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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, DEFINITIONS, AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Myran (1971) states that "a community services 'rhetoric' is emerging (p. 28)." However, the researcher found that Raines (1971) was correct in stating that:

As one attempts to understand the role of community services in the community college he is apt to experience some confusion. Terminology in the field is imprecise, causing considerable difficulty in communication (p. 404).

Thus, it was decided to integrate the literature related to the study, along with the definitions of terms, whenever the survey of the literature uncovered differences of opinion as to possible definition. Knowing that this increases the complexity of the first chapter, the following brief overview of this chapter is provided.

Chapter I contains a statement of the problem, the importance of the study which, in turn, is followed by the definitions of terms used together with any needed discussion of the literature. After a summary of the definitions, the theoretical hypotheses are stated. Lastly, the literature related to the hypotheses is reviewed.

Statement of the Problem

This study has attempted to find answers to the
following questions with regard to community services programs provided by public community colleges in the United States:

(1) What effect does the location of a community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy have upon the scope of the community services program?

(2) What effect does the number of multifarious duties performed by a community services administrator have upon the scope of the community services program?

(3) What effect does the amount of attention paid by a community college president to community services have upon the scope of the community services program?

Importance of the Study

In the last ten years, community services has developed into one of the accepted tasks for a community college. During this time, most of the research conducted on community services has been related to determining what constitutes the community services program. Within this research, theories as to what affects the scope of a community services program were expressed. However, very few studies have been reported which test hypotheses generated from those theories. Such hypotheses are tested in this study.

This study complements the one conducted by Michael Parsons (1971) as an Ed.D. dissertation at Western
Michigan University, Parsons examined the relationship between six variables and the scope of community services programming in Michigan public community colleges. The variables selected by Parsons included the attitude of the community college president toward community services, the age of the community college, the size of the institution, the socioeconomic status of the college, the number of campuses a community college has, and the percent of institutional budget allocated to the community services budget. In reporting the implications of his study, Parsons noted that "there is a noticeable minority of presidents who do not perceive a need for a director to report directly to them (p. 83)," and he went on to suggest that "it would be valuable to be able to empirically assess the effect of placement (p. 83)." Parsons' suggestion is carried out in this study.

Furthermore, since, according to Thornton (1972), "the scope and adequacy of (community) services determine whether or not the college merits the title of 'community' junior college (p. 67)," the researcher believes that presidents of community colleges should be interested in identifying the organizational structure that is likely to increase the scope of their colleges' community services programs. The results of this study should benefit a community college president by giving assistance in defining the most effective role for the college's community services adminis-
trator.

Lastly, as an aid to defining what constitutes the community services program, a systems model of community services is presented. In addition to its stated purpose, this model should be valuable in providing a new basis of discussion for community services.

Definitions of Terms

Community Services

Many different definitions of community services appear in the literature. One of the earliest definitions was provided by Reynolds (1956) who stated:

Community services may be defined as involving both college and community resources and conducted for the purpose of meeting specified educational needs of individuals or enterprises within the college or the community (pp. 141-142).

Myran defined community services as:

Those efforts of the community college, often undertaken in cooperation with other community groups or agencies, which are directed toward serving personal and community educational needs not met by formal collegiate degree or certificate programs (p. 12).

However, as the results of a study he conducted in 1971, Myran modified his definition as follows:

Those action programs of the community college, undertaken independently or in cooperation with other community groups and agencies, which direct the educational resources of the college toward serving individual, group and community needs (Myran, 1971, p. 15).
Reynolds, too, modified his definition. In fact, his later definition bears little resemblance to the earlier one. In 1965 he wrote, "the community-service program includes all the educational services provided by a junior college over and beyond the regular day program for full-time students (Reynolds, 1965, p. 42)."

For the purposes of their studies, three researchers saw fit to define community services quite similarly to Reynolds. Though more wordy than the others, Hamrick (1970), in his study of community services programs in non-urban community colleges, defined community services in the following manner:

Community services in the non-urban community college setting refers to that dimension of the institution which serves as a leadership force in developing and coordinating college-community relations in response to community needs. In providing programs and facilities both on and off campus, this dimension responds to individual and community needs not generally served by the degree-directed curriculum. Through providing creative professional leadership and resources, extending communication and public information services, and encouraging community involvement, the community services dimension offers a breadth and depth of experience which serve to upgrade the educational, occupational, and cultural levels of the area, strengthen community support and acceptance of the community college, and inspire community self-help in solving local problems (p. 5).

In a more concise manner, Raines (1969a), for the purposes of his survey, defined community services as follows:
The educational, cultural, social and recr–
ratinal services which an educational insti–
tution may provide for its community in
addition to its regularly scheduled day and
evening classes (p. 1).

Harlacher (1969) used the following as a definition
of community services in his study:

Community services are educational, cultural,
and recreational services which an educa–
tional institution may provide for its commu–
nity in addition to its regularly scheduled
day and evening classes (p. 12).

For the purposes of this study, a combination of the
definitions provided by Reynolds (1965), Raines (1969a),
and Harlacher (1969) is used. Community Services are the
educational services which a community college may pro–
vide for its community beyond the regular credit courses
scheduled on campus during the day.

It is important to note that continuing education
and adult education will be considered as aspects of
community services. Support for doing so can be found
in first, a survey conducted in 1968 of all institutions
on the mailing list of what was then called the American
Association of Junior Colleges. With 85% responding to
the survey, it was found that the director of the com–
munity services program "is most likely to be the adult
education director of the institution (Shaw, 1969, p. 1)."

Secondly, Murphy (1969) states:

There is so much overlapping of function
between continuing education and community
services that it seems only logical to in–
clude them in the same organizational slot in the community college administration (p. 5).

For the purposes of his paper then, he considered continuing education, adult education, and community services as a single function.

The use of the terms continuing education and adult education is waning. With 192 or two-thirds of the members of the National Council on Community Services responding to his survey, Myran (1971) reported:

Council members use the term community services in their colleges to a greater extent than previous studies have shown to be true of community colleges in general. In addition, the term is preferred by members to a greater extent (149 of 192) than it is used by their institutions (116 of 192) (p. 4).

However, regional differences were noted by Myran. The Western region "showed a significantly greater preference and use of the term community services when compared to other regions (1971, pp. 4-5)," whereas "the use of the term continuing education is significantly greater in the Southern region than other regions, although respondents prefer community services as a term at generally the same level as in other regions (p. 5)."

As for the term adult education, Myran (1971) reported that 2 of 192 preferred to use the term, while 6 of 192 institutions used the term. Though this is a noticeable drop from the results of the 1968 study discussed previously, it seems as logical to the researcher as it
did to Myran that "members of the national council understandably show a preference for the term community services as compared to other terms commonly used to identify their function (1971, p. 4)." Thus, in order to avoid any regional or individual preferences, the terms continuing education and adult education will be considered as being within the umbrella of the single term "community services."

**Community**

Each of the definitions of community services just discussed involves the use of the word community. Since this term can have a different connotation for different people, in this study community will refer to the community college district or service area. Support for this definition is provided by Myran who wrote:

In a real sense, the community college district is seen here as being a new form of functional community, having within its boundaries 'community' characteristics such as a sense of unity and the capacity to meet the emerging needs of people (1969a, p. 6).

**Community College**

As Thornton (1972) points out, "The phrases, 'public junior college' and 'community college,' are roughly synonymous, though not identical (p. 80)." The distinction made by Thornton between the two items is that 'junior college' included institutions offering general and specialized educa-
tion to persons beyond high-school age, either to meet immediately their present educational needs or to prepare them for further study. 'Community junior college' is a kind of junior college which is usually a public institution, draws most of its students from its supporting community, develops programs of study in response to needs of the local community, and is likely to offer a wider variety of courses than the 'non-community' junior college, which intends to attract students from a much wider geographic area (1972, p. 80).

He also states that, while misunderstanding is possible, the term community college usually implies "the concepts of service to local community, public support, and two-year programs (p. 80)."

Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the term community college refers to a public two-year college that uses the word community in its name.

Community Services Administrator

The community services administrator is defined as that person having, as all or part of his or her duties, primary administrative responsibility for the college's community services program.

Multifarious Duties

Multifarious duties are the various duties which may be assigned to a community services administrator—such as administering the community services program, campus evening college responsibility, teaching, administration of academic division or department.
Community Services Program

A distinction must be made between those activities that constitute the community services program and those that are process or programming activities. The conceptual framework for making the differences understood is systems theory. Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1973) describe the systems approach in the following manner:

In the context of systems theory the organization is viewed as one element of a number of elements which interact interdependently. The flow of inputs and outputs is the basic starting point in the description of the organization. In simplest terms, the organization takes resources (its inputs) from the larger system (its environment), processes these resources, and returns them in changed form (its output) (p. 22).

A model of a community services program will be constructed, consisting of the systems input-process-output cycle, where the environment phase is related to the community served by the college; the input phase consists of the resources available to the community college; the process phase is related to programming, which the researcher defines as activities or actions taken by the community services administrator in developing and insuring the continuation of the community services program; and the output phase is the community services program.

For a definition of program, the researcher will use a modification of the one put forth by Minzey and Le Tarte (1972):
Programs are the activities related to the solution of specific community needs. Thus, enrichment opportunities, recreation programs, cultural activities, avocational offerings, and political and civic programs are partial ways of resolving certain community problems (p. 4).

As defined by the researcher, program refers to educational activities commensurate with community needs or preferences. The word educational was added because the researcher agrees with statements made by Myran and Raines. The former stated:

Community services should not attempt to become the 'super government of tomorrow' or, alternatively, another social agency. The community college derives its primary legitimacy as an institution from its educational role; the community services dimension derives its legitimacy from this same role. The community college is not a governmental agency, a social welfare agency, a museum, a social club, a theatre, a voluntary association, a religious institution, or a labor union. Community services in the community college is legitimate only to the extent that it is an extension or expansion of educational resources directed toward the social, economic, cultural, and civic needs of the community (Myran, 1969b, p. 7).

And Raines (1971) wrote:

If a line needs to be drawn to determine what kinds of activities are to be included in the community services program it must be drawn on the basis of the educational implication of the activity. In short, community colleges are in the business of education and their activities should reflect appropriate relationships to the educational process (p. 405).

The word preferences was added because, even though
the words needs and preferences are often used interchangeably, there is a subtle difference. A need refers to something essential or desirable that is lacking as measured against an arbitrarily defined standard or norm. A preference is a choice given priority over others as determined through a collective decision-making process or some other measurement of group or individual choices.

For example, activities designed to ascertain the illiteracy rate in the community would be classified as showing a need, since illiteracy is defined in terms of an arbitrary standard; whereas, determining what courses to offer via a survey submitted to the community is measuring preferences.

The identification of the elements (components) of each phase of the model was made largely from a survey of studies and other publications related to the describing community services programs and administration. The results of each study are not reported here because of the monotony which would occur in a complete and detailed elaboration. However, the description of each phase of the model contains references to the specific studies used.

The document which contributed most significantly to the model was Raines' (1971) Taxonomy of Community Services. Originally appearing in an unpublished paper (Raines, 1969b), the taxonomy was developed through an examination.
of the variety of community services programs and then reviewed by several authorities in the field of community services. On the basis of their suggestions, it was revised (M. Raines, personal communication, August 6, 1974).

The taxonomy is divided into three major categories, each category containing six separate functions (see Appendix A for the complete taxonomy as presented by Raines). The first category, entitled Self-Development Functions, includes the personal counseling function, the educational extension function, the educational expansion function, the social outreach function, the cultural development function, and the leisure-time activity function.

The second category, Community Development Functions, contains the community analysis function, the inter-agency function, the advisory liaison function, the public forum function, the civic action function, and the staff consultation function.

The last category, Program Development Functions, includes the functions of public information, professional development, program management, conference planning, facility utilization, and program evaluation.

From a conversation with Raines, it was learned that the only change that Raines would make in the taxonomy is that of nomenclature. He recommended that the social outreach function be called the constituency development function.
function and the professional development function be renamed the staff development function (M. Raines, personal communication, August 6, 1974).

Careful examination of the descriptions of each of the eighteen functions (see Appendix A) resulted in the researcher's deciding that seven of the functions met his definition of programming and eleven functions his definition of program. Those functions meeting the definition of programming are advisory liaison, community analysis, public information, program management, program evaluation, professional (staff) development and inter-agency cooperation. The remaining eleven functions, then, meet the definition of program. These are the functions of personal counseling, educational extension, educational expansion, social outreach (constituency development), cultural development, leisure-time activity, public forum, civic action, staff consultation, conference planning, and facility utilization.

A key study used in constructing the model is that by Harlacher (1969). In conducting his study and preparing the publication, Harlacher drew upon the findings of two earlier studies he had conducted. The first, Harlacher (1965), was a nationwide study of programs of community services in ninety-nine college districts in thirty-one states. The second, Harlacher (1967), was made by visiting thirty-seven community college districts in thirteen states.
The colleges visited represented "the small and the large, the rich and the poor, the urban and the rural community college (Harlacher, 1969, p. vi)." In addition, Harlacher also corresponded with administrators of twenty-eight college districts in twelve other states, with trustees and presidents of newly organized community colleges, and with officials of state agencies concerned with the governance of community colleges.

Then, on the basis of a survey of related literature, the results of the studies on community services just discussed, and his 1969 study, four major objectives of the program of community services provided by U.S. community colleges were identified:

1. To become a center of community life by encouraging the use of college facilities and services by community groups when such use does not interfere with the college's regular schedule;
2. To provide for all age groups educational services that utilize the special skills and knowledge of the college staff and other experts and are designed to meet the needs of community groups and the college district at large;
3. To provide the community, including business and industry, with the leadership and coordination capabilities of the college, assist the community in long-range planning, and join with individuals and groups in attacking unsolved problems;
4. To contribute to and promote the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the college district community and the development of skills for the profitable use of leisure time. (Harlacher, 1969, p. 19).

The first objective area, Community Use of College Facilities and Services, includes the categories of phy-
sical facilities and services, cosponsorship of community events and activities, community use of library facilities, and campus tours. The second objective area, Community Educational Services, included non-credit short courses, college credit extension courses, in-service training, community counseling, human resource development training, community consultation, campus radio-television stations, and provisions of faculty and student programs.

The third objective area, Community Development, includes leadership and advisory assistance by college personnel; research and planning; studies, surveys and polls; workshops, institutes, and conferences; and the organization of community councils, coordination councils, and other needed community agencies and groups.

In the last objective area, Cultural and Recreational Activities, Harlacher (1969) included arts, lectures, and film series; cultural tours and field trips; gallery programs; physical activities; community science services; festivals; and community performing groups.

Each objective area and its categories meet the researcher's definition of program. Furthermore, each of the eleven functions of Raines, previously identified as meeting the definition of program, are congruent with nearly all of the categories of the objective areas, the single exception being that there is nothing in Raines' list of functions that completely corresponds to the
category of organization of community councils, coordination councils, and other needed community agencies and groups, found in objective area four. Examples of services in this category "include a mutual concerts association, area arts councils, a council of social agencies, a management institute, and a police academy (1969, p. 33)." Via this category "the community college makes a significant contribution to its district by assisting in the establishment, coordination, and sustenance of needed community groups (Harlacher, 1969, p. 33)."

Therefore, the researcher defines a twelfth program element, Agency Organizing Function: assisting in the establishment, coordination, and sustenance of needed community groups; e.g., community councils, ad hoc committees, area audio visual materials center, training institutes or academies, etc.

Thus, for the purposes of this study, the twelve functions identified as elements of the program phase of the model will be used to describe the community services program. That is, the community services program consists of the functions of personal counseling, educational extension, educational expansion, constituency development, cultural development, leisure-time activity, public forum, civic action, staff consultation, conference planning, facility utilization, and agency organization.

Additional support for using these twelve functions
as a basis for describing the community services program is provided by the results of studies by Reynolds (1956, 1959), Medsker (1960), Beaudoin (1968), Fightmaster (1969), Cohen (1969), Hamrick (1970), Goodrich (1970), Bernson (1971), and Myran (1971). The results of all of these studies, plus the twenty-three services listed in the program guide of the National Council on Community Services (Welch, 1974), can be correlated with the twelve program components.

Harlacher (1969) also provides support for the choice of programming elements. In the 1969 study, Harlacher presents a checklist of critical requirements for effective programs of community services. Developed from an earlier study (Harlacher, 1965), and reaffirmed in another study (Harlacher, 1967), the list contains ninety-one separate procedures for the effective administration and supervision of the program of community services (see Appendix B). Quite clearly, the contents of the checklist meet the definition of programming used here.

Since Parsons (1971) found the checklist to be representative of the community services programming universe, and since each of the ninety-one procedures can be paired with one of the seven functions identified earlier as an element of programming, those seven functions—i.e., advisory liaison, community analysis, public information, program management, program evaluation, staff
development, and inter-agency cooperation—are employed in describing the programming phase of this community services mode.

As for the components of the input phase of the model, Weaver (1973) lists four types of input in his Community Education Model, which was based upon a national study of community education goals (Weaver, 1972). Those inputs identified by Weaver (1974) are human, economic, structural, and physical. After surveying two of the previously mentioned studies and documents on community services, it was concluded that these same four input components are applicable to this model as well.

The human element of the input phase includes the faculty, staff, and students of the college; administrators and members of the governing board of the college; personnel of various community groups and organizations; and individual members of the community. The economic component consists of the method and amount of financing available for community services, and the socio-economic conditions found within the community. The structural element refers to how community services is organized and staffed; the amount and type of leadership community services receives; and legal controls placed by a state agency governing community colleges or by a state legislature. The physical component consists of available college and community facilities.
Thus, the model is completed. A comprehensive view is found in Figure 1 on the next page.

**Scope of the Community Services Program**

The scope of the community services program is defined as the breadth and depth of the community services program. The breadth refers to the number of program components implemented, while the depth refers to the range of activities within each component.

**Summary of Definitions**

Community services are the educational, cultural, social, and recreational services which a community college may provide for its community beyond the regular credit courses scheduled on campus during the day.

Community refers to the community college district or service area.

The term community college will refer to a public two-year college that uses the word community in its name.

The community services administrator is defined as that person having, as all or a part of his or her duties, primary administrative responsibility for the college's community services program.
Figure 1: A Proposed Model of Community Services
Multifarious duties are the various duties which may be assigned to a community services administrator—such as administering the community services program, campus evening college responsibility, teaching, administration of student personnel for the college, or having charge of an academic division or department.

The community services program consists of the functions of personal counseling, educational extension, educational expansion, constituency development, cultural development, leisure-time activity, public forum, civic action, staff consultation, conference planning, faculty utilization, and agency organization.

Scope of the community services program is defined as the breadth and depth of the community services program. The breadth refers to the number of program components implemented, while the depth refers to the range of activities within each component.

Hypothesis of the Study

As was indicated earlier, three questions were studied with respect to community services programs provided by public community colleges in the United States. These were:

1. What effect does the location of a community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy have upon the scope of the community services program?
(2) What effect does the number of multifarious duties performed by a community services administrator have upon the scope of the community services program?

(3) What effect does the amount of attention paid by a community college president to community services have upon the scope of the community services program?

The answers to the above questions were obtained by studying three hypotheses and a corollary to each of them. The hypotheses and their respective corollaries are:

**Hypothesis 1**

There is an inverse relationship between how removed a community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy and the scope of the community services program.

The corollary to this hypothesis is as follows:

**Corollary 1**

If a community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy so that he reports directly to the president, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he does not report directly to the president.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is an inverse relationship between the number of multifarious duties performed by a community services administrator and the scope of the community services program.

The corollary to this hypothesis is as follows:
Corollary 2

If a community services administrator has no additional duties beyond community services administration, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he has additional duties.

Hypothesis 3

There is a direct relationship between how attentive a president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

The corollary to this hypothesis is as follows:

Corollary 3

If a community college president is highly attentive to community services, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he is moderately attentive or little attentive.

As stated in the beginning of this study, the hypotheses and corollaries stated above were derived from theories presented by researchers and authorities in the community services field. A review of this literature as it related to each hypothesis (and subsequently each corollary) will now be presented.

Rationale for Hypothesis 1

The earliest reference found by the researcher relative to the importance of where the community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy
is that by Harlacher (1965). In this study he recounts a recommendation made as a result of an earlier study (Harlacher, 1964), namely, "that the program of community services be administered by an administrative dean on the same level with the dean of instruction, dean of students, and business manager (Harlacher, 1965, p. 13)." This opinion is shared by other authorities in community services. Included are Fightmaster (1969), who wrote:

The Board of Trustees, in coordination with administration and faculty, should appoint a full-time administrator of Community Services. This administrator should have a position equal to that of Deans or Directors of Instruction and Business Services (p. 1).

In an organizational chart prepared by Fightmaster, persons in such positions report directly to the college president. Cummiskey (1971) also states that "the traditional functions of transfer, occupational, student services, and community services each qualify for a first line administrator (dean) (p. 67)."

The findings of Myran (1969b) concur with those of Harlacher (1965) and support the opinions expressed by Fightmaster (1969) and Cummiskey (1971). To those participating in the study

the placement of the director or dean of community services in the administrative structure was considered to be a critical factor in the development of the community services program. It was felt that this individual needs the authority and autonomy that is concomitant [sic] with placement in a top level of the administrative struc-
ture in order to deal effectively with groups both within the college and in the community. Reporting directly to the college president or to the dean of instruction was preferred, as was membership on the policy making 'administrative council' made up of the president and second-level administrators (p. 43).

Also, Murphy (1969) in a fictional model, Alpha College, developed a demonstration of the organization and operation of a continuing education program (defined by Murphy as synonymous with community services), which has the administrator of the program report directly to the college president. Murphy's rational for doing so is that "if a community college is to be truly comprehensive, the Continuing Education function must be given equal weight with the other programs offered by the college (p. 20)."

The question of how to administer community services in multicampus districts is addressed by Harlacher (1969). According to Harlacher, the answer to this question lies partially in the development of a district master plan for community services. He goes on to report that his study showed that "the need for centralized coordination of community services programs in multicampus districts was apparent to a majority of administrators in such districts (Harlacher, 1969, p. 62)." Such views imply a recommendation for a first line community services administrator at the district level.

Harlacher also lends support to the contentions of
the aforementioned authors and, at the same time, introduces the idea that the president plays an important role with respect to community services—an idea that will be discussed later in this study. In his 1967 study Harlacher reports that

a possible means of greater presidential support, embodied in several suggestions for improving the program, is to establish the community services division as a major administrative area, with the community services administrator reporting directly to the chief administrator (Harlacher, 1967, p. 66).

Lastly, Beaudoin (1968), in a study of the community services function in 53 junior colleges, reaches a conclusion that suggests that both the number of duties performed by the community services administrator and his location in the administrative hierarchy affect the scope of the community services program. Beaudoin concluded:

The organizational structure of a community services programs appears to vary from those colleges which offer a minimal service where the responsibility is delegated to an administrator who is also responsible for the overall educational program or a major phase of it, to those colleges which have a well established program where a director of community services, with staff, reports to the president of the college (1968, p. 5).

Rationale for Hypothesis 2

The reader will recall that Hypothesis 2 reads:

There is an inverse relationship between the number of multifarious duties performed by a
community services administrator and the scope of the community services program.

As a result of his study on the role and problems of the two-year college—which included community services—Medsker (1960) stated that "the extent and effectiveness of such programs depends largely on the amount and type of administrative leadership they receive (p. 79)."

Harlacher (1969) found support for Medsker's contention during the course of a survey on community services conducted for the American Association of Junior Colleges. Also, participants in the survey emphasized:

If he is to exercise effective leadership for this important function of the community college, the community services administrator should be relieved of other duties such as evening college responsibility, teaching, administration of student personnel or the instructional program, or having charge of an academic division (p. 58).

Additionally, Harlacher reported that it was the general consensus of those community services administrators participating in the study that if one is "bogged down in intramural responsibilities, related only secondarily to community services, such as activities [like off-campus field work] will be restricted, if not impossible (1969, pp. 58-59)."

A conclusion similar to those reported by Harlacher (1969) was also stated in the report of a survey conducted on all institutions on the 1968 mailing list of the American Association of Junior Colleges. It was con-
cluded that "if the man designated community services director has too many other responsibilities, obviously the effect of the program may be diminished (Shaw, 1969, p. 1)."

One of the most frequently reported suggestions for improving the community services program listed by Harlacher in his 1965 study was the suggestion to "employ [a] full-time community services administrator to provide leadership for the program (p. 349)."

And similar to the above suggestion was the recommendation, made by Hamrick (1970), that "each community college should establish a full-time community services administrative position (p. 15)." This recommendation has an added importance in that is was made to serve as a guideline for the community services dimension in the non-urban setting.

Cummiskey (1971) also addressed himself to the need for full-time leadership of the community services program and provided insight into other types of duties assumed by community services administrators. He wrote:

Experience with a number of colleges and their deans of community services indicates a need for full-time leadership. If full-time direction is impossible, 'prime time' will suffice. 'Prime time' implies that whatever other responsibilities are carried out by the dean, his community services program remains his primary responsibility. Priorities are built into his job description and his professional image. He, and the institution,
must recognize the primary and priority status of his community responsibility.

The typical alliances of community services directors have been with student personnel services, with public relations, with occupational-technical divisions, and with new program development or federal program coordination. These alliances generally result from the congruence of the allied field and the major emphasis or philosophical orientation of the community services program.

Each of these possibilities is a logical and functional linkage. In each case, however, the community services side of the equation often falls far short of getting its share of administrative 'prime time.' A similar situation often exists within the family of community services. Where community service programs include an extensive evening program of regular credit offerings, this extension of the day program may become the 'prime time' consumer of the community service dean's time and attention (p. 70).

Rationale for Hypothesis 3

In order to refresh the reader's memory, Hypothesis 3 is reiterated:

There is a direct relationship between how attentive a president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

The extent to which the community college president plays an important role in the development of the community services program is found in statements by several authorities in the field of community services and community college administration. For example, in his study of thirteen "model" community college community services programs, Myran (1969b) reported that "no other
factor is more strongly recognized as a developmental factor than the commitment and support of the president or chief executive (p. 42)." Also, according to Myran,

Leadership in the community college focuses, first of all, on the president. The president is the 'captain' who charts the course of the institution as a whole: he is the prestige leader with whom the college is identified (1969b, p. 34).

Roueche (1968) was also emphatic about the importance of the president's support in relation to developing a program. He stated, "The president is the educational leader of the junior college and the relative success of any program can often be traced directly to the president's interest in it (p. 2)." And Logsdon (1972) expressed a similar opinion when he wrote:

It is of prime importance that the administrator accept his role in setting the tone for others on his staff. He has the responsibility to show by his example that he has a basic interest in community service (p. 198).

According to several authors, community services programs are characterized by innovation, experimentation, and a willingness for change. For example, Myran (1969b) stated that "willingness to change and a fluidity of administrative and instructional approaches are clearly characteristics of community services program (p. 36)."

In line with this fact, a finding by Ramstead (1966) is relevant. From a survey of 233 public junior colleges, taken to determine which environmental and individual
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variables most influenced experimentation, Ramstead found that "the personal attitude of the chief administrative officer toward experimental programs was the most significant single factor in the process of adoption or non-adoption of such programs (p. 30)."

Parsons (1971) felt so strongly about the effects of a president's attitude toward community services programming that he concluded his study "would be remiss were it to ignore presidential attitude as a variable affecting the development of community services (p. 23)."

It is important to note that, while Parsons hypothesized that "there is a relationship between the attitude of the community college presidents or their designated subalterns and scope of community services programming (1971, p. 41)," his study revealed very little relationship between presidential attitude and the scope of programming (r = .165). Parsons concluded that "how the president feels about the concept does not seem to have influenced the scope of programming thus far (1971, p. 64)."

However, the results of Parsons' study are somewhat unrelated to any findings relative to Hypothesis 3, because the instrument used by Parsons to measure both presidential attitude and the scope of community services programming was adapted from the checklist for effective administration and supervision of the program of community services developed by Harlacher (1969). And this checklist
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has been identified with the process phase of the community services model. Thus, Parsons' findings and conclusions are related to the researcher's definition of programming, not program.

The indicator of a president's positive attitude toward, or interest in, community services selected for study is how attentive the president is to the community services program. It is believed that, if community services is high on the president's list of priorities, he will give more attention to this area, and this will be reflected in the scope of the community services program.
CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study has been to examine the effect upon the scope of the community services program by the placement of the community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy of the college, the number of duties performed by the community services administrator, and the attention given by the college president to community services. Three hypotheses and corollaries were studied:

Hypothesis 1: There is an inverse relationship between how removed a community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy and the scope of the community services program.

Corollary 1: If a community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy so that he reports directly to the president, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he does not report directly to the president.

Hypothesis 2: There is an inverse relationship between the number of multifarious duties performed by the community services administrator and the scope of the community services program.
community services program.

Corollary 2: If a community services administrator has no additional duties beyond community services administration, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he has additional duties.

Hypothesis 3: There is a direct relationship between how attentive a president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

Corollary 3: If a community college president is highly attentive to community services, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he is moderately attentive or little attentive.

Before the alternative hypotheses and corollaries can be stated, it is necessary to operationally define each variable. The operational definitions are presented in the next section.

Operational Definitions of the Variables

How removed the community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy is represented by the letter, $h$, and defined by the equation $h = n + 1$, where $n$ is the number of administrative positions between the community services administrator's position and the president as indicated in the college's
organizational charts. If $h = 1$, the community services administrator is said to report directly to the president.

The number of multifarious duties, $d$, is defined as duties indicated in the theoretical definition of this concept stated in Chapter I and from the choice of "other", where the administrator is given the option of writing in duties not listed. A written response is defined as non-community services related if it does not correspond solely to a component of programming. For example, having charge of the college's public relations program, securing all federal grants for the college, or scheduling all classes for the college are duties that are not solely related to community services.

How attentive a president is to community services is defined by the frequency of contact (written or direct) the community services administrator has with the president, and how significant the majority of those contacts are in regard to the community services program. Frequency of contact is defined by the set of integers one to seven, where one represents a frequency of contact of twice a year or less frequently; two corresponds to three times a year; three represents every other month; four corresponds to monthly; five corresponds to twice a month; six corresponds to weekly; and seven represents twice a week or more frequently.

How significant the majority of the contacts are in
With regard to the community services program is defined by the set of integers one to five, where one represents not significant; two represents little significance; three represents some significance; four corresponds to significant; and five corresponds to highly significant.

Letting $A$ represent the variable how attentive a president is to community services, $F$ the variable frequency of contact, and $S$ the variable how significant the majority of the contacts are in regard to the community services program, $A$ is defined as the cartesian product of $F$ and $S$. That is, $A = F \times S$ (read "$F$ cross $S$"). This is a set of thirty-five ordered pairs formed by pairing each element of $F$ with each element of $S$.

Considering $A$ as the universe of discourse, or universal set, then $A$ is further defined in terms of three categories or subsets---$A_H$ (highly attentive), $A_M$ (moderately attentive), and $A_L$ (little attentive)—where

$$A_H = \{(7,5), (6,5), (7,4), (6,4)\}$$

and

$$A_M = \{(7,3), (6,3), (5,5), (5,4), (5,3), (4,5), (4,4), (4,3)\}$$

and

$$A_L = (A_H \cup A_M)'$$---i.e., the set containing the remaining ordered pairs in $A$.

**Scope of the program** is measured by the number, $i$,
called the index of scope which is defined as the sum of the number of program components implemented, \( N \), and the mean of the range of activities with respect to the list of components, \( \bar{r} \). Symbolically this can be expressed as
\[
i = N + \bar{r},
\]
where the range, \( r \), of activities within each program component is measured on a scale from zero (the function is not a part of the college's program) to five (a very broad range of activities).

Alternative Hypotheses and Corollaries

The alternative hypothesis and corollary of each theoretical hypothesis and corollary is denoted by \( H_1 \), \( C_1 \), \( H_2 \), \( C_2 \), \( H_3 \), \( C_3 \), respectively. The following are the alternative hypotheses and corollaries studied:

- \( H_1 \): \( i_{h=1} > i_{h=2} > i_{h=3} \)
- \( C_1 \): \( i_{h=1} > i_{h=2} \)

and

- \( H_2 \): \( i_{d=1} > i_{d=2} > i_{d=3} > i_{d=4} > i_{d=5} > i_{d=6} \)
- \( H_2 \): \( i_{d=1} > i_{d=2} \)

and

- \( H_3 \): \( i_{AH} > i_{AM} > i_{AL} \)
- \( C_3 \): \( i_{AH} > i_{AH}' \)

where \( A_H' = A_M \cup A_L \) - i.e., all ordered pairs in \( A_M \) or \( A_L \) - and where \( \bar{i} \) is the mean of all values of \( i \) for a given \( h, d, \) or \( A \).
Null Hypotheses and Corollaries

The null hypothesis and respective corollary for each alternative hypothesis and corollary is denoted by $H_0$ and $C_0$. Thus, the null hypothesis and corollary corresponding to $H_1$ and $C_1$ are

$$H_0: \bar{I}_h=1=\bar{I}_h=2=\bar{I}_h=3$$
$$C_0: \bar{I}_h=1=\bar{I}_h \geq 2.$$ 

For $H_2$ and $C_2$ the corresponding null hypothesis and corollary are

$$H_0: \bar{I}_d=1=\bar{I}_d=2=\bar{I}_d=3=\bar{I}_d=4=\bar{I}_d=5=\bar{I}_d=6$$
$$C_0: \bar{I}_d=1=\bar{I}_d \geq 2.$$ 

For $H_3$ and $C_3$ the corresponding null hypothesis and corollary are

$$H_0: \bar{I}_{A_H}=\bar{I}_{A_M}=\bar{I}_{A_L}$$
$$C_0: \bar{I}_{A_H}=\bar{I}_{A_H}.$$ 

Source of the Data

The population for this study consisted of community services administrators of the community colleges listed in the *1973 Yearbook of the National Council on Community Services* (Welch, 1974). A total of 359 community colleges, located in 38 states, was included in a list of over 700 private and public junior colleges, community colleges, and two-year vocational-technical colleges. Excluded were
institutions listed under the states of Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin. No two-year colleges in these states identified themselves as community colleges.

According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), in order to be within the parameters of five percent error at the .95 confidence level, the sample size required for a population of 359 is 186. Thus, a random sample of 186 community services administrators was selected for this study. The method used to draw the random sample was to assign a number from 001 to 359 to each member of the population. Then, from a table of five column random numbers (Edwards, 1972), 186 numbers were selected by using the first three digits of each entry selected. The initial entry point chosen was the first row and first column of five digit numbers. Subsequent selections were made by proceeding down each column until the required sample size was reached.

Description of the Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study (see Appendix C) was developed on the basis of the operational definitions of the variables and the definition of the community services program. The purpose of the first two items was to record who returned questionnaires. Question three was
designed to provide information with which to measure how removed a community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy. Questions four and five were developed directly from the definitions of frequency of contact and significance of the contacts. Subsequently, the responses to these two questions were paired in accordance with the definition of the variable how attentive a president is to community services.

Question six was designed to provide a measure of the multifarious duties performed by the community services administrator. Included in the list of duties were administering adult education on campus and administering continuing education on campus. This was done in order to provide alternatives to the choice of administering the community services program. However, the selection of one or more of the three duties was considered as a single response. This was in keeping with the fact that continuing education and adult education were considered as aspects of community services in this study.

Items seven through eighteen consisted of the functions used in defining the community services program, together with descriptions and examples that were intended to help the respondent understand the nature of each function. These items provided values with which to measure the scope of the community services program.
Reliability Estimate

No estimate of internal consistency was made with respect to items three through six, since each of them was used to measure different independent variables. Also, due to the constraints of time and the unique characteristics of the population, neither the test-retest method nor the matched group method could be employed.

In regard to the items used to measure the dependent variable (items seven through eighteen), the constraints of time and the unique characteristics of the population also precluded the use of either the test-retest or the matched group methods of estimating the reliability. However, since the scores of items seven through eighteen were combined into a single score, i.e., the index of scope, an estimate of the reliability of these items could be obtained by using two-way analysis of variance (Respondents X Items), a technique discussed by Kerlinger (1973). Here reliability is interpreted as the accuracy of the measuring instrument (in this case items seven through eighteen). When it is said that reliability is the accuracy of the measuring instrument, it is meant "that a reliable instrument more or less measures the 'true' scores of individuals, the 'more or less' depending on the reliability of the instrument (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 449-450)."

By definition, "reliability is the proportion of the
'true' variance to the total obtained variance (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 446)." Since there is no direct way to measure "true" variance, it is estimated from the measured variance among the respondents, denoted by $V_{\text{ind}}$, which also contains errors of measurement, denoted by $V_e$. In the analysis of variance, $V_{\text{ind}}$ and $V_e$ are, respectively, the Respondent mean square and the Residual. "If $V_{\text{ind}}$ is significantly greater than $V_e$, then there is something in $V_{\text{ind}}$ over and above error variance (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 449)." This excess is an estimate of the "true" variance. Therefore, an estimate of the "true" variance is obtained by subtracting $V_e$ from $V_{\text{ind}}$. Then, since the total obtained variance "is an index of differences between individuals (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 449)," an estimate of the reliability of the measuring instrument is given by the ratio of $V_{\text{ind}} - V_e$ to $V_{\text{ind}}$. Symbolically, this can be stated as:

$$r_{tt} = \frac{V_{\text{ind}} - V_e}{V_{\text{ind}}} = 1 - \frac{V_e}{V_{\text{ind}}}$$

where $r_{tt}$ is the symbol for the reliability coefficient.

Thus, by using two-way analysis of variance (Respondents X Items), an estimate of the reliability of items seven through eighteen of $r_{tt} = .82$ was obtained. The data used in calculating the value of $r_{tt}$ are presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>s.s.</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1016.57</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>5.54 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>517.27</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>33.86 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>2016.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>3550.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity Estimate

It was assumed that the items used to measure the scope of the community services program (items seven through eighteen) had content validity, since eleven of the items (the exception being item thirteen) were extracted from Raines' *Community Services Inventory* (1969a), where the only changes made were those suggested by Raines (M. Raines, personal communication, August 6, 1974). The changes included the addition of the examples social security recipients to item ten, and auditorium use and computer use to item eighteen. Additional changes were made in nomenclature. *Constituency Development* was originally labeled *Social Outreach*, and *Staff Development* was originally labeled *Professional Development*. Since these changes were intended to clarify the meaning of the items, it was assumed that the content validity, which had been established by several authorities in the field of community services (M. Raines, personal communication, August 6, 1974), was not affected. It was also assumed that the validity was not affected by the inclusion of item thirteen (*Agency Organizing Function*), since it was derived from and supported by the results of studies conducted on community services programs in the United States (see Chapter I).

The remaining items on the instrument were judged
to have content validity by the researcher, since they were designed on the basis of operational definitions of the variables. However, to assure that the language chosen communicated the researcher's intent, the questionnaire was submitted to his doctoral committee, which included experts in the fields of continuing education, higher education administration, and educational research. On the basis of their comments and suggestions, revisions were made.

Data Collection Procedure

On October 19, 1974, a package of materials was mailed to the community services administrators selected in the random sample. The package of materials contained a cover letter (see Appendix C) which explained the purpose of the study and provided directions for completing the questionnaire, a copy of the questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the completed instrument.

On January 18, 1975, a follow-up set of materials was sent to the administrators who had not returned the questionnaire. In addition to the items included in the first packet of materials, there was a second letter of explanation (see Appendix C). February 1, 1975, was selected as the cut-off date for awaiting the return of questionnaires. By that date, 133 (71.5% of the sample) community services administrators, representing multi-
campus colleges, community college districts, and urban and rural community colleges, and returned completed questionnaires.

In addition to the completed questionnaires, a total of twelve were returned uncompleted; two because the administrators' definitions of community services did not conform to the one used in this study; six because the colleges were engaged in hiring a new community services administrator; one because the community services administrator was on a sabbatical; and three because the community services administrators said that they did not have time to complete the questionnaire.

No returns were received from sample members in the states of Arizona, Maine, and Missouri (a total of five colleges). Further, effort was made to determine whether those community services administrators not responding had any distinguishing characteristics from those responding. Nothing was found to suggest that those not responding offered from those responding.

Data Analysis

The responses on each questionnaire were coded and punched on Hollerith-IBM cards. The data were analyzed with the aid of two program packages provided by the computer Center of the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio. The packages used were SPSS (Nie & Hull, 1973) and BMD (Dixon,
1973). The latter was used in performing the two-way analysis of variance, from which was calculated the estimate of the reliability of items seven through eighteen, reported earlier in this chapter. SPSS was used in performing the hypothesis tests utilized in this study.

Two hypothesis tests were used in this study, the F-test and the t-test. The F-test was used to test the null hypothesis associated with alternative Hypothesis 3 \( (H_3) \) and a one-tailed t-test was used in testing the null hypothesis associated with each of the alternative corollaries.

In making each t-test, the SPSS package computed a t-value based on the pooled variance estimate and the separate variance estimate of the population variance for the difference in sample means. Also, an F-value from the sample variances was computed. If the probability of the F-value was greater than .05, the t-value based on the pooled variance estimate was used.

The formula used by Nie and Hull (1973) in computing the pooled variance estimate of the population variance for the difference in sample means is

\[
\frac{s^2}{\tilde{d}} = \frac{s^2}{n_1} + \frac{s^2}{n_2},
\]

where the pooled variance estimate of the population variance is computed from:
and there are \( n_1 + n_2 - 2 \) degrees of freedom. Formulas similar to those used by Nie and Hull (1973) are also presented by Hayes (1973).

**Summary**

Chapter II contained the operational definitions of the variables, the alternative hypotheses and corollaries which, in turn, were followed by the null hypotheses and corollaries. After describing the population, the method of selecting the sample for the study was explained. This was followed by a description of the instrument, discussions of its reliability and validity, and the data collection procedure. Lastly, the methods used for analyzing the data were presented. Chapter III contains the analysis of the data collected.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Overview of the Problem

This study was designed to examine the effect upon the scope of the community services program by the placement of the community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy of the college, the number of duties performed by the community services administrator, and the attention given by the college president to community services. Three hypotheses and a corollary to each of them were studied.

Findings

Hypothesis 1

There is an inverse relationship between how removed a community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy and the scope of the community services program.

\[ H_1: \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=1} > \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=2} > \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=3} \]

\[ H_0: \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=1} = \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=2} = \bar{\overline{x}}_{h=3} \]

Table 2 shows the results of calculating the means of the indices of scope (\( \bar{\overline{x}} \)) for each of the three groups used in testing Hypothesis 1. The mean of the indices of scope
of the community services administrators three units removed from the president was greater than the means of the indices of scope of community services administrators either one or two units removed from the president. The resulting ordering was that $\bar{t}_{h=3} > \bar{t}_{h=1} > \bar{t}_{h=2}$. Thus, in regard to those administrators responding, Hypothesis 1 was not accepted, and no further tests were conducted.

**TABLE 2**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INDICES OF SCOPE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM ACCORDING TO HOW REMOVED AN ADMINISTRATOR IS FROM THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Unit Removed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Units Removed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Units Removed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of administrators does not total 133, since eight respondents failed to include an organizational chart.

**Corollary 1**

If a community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy so that he reports directly to the president, the scope of the community services
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program will be greater than if he does not report directly to the president.

\[ C_1: \bar{I}_{h=1} \succ \bar{I}_{h \geq 2} \]

\[ C_0: \bar{I}_{h=1} = \bar{I}_{h \geq 2} \]

Table 3 shows the results of the one-tailed t-test used in testing Corollary 1. It is important to note that, while both the t-ratio and its corresponding probability level (the figure in parentheses) are reported, the level of significance chosen for rejecting the null hypothesis was .05 or less. Both the practice of reporting the probability level of a test for significant difference, and the choice of a level of significance of .05 or less as the level for rejecting a null hypotheses are continued throughout this chapter.

**TABLE 3**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATORS REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT AND NOT REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Directly</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.43 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reporting Directly</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pooled variance estimate, df = 123*
Since the probability level of .33 is greater than .05, the null hypotheses was not rejected. Therefore, no support was found for the hypothesis that if a community services administrator reports directly to the president, the scope of the community services program is greater than if he does not report directly to the president.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is an inverse relationship between the number of multifarious duties performed by the community services administrator and the scope of the community services program.

\[ H_2: \bar{I}_{d=1} > \bar{I}_{d=2} > \bar{I}_{d=3} > \bar{I}_{d=4} > \bar{I}_{d=5} > \bar{I}_{d=6} \]

\[ H_0: \bar{I}_{d=1} = \bar{I}_{d=2} = \bar{I}_{d=3} = \bar{I}_{d=4} = \bar{I}_{d=5} = \bar{I}_{d=6} \]

Table 4 shows the results of calculating the means for each of the six groups used in testing Hypothesis 2. One departure from the predicted ordering of the means was that the mean of the indices of scope of the administrators reporting six duties was slightly greater than those administrators reporting five duties. Since this result was arrived at on the basis of only five respondents, it may not have provided conclusive enough evidence for not accepting Hypothesis 2, had the mean of the indices of scope of the administrators reporting four duties been as predicted. However, the mean of the indices of scope of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Duties</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the community services administrators reporting four duties was greater than the means of all other groups. The result, then, was that

\[ I_{d=4} > I_{d=1} > I_{d=2} > I_{d=3} > I_{d=6} > I_{d=5}. \]

Hence, Hypothesis 2 was not accepted, and no other tests were made.

**Corollary 2**

If a community services administrator has no additional duties beyond community services administration, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he has additional duties.

\[ C_2: I_{d=1} > I_{d=2} \]
\[ C_0: I_{d=1} = I_{d=2} \]

Table 5 shows the results of the one-tailed t-test used in testing Corollary 2. Since the probability level of .20 is greater than .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, no support was found for Corollary 2.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is a direct relationship between how attentive a president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

\[ H_3: I_{A_H} > I_{A_M} > I_{A_L} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Duties</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Duties</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pooled variance estimate, df = 131*
The data found in Table 6 and Table 7 were used to test Hypothesis 3. As evidenced by the data in Table 6, the ordering of the means of the indices of scope of the community services program was as posited in the alternative hypothesis. However, since the probability level of .32 on the one-way analysis of variance test (see Table 7) was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a direct relationship between how attentive the president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

**Corollary 3**

If a community college president is highly attentive to community services, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he is moderately attentive or little attentive.

\[ C_3: \bar{I}_{A_H} > \bar{I}_{A_H} \]

\[ C_0: \bar{I}_{A_H} = \bar{I}_{A_H} \]

Table 8 shows the results of the one-tailed t-test used in testing Corollary 3. Since the probability level of .109 is greater than .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, no support was found for Corollary 3.
### TABLE 6

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INDICES OF SCOPE OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM ACCORDING TO HOW ATTENTIVE A PRESIDENT IS TO COMMUNITY SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Attentive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Attentive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Attentive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not total 133 because two respondents associated with multiple campuses changed question four so that it read how often they had contact with their campus dean rather than the president of their college

### TABLE 7

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF HOW ATTENTIVE A PRESIDENT IS TO COMMUNITY SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.16 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>465.84</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>474.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the probability level of .09 for the t-test suggests that there was a possible relationship between the scope of the community services program and whether a president is highly attentive, or moderately or little attentive to community services. The magnitude of this relationship can be determined by estimating $\omega^2$ (omega squared), the index representing the strength of association between independent and dependent variables (Hayes, 1973). In this case, an estimate of $\omega^2$ was found to equal .01. Thus, how attentive a president was to community services accounted for roughly one percent of the variance of the scope of the community services program. This relatively small strength of association suggests that it may not be worthwhile to spend more time and effort in researching this area.

### TABLE 8

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN PRESIDENTS HIGHLY ATTENTIVE TO COMMUNITY SERVICES AND MODERATELY OR LITTLE ATTENTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Attentive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.36 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately or Little Attentive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Separate variance estimate, df = 60*
Summary of the Results

Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 were not accepted since, in each instance, the resulting order of the means of the indices of scope was not as predicted in the alternative hypotheses. Hypothesis 3 and each of the corollaries studied were not accepted because their associated null hypotheses were not rejected at the .05 level of significance. However, with respect to Corollary 3, a possible relationship was noted between the scope of the community services program and whether a president is highly attentive, or moderately or little attentive to community services. The magnitude of the relationship was estimated by $\omega^2$ and found to be approximately equal to .01, a relatively small value which suggests that further research in that area may not be worthwhile. The implication of this finding and the others presented in this chapter are discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review of the Problem

This study has attempted to find answers to three questions which deal with the effect upon the scope of the community services program by the placement of the community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy, the number of duties performed by the community services administrator, and the attention given by the college president to community services. An answer to each question was obtained by studying a hypothesis and its related corollary. The findings relative to the testing of each hypothesis and corollary were presented in Chapter III. Implications of those findings, as they relate to questions asked in this study and to the theories of researchers and authorities in the field of community services discussed in Chapter I, are presented in this chapter.

Implications

Question 1

What effect does the location of a community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy have upon the scope of the community services program? An answer
question was found by studying Hypothesis 1 and Corollary 1.

**Hypothesis 1:** There is an inverse relationship between how removed a community services administrator is from the president in the administrative hierarchy and the scope of the community services program.

- \( H_1: \bar{T}_{h=1} > \bar{T}_{h=2} > \bar{T}_{h=3} \)
- \( H_0: \bar{T}_{h=1} = \bar{T}_{h=2} = \bar{T}_{h=3} \)

**Corollary 1:** if a community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy so that he reports directly to the president, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he does not report directly to the president.

- \( C_1: \bar{T}_{h=1} > \bar{T}_{h=2} \)
- \( C_0: \bar{T}_{h=1} = \bar{T}_{h=2} \)

The resulting ordering of the means of the indices of scope (\( \bar{T} \)) for the three groups used in testing Hypothesis 1 was that \( \bar{T}_{h=3} > \bar{T}_{h=1} > \bar{T}_{h=2} \). Hence, Hypothesis 1 was not accepted. Corollary 1 also was not accepted, since its corresponding statistical hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. Tables 2 and 3 in Chapter III contain the data used in testing Hypothesis 1 and Corollary 1.

Therefore, the answer to Question 1 suggested by the
results of testing Hypothesis 1 and Corollary 1 is that, among community services administrators one, two, or three units removed from the president, the location of the community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy seemed to have no effect upon the scope of the community services program.

The result found in testing Corollary 1 also indicates that Harlacher, Myran, Cummiskey, and other authorities in the field of community services (whose views were presented in Chapter I) may have been mistaken in attaching a high degree of importance to the placement of the community services administrator in a first line administrative position.

It is important to emphasize that the statements made in the last two paragraphs are not saying that where the community services administrator is placed in the administrative hierarchy is not important. Rather, what has been said is that among community services administrators one, two, or three steps removed from the president in the administrative hierarchy (all upper level administrative positions), placement seemed to have no effect upon the scope of the community services program.

Question 2

What effect does the number of multifarious duties
performed by a community services administrator have upon the scope of the community services program? An answer to this question was found by studying Hypothesis 2 and Corollary 2.

Hypothesis 2: There is an inverse relationship between the number of multifarious duties performed by the community services administrator and the scope of the community services program.

\[ H_2: \bar{I}_{d=1} > \bar{I}_{d=2} > \bar{I}_{d=3} > \bar{I}_{d=4} > \bar{I}_{d=5} > \bar{I}_{d=6} \]

Corollary 2: If a community services administrator has no additional duties beyond community services administration, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he has additional duties.

\[ C_2: \bar{I}_{d=1} > \bar{I}_{d=2} \]

\[ C_0: \bar{I}_{d=1} = \bar{I}_{d=2} \]

The resulting ordering of the means of the indices of scope of the six groups used to test Hypothesis 2 was that \( \bar{I}_{d=4} > \bar{I}_{d=1} > \bar{I}_{d=2} > \bar{I}_{d=3} > \bar{I}_{d=6} > \bar{I}_{d=5} \). Hence, Hypothesis 2 was not accepted. Corollary 2 was also not accepted, since its corresponding statistical hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. Tables 4 and 5 in Chapter III contain the data used in testing Hypothesis 2 and Corollary 2.
The results of testing Hypothesis 2 and Corollary 2 suggest that an answer to Question 2 is that the number of multifarious duties performed by a community services administrator seems to have no effect upon the scope of the community services program.

One must be careful not to misinterpret the answer given to Question 2. While no evidence was found supporting the contentions of those participating in Harlacher's (1969) study that

the community services administrator should be relieved of duties such as evening college responsibility, teaching, administration of student personnel or the instructional program, or having charge of an academic division (p. 58),

it should not be concluded that a community services administrator can be burdened with duties related only secondarily to community services, since the amount of time spent by the administrators in performing each of their duties was not investigated in this study. Perhaps Cum-miskey was correct in stating that "if full-time direction [to community services] is impossible, 'prime time' will suffice (1971, p. 70)." By "prime time" Cummiskey meant that "whatever other responsibilities are carried out by the community services administrator, his community services program remains his primary responsibility (p. 70)."

Cummiskey's comment contains a suggestion for an area of research. It would be valuable to assess empirically
the effect that the amount of time which administrators spend in the performance of their duties has upon the scope of the community services program, before making any further judgments about the effect that the number of duties has upon the scope of the community services program.

Question 3

What effect does the amount of attention paid by a community college president to community services have upon the scope of the community services program? An answer to this question was obtained by studying Hypothesis 3 and Corollary 3.

Hypothesis 3: There is a direct relationship between how attentive a president is to community services and the scope of the community services program.

\[ H_3: \bar{I}_{AH} > \bar{I}_{AM} > \bar{I}_{AL} \]

\[ H_0: \bar{I}_{AH} = \bar{I}_{AM} = \bar{I}_{AL} \]

Corollary 3: If a community college president is highly attentive to community services, the scope of the community services program will be greater than if he is moderately or little attentive.

\[ C_3: \bar{I}_{AH} > \bar{I}_{AH} \]

\[ C_0: \bar{I}_{AH} = \bar{I}_{AH} \]
The ordering of the means of the indices of scope of the community services programs was as predicted in $H_3$. However, the null hypothesis was not rejected since, by the one-way analysis of variance test, the means were not significantly different at the .05 level of significance. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not accepted. Tables 6 and 7 in Chapter III contain the data used in testing Hypothesis 3.

Corollary 3 also was not accepted, since its corresponding statistical hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. However, an emergent inferential relationship was detected between the scope of the community services program and whether a president is highly attentive, or moderately or little attentive to community services. By estimating the value of $\omega^2$, it was determined that how attentive a president is to community services accounted for approximately one percent of the variance of the scope of the community services program. The data used in testing Corollary 3 is displayed in Table 8 in Chapter III.

The results of testing Hypothesis 3 and Corollary 3 suggest that an answer to Question 3 is that the amount of attention paid by the community college president to community services seem to have little effect upon the scope of the community services program.

In regard to the case made in Chapter I that the president directly influences community college programs,
the results of this study do not necessarily refute the claims of authorities in the field of community services that a president's influence extends to the community services program. Instead, the researcher found little evidence to support his assumption that the aforementioned influence would manifest itself in the amount of attention given by the president to community services.

The fact that the amount of attention paid by the president to community services accounted for roughly one percent of the variance of the scope of community services suggests that it may not be worthwhile to spend more time and effort in researching this area. However, since attention was defined in terms of frequency and significance of contacts between the president and the community services administrator, there is a possibility that the attention paid by the president is an integral part of the college's internal communications matrix, the effectiveness of which some authorities [notably Harlacher (1969) in his Checklist and Raines (1971) in his Taxonomy] believe affects the scope of the community services program. Research could be done in this area. By identifying people within the college, in addition to the president, who are likely to affect the scope of the community services program, then measuring the frequency and significance of contacts the community services administrator has with those people and finally, correlating it with the scope of
the community services program, it should be possible to generalize about the impact of internal communications upon the scope of the community services program.

Recommendations for Future Research

Two recommendations for future research have been made earlier in this chapter—i.e., investigating the effect of the amount of time spent by administrators in the performance of their duties, and the effect of internal communications upon the scope of the community services program. In addition, it is recommended that, along with the investigation of the effect of time spent by community services administrators in the performance of their duties, the effect of staffing should be studied. As Harlacher pointed out, "The community services director ... must also have adequate staffing of his office if effective community services are to be rendered (1969, p. 61)." Perhaps a three factor design—where the factors are number of duties, percentage of time spent in performing each duty, and staffing—is appropriate.

Another recommendation is that further refinement of the Community Services Model presented in Chapter I should be done. For example, no attempt was made to identify the components comprising the Community phase of the model. This phase could be completed, and the effect of each component upon the scope of the community services program
could be studied. Possible components are the Givens of Weaver's (1973) *Community Education Model*, which are mores, customs, economic conditions, geography, bureaucracy, demographic factors, and idiographic factors.

Lastly, the effect of the Programming phase of the *Community Services Model* upon the scope of the community services program should be empirically investigated. By measuring the scope of programming and correlating it with the scope of the community services program, it should be possible to generalize about the impact of programming upon the scope of the community services program. Also, it would be beneficial to assess empirically how each component of Programming affects the scope of the community services program, since the components were identified from a survey of studies and other publications which dealt largely with opinion.
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APPENDIX A

Raines' Taxonomy of Community Services
I. Self-Development Functions—Those functions and activities of the college primarily focused upon the needs, aspirations, and potentialities of individuals or informal groups of individuals to help them achieve a greater degree of personal self-realization and fulfillment. This category includes the following functions:

Personal Counseling Function—Providing opportunities for community members with self-discovery and development through individual and group counseling processes; e.g., aptitude-interest testing, individual interviews, career information, job placement, family life, etc.

Educational Extension Function—Increasing the accessibility of the regular courses and curricula of college by extending their availability to the community-at-large; e.g., evening classes, TV courses, "weekend college," neighborhood extension centers.

Educational Expansion Function—Programming a variety of educational, upgrading and new career opportunities which reach beyond the traditional limitations of college credit restrictions; e.g., institutes, seminars, tours, short courses, contractual in-plant training, etc.

Social Outreach Function—Organizing programs to increase the earning power, educational level, and political influence of disadvantaged; e.g., ADC mothers, unemployed males, educationally deprived youth, welfare recipients, etc.

Cultural Development Function—Expanding opportunities for community members to participate in a variety of cultural activities; e.g., fine art series, art festivals, artists in residence, community theatre, etc.

Leisure-time Activity Function—Expanding opportunities for community members to participate in a variety of recreational activities; e.g., sports instruction, outdoor education, summer youth programs, senior citizen activities, etc.

II. Community Development Functions—Those functions and activities of the college primarily focused upon cooperative efforts with community organizations, agencies, and institutions to improve the physical, social, economic, and political environment of the community; e.g., housing, transportation, air pollution, human relations, public safety, etc.
Community Analysis Function—Collecting and analyzing significant data which reflect existing and emerging needs of the community and which can serve as a basis for developing the community service program of the college; e.g., analyzing census tracts, analyzing manpower data, conducting problem-oriented studies, identifying roles and goals of organizations, etc.

Interagency Cooperation Function—Establishing adequate linkage with related programs of the college and community to supplement and coordinate rather than duplicate existing programs; e.g., calendar coordination, information exchange, joint committee work, etc.

Advisory Liaison Function—Identifying and involving (in an advisory capacity) key members of the various subgroups with whom cooperative programs are being planned; e.g., community services advisory council, ad hoc advisory committee, etc.

Public Forum Function—Developing activities designed to stimulate interest and understanding of local, national, and world problems; e.g., public affairs pamphlets, "town" meetings, TV symposiums, etc.

Civic Action Function—Participating in cooperative efforts with local government, business, industry, professions, religious and social groups to increase the resources of the community to deal with major problems confronting the community; e.g., community self-studies, urban beautification, community chest drives, air pollution, etc.

Staff Consultation Function—Identifying, developing, and making available the consulting skills of the faculty in community development activities; e.g., consulting with small businesses, advising on instructional materials, designing community studies, instructing in group leadership, laboratory testing, etc.

III. Program Development Functions—Those functions and activities of the community services staff designed to procure and allocate resources, coordinate activities, establish objectives, and evaluate outcomes. This category includes the following functions:

Public Information Function—Interpreting programs and activities of community services to the college staff as well as to the community-at-large and coordinating releases with the central information services of the college.
Professional Development Function—Providing opportunities and encouragement for staff members to up-grade their skills in program development and evaluation; e.g., professional affiliations, exchange visitations, professional conferences, advanced graduate studies, etc.

Program Management Function—Establishing procedures for procuring and allocating the physical and human resources necessary to implement the community services program; e.g., staff recruitment, job descriptions, budgetary development, etc.

Conference Planning Function—Providing professional assistance to community groups in the planning of conferences, institutes, and workshops; e.g., registration procedures, program development, conference evaluation, etc.

Facility Utilization Function—Encouraging community use of college facilities by making them readily accessible, by facilitating the scheduling process, and by designing them for multipurpose activities when appropriate; e.g., campus tours, centralized scheduling office, conference rooms, auditorium design, etc.

Program Evaluation Function—Developing with the staff the specific objectives of the program, identifying sources of data, and establishing procedures for gathering data to appraise the probably effectiveness of various facets of the program; e.g., participant ratings, attendance patterns, behavioral changes, program requests, etc.
APPENDIX B

Harlacher's Checklist
For Effective Programs of
Community Services
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The effective administration and supervision of the program of community services involves:

I. Securing community-college support
   A. Involve community in planning and development
      --Utilize personnel of appropriate community groups in planning and promotion of program
      --Engage community advisory committees in planning of program
      --Obtain cosponsorship of services and activities by local groups
      --Actively involve a large number of community people and groups in program
      --Secure active participation and support of community leaders
      --Organize community advisory council as means of identifying community needs and interests
      --Develop and maintain cooperative, friendly relationships with community groups
      --Arrange for community cultural groups to affiliate with college
   B. Maintain effective internal and external communication
      --Establish regular information service to keep citizens of college district community informed on college matters
      --Provide adequate time to plan publicity campaigns
      --Use a wide variety of media to communicate with public and reach all segments of college district community
      --Direct publicity and publications toward specific audiences in community
      --Utilize extensive direct mail publicity
      --Arrange for direct coverage of college events by area press
      --Develop and maintain personal relationship with area press
      --Prepare brochures regarding activities and services and distribute throughout community
      --Issue personal invitations to community leaders to attend events
      --Keep public fully informed of services available from college
      --Establish citizens' committees as an aid in presenting programs to community
      --Clarify channels of communication between community services office and other college departments involved in providing services
   C. Involve faculty and students in planning and development
--Encourage active participation of faculty and students in program
--Organize student-faculty planning committee
--Provide opportunity for faculty to help plan program informally and through study and advisory committees

D. Coordinate services with other community groups
--Coordinate program with other community and regional groups to avoid unnecessary duplication of services
--Maintain close liaison with public school personnel of college district
--Encourage communitywide coordination of cultural and recreational activities

E. Encourage college staff to participate in community affairs
--Encourage college personnel to participate in community activities
--Make college personnel available to community as consultants
--Provide leadership in organizing needed community groups and solving community problems

F. Orient faculty and staff to community service function
--Interpret community service function to college faculty and staff on continuous basis

II. Determining nature and scope of program
A. Provide effective planning and research
--Insure long-range planning of program
--Plan carefully all details of each individual service or activity
--Begin planning of individual services and activities at early date
--Consider carefully timing of services or activities
--Encourage staff experimentation and innovation in developing program
--Invite community groups to utilize college facilities and resources
--Preplan advisory committee meetings carefully
--Obtain evaluation of services and activities from participants
--Conduct appropriate research studies, including surveys and polls

B. Establish high standards for public performance
--Select known, quality artists and lecturers
--Determine and adhere to standards for public performance
C. Tailor services to specific needs and interests
   --Tailor program and individual services to
      meet needs and interests of specific groups
      in district community

D. Define program purposes and objectives
   --Determine objectives and philosophy of
      program and individual services
   --Emphasize educational aspects of program
   --Present diversified and balanced program
   --Define specific functions of citizens'
      advisory committees

E. Identify community needs and interests
   --Make community survey to determine specific
      needs and interests of district community
   --Base each decision to provide a service or
      activity on analysis of community needs and
      interests
   --Hold conferences and informal discussions
      with community people for purposes of
      determining community needs and interests
   --Encourage community-at-large to express its
      desires and needs for specific services

III. Organizing and administering program
A. Provide effective administration and supervision
   --Establish community services division as
      major administrative area
   --Obtain full-time community services adminis-
      trator to provide leadership and assume over-
      all responsibility for program
   --Provide adequate staff to organize and
      implement program
   --Select enthusiastic, well-qualified staff
      supervisors for program
   --Employ qualified public information officer
   --Provide supervisors with sufficient time and
      authority to plan and coordinate activities
   --Assure staff supervisors of freedom and
      authority to develop their activities
   --Obtain adequate clerical assistance
   --Select membership of citizens' advisory
      committees carefully on basis of purposes
      of committee
   --Provide expert staff help for citizens'
      advisory groups
   --Provide over-all coordination of events
      cosponsored by community groups

B. Establish and adhere to written policies,
   regulations, and procedures
   --Establish written policies, regulations and
      procedures for all aspects of program
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--Apply policies and regulations uniformly
--Review policies, regulations, and procedures periodically to see if they are still effective
--Maintain flexibility in accommodating community needs
--Require that all instructions and requirements for use of college facilities be in writing
--Arrange meeting with representatives of groups using college facilities for detailed joint-planning
--Require college supervisor to be present during time facility is being used by community group

C. Utilize community facilities and resources
--Offer services and activities at off-campus locations
--Utilize qualified consultants in developing program when need arises

D. Secure board, administration, and faculty support
--Secure understanding and support of board of trustees for program
--Elicit support and cooperation of administration and faculty
--Obtain support of board, administration, and faculty for community service as a major function

E. Obtain essential resources
--Secure essential financial support for program
--Provide adequate facilities and equipment for program
APPENDIX C

Letters and Questionnaire
Dear Community Services Administrator,

You are no doubt aware of the fact that programs of community services are receiving increased emphasis by many community colleges in the United States. You are aware, too, that many questions as to what affects the scope of a community service program remain unanswered.

As a part of my doctoral studies at Western Michigan University I am examining the effect on the scope of the community services program by the placement of the community services administrator in the administrative hierarchy of the college, the number of duties performed by the community services administrator, and the attention given by the college president to the community services program.

Therefore, I am soliciting your cooperation in helping me investigate these relationships by completing the attached questionnaire as accurately as possible. All responses will be held in strictest confidence and only overall group data will be reported in the study.

For the purposes of this study, community services are defined as educational, cultural, social, and recreational services which a community college may provide for its community beyond the regular credit courses scheduled on campus during the day. This definition should be kept in mind when responding to questions seven through eighteen.

Naturally, I would appreciate an immediate return of the questionnaire. Therefore, for your convenience, I have designed the questionnaire so that the amount of time required to respond to the items should not exceed twenty-five minutes and I have included a pre-addressed, postage paid return envelope.

Also, if you would like a synopsis of the results of the study, so state in the top margin of the first page of the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. It will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Oravecz
Dear Community Services Administrator:

In early October I sent to you the questionnaire that I am using to gather data for my dissertation. As of the date above, I have not received a reply from you. Since you are a part of a randomly selected sample, a reply is needed. Therefore, I am sending you a copy of the questionnaire along with the original cover letter, which contains an explanation of the study. Before you respond to the questions, please read the original letter.

If you don't wish to participate, please return the questionnaire anyway. In such a case I would appreciate your filling out the first two items on the questionnaire and then, in item three, briefly state your reason for not wanting to participate. This will increase the validity of my study.

Please return the questionnaire by February 1, 1975.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Oravecz

MTO/cra

Enclosures
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name_______________________________________________________

2. Institution_________________________________________________

3. Please include a copy of your college's organizational chart with the return of this questionnaire. Or if one is not available, in the space below or on the back of this questionnaire sketch a diagram of the administrative structure of your college down to, and including, your position. Also, please indicate your place in the administrative structure by circling your position on the chart or diagram.

4. Circle the number which most appropriately describes the frequency of contact (written or direct) you have with the president of your college.

1. Twice-a-year or less frequently
2. Three times a year
3. Every other month
4. Monthly
5. Twice-a-month
6. Weekly
7. Twice-a-week or more frequently
8. Other (please state) ____________________________
5. Circle the number which most appropriately describes how significant the majority of your contacts with the president are in regard to the community service program.

1  Not significant
2  Of little significance
3  Of some significance
4  Significant
5  Highly significant

Comments:___________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

6. Check all those duties to which you are assigned.
   __ Administering the community services program.
   __ Administering adult education on the campus.
   __ Charge of the evening college.
   __ Administering continuing education on the campus.
   __ Administration of student personnel program for the college.
   __ Administering an instructional program.
   __ Charge of an academic division or department.
   __ Teaching.
   __ Other (Please list) _____________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
This section of the instrument contains a list of functions intended to describe the community services program. While the descriptions are intended to be as definitive as possible, they are not definitions. Thus, you should carefully read the central theme and intent of the description. After reading the description you are asked to judge (in terms of appropriateness to your community) the current range of activities found within each function in your community services program by using the following code and circling the appropriate number.

0 The function is not a part of your program
1 Very limited range of activities
2 Limited range of activities
3 Moderate range of activities
4 Broad range of activities
5 Very broad range of activities

Note: A broad range of activities indicates many and varied activities within a function.

7. Developmental counseling function - Providing community members with opportunities for self-discovery and development through individual and group counseling processes; e.g., aptitude-interest testing, individual interviews, career information, job placement, family life, etc.

0  1  2  3  4  5

8. Educational extension function - Increasing the accessibility of the regular courses and curricula of the college by extending their availability to the community-at-large; e.g., evening classes, TV courses, "weekend college", neighborhood extension centers, etc.

0  1  2  3  4  5

9. Education expansion function - Providing a variety of educational, up-grading and new career opportunities which reach beyond the traditional limitations of credit restrictions; e.g., institutes, seminars, tours, short courses, contractual in-plan training, etc.

0  1  2  3  4  5
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10. **Constituency development function** - Organizing special programs to increase the earning power, educational level, and political influence of the disadvantaged; e.g., ADC mother, unemployed males, educationally deprived youth, social security and welfare recipients, etc.

11. **Cultural development function** - Expanding opportunities for community members to participate in a variety of cultural activities; e.g., fine art series, art festivals, artists in residence, community theater, etc.

12. **Leisure-time activity function** - Expanding opportunities for community members to participate in a variety of recreational activities; e.g., sports instruction, out-door education, summer youth programs, senior citizen activities, etc.

13. **Agency organizing function** - Assisting in the establishment, coordination, and sustenance of needed community groups; e.g., community councils, ad hoc committees, area audio visual materials center, training institutes or academies, etc.

14. **Public forum function** - Developing activities designed to stimulate interest and understanding of local, national, and world problems; e.g., public affairs pamphlets, "town" meetings, TV symposiums, etc.

15. **Civic Action function** - Participating in cooperative efforts with local government, business, industry, professions, religious and social groups to increase the resources of the community to deal with major problems confronting the community; e.g., community self-studies, urban beautification, community chest drives, air pollution, etc.
16. **Staff consultation function** - Identifying, developing, and making available the consulting skills of the faculty in community development activities; e.g., consulting with small businesses, advising on instructional materials, designing community studies, instructing in group leadership, laboratory testing, etc.

0 1 2 3 4 5

17. **Conference planning function** - Providing professional assistance to community groups in planning of conferences, institutes, and workshops; e.g., registration procedures, program development, conference evaluation, etc.

0 1 2 3 4 5

18. **Facility utilization function** - Encouraging community use of college facilities by making them readily accessible, by facilitating the scheduling process, and by designing them for multi-purpose activities when appropriate; e.g., campus tours, centralized scheduling office, conference rooms, auditorium design and use, computer use, etc.

0 1 2 3 4 5