component. A score of 25 would indicate total agreement with a particular component.

The scores indicating amount of agreement with the total philoso­phy of community education for superintendents in school districts with community education programs ranged from a high of 150 to a low of 104. The scores indicating amount of agreement with the total philosophy of community education for superintendents in school dis­tricts without community education programs ranged from a high of 150
to a low of 70. The range of scores for the two groups is illus-
trated in Figure 1 (page 80).

In comparing the range of scores for the six components of com-
munity education, the following information was found: (1) Component
I, the traditional day school program: with community education the
high was 25 and the low was 17; without community education the high
was 25 and the low was 16; (2) Component II, extended use of school
facilities: with community education the high was 25 and the low was
14; without community education the high was 25 and the low was
12; (3) Component III, additional programs for school-age children
and youth: with community education the high was 25 and the low was
12; without community education the high was 25 and the low was 9;
(4) Component IV, programs for adults: with community education the
high was 25 and the low was 15; without community education the high
was 25 and the low was 9; (5) Component V, delivery and coordination
of community services: with community education the high was 25
and the low was 11; without community education the high was 25 and
the low was 7; and (6) Component VI, community involvement: with
community education the high was 25 and the low was 16; without
community education the high was 25 and the low was 10.

To examine the attitudes of superintendents in school districts
with and without community education programs toward a philosophy
of community education, seven research hypotheses were postulated
stating that a difference would exist between the two groups of
superintendents in each of the following situations: (1) overall
community education philosophy; (2) Component I, traditional day
Broken Line = Group with community education
Solid line = Group without community education

Figure 1
Range of Total Scores, Two Groups, With and Without Community Education
school programs; (3) Component II, extended use of school facilities; (4) Component III, additional programs for school age children and youth; (5) Component IV, programs for adults; (6) Component V, delivery and coordination of community services; and (7) Component VI, community involvement.

To test the difference in superintendents' attitudes toward a philosophy of community education as postulated in the research hypotheses, the null hypothesis corresponding to each research hypothesis was tested for statistical significance of the findings. The null hypotheses are as follows:

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 1:

There is no difference in attitudes toward a philosophy of community education between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 2:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as the traditional day school programs, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 3:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as extended use of community facilities, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 4:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as
additional programs for school age children and youth, between superintendents in school districts with community education and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 5:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as programs for adults, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 6:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as delivery and coordination of community services, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

\( H_0 \) for Hypothesis 7:

There is no difference in attitudes toward the component of community education identified as community involvement, between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

The mean scores for the two groups of superintendents in terms of agreement with the overall philosophy of community education were 128.2 for the superintendents in school districts with community education programs and 120.0 for the superintendents in school districts without community education programs. The mean scores for the two groups of superintendents in terms of the six components are displayed in Table IV (page 83). In all instances, the mean scores for the superintendents from school districts with community education programs was higher than the mean scores for the
### Table IV

Mean Scores, Six Components of Community Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Mean With Community Education</th>
<th>Mean Without Community Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>19.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendents from school districts without community education programs. The highest mean score (22.5) for the superintendents was for Component I, traditional day school programs, while the lowest mean score (20.12) for the same group was for Component III, additional programs for school age children and youth. For the superintendents from school districts without community education programs, the highest mean score (21.49) was also for Component I, traditional day school programs, while the lowest (19.04) was for Component V, delivery and coordination of community services.

A t-test for independent groups was used to analyze the results as related to each of the seven null hypotheses. This t-test was selected because these seven hypotheses involved comparing the means of two independent groups. In these seven hypotheses, the comparisons...
were between superintendents from school districts with community education programs and superintendents from school districts without community education programs.

The results as related to the comparison of superintendents' attitudes toward an overall philosophy of community education are displayed in Table V (page 85). The mean score (128.2) for superintendents from school districts with community education programs was significantly higher than the mean score (120.0) for superintendents of school districts without community education programs. The obtained value of t led to the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .001 level of significance. These results indicate that a statistically significant difference did exist between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs in terms of their acceptance of a philosophy of community education. It would therefore seem that superintendents from school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with an overall philosophy of community education than are those from school districts without community education programs.

In examining the results as related to the superintendents' attitudes toward Component I, the traditional day school programs, the mean score (22.50) for superintendents from school districts with community education programs was significantly higher than the mean score (21.49) for superintendents from school districts without community education programs. The obtained value of t allowed the null hypothesis to be rejected at the .001 level of significance.
Table V

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Mean} & \text{SD} & \text{Mean} & \text{SD} \\
\text{Districts With} & \text{Districts Without} & \text{df} & t \\
\text{Community Education} & \text{Community Education} \\
\text{Programs} & \text{Programs} \\
1 & 128.2 & 11.33 & 120.0 & 13.67 & 255 & -5.17* \\
\end{array} \]

*Significant at the .001 level
Critical value of \( t = 3.29 \)

These results, as illustrated in Table VI (page 86) show that a statistically significant difference did exist between the two groups of superintendents in terms of their attitudes toward the traditional day school programs. The results would seem to indicate that superintendents from school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with the philosophy of the traditional day school than are superintendents from school districts without community education programs.

Table VII (page 86) displays the \( t \)-test as applicable to the superintendents' attitudes toward Component II, extended use of school facilities. The mean score (22.42) for superintendents from school districts with community education programs was significantly higher than the mean score (20.72) for the superintendents from school districts without community education programs. The \( t \) value allowed for the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .001 level of significance. This would indicate that there was a statistically
Table VI

$t$ Value for Independent Groups, Superintendents' Attitudes Toward the Traditional Day School Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean [Districts With Community Education Programs]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean [Districts Without Community Education Programs]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level

Critical value of $t = 3.29$

A significant difference when comparing superintendents' attitudes from school districts with and without community education programs toward the extended use of school facilities. Superintendents from school districts with community education programs seem to be more in agreement with extended use of school facilities than do superintendents from school districts without community education programs.

Table VII

$t$ Value for Independent Groups, Superintendents' Attitudes Toward the Extended Use of School Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean [Districts With Community Education Programs]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean [Districts Without Community Education Programs]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-5.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level

Critical value of $t = 3.29$
The t value as related to superintendents' attitudes toward Component III, additional programs for school age children and youth, is displayed in Table VIII. The mean score (20.12) for superintendents from school districts with community education programs is significantly higher than the mean score (19.07) for superintendents from school districts without community education programs. At the .01 level the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, a statistically significant difference was found between superintendents from school districts with community education programs and superintendents from school districts without community education programs when comparing their attitudes toward additional programs for school age children and youth. An attitude more in agreement with providing additional programs for school age children and youth seems to be expressed on the part of superintendents with community education programs than on the part of superintendents without community education programs.

Table VIII

| t Value for Independent Groups, Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Additional Programs for School Age Children and Youth |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD | df | t |
| H₀ | | Districts With Community Education Programs | | Districts Without Community Education Programs | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4 | 20.12 | 2.57 | 19.07 | 2.76 | 255 | -3.16* |

*Significant at the .01 level
Critical value of t = 2.57
The results as related to the superintendents' attitudes toward Component IV, programs for adults, are displayed in Table IX. The mean score (21.35) for superintendents from school districts with community education programs was significantly higher than the mean score (20.09) for superintendents from school districts without community education programs. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level. A statistically significant difference was found to exist in terms of attitudes toward programs for adults between superintendents from school districts with community education programs and superintendents from school districts without community education programs. Therefore, it would appear that superintendents from school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with the idea of providing programs for adults than superintendents from school districts without community education programs.

Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts With</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts Without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level
Critical value of $t = 3.29$
In examining the attitude of superintendents toward Component V, delivery and coordination of community services, the mean score (20.37) for superintendents of school districts with community education programs was significantly higher than the mean score (19.04) for superintendents in school districts without community education programs. The obtained value of $t$ as displayed in Table X allowed for the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .001 level of significance. When comparing attitudes toward delivery and coordination of community services, a statistically significant difference was found to exist between superintendents in school districts with community education programs and superintendents in school districts without community education programs. Superintendents in school districts with community education programs seem to be more in agreement with delivery and coordination of community services than do superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

Table X

$t$ Value for Independent Groups, Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Delivery and Coordination of Community Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0$ Districts With Community Education Programs</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level

Critical value of $t = 3.29$
Table XI displays the $t$ value as applicable to superintendents' attitudes toward Component VI, community involvement. In looking at the mean scores, one finds that the mean score (21.42) for superintendents in school districts with community education programs is significantly higher than the mean score (19.66) for superintendents in school districts without community education programs. The null hypothesis can be rejected on the basis of the $t$ value at the .001 level. The results indicate that a statistically significant difference did exist when the attitude toward community involvement of superintendents in school districts with community education programs and the attitude toward community involvement of superintendents in school districts without community education is compared. As the results suggest, superintendents in school districts with community education are more in agreement with community involvement than are superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

Table XI

$t$ Value for Independent Groups, Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Community Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H_o</th>
<th>Mean (Districts With Community Education Programs)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean (Districts Without Community Education Programs)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-5.51*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level
Critical value of $t = 3.29$
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To summarize, a statistically significant difference was found to exist at the .001 level between the attitudes of superintendents in school districts with community education programs and the attitudes of superintendents in school districts without community education programs in the following instances: (1) overall philosophy of community education; (2) traditional day school programs; (3) extended use of school facilities; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement. A statistically significant difference was found between the two groups at the .01 level in the case of additional programs for school age children and youth. The results of the $t$ values are summarized in Table XII.

Table XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-5.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-5.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-3.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-5.51*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level  
**Significant at the .01 level
Summary

This study dealt with the attitudes of superintendents in school districts with and without community education programs toward a philosophy of community education and toward six basic components of community education programs. Out of seven research hypotheses which suggested a difference in attitudes between the two groups of superintendents, a significant difference was found at the .001 level in these situations: (1) overall philosophy of community education; (2) traditional day school programs; (3) extended use of school facilities; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement. At the .01 level a statistically significant difference was found in the case of attitudes toward additional programs for school age children and youth.

The results indicate that superintendents in school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with a philosophy of community education than are superintendents in school districts without community education programs. In addition, the superintendents in school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with each of the six basic components than are superintendents in school districts without community education programs.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results of the attitudinal research study of Michigan superintendents toward a philosophy of community education. The chapter is organized as follows: First, a review of the research problem and a summary of the procedures used in the study of the superintendents are discussed; second, conclusions drawn from the research study results of the superintendents' attitudes are elaborated upon; third, recommendations for theorists and practitioners in the field of community education based on the research findings of this study are set forth by the author; fourth, implications for further research in the area of community education utilizing the M-CEPI are presented with a view toward gaining future knowledge in the field.

Summary of the Problem and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes of superintendents about a philosophy of community education in school districts that had community education programs with the attitudes of superintendents toward a community education philosophy in school districts that did not have community education programs in the state of Michigan. Comparisons were made between the two groups of superintendents in terms of their attitudes toward an overall philosophy.
of community education and in terms of six components of community education identified as: (1) the traditional day school program; (2) extended use of school facilities; (3) additional programs for school age children and youth; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of services; and (6) community involvement.

Superintendents within Michigan school districts were selected for the study because Kelly (1975) indicated that to implement the concept of community education into a local school district the support and understanding of the philosophy by the superintendent was an essential factor. While, as Knezevich (1975) stated, it is the board of education that establishes school policy, the superintendent provides the professional leadership for the educational programs in the schools. Unless the superintendent is in agreement with the concept of community education and ultimately presents it to the board of education for acceptance or rejection, it seems probable that some school districts may ultimately be denied the alternative of having a choice.

To accomplish the stated purpose of this study, the M-CEPI was developed as a modification of the CEPI (Jeffrey, 1975). The M-CEPI allows the respondent to indicate extent of agreement or disagreement with a series of 30 community education philosophy statements. Each statement fits under one of the six components of a community education program identified earlier in this section.

To collect data from superintendents, the four Michigan Regional Centers for Community Education were asked to identify school districts in their area with and without community education programs.
From the 590 school districts in the state, 263 were identified as having community education programs and 327 were identified as not having community education programs. A large enough random sample was selected from each of these two groups to allow the researcher to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. From the 263 superintendents in school districts with community education programs, the sample was 155, and from the 327 superintendents in school districts without community education programs, the sample was 178.

After the samples were selected, the M-CEPI was mailed to each superintendent in the two samples. After the first mailing, 257 superintendents had completed and returned the M-CEPI. This was a return of 77.1%. In examining the returns from the two groups, 121 or 78.0% of the superintendents from school districts with community education programs returned the M-CEPI and 136 or 76.4% of the superintendents from school districts without community education programs returned the M-CEPI. The return from both groups was higher than the original goal of 70%.

To determine if a difference in attitudes toward a philosophy of community education existed between the two groups of superintendents, a t-test for independent groups was used. At the .001 level, a statistically significant difference was found to exist between the attitudes of superintendents in school districts with community education programs and the attitudes of superintendents in school districts without community education programs in these instances: (1) overall philosophy of community education; (2) the traditional
day school program; (3) extended use of school facilities; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement. A statistically significant difference was found at the .01 level between the two groups in terms of their attitudes toward additional programs for school age children and youth.

Conclusions

This study was undertaken to examine the attitudes of school superintendents toward a philosophy of community education. The study explored the possibility that differences in attitudes toward a philosophy of community education would exist between superintendents in school districts that had community education programs and superintendents in school districts that did not have community education programs.

A number of authors, Crews (1975), Minzey (1975), and VanVoorhees (1972) have all suggested that the superintendent is a key person in implementing the community education concept through the public schools. The attitude of the superintendent toward community education seems to be an important factor in determining whether or not a school district adopts the philosophy and consequently implements programs and services based on this philosophy. As Knezevich (1975), Griffiths (1966) and Campbell et al. (1971) have all noted, the superintendent is the person who provides leadership and who has the final responsibility for operation of all educational programs in the schools. These same authors also suggest that the
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superintendent must provide for innovation, change and development of new programs. If community education is to be implemented, support from the school leader and decision maker, the superintendent, seems to be a necessity.

In this particular study, superintendents in school districts with community education programs were more in agreement with an overall philosophy of community education than were superintendents in school districts without community education programs. These findings seem to support those of Kelly (1975), who found that an understanding of community education on the part of the superintendent was necessary in order that community education be implemented in a school district. Crews (1975) also indicated that superintendents must be sold on the community education philosophy if it is to become a reality.

When examining the superintendents' attitudes toward the six components of community education, the results of this study led to the conclusion that superintendents from school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with each component than are superintendents from school districts without community education programs. These six components are: (1) the traditional day school; (2) extended use of school facilities; (3) additional programs for school age children and youth; (4) programs for adults; (5) delivery and coordination of community services; and (6) community involvement. Minzey (1975) indicated that school administrators, including the superintendent, must be willing to accept responsibility for all dimensions of community education.
It would seem reasonable that one of the first steps toward accepting this responsibility would be for superintendents to be in agreement with the philosophy of each component. As the present study indicated, superintendents in school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with the six components than are superintendents in school districts without community education programs.

In summary, one might conclude from this study that superintendents from school districts with community education programs are more in agreement with an overall philosophy of community education than are superintendents from school districts without community education programs. Similar conclusions might be drawn when looking at superintendents' agreement with the six components.

Recommendations for Theorists and Practitioners

Understanding why some school districts implement community education programs while others do not is an important consideration for the future advancement of the concept. It seems reasonable to assume, particularly in light of the information presented in Chapter II and in light of the results of this study, that positive leadership in the field of community education is imperative to its development. Without the leadership needed to motivate the forces to implement the community education concept, it appears that the idea is reduced to academic rhetoric with mundane conversation as its primary goal.
Evidence from this study seems to indicate, at least in Michigan, that the superintendents in districts with and without community education programs have an interest in the concept. This appears reasonable considering the response of 77.1% from both groups of superintendents after the first and only request for information.

Since this study focused on the leadership role of school district superintendents in Michigan, it seems appropriate that persons or groups consider contact with the superintendent as one of the first steps to introduce the concept. Even though there was some agreement, as Knezevich (1975) pointed out, that boards of education usually set school policy, without the superintendent initiating discussion with the board, the community education concept may not be given a chance for acceptance or rejection. Therefore, a first step for implementation of community education into a school district in Michigan seems to be the approaching of the superintendent and the maintaining of appropriate follow-up procedures.

From this study, which seemed to indicate that both groups of superintendents have a basic understanding and awareness of community education, a follow-up strategy appears to be a necessity. One visitation or presentation to a superintendent does not seem to be adequate enough to make the concept evolve from a theory into a reality. While superintendents in Michigan seem to have an awareness of the concept, less than half of the school districts have what are considered operable community education programs. While this may appear adequate in 49 other states, it seems unjustified in Michigan. This is based on the fact that Michigan has appeared to
have been the leading state for promoting the community education concept. Perhaps this situation exists primarily because of a conflict regarding the leadership method by which to determine the best approach for initiating community education.

The conflict appears to center around the methods utilized by theorists and practitioners questioning whether community education should begin with a process or a series of programs. This study seems to have pointed out that the community education movement utilized a combination of both programs and processes and ultimately appeared successful. It seems unreasonable to return to isolated community education projects or ill-defined semantic positions and hope for the same successful results in the future.

The above mentioned conflict appears to point toward a need for more intensive in-service training for both theorists and practitioners on an equal professional basis. It does not seem logical that either group can sell the concept to superintendents or others with any chance of maintaining longevity without working together. It does appear that one of the primary roles of Regional Community Education Centers was and is to do precisely that—draw both professional factions together to insure and maintain the continuity of the concept.

Throughout the history of community education there was not a bona fide community education movement due mainly to a lack of unified purpose on the part of the leadership. That problem appears to have been resolved with a modern community education movement. To continue and improve, it seems that the Regional Community
Education Centers should accept more responsibility for bringing all of the community educators, including the superintendents, under one flexible philosophy.

Regional Community Education Centers with the added resources of graduate interns should develop and maintain practical workshops for superintendents and other interested people. These workshops should involve superintendents beginning with the initial planning. They should also be a part of a team to put the actual workshop model into action. Evidence from this study seems to indicate that not only are superintendents in Michigan aware of the community education concept, but they are willing to assist in its growth and expansion. This leadership role to unite superintendents seems to have been the province of the Regional Centers from their inception and should expand to meet today's needs.

Superintendents in school districts with community education programs should be encouraged to bring superintendents without programs to workshops and seminars to expose them to the concept. The Regional Centers should then maintain a continuous line of communication with superintendents without programs and offer the full range of services to assist them in implementing the concept. A flow of information should be developed and maintained by the Regional Centers into all school districts in their service areas. This might include superintendent study groups to discover methods for making the community education concept economically feasible and to deal with other problems which stand in the way of implementing community education.
Finally, practicing community educators in the field should keep their superintendents continually informed and up to date in regard to the ongoing process being utilized in their school districts. An open line of communication should be developed whereby the superintendent understands, accepts and supports the community education concept in a given school district in Michigan.

Implications for Further Research

In view of the findings of this study, a number of implications for further research seem appropriate. It is suggested that this study be replicated in other geographic areas where community education programs are in operation or where community education is just getting started. Examining superintendents' attitudes toward community education in areas where the concept is just being introduced might assist in developing a more effective strategy for furthering the understanding and acceptance of community education. This study might also be feasible in school districts without community education programs to determine the superintendents' attitude toward the concept and provide more insight for initiating community education within the district.

The study might even be replicated with other school administrators, with board of education members, with advisory council members, and with other school employees involved in community education. In addition, studies which compared attitudes of these various groups might provide useful information for community educators. Comparisons could be made between: (1) superintendents and school board members;
(2) superintendents and community school directors; (3) superinten-
dents and advisory council members; (4) superintendents and principals;
(5) superintendents and community education custodial staff; (6) or
any combination which should provide needed additional information.

The M-CEPI, which was modified from the CEPI, should be further
field tested in order to add to the existing information about the
reliability and validity of the instrument. Such field testing
should assist in making the M-CEPI an even more valuable tool to
use in understanding, developing and implementing the community edu-
cation concept.
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APPENDIX A

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

School Districts With Community Education Programs

School Districts Without Community Education Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Community Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegan</td>
<td>Caledonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Park</td>
<td>Calumet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Caro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almont</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpena</td>
<td>Chassell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Chesaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraga</td>
<td>Clawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark River</td>
<td>Clio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City</td>
<td>Comstock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>Coopersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belding</td>
<td>Corunna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>Croswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>Crystal Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessemer</td>
<td>Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bay</td>
<td>Delton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Rapids</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Dollar Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>Dryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyne City</td>
<td>Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>East Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>East Tawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Edwardsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td>Elsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escanaba</td>
<td>Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewen</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Iron Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>Ishpeming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Rock</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenmuth</td>
<td>Jenison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitport</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>Kenowa Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>Kingsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladwin</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Blanc</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Haven</td>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandville</td>
<td>Livonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayling</td>
<td>Mackinac Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosse Pointe</td>
<td>Manistique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinn</td>
<td>Marquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Springs</td>
<td>Middleville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillman</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Mona Shores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH COMMUNITY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Sault Ste. Marie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Clemens</td>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munising</td>
<td>South Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon</td>
<td>South Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negaunee</td>
<td>Spring Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>Standish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles Brandywine</td>
<td>Sturgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okemos</td>
<td>Suttons Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchardview</td>
<td>Swartz Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otisville</td>
<td>Tekonsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paw Paw</td>
<td>Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petoskey</td>
<td>Union City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Utica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>Vassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>Walled Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed City</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeths Puffer</td>
<td>Wayland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>West Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>Whitehall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Whitmore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Wyoming
Wyoming Godfrey Lee
Wyoming Godwin Heights
Ypsilanti
Zeeland
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITHOUT COMMUNITY EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au Gres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blissfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlevoix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheboygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITHOUT COMMUNITY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Community Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flint Westwood Heights</td>
<td>Haslett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowlerville</td>
<td>Hesperia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort</td>
<td>Holland West Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frasier</td>
<td>Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freesoil</td>
<td>Houghton Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galesburg</td>
<td>Howard City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord</td>
<td>Hudsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobles</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrich</td>
<td>Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ledge</td>
<td>Imlay City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Forest Hills</td>
<td>Indian River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Lake</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosse Ile</td>
<td>Jackson - East Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale</td>
<td>Jonesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Kalkaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamtramck</td>
<td>Kent City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>Kindee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Beach</td>
<td>Kingsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Woods</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITHOUT COMMUNITY EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Waverly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Roy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litchfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancelona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manistee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Bullock Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morenci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon Oakridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lothrop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newaygo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otsego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owosso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITHOUT COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Palo
Parchment
Peck
Pellston
Perkins
Perry
Pigeon
Pinckney
Plainwell
Port Austin
Port Hope
Port Huron
Portland
Posen
Powers
Quincy
Rapid River
Ravenna
Reading
Reese
River Rouge
Rock
Rogers City
Roscommon
St. Johns

Sparta
Traverse City
White Pigeon
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

Permission to Use and Modify CEPI

Cover Letter for M-CEPI
June 4, 1975

Permission was requested and obtained from the author of the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI), Dr. John B. Jeffrey, for use in this study. Also, permission was granted by Dr. Jeffrey to modify the instrument to strengthen and increase its value relative to future community education research.

[Signature]
Dr. John B. Jeffrey
October 31, 1975

The Community Education concept is being adopted as the basic philosophy by many school districts throughout the State of Michigan. This growth generates a fundamental need for gathering research data which will evaluate this educational movement.

As in the past, educators in Michigan have always been interested in serving people better and superintendents have been fore-runners in this area. The data being collected can only be obtained through the cooperation of educational leaders such as yourself and I hope you will find time to respond to the questionnaire. It requires approximately 10 - 12 minutes to complete.

The study report will contain no identification of individuals or school districts. Your response will be treated confidentially and will only be analyzed as part of a group. A code number will be used strictly to cross-check the returns against the original mailing list.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is included for your convenience. Your cooperation is much needed and appreciated.

Always,

Frank J. Manley III
Assistant to the Director

FJM:te

Enclosure
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT

Modified Community Education Philosophy Instrument

Philosophy Statements for Each Component of Community Education
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY INSTRUMENT (MODIFIED)

Directions

Please read each statement on the following pages. Circle the number which most accurately indicates the extent to which each statement reflects your personal educational philosophy. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

5 - Strongly Agree
4 - Agree
3 - Neutral
2 - Disagree
1 - Strongly Disagree

1.1 Research studies indicate that students learn from their total environment; hence, the entire community is a vital part of the learning experience.  5 4 3 2 1

2.2 Public school facilities belong to all the taxpayers in the community and their use should be maximized beyond the traditional academic school day.  5 4 3 2 1

3.3 There is an increasing need for additional educational experience and opportunities for youngsters.  5 4 3 2 1

4.4 Public schools should provide opportunities for adults to complete high school (earn a diploma).  5 4 3 2 1

5.5 Public schools, with other agencies should assume the leadership for identifying community resources to attack community problems.  5 4 3 2 1

6.6 Administrators, other school personnel, and community leaders should work together to develop educational goals to make learning opportunities available to individuals of all ages.  5 4 3 2 1

7.1 Educational practices should reflect the expressed interests, needs, desires, and problems of all students for whom they are planned.  5 4 3 2 1

8.2 Public school facilities which are restricted entirely to use by school-age students represent a wasted community resource.  5 4 3 2 1
5 - Strongly Agree  
4 - Agree  
3 - Neutral  
2 - Disagree  
1 - Strongly Disagree

9.3 Recreational activities for school age children not provided by another community agency in sufficient quantity, should be provided by the community education department.  

10.4 Other agencies, working together with the public schools should be responsible for adult vocational training and job upgrading programs.  

11.5 Public schools should share its facilities and resources with local governmental and social agencies to deliver increased and improved services.  

12.6 Citizens' advisory councils are needed to assist professional educators in uncovering the community's educational needs, desires and expectations.  

13.1 Educational programs can be made more meaningful by bringing "the community into the classroom" and taking "the classroom into the community."  

14.2 Administrators should be expected to meet the increasing needs of K-12 students while attempting to provide services for all citizens in the community through the schools.  

15.3 Other agencies, in cooperation with public schools, should be responsible for providing pre-school activities for 3 and 4 year old children.  

16.4 Taxpayers should be expected to finance their share of the so-called "frills" included in education, such as enrichment, avocational, recreational or evening programs.  

17.5 The public school has an obligation to work toward the improvement of the physical, social, economic and psychological environment through cooperative efforts with other agencies.  

18.6 School personnel should be aware that people in every community provide a wealth of untapped skills, talents, and services which should be utilized by the school district.
5 - Strongly Agree  
4 - Agree  
3 - Neutral  
2 - Disagree  
1 - Strongly Disagree

19.1 Public school buildings should remain open as many hours as necessary to satisfy the total educational needs of its community members.  

20.2 Administrators should have or develop a flexible procedure to insure that school facilities are made available for use by interested community groups or responsible agencies.  

21.3 The school should provide remedial learning opportunities for students who need such programs.  

22.4 Learning is a life long process; therefore, a balanced program of educational experiences, including adults, should be offered by the public schools.  

23.5 The public school should be considered a human resource center through which some other agencies may funnel their services into the community.  

24.6 Community members without children in school should have as influential a voice in educational affairs as those whose children are presently enrolled.  

25.1 Helping the student develop a positive self-concept is as important as helping the student learn "subject matter."  

26.2 Administrators should plan the construction of new school facilities with the total learning needs of the community as a high priority.  

27.3 Avocational (hobby) and enrichment (interest areas) programs for youngsters should be the shared responsibility of appropriate city/county agencies and the public schools.  

28.4 Recreational, cultural and avocational (hobby) activities for adults should be a shared responsibility of public schools and other agencies in community sponsorship.
29.5 Agency personnel, in coordination with the public school staff, should serve as catalytic agents in directing local resources to solve community problems.

30.6 Authority for educational planning should not rest solely in the hands of the professional educator.
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENTS FOR EACH COMPONENT OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Component I

Traditional Day School Programs

1.1 Research studies indicate that students learn from their total environment; hence, the entire community is a vital part of the learning experience.

7.1 Educational practices should reflect the expressed interests, needs, desires, and problems of all students for whom they are planned.

13.1 Educational programs can be made more meaningful by bringing "the community into the classroom" and taking "the classroom into the community."

19.1 Public school buildings should remain open as many hours as necessary to satisfy the total educational needs of its community members.

25.1 Helping the student develop a positive self-concept is as important as helping the student learn "subject matter."

Component II

Extended Use of School Facilities

2.2 Public school facilities belong to all the taxpayers in the community and their use should be maximized beyond the traditional academic school day.

8.2 Public school facilities which are restricted entirely to use by school-age students represent a wasted community resource.

14.2 Administrators should be expected to meet the increasing needs of K-12 students while attempting to provide services for all citizens in the community through the schools.

20.2 Administrators should have or develop a flexible procedure to insure that school facilities are made available for use by interested community groups or responsible agencies.

26.2 Administrators should plan the construction of new school facilities with the total learning needs of the community as a high priority.
Component III
Additional Programs for School Aged Children and Youth

3.3 There is an increasing need for additional educational experience and opportunities for youngsters.

9.3 Recreational activities for school age children not provided by another community agency in sufficient quantity, should be provided by the community education department.

15.3 Other agencies, in cooperation with public schools, should be responsible for providing pre-school activities for 3 and 4 year old children.

21.3 The school should provide remedial learning opportunities for students who need such programs.

27.3 Avocational (hobby) and enrichment (interest areas) programs for youngsters should be the shared responsibility of appropriate city/county agencies and the public schools.

Component IV
Programs for Adults

4.4 Public schools should provide opportunities for adults to complete high school (earn a diploma).

10.4 Other agencies, working together with the public schools, should be responsible for adult vocational training and job upgrading programs.

16.4 Taxpayers should be expected to finance their share of the so-called "frills" included in education, such as enrichment, avocational, recreational or evening programs.

22.4 Learning is a life long process; therefore, a balanced program of educational experiences, including adults, should be offered by the public schools.

28.4 Recreational, cultural and avocational (hobby) activities for adults should be a shared responsibility of public schools and other agencies in community sponsorship.
Component V

Delivery and Coordination of Services

5.5 Public schools, with other agencies should assume the leadership for identifying community resources to attack community problems.

11.5 Public schools should share its facilities and resources with local governmental and social agencies to deliver increased and improved services.

17.5 The public school has an obligation to work toward the improvement of the physical, social, economic and psychological environment through cooperative efforts with other agencies.

23.5 The public school should be considered a human resource center through which some other agencies may funnel their services into the community.

29.5 Agency personnel, in coordination with the public school staff, should serve as catalytic agents in directing local resources to solve community problems.

Component VI

Community Involvement

6.6 Administrators, other school personnel, and community leaders should work together to develop educational goals to make learning opportunities available to individuals of all ages.

12.6 Citizens' advisory councils are needed to assist professional educators in uncovering the community's educational needs, desires and expectations.

18.6 School personnel should be aware that people in every community provide a wealth of untapped skills, talents, and services which should be utilized by the school district.

24.6 Community members without children in school should have as influential a voice in educational affairs as those whose children are presently enrolled.

30.6 Authority for educational planning should not rest solely in the hands of the professional educator.