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DETERMINING THE SKILL AND TRAINING NEEDS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS: AN INQUIRY INTO METHODS

Duane Douglas Gates, Ed.D.
Western Michigan University, 1982

The primary purpose of this study was to examine different methods of assessing the training needs of community education directors.

Twelve major skill areas used by community education directors were synthesized from the literature and served as a basis for developing the survey instrument. This instrument was used to measure the perceptions of the 12 skill areas by each of the four groups in the study.

Each group was polled on a different dimension of how the training needs of a community education director might be determined:

Group 1 (Community Education Directors): Perceived amount of time each of the 12 skills was used.

Group 2 (Community Education Directors): Perceived importance of each skill.

Group 3 (Community Education Directors): Perceived need for training.

Group 4 (Community Education Center Directors): Perceived importance of each skill.

The sample population of this study consisted of 150 community education directors in the state of Minnesota who were selected at random. The fourth group in this study consisted of ten community education center directors from seven states.

A survey instrument was sent to a total of 160 individuals and the return rate was 100 percent. In an attempt to incorporate one
of the basic tenets of the naturalistic method of inquiry into this investigation, a summary of selected findings was mailed to each of nine participants, who were then interviewed to elicit their reactions in a follow up to the original survey.

Conclusions:

1. How skill needs are defined will have an effect on the skill needs that are identified.

2. Who identifies training needs will have an effect on what skill needs are identified.

3. How skill needs are identified may have an effect on what skill needs are identified.

4. Multiple realities of need exist when identifying the training needs of community education directors.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The community education concept was developed in Flint, Michigan during the 1930's, and has continued to expand rapidly throughout the United States during the past 50 years. By 1972, the number of school districts with community education programs had grown to over 600 (Weaver, 1972), and to over 2,100 by July, 1980 (Smith, 1981).

The rapid expansion of the community education movement has created an increasing demand for leaders trained to operationalize the concept. Seay (1974) expressed the belief "that community education will be used increasingly as a viable means for providing educational services and, therefore, ... demands for trained leadership will increase" (pp. 135-136). However, Lisicich and Watt (1975) indicated that "the realization that the implementation of community education require[s] specially trained persons is relatively recent" (p. 12).

The need for this training was being met in 1972 by 15 regional centers for community education development supported by the Mott Foundation (Schmitt & Weaver, 1979). By 1974, there were over 50 institutions of higher education responsible for developing leaders in community education (Johnson, 1975). According to a recent publication of the Mott Foundation, there are currently over 80 centers for community education funded by the Mott Foundation that are involved in various aspects of training in the field of community
Lisicich and Watt (1975) indicated that "no college or university offers a degree program in community education. Rather, community education is treated as a specialty within a designated area such as education administration and supervision, curriculum and instruction, educational leadership or adult education" (p. 13). They also pointed out that community education "centers have designed objectives in accordance with the college or university with which they are affiliated for the training of community educators" (p. 14).

Previous Studies on Skill and Training

Examination of the community education literature revealed that at the time of this writing, most of the research related to skill and training requirements of community education directors has been limited to doctoral dissertations. Prior to 1975, there were four dissertations completed relating to the training of community education directors according to Lisicich and Watt (1975). The authors were Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Winters (1972), and Johnson (1973).

Berridge (1969) "examine[d] the opinions of a panel of experts and a nationwide sampling of community school directors concerning categories and topics to be included in intensive preparation programs for community school directors" (p. 1).

The purposes of the study by Ederle (1970) were "(1) to develop guidelines for curriculum content in preparing community school directors, and (2) to ascertain if there is a significant difference
in the frequencies of rating responses concerning skills and knowledge areas among community school directors with varying amounts of job preparation" (pp. 2-3).

The primary purpose of the study by Winters (1972) was to gather empirical data on the behavior of community education directors and to compare their behavior in relation to the type of leadership training they had received.

The goal of the study by Johnson (1973) was "to develop a Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors based on a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders" (abstract).

Since 1974, there have been six dissertation dealing with the topic of skills needed by a community education director or building coordinator. Kliminski (1974) examined "significant differences between the technical, conceptual and human skills of successful Directors of Community Education and other Directors of Community Education in Michigan" (abstract).

The study by Zemlo (1977) "encompassed three main tasks: (1) to identify the components of the technical skills inherent in the role of the community educator, (2) to determine the relative importance of the technical and component skills, and (3) to determine if experience or professional preparation affected community educators' perceptions of the technical and component skills most important to them in the performance of their jobs" (p. 13).

Foelber's (1976) and Lisicich's (1977) investigations examined the competencies needed by community education directors, while the purpose of Hall's (1980) study was:
[to focus] on the role of the coordinator in implementing community education. Specifically, the primary purposes of the study were: (1) to assess and analyze the perceptions of community educators in the Mid-Atlantic region toward specified competencies for building-level community education coordinators and (2) to assess and analyze the perceptions of coordinators regarding their need for assistance in developing or refining skill in the competencies. (abstract)

Casale (1977) indicated the main purpose of his study "was to determine the most important tasks performed by community educators in Texas" (p. 66).

Additional literature on both the training of community education directors and skills needed by a community education director includes publications by Young (1975), Gerson (1975), Weaver (1975), Weaver (1978), Stalcup (1980), Seay (1974), Flores (1973), and McCleary, Paddock and Miller (1979). The latter two are briefly discussed below.

Flores (1973) examined "14 universities offering degree preparation programs in the field of community education. . . . The primary purpose of the study was directed at determining the characteristics of such programs at the Master's, Educational Specialist and Doctoral levels" (p. 127).

The investigation by McCleary et al. (1979) had the following primary goals:

(1) identification for each of the roles of administration of critical task areas, the primary competencies for each task area, and indicators of competence for each primary competency identified; and (2) assessments derived from practitioners, of how competencies might best be acquired and levels of attainment required for adequate performance. (pp. 1-2)

This investigator saw a need for further research in the area of
the skills of a community education director for two reasons. First, regarding the relationship of skill requirements to training programs in the field, many investigators have acknowledged limitations in their studies and have therefore recommended further research. Second, most of the investigators prior to 1981 did not have access to recent needs assessment literature and new approaches to scientific inquiry. This literature adds a new dimension to be considered by investigators when they are examining the skill and training requirements of community education directors. Each of these reasons will be discussed further.

Limitations of Previous Studies

Writers in the field, especially those who have conducted investigations into training requirements for community educators, have admitted serious limitations of their studies and have, therefore, recommended further research. For example, Lisicich and Watt (1975), in summing up the research that had been completed up to 1975, said, "very little has been done to discover and validate those characteristics which constitute effective community educators" (p. 14). They also reported that:

Dr. Curtis Van Voorhees, Director of the Office of Community Education Research, indicates that further research is needed in the area of community education training. Further research will assist the leaders in community education to develop more functional guidelines and more well-defined competencies required for the training of community educators. (p. 15)

Zemlo (1977) indicated that his study was limited to southwestern Michigan and "other studies might examine technical and
component skills in . . . different states" (p. 191).

He also stated:

Further refinement of an instrument to determine the relative importance of . . . skills inherent in the role of the community educator is recommended. . . . Possible alterations might include:

1. A change in instrumentation format which would ask respondents to select a designated number of . . . skills perceived to be extremely important . . . .

2. A change in instrumentation format which would ask respondents to indicate the portion of time per week that would be delegated to the various . . . skills. (pp. 191-192)

In addition, he indicated:

A total reliance upon community educators for direction in training strategies is not advocated. Discrepancies may exist between those competencies perceived by community educators to be of importance to them . . . and those competencies which are in reality important to the practitioner. . . . Efforts to answer the question, what skills are actually used in the field, must continue. (pp. 192-193)

Lisicich's (1977) study examined what coordinators, center directors and community school principals perceived to be the actual or present level of training that the community education director has received in designated skills and also what they perceived to be the ideal level of training in each of those skills. In her study, she recommended

that further study of the competencies of the Community Education Coordinator be conducted with the following kept in mind:

a) Whether the community is an urban, rural or suburban setting.

b) The competencies should be studied in terms of their usefulness on the job and the extent to which they are actually used on the job. (p. 210)
Foelber's (1976) study was limited to 25 school districts in California. He posed the question, "would replication of this study in other parts of the country result in substantially similar results?" (p. 152). He also asked, "because of the limitation inherent in mail surveys, would personal interviews have provided additional insights into perceived competencies of community education directors?" (p. 152).

Casale (1977), in examining the "tasks in the administration of a school-based community education project . . . considered most important by community education directors/coordinators" (p. 116), did use the interview method in his study. However, his sample of 29 community educators in Texas placed certain limitations on his study and he recommended that "another study . . . should be undertaken in a different state. . . . Other research methods are encouraged" (abstract).

The investigation by Hall (1980) was limited to the mid-Atlantic states and was aimed specifically at building-level coordinators and not at district-wide community education directors. She recommended that further research be conducted with district-wide directors.

Many of the previous studies of community education skills have been limited to perceived importance of the skill. Zemlo (1977) suggested that the amount of time devoted to the practice of a particular skill should be investigated in addition to the perceived importance of the skill. This writer concurs with Zemlo in this regard and posits that not only the amount of time a skill is used should be investigated, but also the interrelationship between
amount of time a skill is used and other variables, such as perceived importance of a skill and perceived need for training, should be examined. That is to say, a director may rank a skill as important, but in practice may use the skill to a very limited extent. Or a community education director may use a skill to a great extent, perceive it to be important, but perceive little need for training in that skill. In reality, however, he or she may in fact need training in that skill but may not be able to recognize it.

Zemlo (1977) also suggested that discrepancies may exist between what skills a director perceives as being important and those which are important in reality. If this is the case, then it would be valuable not only to identify what skills are perceived to be important by community education directors, but also to use several different methods to determine the importance of a skill, such as a survey instrument regarding perceptions and a follow up interview. This process would help those individuals who are responsible for training community education directors in these skill areas to be more accurate in identifying the training needs of community education directors.

In summary, this investigator believes that, although several studies to identify skill and training requirements have been completed, there appears to be a need for further study. Studies prior to this writing had various limitations, many of which were discussed by their authors. Limitations of previous studies include:

1. Many studies have been limited in populations sampled.

2. The methodology employed prior to this writing,
except for one study, has been limited to mail questionnaires.

3. Few attempts have been made to determine the relationships among the perceived importance of the skill, the perceived need for additional training, and the extent to which skills are used in practice.

4. Most of the studies prior to this writing have attempted to determine the need for training in a particular skill area based upon the perceived importance of the skill.

5. Additional methodological limitations of some of the previous studies include: sample size, nondiscriminating data, and lists of skills that were not synthesized from previous studies.

Need Assessment Techniques

Whereas there have been several studies to identify the skill and training needs of community education directors, most such studies have been conducted without access to recent needs assessment literature and new methods of inquiry. The next two sections discuss needs assessment and methods of inquiry literature as they contribute to improved approaches to research in the area of skills and training needed by community education directors.

Suarez (1980) indicated that one of the greatest criticisms in the area of needs assessment is in the failure to specify precisely what is meant by the term 'needs'. . . . To rectify this situation, it would seem important for designers of needs assessments to include: (a) a definition of the term 'need' as it is used in the needs assessment, (b) the identification of whose needs are of concern, and (c) a specification of types of needs that will be identified. (p. 32)

Most of the studies to date gave only brief consideration to these points. This will be demonstrated in the discussion of
definition of need.

Stufflebeam (1977a) defines need in four ways. They are:

Discrepancy View—A need is a discrepancy between desired performance and observed or predicted performance.

Democratic View—A need is a change desired by a majority of some reference group.

Diagnostic View—A need is something whose absence or deficiency proves harmful.

Analytic View—A need is the direction in which improvement can be predicted to occur given information about current status. (pp. 1-2)

As previous studies assessing the skills and training needs of community education directors were examined, it appeared that most of the studies have utilized the democratic view of need, i.e., they asked individuals to rate how important various skills were to community educators. Hence, the results of these studies are based on what a majority of individuals found to be the most important skills needed by a community education director. As a result, most of these studies made the assumption that there are absolute needs, i.e., that there are only a given number of needs that exist and that it is possible to identify them.

Since both Suarez (1980) and Stufflebeam (1977b) indicated that there are multiple factors to be considered in determining need, the assumption that needs are absolute seemed questionable. Rather, it seemed reasonable that needs are relative, not only as to how they are defined, but also as to who is identifying them, the context in which they are identified (Kaufman & English, 1979), when they are identified, and the types of needs identified.
If indeed needs are relative, then it appeared that how needs are perceived will determine what needs are discovered. For example, a particular skill need of a community education director may be eliminated from consideration depending upon: (a) how need is being defined, (b) the person being asked to identify the skill requirement, (c) the situation in which the need is being considered, (c) the time at which the study is being conducted or (e) the type of skill need under consideration.

New Methods of Inquiry

Assuming that needs are considered relative and not absolute, Guba's (1978) discussion of the concept of the "reality manifold" and methods within the "naturalistic method of inquiry" seemed appropriate for investigating the skill and training needs of community education directors. An investigation which incorporates some of the basic tenets of multiple realities and the methods suggested by the naturalistic inquiry approach appeared to be indicated, inasmuch as none of the previous investigations on the skill and training requirements of community education directors used these tenets or methods. The concept of multiple realities and the methods suggested by the naturalistic inquiry approach to scientific inquiry will be discussed further below.

In examining an investigator's view of reality, Guba (1978) suggested that reality only exists in the minds of individual people and will depend on the separate perceptions of each of these individuals. Because each individual has different perceptions, a
multiple reality will exist.

In addition, Guba stated

that the reality manifold is constantly changing in terms of time, people, episodes, settings and circumstances. One should expect 'reality' to be different at different times, recognizing the difference will depend on the situation and not necessarily or merely on a lack of reliability in methodology. (p. 15)

In discussing the methods used by both conventional and naturalistic inquirers, Guba (1978) indicates that both want to be objective. However, he states:

the meaning which they ascribe to that term is quite different. The conventional inquirer strives for objectivity in the sense of intersubjective agreement, i.e., agreement among two or more equally competent observers. The naturalistic inquirer, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the belief in a multiple reality, places little store in that form of objectivity and strives instead for confirmability, i.e., agreement among a variety of information sources. (p. 17)

Since most of the past studies in the area of skills and training required of community education directors did not attempt to account for differences in the perceptions of their respondents by conducting a follow-up inquiry of their respondents, this investigator suggested that a study be conducted involving such a follow-up inquiry of the respondents to achieve confirmability as suggested by Guba (1978) to determine the objectivity of the inquiry.

Because the rapid expansion of the community education concept created the need for both preservice and inservice training of community education directors, and because such training is important to the growth and development of both the individual and the profession, the following assumptions were made regarding needs and
needs assessment in the area of skill and training requirements of community education directors and the development of training programs for them:

1. Training programs should be needs based.

2. Needs are dynamic in nature and are continually changing.

3. Training programs are continuously assessing needs, though some more systematically than others, and as a result, anyone involved in training is also involved in needs assessment.

4. How needs are defined and identified, who identifies them, the context in which they are identified, and when they are identified will affect the needs that are identified in a needs assessment.

Problem Statement

There appeared to be a need for additional research in the area of skill and training requirements for community education directors for two reasons. First, regarding the relationship of skill requirements to training programs in the field, many investigators had acknowledged limitations in their studies and had therefore recommended further research. Second, most of the investigators prior to 1981 did not have access to recent needs assessment and methodological literature. This literature added a new dimension to be considered when examining the skill and training requirements of community education directors.

The present study was based upon a review of the community education literature, recent needs assessment and methods of inquiry literature and conclusions drawn from previous investigations of
need, needs assessment and training. The writer proposed to inves-
tigate methods by which the training needs of community education
directors could be determined. This investigation would include:

1. using more than one definition of need to
determine if the use of different definitions will result
in the identification of different skills needed by
community education directors;

2. using both community education directors and
community education center directors as separate groups
to determine if who identifies needs will result in the
identification of different needs;

3. using the concept of multiple realities of
need to examine the skills needed by community education
directors. Specifically, this study would investigate
the perceptions of selected community education directors
regarding the relative importance of each skill area, the
amount of time spent in each skill area on the job, and
the need for additional training in each of the identified
skill areas. Furthermore, this study would also identify
the perceived importance of each of the major skill areas
by a panel of expert trainers;

4. using the method of confirmability as suggested
by Guba (1978) to account for differences in the percep-
tions of the respondents regarding the skills needed by
community education directors; and

5. making recommendations to be considered when
identifying the training needs of community education
directors and planning training programs for community
education directors.

Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was to examine different
methods of assessing the training needs of community education
directors. In addition, recommendations to be considered when iden-
tifying training needs of community education directors and planning
training programs for community education directors were made. This
was to be accomplished by the following objectives:

1. to compare the perceptions of three groups of selected community education directors, regarding the skills required of a community education director, across the following dimensions:
   a. the relative importance of each major skill area,
   b. the amount of time spent using the skills in each major skill area, and
   c. the need for additional training in each major skill area.

2. to compare the perceptions of the three groups of selected community education directors regarding:
   a. the relative importance of each major skill area,
   b. the amount of time spent using the skills in each major skill area, and
   c. the need for additional training in each major skill area as they relate to the perceived importance of each major skill area by a panel of expert trainers.

3. to examine the relationships that exist between the perceptions of selected community educators regarding the skills required of a community education director and the results of previous investigations reported in the literature.

4. to report the implications of the methodology used to identify needs in the present study as it relates to the development of training programs for community education directors.

Definitions

Community Education

For the purpose of this study, the following definition of
Community education by Minzey and LeTarte (1972) was used:

Community education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all the educational needs of its members. It uses the local school to serve as the catalyst for bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop a positive sense of community, improve community living, and develop the community process toward the end of self actualization. (p. 19)

Community Education Director

The definition of a community education director in this study is an individual who is responsible for the development of the community education concept within a defined community or geographical area.

Community Education Center Director

Within the context of this study, a community education center director was defined as an individual who is a trainer of community education directors and is employed at a college or university as a director or assistant director of a community education center.

Skill

The definition of skill in this study was taken from Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary which states that skill is "the ability to use one's knowledge effectively and readily in execution or performance" (p. 1088).

Major Skill Area

These skill areas were synthesized from skills identified in
previous studies and will be discussed in Chapter II. The 12 major skill areas are:

1. Communicating.
2. Evaluating.
4. Identifying Resources.
5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds.
6. Coordinating.
7. Programming.
8. Involving Community.
10. Organizing.
11. Leading.
12. Managing Interpersonal Relations.

Collectively, these major skills will be referred to as the major skill areas in this study.

Training Needs

In this study, training needs were defined as those specific major skills in which individuals should improve their own proficiency. A variety of techniques can be employed to identify these training needs.

Limitations

The following limitations of this investigation are acknowledged by the researcher.
1. The population of community education directors from which the sample was drawn was limited to community education directors in the state of Minnesota. The official list of directors from the Minnesota State Department of Education was used as the population.

2. The panel of experts was not chosen using a random sample procedure; instead, a known authority and author in the field of community education was asked to assist the investigator with this task.

3. This investigator limited his study to only four of many possible methods by which training needs of community education directors might have been assessed.

4. Although the 12 major skill areas were synthesized from previous studies in community education, the investigator acknowledges that the reader's personal preference may be that the number of major skills be less than or greater than 12.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are made with regard to this study:

1. That the different survey instruments in this study can be used to represent different approaches to assessing and defining need.

2. That the panel of experts is representative of expertise among community education center directors in this country.

3. That the list of 12 major skills is representative of those skills employed by community education directors to complete a majority of the tasks inherent in their jobs. It is also assumed that a majority of the skills used by community education directors could be classified to fit into one of these 12 major skills.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of four additional chapters. Chapter II reviews the literature with regard to: (a) the development of the 12 major skill areas included in the survey instrument, and (b) need,
needs assessment, and methods of inquiry as it was used to develop the format of the survey instruments. Chapter III describes the methodology and procedures used to develop the survey instrument and analyze the data. Chapter IV reports the quantitative and qualitative findings. Finally, Chapter V discusses the findings and conclusions of the study while making recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature pertinent to this investigation which will be divided into two sections. Section one will review the literature that was used to develop the 12 major skill areas used in the survey instrument. Section two will review the literature related to need, needs assessment and the naturalistic method of inquiry that was identified to develop the format for the four instruments used in the present study.

Major Skill Areas

Many investigators have used a variety of methods to examine the skills that community education directors should possess: Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Johnson (1973), Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977), and Hall (1980). Specific skill areas identified in the above studies were synthesized by this investigator to develop the 12 major skill areas incorporated in the survey instrument. Since the purpose of each of these investigations was briefly stated in the previous chapter, that discussion will not be repeated here.

It should be noted at this time that the above researchers reviewed the works of many writers and publications in the field of community education while conducting their research. Since these
investigators and publications have had an indirect effect on this study, the writer would like to acknowledge their contributions to this investigation.

In the sections that follow, investigations prior to this writing will be discussed as they relate to each of the 12 skill areas included in the present study.

**Communication**

"Communication" or "communicating" was used by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Winters (1972), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), and Zemlo (1977) as a major skill area in their investigations of the skills required of community educators. In addition, Johnson (1973), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), and Foelber (1976) and Hall (1980) cited specific examples of communicating in their studies.

Berridge (1969) used communicating as one of nine major skill areas in his instrument. Under communicating, he listed 11 specific skills. Ederle (1970) used communicating as one of seven major skills with 14 specific components, while Lisicich (1977) used communication as one of 14 major skill areas with three specific components. Communicating was also considered one of eight major skill categories by Casale (1977), who listed them as task statements. He listed eight specific task statements dealing with communicating under this major skill area. All of the above investigators included writing, speaking and listening in their lists of specific component skills. In addition, Zemlo (1977) believed that each of these three component skills were important enough to list
separately as major technical skills in his survey instrument. His instrument had a total of 17 major skill areas with 150 specific skills under them, which he labeled component skills. Of these, 28 were listed under the three major skills of writing, speaking, and listening.

In addition to the component communication skills of writing, speaking and listening within all of the above studies, Foelber (1976) included critical analysis of readings as one of the skills in his study.

Finally, for the purpose of defining communicating in this study, this investigator used the work of Lisicich (1977), Ederle (1970), and Flores (1973) to expand upon the basic definition of communication—namely, speaking, writing, listening and reading—to include the exchange of information with individuals and groups of various ages and diverse backgrounds. The definition of communicating used by this researcher in the survey instrument is as follows: the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.

Previous investigators made the following observations regarding the skill of communicating: Berridge (1969), indicated that the use of public relations, listening skills, discussion skills, should be included in intensive preparations programs. Ederle (1970) found the major area of communication contained "the single skill rated the highest of all the skills in both preservice and inservice
preparations by respondents" (p. 104).

Johnson (1973) included communication as one of 17 major areas of training needs of community education directors, while Zemlo (1977) indicated that the component skills listed under communicating—oral, written, and aural—were all found to be important.

Lisicich (1977) reported that communicating was one of 11 skills upon which all three groups in her study—community education directors, community education center directors, and community education principals—agreed to the extent to which community education directors should be ideally trained.

Communication was one of the top four most important skills or tasks within the context of his study reported by Casale (1977). In addition, community education directors perceived communication as one of the top two skills in which they were the most proficient.

Evaluating

"Evaluating" was listed by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), and Zemlo (1977) as a major skill area in their investigations of the skills of a community education director. Investigations by Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), Poelber (1976), and Hall (1980) utilized specific examples of evaluation skills, but didn't use evaluation as a major skill area. In addition, other writers in the field such as Seay (1974), Minzey and Le Tarte (1972), and Schmitt and Weaver (1979) have included evaluation as a major chapter in their publications.
It appears that the investigations by Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977) and Hall (1980) would support the first notion in this investigator's instrument: that evaluating is the ability to design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs.

Casale (1977) supported the notion that evaluation includes the ability to analyze the results of the evaluation by asking "How important is it for you to be able to interpret survey data?" (p. 151). This idea is implied by the other investigators. The instruments used by Ederle (1970), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977), and Hall (1980) all contribute to the belief that evaluating includes the ability to use the results of an evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

Ederle's (1970) instrument asks the community educator to rank his or her "ability to use evaluative results to facilitate change" (p. 125), while Hall (1980) questioned the extent to which respondents would "utilize evaluation results for planning future programming" (p. 151).

It would appear that the literature supports including evaluating as a major skill area. The definition developed and defined by this investigator is as follows: Evaluating is the ability to (a) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs, (b) analyze the results of the evaluation, and (c) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

The following observations regarding evaluation as a major skill
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area were made by previous investigators. In the study by Berridge (1969), evaluation was one of the two major categories from a total of nine that was not suggested as a content area for an intensive preparation program for community education directors.

Ederle (1970) reported that "respondents placed a moderate value on the importance of evaluation skills in community school director programs of preparation" (p. 105). Four specific skills that were considered as a requirement for preparation programs included:

---Ability to use evaluative results to facilitate change
---Ability to identify those effects of the program that are measurable
---Ability to identify effects of program on individuals in the community
---Ability to identify beneficial effects of program on community in general. (p. 106)

Johnson (1973) included "research and evaluation" as one of the 17 major areas suggested as training needs for community education directors, while all 15 of the component skills listed under "evaluating community education outputs" by Zemlo (1977) were considered important technical skills.

Finally, both Lisicich (1977) and Casale (1977) reported their findings regarding the major skill area of evaluating the same as the skill of communicating, which was just discussed. In addition, however, Casale (1977) reported that evaluating was one of the two skill areas in which community education directors felt the least competent.
Assessing Needs

"Assessing needs" was used by Ederle (1970), Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), Zemlø (1977), and Hall (1980) as a major skill area in their investigations. Berridge (1969), Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), and Casale (1977) also utilized the skill "assessing needs" in their instruments, but as part of other major skill areas such as organization and leadership. Other writers in the field, Minzey and LeTarte (1972), have a chapter in their publication entitled "Determining and Meeting Staffing Needs."

Several writers, Ederle (1970), Johnson (1973), and Foelber (1976) among them, by their use of the terminology "surveying" have apparently indicated their preference for a particular method to be used for determining need. In comparison, Hall (1980) and Lisicich (1977) seem to believe in a variety of methods for assessing needs. One of the questions on Lisicich's (1980) survey asks the respondent to rate the importance of the skill, "to have knowledge of various methods of needs assessment" (p. 254). The above discussion provided a rationale for the first part of the definition of assessing needs.

Concerning the second part of the definition used in this investigator's survey instrument, Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976), and Lisicich (1977) all support the notion of involving community members in determining priorities of need.

Finally, with regard to the third component in the definition of assessing needs, Ederle (1970), Flores (1973), Casale (1977), and
Zemlo (1977) all support the idea of developing an action plan to meet identified needs.

The definition of assessing needs developed by this investigator for the purposes of this study is as follows: the ability to (a) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (b) involve community members in determining priorities of need; and (c) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

The following observations were made by previous investigators regarding assessing needs as a major skill area. Ederle (1970) concluded the following with regards to community surveys as a major skill area:

Community school directors with their characteristic 'too busy' schedules do not feel they have time for lengthy surveys. . . . The research data reflects that practicing directors feel the following skills should be embodied in community survey preparation:

- Ability to approach individuals to obtain data
- Knowledge of physical environment of community
- Ability to use data received in a meaningful way.

(p. 106)

Johnson (1973) included surveying as one of 17 major areas of training needs for community educators, while Zemlo (1977) concluded that all component skills that he listed under the major skill area of Surveying Community Education Needs were important.

Lisicich (1977) reported that assessing need was one of the 11 major skill areas in her study which directors, center directors and building principals agreed upon to the extent to which community education directors should ideally be trained.
In contrast to the generally favorable findings of the four studies just discussed, Hall (1980) reported that assessment was ranked fifth in importance out of seven major skills by both center directors and building level community education directors. However, she also reported that assessment was ranked third by building directors who were indicating their need for assistance in developing skills in this area.

Identifying Resources

"Identifying resources" was used by Lisicich (1977) and Zemlo (1977) as a major skill category in each of their survey instruments, while Berridge (1969), Kliminski (1974), and Foelber (1976) used the specific skills related to identifying resources under other major skill areas. Johnson (1973), Winters (1972), and Hall (1980) all utilized skills somewhat similar to identifying resources in their survey instruments. For example, Johnson (1973) used recruiting as a major skill area. In addition, Totten and Manley (1969) include a chapter on community resources in their publication The Community School. Berridge (1969), Kliminski (1974) and Foelber (1976) discuss identification of resources in general terms, like "identifies required resources" (Foelber, 1976, p. 176). In comparison, Lisicich (1977) asked respondents "to identify existing and potentially valuable physical resources for community use" (p. 254).

Zemlo (1977) asked respondents in his survey to indicate the importance of the following skill: "to discover informal community resources (i.e., community residents who serve as gatekeepers or
are themselves resources)" (p. 212). Although identifying financial resources was not specifically stated in the investigations reviewed by this researcher, it was included in the definition because it logically could be included within such broad statements as "identify required resources." The definition used by this investigator for identifying resources in this study is as follows: the ability to identify the human, physical, and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

Zemlo (1977) found that all of the eight component skills listed under the major skill of Identifying Community Resources were found to be important. Kliminski reported that, of the 40 skills in his study, successful directors ranked identification of community resources 16th in order of importance, their subordinates ranked it 23rd in order of importance, and their superordinates ranked it 34th in order of importance.

Lisicich (1977) indicated that resource assessment was also one of the 11 major skills that all three of the groups participating in her study agreed upon the extent to which community education directors should ideally be trained.

**Obtaining and Budgeting Funds**

"Obtaining and budgeting funds" was utilized as a major skill area investigated by Winters (1972), Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), and Zemlo (1977). The investigations by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), Foelber
(1976), and Hall (1980) listed this skill area under other major headings, such as Identification of Program Components and Resources (Hall, 1980), Organization (Berridge, 1969), or Organization of Programs (Ederle, 1970). In addition, writers such as Minzey and LeTarte (1972), Schmitt and Weaver (1979), Berridge, Stark and West (1977), Totten and Manley (1969), and Whitt (1971) have included chapters in their publications relating to this skill area.

It appears that the first portion of the definition of this skill, the ability to utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program, is supported by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Winters (1972), Johnson (1973), Kliminski (1974), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), and Hall (1980).

Sources suggested by these authors include local, state and federal governments. Methods include taxation, fundraising, and proposal writing.

The second component of this skill, the ability to develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution, and supervision of these funds, is included in the instruments of Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Foelber (1976), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977) and Hall (1980). The element that is common among these investigations appears to be the development and utilization of a budget instrument and procedure for maintaining records.

The definition of this major skill area, Obtaining and Budgeting Funds, developed for this survey instrument by this investigator is: the ability to (a) utilize a variety of both funding sources and
methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (b) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

The following observations have been made by previous investigators regarding this skill area. Winters (1972) reported that:

Directors of community education spend greater portions of time in: budget planning and administration, fee collection, and application and administration of State and Federal funds than in other aspects of finance administration. (p. 187)

Johnson (1973) indicated that finance should be considered as one of 17 areas in which community education directors should be trained.

Zemlo (1977) reported that all nine of the component skills listed under Financing Community Education Programs in his study were found to be important by the community education directors completing his survey.

By comparison, Lisicich (1977) reported that community education directors had a significantly higher perception of the extent to which community education directors should be trained in this skill area than community education center directors and community education principals.

In contrast, Casale (1977) in the context of his study indicated that the skill finance ranked in the bottom half in terms of importance among the eight skill areas in his study.

Coordinating

"Coordinating" was utilized as a major skill area in the
investigations by Winters (1972), Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), Casale (1977), and Hall (1980), while Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), and Foelber (1976) used coordinating as part of their respective investigations under other major skill categories. In addition, Coordinating Community Efforts was a chapter in a publication by Berridge et al. (1977).

All of the above investigations influenced this researcher's definition of coordinating. However, Lisicich (1977) and Hall (1980) had the greatest impact.

Lisicich listed the following skill categories in her instrument:

5. To effect collaboration among and between community agencies
   a. To facilitate cooperation between community agencies and groups
   b. To have knowledge of various methods to build desirable trust levels among community agencies, organizations, groups and individuals
   c. To assist the development of mutually desirable and attainable goals with other community agencies and organizations
   d. To honor the autonomy of existing services, agencies, facilities, programs and organizations in the community. (p. 255)

Hall (1980) stated,

The coordination process brings together public and private agencies and organizations within the community so that the delivery of services is improved and duplication is avoided. Community education provides the framework for coordination by soliciting the cooperation of agencies and residents in identifying services and resources and mobilizing them to meet needs more effectively. (p. 144)
For this investigation, coordinating was defined as: the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

Previous investigators have made the following observations regarding the skill area coordinating.

Johnson (1973) indicated that coordinating was listed both as one of the 12 major components of the role of the community educator and as one of the 17 training components in his Leadership Training Model.

Winters (1972) concluded from his investigation that:

Community education coordinates its efforts most frequently with: recreational agencies, P.T.A. and parent groups, health and welfare agencies, and civic and fraternal organizations. . . .

The nature of coordination with community agencies is generally informal. This is supported by the high percentage of directors who reported an informal coordinating process (p. 131) and the types of communication channels that were used for coordinating. (p. 187)

Winters (1972) also reported that coordination was one of the five functions that were listed in his study as ideal priorities in programming of community education directors.

Both Casale (1977) and Lisicich (1977) reported similar findings as they did with the skills evaluating and communicating. Lisicich (1977) reported within the context of her study that coordinating was one of the 11 skills that all three groups in her study agreed upon to the extent to which community education directors should ideally be trained. Casale (1977) indicated that coordinating was ranked as one of the top four skills within the context of his study.
In addition, Hall (1980) reported that center directors ranked coordinating number one in her study in terms of perceived importance, while building directors ranked it at 3.5 for importance and four in terms of perceived need for assistance.

**Programming**

"Programming" has been utilized as a major skill area in the investigations conducted by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Johnson (1973), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977), and Hall (1980). It has also been listed as a skill under a different major heading by Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976) and Liscich (1977). In addition, various writers in the field such as Minzey and LeTarte (1972) and Seay (1974) dedicated entire chapters in their publications to the skill of programming.

Berridge (1969) and Ederle (1970) list 11 and 12 specific programs respectively, (such as adult education programs, family programs, and youth programs) under their major heading "programming." Casale (1977) lists similar specific programs, but in addition asks questions like, "How important is it for you to be able to identify the values and attitudes of various racial and ethnic groups?" and "How important is it for you to be able to increase the contact between people of different cultures?" (p. 149). All of the above investigations helped influence this writer's definition of programming, with the greatest influence being attributed to Flores (1973) and Hall (1980). Flores (1973) described the following behavior in his survey regarding the skill programming:
Programming is the ability to adapt programs, facilities and resources into activities and experiences which help solve current human problems. This is in juxtaposition to the traditional practice of dealing with deferred learning problems. (p. 163)

Hall (1980), in describing the process of programming, one of seven major processes in her investigation, stated, "the process of program development generates services and academic, social, cultural and recreational offerings for all ages based on identified needs and interests of the community" (p. 147).

Utilizing the investigations just discussed, the writer posits the following definition of programming for this investigation: Programming is the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

Previous investigators have made the following observations regarding the skill of programming. Berridge (1969) recommended that the ability to develop the following programs under the programming category be included in an intensive preparation program: youth programs, adult education, job training, youth enrichment, family and senior citizens programs. Ederle (1970) recommended in his study that programming for all of the groups suggested by Berridge (1969), as well as summer programs and physical fitness programs, be part of the first priority skills in his framework of guidelines for a preparation program for community school directors.

Johnson (1973) indicated that programming should be considered one of the 12 major components in defining the role of the community.
education director. Zemlo (1977) indicated that all seven of the component skills listed under the major skill area, Establishing Community Education Programs, were found to be important.

In comparison, Casale (1977) indicated that programming was in the bottom half of the major skills in his study and Hall (1980) indicated a rather low ranking by both center directors (4) and community education directors (3.5). In addition, she reported that community education directors ranked programming the lowest (7) of all the skills in terms of need for assistance in developing or refining a skill.

Involving Community

"Involving community" has been utilized by Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), and Hall (1980) as a major skill category in their investigations, while Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Winters (1972), Kliminski (1974) and Casale (1977) have listed it as a skill under another major skill category. In addition, Schmitt and Weaver (1979), Whitt (1971), and Seay (1974) have chapters in their respective publications discussing various aspects of community involvement.

Several investigators, by their use of the terminology in their survey instruments, might lead one to believe that involving community is limited to utilizing community advisory councils (Berridge, 1969; Ederle, 1970). However, this is not the case with Lisicich (1977) and Hall (1980), who greatly influenced this investigator's definition of involving community.
Lisicich (1977), in her survey instrument, asked individuals to rate the importance of the skills listed under the major skill area:

To develop community leadership and involvement

a. To recruit and involve people in community education programs

b. To convey to community members the knowledge, skills and values they possess and then to assist them in realizing their own resource-giving potential

c. To assist people in broadening their perspectives on life and to assist them in facilitating and accepting change

d. To assist others in realizing a feeling of personal power that helps them to risk change and take responsibility

e. To expand a community's understanding of the social and political forces that operate in their community and other communities

f. To organize people in teams to meet community needs

g. To assist groups to set and attain goals and obtain appropriate decisions through group process. (p. 255)

Hall (1980), in her survey instrument, introduced the 12 questions on citizen involvement by describing the citizen involvement process. She stated:

The citizen involvement process is designed to create increased awareness of the need for citizen participation in the problem solving, secure broad representation from the community and provide a mechanism wherein the greatest possible citizen involvement in decision making is realized. (p. 136)

Based to a great extent on the survey instruments of Lisicich (1977) and Hall (1980), this investigator posits his definition of
involving community as it is used in this investigation. Involving community is the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision-making and problem-solving process within the community.

The following observations have been made by investigators in the field regarding the skill of involving community.

Johnson (1973) indicated that community involvement should be considered one of the 12 major components defining the role of the community education director.

Lisicich (1977) recommended that "greater emphasis on the specific competencies of . . . 'leadership development and community involvement' . . . should be encouraged in training programs" (p. 202). In addition, she indicated that involving community was one of the 11 skills that all three groups in her study agreed upon to the extent to which community education directors should be ideally trained.

Finally, Hall (1980) concurred with the previous investigators when she reported that citizen involvement ranked number two by both center directors and community education building directors. She also reported that this skill was ranked number one with regard to the building directors' perceived need for assistance in developing the skill.

Training

"Training" has been utilized as a major skill area in the
investigations conducted by Johnson (1973) and Hall (1980), while Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976), Lisicich (1977), and Casale (1977) use it as a skill under a related major skill area. Several investigators (Kliminski, 1974; Foelber, 1976; Ederle, 1970; and Lisicich, 1977) appear to believe that training is only a skill area to be utilized with staff. This is indicated by their choice of survey questions. In comparison, Berridge (1969) and Casale (1977) appear to support the notion that this skill would be utilized for community members as well as staff. For example, Casale (1977) asked the following questions in his survey: "How important is it for you to be able to arrange for the professional growth of your staff? (staff development)" and "How important is it for you to be able to train volunteers?" (p. 149).

Flores (1973) and Hall (1980) described the training function in more general terms in their survey instruments. Flores (1973) viewed training as the "ability to organize and develop needed pre-service and in-service training programs which perpetuate the community education concept via leadership qualities that stimulate small and large groups toward action" (p. 162). Hall (1980) stated "The training process lays the foundation for positive citizen participation by providing opportunities for community members to develop knowledge and skills for leadership and involvement" (p. 139).

Based upon the literature just discussed, the writer utilized the following definition of training for the purpose of this
investigation: Training is the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members, and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

Previous investigators have made the following observations about training. Johnson (1973) indicated that training should be included as one of the 12 major components in the role of a community education director.

Flores (1973) reported that of 135 competencies provided by a panel of experts, the following statement regarding training was one of 16 considered to be essential to community education directors:

ability to organize and develop needed pre-service and in-service training programs which perpetuate the community education concept via leadership qualities that stimulate small and large groups toward action. (p. 113)

In contrast, Hall (1980) reported that both community education building directors and center directors ranked this skill the lowest (7) in terms of perceived importance. However, the building directors did rank it second in terms of need for assistance in developing the skill.

Organizing

"Organizing" has been utilized as a major skill area in investigations by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), Flores (1973), and Casale (1977). Other investigators such as Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976), Lisicich (1977) and Hall (1980) have utilized skills that relate to organizing under other major skill areas in their
investigations.

Previous investigators have allowed a very broad interpretation of what types of activities might be included under the skill of organizing. For example, Berridge (1969) in his survey instrument included the following skills under his major skill area of Organization:

- methods of orienting community leaders
- methods of orienting staff members
- conducting community surveys
- using lay persons in the program
- establishing community advisory boards
- establishing neighborhood advisory boards
- local financing
- state financing
- federal financing
- local, state and federal taxation. (p. 150)

Ederle (1970) included the following list of skills under this major heading of Organization of Programs:

- Knowledge of role of the school principal, superintendent, and school board in the community school
- Knowledge of community school organizational models
- Knowledge of school law affecting Community School operation
- Orientation of school staff to operation of community school
- Ability to obtain lay cooperation in planning and function
- Ability to survey community for program needs
- Ability to organize citizen advisory boards
- Ability to enlist local agencies and resources. (p. 124)

Some of the questions posed by Casale (1980) under the skill Organization include:
How important is it for you to control inventory? (supplies and materials)

How important is it for you to be able to maintain records and files?

How important is it for you to be able to establish a community resource profile? (an inventory of community resources, people, clubs and agencies)

How important is it for you to be able to organize and schedule your own time? (pp. 148-9)

Since the opinions of previous investigators vary on what constitutes skills under the major heading of organization, this writer chose to pick out the one feature common to all these skills when developing the following definition. Organizing is defined as the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department. Most of the investigations previously listed would be able to fit their specific skills under this definition:

Berridge (1969) recommended that five of the skills listed as part of the Organization skills category in his study be included in an intensive preparation program for community education directors. Ederle (1970) reported that "respondents felt that the success of the community school director is determined to a large degree by his abilities to organize resources to meet the specific needs of the community" (p. 104).

Flores (1973) indicated that the organizing function was one of five functions "considered essential to community education leaders of the future" (p. 108).

In contrast to the above three studies, Casale (1977) reported
that organizing was one of two skills ranked the lowest by community education directors within the context of his study.

**Leading**

"Leading" or leadership has been listed as a major skill area by various investigators, including Johnson (1973), Casale (1977), Zemlo (1977), and Hall (1980). Berridge (1969), Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976) and Lisicich (1977) also enumerated skills that were closely related to the term "leading" in their investigations. Several writers, including Seay (1974) and Schmitt and Weaver (1979), have also included a chapter in their publications on this skill area.

Johnson (1973), Flores (1973), Kliminski (1974), and Lisicich (1977) all support the idea that leading is the ability to assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals. For example, one of the statements that Kliminski (1974) asked respondents to rate in terms of importance was "I demonstrate initiative and persistence in goal attainment" (p. 133).

Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976), and Zemlo (1977) support the notion that leading is the ability to create a positive organizational climate. For example, Zemlo (1977) asked individuals to rate the importance of the following component skills under the major skill:

**Creating the Proper Organizational Climate**

a. To display an authentic concern for people
b. To communicate to others a recognition of their strengths and capabilities

c. To display an ability to empathize

d. To understand and accept group members as individuals

e. To recognize the system’s power base

f. To provide internal control within the organization

g. To know and use communications patterns which are beneficial to group cohesiveness. (pp. 216-7)

Winters (1972), Flores (1973), Lisicich (1977), and Casale (1977) support the idea that leading is the ability to help people resolve problems. In solving problems, these investigators view the leader as the change agent. Casale (1977) asked the question "How important is it for you to implement organizational change?" (p. 152).

Casale (1977) and Zemlo (1977) believe that leading is the ability to facilitate group process. Casale (1977) asked in his survey instrument "How important is it for you to be able to facilitate group change?" (p. 152).

The final idea presented is that leading is the ability to develop leadership ability among members of the community, which is supported by the survey instruments of Berridge (1969), Foelber (1976), Casale (1977), and Lisicich (1977). For example, Lisicich (1977) asked respondents how important it is "to assist others to develop strategies for program development and to chart the results they desire" (p. 256).

The five ideas just discussed make up a definition of leading that this investigator utilized for this investigation, stated as follows: Leading is the ability to (a) assist individuals and
groups to identify and achieve goals, (b) create a positive organizational climate, (c) help people resolve problems, (d) facilitate group process, and (e) develop leadership ability among members of the community.

Johnson (1973) indicated that demonstrating leadership was one of the 12 major skills for the role of community educators, while Zemlo (1977) reported that all nine of the component skills under Leading Groups in his survey instrument were found to be important.

In addition, Casale (1977) reported that leadership was ranked among the top two skills by community education directors participating in his study.

A comparison of the above three studies with the findings of Hall (1980) reveals an interesting contrast among the studies. Hall (1980) indicated that both the center directors and building community education directors ranked leadership sixth out of seven skills in terms of importance. In addition, building directors also ranked leadership sixth in terms of need for assistance in developing that skill.

Managing Interpersonal Relations

"Managing interpersonal relations" is the 12th and final major skill area to be discussed. It is rather unique because previous investigators have not utilized this term as a major skill area in their investigations. However, it does encompass what Kliminski (1974), Lisicich (1977), and Foelber (1976) called human skills. In addition, related skills have been used by Berridge (1969),
Ederle (1970), Flores (1973) and Casale (1977) in their investigations.

Kliminski (1974), Foelber (1976) and Lisicich (1977) all support the notion that managing interpersonal relations is the ability to be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate. Flores (1973) put forth the idea that it is important for a community educator to have the "ability to exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people by relating to them in a manner which inspires self actualization" (p. 162). Foelber (1976) in his survey asked how important it was that a community education director "has a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if adequate opportunity is had" (p. 174).

In essence, the three ideas just presented make up the components of this writer's definition of managing interpersonal relations, which is: the ability to (a) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (b) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (c) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available. This investigator believes that this definition encompasses most of the skills that might be placed in the category of the major skill, managing interpersonal relations.

Kliminski (1974) reported that of the four specific skills ranked most important by both groups in his study, at least two were classified into the major area of human skills. Lisicich (1977)
indicated that all three groups in her study agreed upon the extent to which community education directors should be ideally trained in human skills. Foelber (1976) reported that those skills classified as human skills were rated much higher by community education directors, principals and advisory council members than the other two major skill areas in his study. In addition, he recommended that "interpersonal skill training [be considered] as an important component of any training program" (p. 151).

Once again, the reader is reminded that the human skills discussed in these three studies were considered to be part of the major skill area this investigator has labelled as "managing interpersonal relations" within the context of this study.

Summary Section One

In the first section of this chapter, this writer discussed how investigators of previous studies and writers in the field of community education have contributed to the choice of the 12 major skill areas of community education directors that were utilized in this investigation. The investigator also demonstrated how previous investigations have influenced his definition for each of the 12 skill areas. Finally, the writer gave examples of the conclusions that previous investigators have made regarding each skill area.

Needs Assessment and the Naturalistic Method of Inquiry

This section will discuss "needs assessment," "need," and "naturalistic method of inquiry" literature as they contributed to the
development of the survey instrument and collection of data for this investigation.

Investigations by Suarez (1980) and Roth (1978), and publications by Kaufman and English (1979) and Stufflebeam (1977a, 1977b) will be reviewed as they relate to needs assessment while Guba's (1978) publication on the naturalistic method of inquiry will be discussed. None of the above investigations specifically discussed needs assessment within the context of training needs for community education directors in their studies. However, these investigations do provide an appropriate background for discussing the concept of needs assessment, needs and naturalistic inquiry within the context of the present investigation.

**Needs Assessment**

Kaufman and English (1979) define a needs assessment as

>a formal process which determines the gaps between current outputs or outcomes and required or desired outcomes or outputs; places these gaps in priority order; and selects the most important for resolution. (p. 8)

Within the context of this study, the researcher will only examine the process by which the training needs of community education directors are determined and how these gaps might be placed in priority order.

Since Suarez (1980), Stufflebeam (1977b), Kaufman and English (1979) imply there are multiple factors to be considered when assessing needs, this investigator assumes that needs are relative.

As a result, this investigator believes that the process by
which training needs of community education directors are assessed
will be affected by (a) how needs are defined, (b) who is identi-
ifying them, (c) the context in which they are identified, (d) when
they are identified, and (e) the types of needs identified. Each
of these will be discussed in further detail as they relate to the
present investigation.

Definitions of Need

Stufflebeam (1977b) suggested "that approaches to needs assess-
ment varied greatly depending on how the term need was defined;
moreover, there was considerable confusion and disagreement about
what the term means" (p. 5). The various definitions of "need"
presented in previous studies will be discussed in further detail.

Kaufman and English (1979) defined need as a gap that exists
between future desired and required outcomes, or, more succinctly,"needs are gaps between 'what is' and 'what should be' in terms of
results, not processes or conditions" (p. 37). Suarez (1980)
reported that "while all definitions of need as a discrepancy do
not agree with Kaufman's emphasis on ends as the focus of needs
assessment, the definition of need as a discrepancy remains as the
most often used . . . for needs assessment" (p. 33).

Stufflebeam (1977a) reported the following four definitions
of "need" from his review of the literature:

**Discrepancy View** A need is a discrepancy between de-
sired performance and observed or predicted performance.

**Democratic View** A need is a change desired by a major-
ity of some reference group.
Diagnostic View A need is something whose absence or deficiency proves harmful.

Analytic View A need is the direction in which improvement can be predicted to occur given information about current status. (pp. 1-2)

In addition, Roth (1978) suggested the following expanded view of need based upon the formula of need listed below:

\[ X - A = N \]

where: \( X \) = target state
\( A \) = actual state
\( N \) = need (Where the actual state already exceeds the target state there obviously is a surplus rather than a need. The surplus indicates some potential for reallocation of resources.)

This formula can be used to produce different relationships depending on how the target state is defined.

If \( X \) represents an ideal state, then:

\( \text{ideal} - \text{actual} = \text{goal deficit} \) (the actual has fallen short of the ideal).

Similarly, if \( X \) represents the desired state, expected state, norm, or minimal satisfactory state, then we have respectively:

\( \text{desired} - \text{actual} = \text{want deficit} \) (people are not getting what they want).

\( \text{expected} - \text{actual} = \text{expectancy deficit} \) (the unilaterally expected outcome has not been achieved).

\( \text{norm} - \text{actual} = \text{norm deficit} \) (the national average is not being attained).

\( \text{minimal sufficient} - \text{actual} = \text{essential deficit} \) (the basics are not being met). (pp. 32-33)

In comparing the definitions presented by Stufflebeam (1977a) and Roth (1978), Suarez (1980) suggested: "they found the definitions of need to be: (a) a discrepancy between targeted and actual
states, (b) a want or preference, (c) a necessity, and (d) an anticipated or expected event or outcome" (p. 35). It appears that the definition suggested by Kaufman and English (1979) would concur with the first observation by Suarez (1980).

Who Identified Needs

Both Roth (1978) and Kaufman and English (1979) support the notion that who participates in the needs assessment will affect the outcome. In the context of her study, Roth (1978) suggested that program staff, experts in the field and clients all must participate in needs assessment activities to be successful. In addition, Kaufman and English (1979) stated, "values of people, individually and collectively, are an integral and undeniable fact of needs assessment and planning" (p. 29).

The investigator incorporated two different populations, community education directors and community education center directors, into this study and measured their perception regarding the importance of the 12 skill areas using instruments B and D (Appendices B and D). Demographic data regarding "who" identified various needs was also collected.

Context of Needs

Kaufman and English (1979) posit that there is a taxonomy for assessing needs,

one for each of the six different functions of the system approach model: Alpha (1.0), Beta (2.0), Gamma (3.0),
Delta (4.0), Epsilon (5.0) and Zeta (6.0). Each mode differentially starts at one of the six system approach steps (or functions), these differing according to the available data and/or existing restrictions placed upon the needs assessment process. (p. 56)

Appendix E discussed the details, characteristic and context in which each of the six models would be used and their relationship to a systems approach referent.

It would appear that the present study is a "Beta-type needs assessment" mode since it is attempting to perceive the training needs, using a variety of methods, and "need" appears to be both an outcome gap and a process gap. Whereas most of the previous studies of assessing training needs in community education appear to have been limited to the "Gamma needs assessment" approach ordering skills for ranking purposes only, the present study uses several methods to perceive training needs. Hence it is considered to be a "Beta type needs assessment" by this writer. However, in the opinion of this writer, this investigation would be considered a "Gamma needs assessment" if individuals were only asked to order skills for the purpose of obtaining a ranking and no follow up study was conducted.

**Types of Needs Identified**

It would appear that the 12 major skill areas identified in this study could be classified as being either "basic" or "incremental" depending on the individual completing the instrument. According to Roth (1978), "basic need is defined as a need which is presently being met but needs to be maintained. By contrast, an
incremental need is a new, yet-to-be-remedied need. Alternative terms for each are, respectively, maintenance and add-on" (p. 46).

Stufflebeam (1977b) also classified needs into two categories: primary and secondary. He described them as follows:

The primary needs are fundamental. In the language of research they are dependent or consequential variables. In education they usually refer to the achievement levels of children. . . .

The secondary needs are derived from and contribute to fulfilling the primary needs. The secondary needs are the independent or instrumental variables. They are those variables that can be shown through some rational means, such as research or past experience, to be necessary or useful in promoting human growth and development. (p. 14)

This investigator would posit that Instrument C—Perceived Need for Training (Appendix C)—would measure both incremental, those skills ranked in the top half, and basic, those skills ranked in the bottom half. Perhaps it is important to note that both basic and incremental needs would be relative to the individual completing the needs assessment instrument.

In addition, the investigator would suggest that primary needs would probably be those skills that were measured by instruments B (Appendix B) and D (Appendix D).

When Needs Are Identified

Kaufman and English (1979) support the notion that since needs are relative, when they are identified will affect what needs are identified. They state, "What is deemed essential by any given social order is subject to change over a period of time; no one set
of skills, knowledges and attitude is ever totally permanent" (p. 28).

One result of this investigator's belief, the concept that when needs are identified will affect what needs are identified, was incorporating several concepts within the "naturalistic method of inquiry" discussed in the next section into the methodology of this investigation.

**Naturalistic Method of Inquiry**

Since needs are relative and not absolute, Guba's (1978) discussion of the concept of "reality manifold" and methods of naturalistic inquiry were incorporated into the methodology of this study.

Guba (1978) suggested that reality only exists in the minds of individual people and will depend on the separate perceptions of each of these individuals. This is supported by Kaufman's and English's (1979) discussion on values previously discussed. Because each individual has different perceptions, a multiple reality will exist.

The following statement by Guba (1978) supports the concept of multiple realities. The previous statement by Kaufman and English (1979), regarding when needs are identified, also supports this concept. Guba (1978) stated:

The reality manifold is constantly changing in terms of time, people, episodes, settings and circumstances. One should expect 'reality' to be different at different times, recognizing the difference will depend on the situation and not necessarily or merely on a lack of reliability in methodology. (p. 15)

In discussing the methods used by both conventional and
naturalistic inquirers, Guba (1978) indicated that both want to be objective; however, he stated:

the meaning which they ascribe to that term is quite different. The conventional inquirer strives for objectivity in the sense of inter-subjective agreement, i.e. agreement among two or more equally competent observers. The naturalistic inquirer, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the belief in a multiple reality, places little store in that form of objectivity and strives instead for confirmability, i.e. agreement among a variety of information sources. (p. 17)

In an attempt to reflect several realities of identifying training needs for community education directors, four instruments were developed. Instrument A—Perceived Amount of Time (Appendix A)—measured the perceived amount of time that community education directors thought they were using the 12 skill areas. Instrument B—Perceived Importance (Appendix B)—measured the perceived importance of the 12 major skills in the study by community education directors. Instrument C—Perceived Need for Training (Appendix C)—measured the community education directors' perceived need for additional training in the 12 major skill areas in the study. The fourth instrument, D, Perceived Importance of Experts (Appendix D) measured the community education center directors' perceived importance of the 12 major skill areas.

In addition to these four instruments, the investigator conducted a follow-up study of the respondents in an attempt to use confirmability to determine the rationale for the results of the study.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will be divided into six major subdivisions: (a) overview, (b) study design, (c) instrument development, (d) population of the study, (e) data collection, and (f) data analysis.

Overview

The primary purpose of this study was to examine different methods for determining training needs of community education directors, and make recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs and planning training programs for community education directors. The following procedures, which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, were utilized to achieve this purpose.

First, the investigator developed the overall design of the study by reviewing need and needs assessment literature to determine what definitions of need should be used in this study, since each definition would represent different methods for determining the training needs of community education directors.

Second, the community education literature was reviewed to develop a list of major skills utilized by community education directors. These skill areas and the various definitions of need
were then used as a basis to develop the four survey instruments. Each survey was sent to one of four groups of selected community educators. The data were then analyzed using the DECsystem 1099 computer at Western Michigan University made by the Digital Equipment Corporation, using version 8.1 of the SPSS (Statistical Package of the Social Sciences).

Next a summary of selected findings was sent to a number of respondents who were asked their opinions regarding the reasons for those results.

Finally, based upon the information gathered during this investigation, the researcher made recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs and planning training programs for community education directors.

Study Design

Based upon a review of the needs and needs assessment literature, this investigator selected the four methods of determining the training needs of community education directors that were to be examined in this study. Each of these four methods are represented by one of the survey instruments discussed below. The use of several instruments together, also discussed below, could represent additional methods by which the training needs of community education directors might be assessed.

Survey Instrument A (Appendix A), which measured the Perceived Amount of Time a skill is used by a community education director,
represents a job analysis approach to needs assessment. Survey Instrument B (Appendix B), which measured the Perceived Importance of a skill by a community education director, was employed to represent the democratic view of need. The assumption underlying the democratic view of need is that when a majority of individuals think a skill is important, it then becomes a training need. Survey Instrument C (Appendix C), which measured Perceived Need for Training by community education directors, was used to measure need as a discrepancy between an ideal state and actual state. Instrument D (Appendix D), which measured the Perceived Importance of a skill by a group of experts, was intended to represent the diagnostic view of need presented by Stufflebeam (1977b).

The use of a combination of instruments (Lisicich, 1977; Hall, 1980) such as B and C to measure perceived importance by community education directors and perceived need for additional training would appear to represent Suarez's (1980) view of need as a necessity.

Finally, using any combination of three or more of the instruments perhaps would represent the analytic view of need suggested by Stufflebeam (1977b).

Instrument Development

Since a review of the community education literature did not reveal an appropriate instrument that could be utilized in this study, it was necessary to develop an instrument to be used specifically for this investigation. This was accomplished by synthesizing the major skill areas of community educators discussed in
the literature.

The rationale and specific definition for each of the 12 major skill areas utilized in this study was discussed in Chapter II.

The 12 major skill areas utilized in Part II of each of the four surveys were the same; however, the directions for completing Part II of each survey were different. The basic differences in the directions for each survey are listed below:

Survey A—Perceived percent of time skill is used (Appendix A). Based upon your perception of the amount of time that you utilize each skill during an average work week, please distribute 100 percentage points among the 12 major skill areas.

Survey B—Perceived importance of skill (Appendix B). Based upon how important you perceive each skill to be, please distribute 100 points among the 12 major skill areas.

Survey C—Perceived need for training (Appendix C). Based upon your perceived need for additional training in each skill, please distribute 100 points among the 12 major skill areas.

Survey D—Perceived importance of skill by experts (Appendix D). Based upon how important you perceive each skill to be, please distribute 100 points among the 12 major skill areas.

Please note that even though Surveys B and D sample two different populations, the directions for both surveys are the same, inasmuch as both surveys investigated the perceived importance of each skill.

The instructions for completing Part I, the demographic section, were the same for all four groups. However, Part I of Survey D (Appendix D) did not ask the university center directors to respond to questions one and four that are included in Surveys A, B and C. These questions were not apropos for center directors.
In addition, the wording of question 10 on surveys A, B and C was changed in survey D so that center directors answered the question in the context of what type of community they believe they serve rather than in the context of the type of community in which they work.

Validity

The instruments used in this were believed to have content and face validity. The content validity of the instrument is based upon the 12 major skill areas that were derived from the literature review.

The instrument was deemed to have face validity by several professors at Western Michigan University.

Given that the instrument had face and content validity, the question remained: Could the instrument discriminate among differences in perceptions and activities held by or engaged in by the respondents? The procedure used by this investigator to answer this question was as follows: First, hypothetical role descriptions were written that described the schedule and decisions made by community education directors during a typical day (Appendix F). Two role descriptions were written for survey instruments A, B and C.

Second, the investigator estimated which skills would be deemed most important by individuals completing a survey instrument based upon the role description they read and assumed while completing this survey.

Third, 30 students enrolled in classes at Western Michigan
on sense sheets and put on magnetic tape by Testing Services at Western Michigan University. The DECsystem 1099 computer at Western Michigan University, made by the Digital Equipment Corporation, made the statistical analysis listed below using version 8.1 of the SPSS (Statistical Package of the Social Sciences).

First, the median scores of each of the major skill areas were utilized to determine the ranking of each major skill within each of the four groups.

Second, the correlation coefficient between the rankings of each of the four groups was made using the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient (Siegel, 1956).

Third, the non parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there is a difference between the scores of the four groups for each of the major skill areas.

Fourth, a further analysis of the skill areas in which a difference in the scores was reported was made using the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparisons Based on Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sums (Hollander & Wolfe, 1973).

Fifth, cross tabulations on the demographic data were made.

Sixth, the statistical results were shared with a select group of respondents to determine why they think the results turned out as they did.

Finally, based upon the statistical analysis and the confirmation effort made of the respondents' interpretations of the results,
on sense sheets and put on magnetic tape by Testing Services at Western Michigan University. The DECsystem 1099 computer at Western Michigan University, made by the Digital Equipment Corporation, made the statistical analysis listed below using version 8.1 of the SPSS (Statistical Package of the Social Sciences).

First, the median scores of each of the major skill areas were utilized to determine the ranking of each major skill within each of the four groups.

Second, the correlation coefficient between the rankings of each of the four groups was made using the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient (Siegel, 1956).

Third, the non parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there is a difference between the scores of the four groups for each of the major skill areas.

Fourth, a further analysis of the skill areas in which a difference in the scores was reported was made using the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparisons Based on Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sums (Hollander & Wolfe, 1973).

Fifth, cross tabulations on the demographic data were made.

Sixth, the statistical results were shared with a select group of respondents to determine why they think the results turned out as they did.

Finally, based upon the statistical analysis and the confirmation effort made of the respondents' interpretations of the results,
the investigator made recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs and planning training programs for community education directors.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to examine different methods for assessing the training needs of community education directors. In addition, recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs of community education directors and planning training programs for community education directors were made.

There was a total of four groups in the study. Each group completed a different survey instrument on which demographic data were recorded as well as perceptions about 12 major skills utilized by community education directors as defined in this study.

These perceptions were across four dimensions, one for each group. Group 1 completed the instrument based on the "perceived amount of time they utilized each of the 12 skill areas." Group 2 completed the instrument according to the "perceived importance of each skill." Group 3 completed the instrument on the "perceived need for additional training," while Group 4 completed the instrument on the basis of the "perceived importance of each skill."

It should be noted that groups 1, 2, and 3 were community education directors while group 4 was a panel of expert trainers (community education center directors).
The data collected with regard to the survey instruments is reported in the following section based upon questions regarding the following major areas: demographics, comparison of perceptions of groups 1, 2, and 3, and comparisons of perceptions of groups 1, 2, 3, and 4. Each of these constitute the remaining sections in this chapter.

Demographic Data

This section will answer questions regarding the demographic data collected from the groups in the study.

Data Collection

Question 1: Who participated in the study?

Of the 150 survey instruments mailed to community education directors in Minnesota and ten survey instruments mailed to community education center directors on July 31, 1981, 119 surveys (74.3%) were received within three weeks. A second mailing to the non-respondents on August 21, 1981 resulted in the collection of an additional 34 survey instruments for an overall return rate of 153 from a possible 160 (95.6%). On September 5, hand-written letters were mailed to the remaining seven non-respondents.

Telephone calls were placed to the three remaining non-respondents on September 11. A follow up telephone call was made to the single non-respondent on September 16 which resulted in the final survey being received on September 19. Therefore, the final return rate was 100 per cent.
It should be noted that one of the survey instruments returned was not considered to be usable because the community education director had resigned in that community and it could not be completed.

In addition, another respondent completed only the demographic portion of the survey instrument; hence the information requested concerning the 12 major skill areas were recorded as missing data.

Question 2: What are the demographic characteristics of the respondent population?

Size of Community. Of the community education directors responding to this survey, 69.8% indicated that the population of their school district or service area was 7,000 or less. Only 30.2% stated that the population of the school district was over 7,000 people.

Experience. Up to four years of experience were claimed by 59.1% of the respondents, while 24.8% have five to seven years of experience, and 16.1% have eight or more years of experience as a community education director. A majority of the center directors in the study have between five and ten years of experience in the field of community education.

Amount of Time Devoted to Community Education. Part-time community education directors account for 24.2% of the respondents, while only 20.2% are employed as full time community education directors without other major responsibilities. The majority of the remaining individuals reported that they were employed full time by their employer but had the following major responsibilities
in addition to community education: superintendent (16.1%), principal (8%), teacher (8.7%), vocational director (4.1%), and athletic director (2.7%).

**Educational Level.** All the community education center directors in the study reported doctoral degrees, whereas 89.3% of the community education directors in the study reported bachelor's degrees and 49.7% reported master's degrees.

**Sex.** Approximately two-thirds (67.3%) of the individuals in the study are male and one-third (32.7%) are female.

**Employer.** School districts employed 86.5% of the community education directors in the study, while 11.4% were employed jointly by a school district and city. All of the community education center directors in the study were employed by a college or university.

**Type of Community.** Approximately four-fifths (79.7%) of the community education directors in the study considered the community they worked in to be rural while only 12.1% considered themselves working in a suburban community. Thirty percent of the university center directors indicated that they serve primarily rural communities while 60% of the center directors reported that they serve all three types (rural, suburban and urban) communities.

Comparing the Perceptions of the Three Groups of Community Education Directors

This section addresses questions regarding the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors, while the following section compares the perceptions of the three groups of...
community education directors with the perceptions of the fourth group in this study, community education center directors (the "experts").

Question 1: How did the three groups of community education directors rank the 12 skill areas used in this study?

Table 1 below reports how each of the three groups of community education directors in the present study ranked the 12 skill areas. The ranking was based on the median of the scores in each skill area (Appendix 0 reports the actual median of the scores in the 12 skill areas, for all the groups in the study).
# Table 1

Ranking of Skill Areas by Community Education Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Areas</th>
<th>Group 1 (Perceived Amount of Time Used)</th>
<th>Group 2 (Perceived Importance)</th>
<th>Group 3 (Perceived Need for Training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
<td>(N = 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 indicates, Programming, Communicating and Organizing were the skills ranked the highest by Group 1 (perceived time used). Communicating, Assessing Needs and Programming were the three skills perceived to be most important by Group 2, while Group 3 (perceived need for training) ranked Involving Community, Assessing Needs and Communicating the highest. The only skill to be ranked within the
first three places by all three groups was Communicating.

However, two skill areas—Assessing Needs and Programming—were
ranked in the top three places by at least two of the three groups.

In contrast to the above findings, the skills ranked the lowest
by each group are also reported. The skills perceived to be used
the least amount of time by Group 1 included Training, Evaluating,
and Obtaining and Budgeting Funds, whereas the skills perceived to
be least important by Group 2 were Training, Evaluating, and Managing
Interpersonal Relations. Finally, the skills in which Group 3
perceived the least amount of need for additional training were:
Managing Interpersonal Relations, Training, and Coordinating. The
only skill to be ranked within the lowest three places by all three
groups was Training. However, two skill areas—Evaluating and
Managing Interpersonal Relations—were ranked in the bottom three
places by at least two of the three groups.

Question 2: How similar or different are the perceptions of
the three groups of community education directors with regard to
the 12 skill areas?

This question will be answered from two points of view. First,
the rankings of the groups were compared using the Spearman Rho
Rank Correlation Coefficient. Second, the item scores for each of
the 12 skill areas were compared among the three groups using the
Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. A further analysis of
the item score differences will be made using the Distribution-Free
Multiple Comparisons Based on Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sums (Hollander
That is to say that the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient will examine how similar or different the three groups ranked the 12 skill areas, while the Kruskal-Wallis test and Multiple Comparisons procedure will examine the individual item scores of each group.

The Spearman Rho Rank correlation coefficient was used to determine the degree of similarity between the rankings of the 12 skill areas by each of the three groups in the study. Based upon the results of this test reported below in Table 2, this investigator found a high correlation between the responses of Groups 1 (perceived amount of time used) and 2 (perceived importance), and Groups 2 and 3 (perceived need for training). In contrast, there was a low correlation between Groups 1 and 3.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 and Group 2</td>
<td>.874*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 and Group 3</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 and Group 3</td>
<td>.657*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \)

According to Tuckman (1978), correlations above .506 are considered to be significant at the .05 level. The higher the
correlation coefficient, up to a maximum of 1.0, the greater the degree of similarity between the rankings of the groups.

The second method by which the question of similarity among the perceptions of the three groups will be addressed is by examining and comparing the individual item scores.

This comparison was accomplished by using the Kruskal-Wallis test to determine if there is a difference among the groups in the individual item scores for each skill area. If a difference is discovered, then the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparison Procedure Based on Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sums must be used to identify the specific groups between which a difference in the scores exists.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test indicate that there is a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the scores of at least two groups in the study in eight of the 12 skill areas. The eight skill areas where differences occurred are Communicating, Evaluating, Assessing Needs, Obtaining and Budgeting Funds, Programming, Involving Community, Training, and Organizing. The four skill areas in which no difference in the scores between groups was found are: Identifying Resources, Coordinating, Leading, and Managing Interpersonal Relations.

One question that is still unanswered is: Between which groups does a difference in scores exist? To answer this question, the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparison Procedure Based on Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sums was employed.

Table 3 reports the findings of this Multiple Comparison Procedure. In Table 3, an X by a particular skill in one of the columns.
indicates between which groups a difference in the scores exists. Most of the differences in the scores are between Group 1 and Group 3. This would tend to support previous findings that responses of Groups 1 and 3 are the most different while responses of Groups 1 and 2 and Groups 2 and 3 tend to be more similar in how they rated the 12 skill areas.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Groups 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>Groups 1 &amp; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All differences reported are p < .05.
Thus far in this section the investigator has compared the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors regarding the 12 skill areas based upon ranks and individual item scores, using rather traditional methods or tests. In Chapter I this researcher presented a rationale for incorporating at least one of the tenets of the naturalistic method of inquiry, a non-traditional approach, into this investigation. The answer to the next question was pursued, within the constraints of the study, using the concept of confirmation as suggested by Guba (1978).

Question 3: How might the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors in this study be interpreted?

In an attempt to provide an answer to this question, a summary of the results of the study was sent to approximately 5% of the respondents in the study. Based upon a follow up telephone interview, the following observations were reported by this investigator.

Concerning the correlation that exists between Group 1 (perceived amount of time) and Group 2 (perceived importance) there was a general consensus among the individuals in the follow up study that community education directors tend to spend their time on what they feel is important.

One important exception to the above belief cited during an interview was that some tasks may not take a lot of time to complete yet are considered to be very important.

Regarding the correlation between the rankings of the skills by Group 2 (perceived importance) and Group 3 (perceived need for
training), most of the individuals in the follow up study felt that no
matter how good a community education director is at using a par-
ticular skill, if he or she perceives that skill to be important
then he or she will probably perceive a need for additional training
in that skill.

However, one individual indicated that there appeared to be a
discrepancy between the correlation that exists between Groups 1 and
2 and between Groups 2 and 3. This individual was puzzled as to why
a high correlation would exist between perceived need for training
(Group 3) and perceived importance (Group 2) when there was a high
correlation between Group 1 (perceived time) and Group 2 (perceived
importance). He indicated that if a skill was being used quite
often and was considered important that there probably shouldn't
be a need for inservice training in that skill.

Regarding the rankings of 12 of the skill areas by each of
the three groups, most respondents felt the rankings were represen-
tative except for the skill "Identifying Resources," which several
individuals thought was ranked too low. No other generalizations
could be drawn from their comments.

However, the following individual comments were recorded:

"Perceived need for training for 'involving community' may be high because directors don't know if they are
doing it right."

"It is surprising that perceived importance of 'involving
community' is not ranked as number one."

"The rankings of the perceived need for training in the
areas of 'involving community' and 'assessing needs' are
surprisingly high."
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"The perceived amount of time that directors spend obtaining and budgeting funds seems low. . . . This may change in the future as traditional sources of funding disappear."

"The perceived importance of 'evaluating' and the perceived amount of time directors spend evaluating is low, however directors have expressed a need for training in evaluating and that is a good sign."

Individuals involved in the follow up study had very few comments regarding the reason why scores for the following skills—Identifying Resources, Coordinating, Leading and Managing Interpersonal Relations—were not found to be significantly different among the three groups.

In summary, this investigator has reviewed the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors in this section by examining the rankings of the 12 skills by the three groups, the scores of the three groups, and how these perceptions might be interpreted by individuals in a follow up study. In the next section, the above findings will be compared with the perceptions of the fourth group in the study, community education center directors.

Comparing the Perceptions of the Three Groups of Community Education Directors With the Perceptions of Community Education Center Directors

This section will answer questions regarding the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors as compared to those of community education center directors.

Question 1: How did the three groups of community education
directors and the community education center directors rank the 12 skill areas used in this study?

Table 4 below reports how each of the four groups in the present study ranked the 12 skill areas. Please note that Groups 1, 2 and 3 represent community education directors, while Group 4 represents the community education center directors.

The ranking in each group was based on the median of the scores in each skill area. (Appendix 0 reports the actual median of the scores in the 12 skill areas for all four groups in the study.)
Table 4
Ranking of Skill Areas by Community Education Directors and Community Education Center Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Community Education Directors</th>
<th>Community Education Center Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Perceived Amount of Time Skill Is Used)</td>
<td>2 (Perceived Importance of Skill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As Table 4 indicates, Programming, Communicating and Organizing were ranked the highest by Group 1 (perceived time used). Communicating, Assessing Needs, and Programming were the three skills perceived to be most important by Group 2, while Group 3 (perceived need for training) ranked Involving Community, Assessing Needs and Communicating as the highest skills. Finally, Group 4 (perceived importance by center directors) ranked the following skills the highest: Involving Community, Communicating, and Leading.

The only skill rated within the top three possible rankings by all four groups was Communicating.

In comparison to the above findings, the skills ranked the lowest by each group are also reported. Group 1 perceived the following skills to be used the least amount of time: Training, Evaluating, and Obtaining and Budgeting Funds. Group 2 perceived the following skills to be the least important: Training, Evaluating, and Managing Interpersonal Relations.

Group 3 ranked Managing Interpersonal Relations, Training, and Coordinating the lowest in terms of perceived need for training. Finally, Group 4, the community education directors, perceived the following skills to be least important: Training, Evaluating, and Programming. The only skill to be rated within the lowest three rankings by all four groups was Training. In addition, Evaluating was rated within the lowest ranking by three of the four groups (all but the group reporting perceived need for training).

One final observation regarding the ranking of two skills, before proceeding to the next question: The skill area Programming
is ranked number one by Group 1 (community education directors) in terms of perceived amount of time used, whereas Group 4 (community education center directors) ranked Programming extremely low (tenth) in terms of perceived importance. These two groups are also at opposite ends of the ranking scale with regard to the skill Leading. Group 4 (center directors) ranked it in a tie for first place with two other skills in terms of perceived importance, while Group 1 ranked the skill Leading ninth in terms of the amount of time it is used. Additional discrepancies in the perceptions of Group 4, center directors, and the other three groups will be acknowledged in exploration of the next question.

Question 2: How similar or different were the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors and community education center directors with regard to the 12 skill areas?

Once again the question will be examined from two points of view. First, the rankings of the groups were compared using the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient while the scores for each of the 12 skill areas were compared using the Kruskal-Wallis Test and the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparison Procedure. Since all three of these procedures were discussed in the previous section, another detailed explanation is not necessary at this time.

Table 5 below reports the results of the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient, which was used to determine the degree of similarity between the rankings of the 12 skills areas, by the four groups in the study. The results indicate that there is a high correlation between the rankings of Groups 1 and 2 and Groups 2
and 3. A relatively low correlation was found between the rankings of the following groups: 1 and 3, 1 and 4, 2 and 4, and 3 and 4.

It is interesting to note that there was a low correlation between the rankings of the 12 skill areas by community education center directors (perceived importance) and the rankings by each group of community education directors (Groups 1, 2, and 3).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>.874*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>.657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

According to Tuckman (1978), correlations above .506 are considered to be significant at the .05 level. The higher the correlation coefficient (up to a maximum of 1.0), the greater the degree of similarity between the rankings of the groups.

The second method used to determine if the four groups are similar or different with regard to the 12 skill areas is the Kruskal-Wallis test. This test was used to determine if there was
a difference in the item test scores, among the four groups in each skill area. When a difference was found, a Multiple Comparison Procedure was used to identify the specific groups between which a difference in the scores exists.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test indicate that there is a significant difference (at the .05 level) in the scores between groups in nine of the 12 skill areas. These nine skill areas are: Communicating, Evaluating, Assessing Needs, Obtaining and Budgeting Funds, Programming, Involving Community, Training, Organizing, and Leading. The three skill areas in which no significant difference exists in the scores between the groups are: Identifying Resources, Coordinating, Managing Interpersonal Relations.

In order to determine between which groups a difference exists in the scores for the nine skill areas identified by the Kruskal-Wallis test, the Distribution-Free Multiple Comparison Procedure was utilized.

Table 6 below reports the findings of this Multiple Comparison Procedure. A majority of the differences reported in the scores are between Groups 1 and 3 and Groups 1 and 4.
Table 6

Results of the Multiple Comparison Procedure Among the Four Groups Which Identifies the Groups Between Which There are Differences* in the Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups:</th>
<th>1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>1 &amp; 3</th>
<th>1 &amp; 4</th>
<th>2 &amp; 4</th>
<th>3 &amp; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All differences reported are $p < .05$.

Thus far in this section, the investigator has compared the perceptions of three groups of community education directors and one group of community education center directors regarding the 12 skills areas in this study. These perceptions have been compared on:
(a) the ranking of each skill area by each group; (b) the similarity or difference of the rankings based upon the Spearman Rho Rank Correlation Coefficient, and (c) the similarity or difference in individual item scores based upon the Kruskal-Wallis test and the Multiple Comparison Procedure. The final question in this section will examine how the perception of the four groups might be interpreted. The answer to this question was pursued in the same manner as question three in the previous section, using the concept of confirmability as suggested by Guba (1978).

Question 3: How might the differences in perceptions of the four groups in this study be interpreted?

Please note that the interpretation of the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors is reported in the previous section. Only those comments pertinent to this discussion as a result of the addition of the Group 4 to the investigation will be made in this section.

A summary of the results of the study were sent to approximately 5% of the respondents in an attempt to provide an answer to this question. Based upon a follow up telephone interview, the following observations were reported by this investigator.

Concerning the correlation or lack of it that exists between Group 2 (perceived importance by community education directors) and Group 4 (perceived importance by university center directors), most individuals in the follow up study felt that the educational background of Group 4 (all have doctoral degrees) and experience tend to make them more "idealistic." In comparison, they felt that
community education directors in the field tend to base their perceived importance of a skill on the realities of the situation and in general are more "realistic" when ranking skills.

Individual comments regarding this correlation between Group 2 and Group 4 included the following:

"Center directors are out of touch."

"Center directors are more process-oriented."

"The perceptions of community education directors appear to be influenced by: (a) time available, (b) their own knowledge of a skill, (c) their own skill level, (d) the priorities inherent within the position within a particular setting."

"The two groups operate in a totally different setting. Center directors represent a theoretical background and as such are more idealistic, whereas community education directors come from practical backgrounds and tend to be more realistic."

With regard to the low correlations between the remaining groups, no generalizations could be made; however, one individual did inquire, "How good are we [community education directors] at perceiving our own weaknesses and hence our own need for training?"

Another individual suggested that the low correlation between Group 3 (perceived need for training) and Group 4 (perceived importance by center directors) appears to be very important. The rationale he provided is that if center directors base training programs on their perceived importance of a skill, they will not be meeting the perceived training needs of community education directors.

In regard to the ranking of the skill areas not discussed in the previous section, several individuals indicated that they were
surprised that center directors (Group 4) perceived evaluation as being so low in importance. However, both Group 1 (perceived time used) and Group 2 (perceived importance by community education directors) also ranked this skill very low. This investigator was not able to make any additional generalizations regarding the rankings from the interviews. However, the following comments in regard to the ranking of skill areas were made by individuals and are reported for the reader's consideration:

"The ranking of the skill Leading by Group 4 (center directors' perceived importance) is higher because the role of the center director is different than the practitioner."

"I'm surprised that both center directors (Group 4) and community education directors (Group 2) perceived evaluating so low in importance."

"I'm surprised that the perceived importance of obtaining and budgeting funds is ranked so low by both Group 2 and Group 4 (perceived importance)."

Individuals involved in the follow-up study had very few comments regarding the reason why the scores for the following skills—Identifying Resources, Coordinating, and Managing Interpersonal Relations—were not found to be significantly different among the four groups in this study.

Summary

This chapter has reported data gathered during this investigation by answering questions in the following major areas: demographics, comparison of the perceptions of the three groups of community education directors, and a comparison of the perceptions
of the three groups of community education directors with community education center directors. The next chapter will provide a summary of the investigation, a discussion of major findings, and conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

A brief summary of this study is provided in the first section of this chapter while the second section discusses the major findings and conclusions. In the final section, recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs of community education directors will be made as well as recommendations for further research.

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to examine different methods of assessing the training needs of community education directors. In addition, recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs of community education directors and planning training programs for community education directors were made.

Twelve major skill areas used by community education directors were synthesized from the literature and served as a basis for developing the survey instrument. This instrument was used to measure the perceptions of the 12 skill areas by each of the four groups in the study.
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Each group was polled on a different dimension of how the training needs of a community education director might be determined. Group 1 (community education directors) completed the instrument based on the "perceived amount of time they use each of the 12 skills."

Group 2 (community education directors) completed the instrument based on its "perceived importance of each skill."

Group 3 (community education directors) completed the instrument based on its "perceived need for training" in each skill, while Group 4 (community education center directors) completed the instrument according to its "perceived importance of each skill."

The sample population of this study consisted of 150 community education directors in the State of Minnesota who were selected at random and divided into three groups of 50. The fourth group in this study consisted of ten community education center directors from seven states.

A survey instrument was sent to a total of 160 individuals. The return rate was 100 per cent and the data were analyzed using the DECsystem 1099 computer at Western Michigan University. In an attempt to incorporate one of the basic tenets of the naturalistic method of inquiry into this investigation, a summary of selected findings was then mailed to nine participants who were then interviewed to elicit their reactions in a follow up to the original survey.
Discussion of Major Findings

The first part of this section will discuss major findings with regard to the perceptions of the four groups in the study, while the second part will discuss major findings with respect to each of the 12 skill areas and how they compare to the findings of previous investigators.

Major Findings

1. There was a high correlation between the perceptions of community education directors who ranked the 12 skills based upon the amount of time they used the skill and the perceptions of directors who ranked the skills based upon their perceived importance of a skill. That is to say, a high correlation exists between the amount of time spent using a skill and the perceived importance of that skill; hence one would expect community education directors to spend most of their time in the skill areas which they consider to be important, and conversely, one would expect them to spend the least amount of time using those skills which they consider least important.

A follow up interview, with a 5% sample of the respondents, confirmed the finding that there is high correlation between how a director spends his or her time and the skills he/she believes to be important. In addition, the respondents indicated that this finding was to be expected; i.e., most of those interviewed reported that they would expect the director to attach a great importance
to a skill which he/she utilizes a great deal on the job. An exception to the above belief, noted by one individual, would be those tasks considered to be important but which take little time to complete. However, most of the individuals interviewed believed that directors are likely to spend most of their time utilizing skills they believe to be of high importance. For example, it seems unlikely that directors who place a high priority on programming, communicating and organizing will spend most of their time obtaining and budgeting funds or evaluating.

However, a word of caution may be in order. As a result of the above finding, this investigator would suggest to anyone identifying training needs that those skills which are ranked low both in terms of perceived amount of time used and perceived importance be closely examined to determine if a real need for training in that skill may exist. The reason for this suggestion is that it seems reasonable to assume that if an individual is not proficient in a skill area, he or she may tend not to use it very much and may therefore perceive it to be unimportant; yet a real training need may exist in this particular skill area.

2. Among community education directors in this study there is a high correlation between responses of those who ranked the 12 skill areas based upon the perceived importance of the skill and the perceived need for training in the 12 skill areas. In other words, those skills that are perceived to be important by community education directors are also skills in which they perceive a need for additional training.
Follow up interviews with a 5% sample of the respondents reveal that the high correlation between perceived importance of a skill area by a director and his or her perceived need for additional training is to be expected. Most of those interviewed indicated that no matter how good a community education director is in a particular skill area, if he/she perceives that skill to be important then he/she will probably perceive a need for additional training in that skill. However, if a director does not perceive a skill as being important, it does not necessarily follow that he/she does not perceive a need for additional training. For example, the skill Evaluating is ranked rather low (11th) in perceived importance but somewhat higher (fifth) in perceived need for additional training. Based upon the results of the present study, it seems reasonable to conclude that community education directors generally perceive a need for further training in those skills areas perceived to be most important to them.

3. In the present study a low correlation was found between the perceptions of the community education directors who ranked the 12 skill areas according to the amount of time the skill is used and the directors who ranked the skills according to their need for additional training. That is to say, if a director is spending considerable time in a particular skill area, he/she does not necessarily perceive a need for additional training in that area.

Given a need to spend a considerable amount of time on the job utilizing a particular skill, it is possible that many community education directors have set about improving that skill on the job.
without formal training. This may account for the low correlation between amount of time spent in a particular skill area and perceived need for training. That is, directors may have, in effect, trained themselves on the job.

Here, too, a word of caution to those designing training programs is probably in order. While it may be possible to develop proficiency in high-use skill areas on the job, it does not necessarily follow that skills so developed are appropriate to the job and that a need for additional training does not exist.

For example, just because a director may spend most of his/her time programming does not mean that he/she is proficient at programming or that with additional training he/she could not improve programming skills. Hence, there could be a need for additional training in that skill area on the part of the director, who may or may not acknowledge such a need.

An implication of this finding is that the perceived amount of time an individual uses a particular skill is not necessarily a good indicator of his or her training needs by itself. Since it is possible to spend a lot of time using a skill, and yet not be proficient at it, training would be desirable. Similarly, an individual could be very good at a particular skill, spend little time using it, and not necessarily need additional training.

4. A low correlation existed between the responses of community education center directors, who ranked the 12 skills according to perceived importance, and the responses of the three groups of community education directors, who ranked the skills according to...
perceived amount of time used, perceived importance, and perceived need for additional training, respectively. That is to say, the rankings of the 12 skill areas by community education center directors according to perceived importance were not found to be similar to the rankings of any one of the three groups of community education directors.

This finding is of major importance, since community education center directors are responsible for providing both preservice and inservice training to community education directors. Each of the low correlations between the center directors and the three groups of community education directors will be discussed further.

One explanation for the low correlation between the perceptions of community education directors and community education center directors regarding the perceived importance of the 12 skill areas is that the educational background and experience of the center directors tend to make them more "idealistic," whereas community education directors are in the field and tend to be more "realistic" when ranking the perceived importance of the 12 skills. The terms "idealistic" referring to the center directors and "realistic" referring to community education directors were used by respondents in the follow up interviews. It is the perception of the writer that those respondents using such terms meant to convey that practitioners in the field (community education directors) are more realistic regarding training needs in the field because of their day-to-day involvement, whereas center directors may tend to be out of touch with individuals in the field.
Based upon the findings of the present study, if center directors were to assess training needs solely on their perceived importance of a skill, then training would not necessarily be provided in those skills perceived to be important by community education directors.

With regard to the ranking of perceived importance by center directors and of perceived need for training by community education directors, a low correlation was found. That is to say, in this study the skills perceived to be important by center directors were not similar to those skills in which there was a perceived need for training on the part of community education directors in the field. The investigator believes, and is supported by at least one individual in the follow up study, that this discrepancy between the perceived importance of the 12 skills by center directors and the perceived need for training by community education directors could result in the designing of training programs in which the clients for whom the program was designed would refuse to participate. It would seem, therefore, that in designing training programs, community education center directors would be well advised to poll community education directors regarding their perceptions of the need for training so that these perceptions could at least be considered in the developing of a training program.

Finally, this investigator found a low correlation between the ranking of the 12 skill areas according to the perceived importance by community education center directors and the perceived amount of
time used by community education directors. That is to say, if a skill was perceived as being important by a center director, it was not necessarily used to a great extent by a community education director.

As discussed earlier, it is possible that the perceptions of community education center directors are based on an "idealistic" approach to the practice of community education whereas the perceptions of community education practitioners tend to be "realistic" with respect to the day to day demands of the community educator's job. Ideally, a training program designed for community education directors would train for the skills implied in the theoretical and philosophical aspects of community education, which might be the preference of community education center directors and, at the same time, train in those skill areas for which practitioners in the field see a need.

The next part of this section will discuss specific findings with regard to each of the 12 skill areas used in this study. Although the reporting of the perceptions of community education directors regarding particular skills was not the primary purpose of the present study, such information is reported to provide the reader with additional information regarding each of the 12 skill areas.

**Communicating**

In the present study, Communicating was the only skill to be ranked by all four groups in the first three places. That is to
say, Communicating was high in terms of perceived amount of time used, perceived need for training and in perceived importance by both community education directors and center directors. These findings are supported by Ederle (1970), who found Communicating to be the skill rated the highest in terms of preservice and inservice preparation, and by Berridge (1969), Johnson (1973), Lisicich (1977), and Casale (1977), in whose investigations the skill Communicating was ranked as an important skill for community education directors to possess.

Based on the findings of this investigation as well as those of previous investigations, this researcher posits that the skill of Communicating should be considered one of the foremost training needs of community education directors, both preservice and inservice.

**Evaluating**

This skill was ranked very low (11th) in perceived amount of time used and perceived importance by both community education directors and center directors. This would tend to support the recommendations of Berridge (1969), inasmuch as Evaluating was only one of two skills, from a total of nine, that was not recommended as a content area for an intensive preparation program.

In contrast, Evaluating was ranked much higher (fifth) in terms of perceived need for training by community education directors. This would support Casale's (1977) finding that evaluating was one of two areas in which community education directors felt least
This writer is somewhat surprised, as was at least one individual in the follow-up study, that evaluating was ranked so low in terms of perceived importance by both community education directors and center directors, and this writer would suggest additional inquiry into why evaluating was ranked so low.

The low ranking of the importance of evaluating by both community education directors and center directors, and a low ranking of the perceived amount of time spent in evaluating by community education directors is particularly surprising in view of the high priority given evaluation as a process in recent years. For example, practically all grant proposals for funding to the state and federal government and private foundations require that an evaluation process be specified.

Assessing Needs

Community education directors perceived this skill to be important, as well as indicating a need for training in assessing need. Assessing needs was ranked second by both groups in this study. This would tend to support the findings of Ederle (1970), Johnson (1973), Zemlo (1977), and Lisicich (1977), which reported that assessing needs was perceived as being important within the context of each of their studies. In contrast, however, Hall (1980) indicated that building directors ranked assessing needs fifth out of seven skills in terms of perceived importance.

Based upon this investigator's experience as a community
education director for eight years, the writer concurs with the high ranking in perceived importance given this skill by both community education directors and community education center directors.

Identifying Resources

Identifying Resources was ranked low (ninth) in terms of perceived importance and ninth in terms of need for additional training by community education directors. In contrast, center directors perceived this skill to be more important than community education directors by ranking it fifth. This ranking by center directors supports the finding in the study by Kliminski (1974) in which identifying resources was ranked 16th out of 40 skills.

Obtaining and Budgeting Funds

Obtaining and Budgeting Funds was in the lower half of the rankings in terms of perceived time used and perceived importance by both community education directors and center directors. This would support the finding by Casale (1977), who found Obtaining and Budgeting Funds to be ranked, in terms of importance, in the lower half of his list of skills. However, it is interesting to note that Obtaining and Budgeting Funds was ranked fourth in terms of perceived need for training.

This writer would posit that a community education director does not spend a great deal of his time using this skill and as a result probably does not consider it very important until there is
a lack of financial resources.

As financial resources are reduced from traditional sources, the ranking of this skill in terms of perceived need for training, importance and amount of time used could increase. It is also possible that with the present decline in available funding, the perceived need for expertise in obtaining and budgeting funds may increase sharply.

Coordinating

Coordinating was ranked sixth or seventh in terms of perceived time used and perceived importance by both center directors and community education directors. In addition, it was ranked low in terms of perceived need for training. The above findings are in contrast to the investigation by Hall (1980), who reported that center directors perceived coordinating to be the most important skill. This writer would suggest that the above contradiction indicates a need for further investigation in this skill area.

Programming

There is an interesting contrast in the ranking of the amount of time spent programming by community education directors (ranked first) and its perceived importance by community education center directors (ranked tenth). However, community education directors perceived programming to be important (ranked third).

As discussed earlier, such extreme differences between the perception of the two groups in the present study may be attributed
to "realistic" views represented by the community education practitioners in the field, as compared to the more "idealistic" and theoretical viewpoint represented by the community education center directors.

As a community education director for eight years, the writer believes that it is easy for a community education director to get locked into spending a great deal of time programming for a variety of reasons. Several are given for the reader's consideration:

1. Programming is the most visible aspect of community education. People in the community tend to think a community education director is doing his job if the lights in the school buildings are on and the parking lot is full at night.

2. There is an expectancy among employers of community education directors that directors will produce a program. Therefore, many job descriptions will probably reflect this expectation.

3. Superiors perceive the role of the community education director to primarily fall in the area of programming.

One final comment with regard to programming: It is interesting to note that perceived need for training was low (ranked tenth) and that this finding is supported by Hall (1980) who reported that programming was ranked lowest in terms of perceived need for training in her study.

Involving Community

The skill Involving Community was ranked the highest of all
the skills in perceived need for training and tied for the highest ranking in terms of perceived importance by community education center directors. This supports the finding by Hall (1980) that building directors ranked it number one in terms of assistance needed in developing that skill.

The above findings indicate to this investigator that, in this particular skill, community education directors are correct in their perceptions regarding the need for training. As community education director for eight years, this writer would agree that perhaps his greatest perceived need for training was in the skill area Involving Community.

**Training**

Training is the only skill to be ranked in the lowest two places in terms of perceived time used, perceived need for training, and perceived importance by both community education directors and center directors. The above finding is supported in the study by Hall (1980), which reported that both center directors and building level directors ranked training the lowest in terms of perceived importance. In contrast, however, this writer and at least one individual in the follow up study were surprised by this finding.

It would be easy for this writer to suggest that from the results of his investigation and previous studies that Training should be eliminated as a skill area in which community education directors need to further develop their skills. If indeed community educators are not to be involved in training local leaders, who does
train the local leadership to solve the pressing social and organizational problems at the grass roots level? This writer is inclined to believe that there is a possibility that training as a skill area in the present study may have been misunderstood and hence not viewed as important. From a philosophical viewpoint, it is difficult to envision a community in which the community education director would not be involved in developing local grass roots leadership. However, the findings from the present study indicate that local community education directors are not so involved.

Therefore, this investigator would strongly suggest that the skill of Training be investigated further in an attempt to understand why it was ranked so low by all groups in this study.

**Organizing**

Organizing was ranked high (third) in the amount of time it was used and fifth in perceived importance by community education directors. The latter ranking corroborates the similar findings by Berridge (1969), Ederle (1970), and Flores (1973). By comparison, center directors ranked this skill somewhat low (tied rank of eighth and ninth). The responses of center directors were similar to the findings of Casale (1977), who reported Organizing as one of the two lowest ranked skills in his study.

Based on this writer's experience, he posits that community education directors would tend to rate this skill highest in terms of time spent using it since many of the tasks performed by community education directors require organizational skills.
Leading

Leading was perceived to be one of the most important skills (tied for first place) by community education center directors. In contrast, community education directors ranked it rather low in terms of perceived need for training (ranked seventh), perceived importance (ranked eighth), and perceived amount of time used (ranked ninth).

Previous investigations reveal additional contrasts. Casale (1977) reported that community education directors ranked leading as one of the top two skills in his study, whereas Hall (1980) found that both center directors and building level community education directors ranked leadership low in terms of perceived importance. One explanation for the result in Hall's study might be attributed to the fact that the skills being identified were for building level directors and not district-wide community education directors. This is probably the case because building directors may perceive themselves responsible for a building rather than for the leadership required of a district-wide director.

This writer believes there might be at least two possible reasons why this dichotomy may exist between the perceptions of community education directors and center directors with regard to the skill Leading. First, it seems reasonable to assume that since center directors are in positions where they are expected to personify the skill Leading, their ranking of that skill would tend to be high. Second, it also seems reasonable to assume that community
education directors may be so burdened with the maintenance tasks within the organizations just to keep the doors open that they may not be concerned about a skill that will not help them with their immediate concerns.

Managing Interpersonal Relations

This skill was ranked relatively high (fourth) by center directors in terms of perceived importance, while in comparison, community education directors ranked it lower in terms of perceived amount of time used (ranked eighth), perceived importance (ranked tenth), and perceived need for additional training (ranked twelfth).

The ranking of this skill in terms of perceived importance by center directors would support Foebler's (1976) recommendation that this skill be considered an important component of any training program.

It is probably very difficult for most people to assess their impact upon others in day to day social interaction required in positions of leadership. Because the community education director constantly practices skills of interpersonal relations, he/she may assume that the skills used are done so effectively, whereas there may be a discrepancy between the actual and perceived skill effectiveness in this particular skill area.

Conclusions

This section shall address the conclusions of the above findings as they relate to the following factors in assessing needs suggested
by Stufflebeam (1977a, 1977b), Roth (1978), Kaufman and English (1979), Suarez (1980), and Guba (1978): (a) how need is defined; (b) who is identifying the need; (c) how the need is being identified; and (d) the multiple realities of need that may exist.

1. The first major conclusion with regard to the above findings is that how skill needs are defined will in fact have an effect on the skill needs that are identified.

Each of the four groups in the study represented a different dimension or definition of skill need, i.e. perceived amount of time a skill is used, perceived need for the training in a skill, and perceived importance of a skill. The reader will note that perceived importance was a dimension reported by both community education directors and center directors.

The idea that how needs are defined will determine what needs are identified is exemplified by the low correlations that existed in the ranking of the 12 skill areas between Groups 1 and 3, Groups 1 and 4, Groups 2 and 4 and Groups 3 and 4 in the present study. That is to say, when the skill needs were ranked by community education directors using a different dimension of need, there was a low correlation of the rankings of the 12 skill areas in terms of perceived amount of time used and perceived need for training.

In addition to the low correlations between groups that ranked the 12 skill areas according to different definitions of need, the individual ranking of a particular skill between groups varied a great deal, which also suggests that how skill needs are defined will have an effect on what skill needs are identified.
For example, community education directors ranking the skill of Obtaining and Budgeting Funds rank it seventh when viewing it in terms of perceived importance, but ranked it tenth in terms of time spent in that skill area, and fourth when viewing it in terms of perceived need for training.

2. The second conclusion is that who identifies training needs of community education directors will determine what needs are identified.

There were two different populations participating in this study. The first was community education directors who made up Groups 1, 2, and 3 in the study. Community education center directors made up Group 4 in the study.

A low correlation was found between the rankings of community education directors and center directors in terms of perceived importance of the 12 skill areas. Furthermore, community education directors and center directors ranked two skills at opposite ends of the scale in terms of perceived importance.

The community education directors ranked Programming third in perceived importance while the community education center directors ranked it tenth. Another example was ranking of Managing Interpersonal Relations, fourth in terms of perceived importance by community education center directors and tenth by the community education directors.

3. The third conclusion is that how skill needs are identified may have an effect on what skill needs are identified.

In the present study, training needs were identified by using
four survey instruments which measured perceived importance of a skill by both community education directors' and center directors' perceived amount of time a skill is used and perceived need for training in a particular skill. The results of the findings from the survey instruments were then distributed to a small group of respondents to determine if the findings from the survey instrument would be the same as the findings in the interviews. As the discussion with regard to the skill Evaluating indicates, it ranked low in terms of perceived amount of time used, and perceived importance by both community education directors and community education center directors. In contrast, it was ranked higher in a perceived need for training by community education directors. In addition, an individual in the follow up study and this investigator question the rankings. As a result, further investigation of this skill was recommended.

4. The fourth conclusion is that multiple realities exist when assessing needs. In essence, this could be considered a combination of the other conclusions previously discussed, since this investigator developed four instruments to reflect different realities and solicited opinions from two populations. In addition, a follow up study was conducted in an attempt to use the concept of confirmability to determine if the results of the study were accurate. It is posited that all of the findings reflect to some degree Cuba's (1978) concept of multiple realities. He stated,

The reality manifold is constantly changing in terms of time, people, episodes, settings and circumstances. One should expect reality to be different at different times,
recognizing the differences will depend on the situation and not necessarily or merely on a lack of reliability in methodology. (p. 15)

The differences in the rankings of the 12 skill areas, differences in individual item scores and differences between groups on a specific ranking all would appear to support the implication that multiple realities exist when assessing needs.

Recommendations

With the above conclusions and findings in mind, the next section will discuss: (a) recommendations to be considered when identifying training needs of community education directors and planning training programs for community education directors, and (b) recommendations for further research.

Findings from the present study would indicate that the following factors should be considered when designing skill training programs for community education directors:

1. Needs should be defined from several points of view. The dimension investigated in this study may provide a starting point, namely, perceived amount of time a skill is used, perceived importance of a skill and perceived need for additional training.

2. Trainers should give careful consideration to who identifies the training needs. They should not rely solely on the community education director or community education center director. Relying solely upon the perceptions of either practitioners or center directors (trainers) can result in major biases and/or omissions. Probably the best training program will represent a balance between the perceptions of those practitioners in the study, labeled by some respondents as "realistic," and those center directors (trainers), labeled by some respondents as "idealistic."
3. A variety of methods (survey, interview, research, informal comments, etc.) can be utilized to identify training needs. The use of a variety of methods for identifying training needs is likely to produce a training program geared to the needs of the clients. Follow up of responses to surveys similar to those used in the present study (i.e. tenets of the "naturalistic method of inquiry") to ascertain why certain responses may have been given can be helpful in interpreting such responses.

4. Trainers should accept the challenge that identifying training needs is a multiple reality and is "constantly changing in terms of time, people, episodes, settings and circumstances" (Guba, p. 15). This may result in the incorporation of multiple realities into the needs identification process with the result that training programs are designed to meet the real needs of community education directors.

Based upon the results of the present study, this investigator makes the following recommendations with regard to future research:

1. Additional research should be conducted to investigate the discrepancies that exist between the perceptions of community education center directors (trainers) and community education directors (practitioners) with regard to the 12 skill areas in this study. An investigation that would provide insights to this discrepancy could result in the development of more meaningful training programs for community education directors.

2. Additional research with regard to who determines need could help to provide a new dimension to be considered when designing training programs for community education directors.

3. A more extensive use of the "naturalistic method of inquiry" is indicated inasmuch as its limited use in the present study added a new dimension to identifying the training needs of community education directors.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT A
Community Education Survey

Part 1—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the *entire population* (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,000 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. _______ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.
   a) Community education director .................% of time
   b) Superintendent ..................................% of time
   c) Principal .......................................% of time
   d) Athletic director ................................% of time
   e) Teacher .........................................% of time
   f) Vocational director ................................% of time
   g) Other .............................................% of time

(Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelor's Degree completed
   d) Master's Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list) ________________________________

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban

(OVER)
Part II-A-Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas that could be utilized by community education directors. First, please carefully read the descriptions of all twelve skill areas. Second, based upon your perception of the amount of time that you utilize each skill during an average work week, please distribute 100 percentage points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100.

Please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas, except in those cases where you believe that you actually do spend an equal amount of time in each of two skill areas.

pts 1. Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)

pts 2. Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

pts 3. Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

pts 4. Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

pts 5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

pts 6. Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

pts 7. Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e., educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

pts 8. Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.

pts 9. Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

pts 10. Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.

pts 11. Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.

pts 12. Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.

100 pts = Total
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT B
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the entire population (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,000 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. _______ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.
   a) Community education director . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   b) Superintendent . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   c) Principal . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   d) Athletic director . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   e) Teacher . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   f) Vocational director . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______
   g) Other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time ______

   (Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelors Degree completed
   d) Masters Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.
   Degree ..............................................................
   Major ..............................................................
   Degree ..............................................................
   Major ..............................................................
   Degree ..............................................................
   Major ..............................................................
   Degree ..............................................................
   Major ..............................................................

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list) ...................................................

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) Rural
   b) Suburban
   c) Urban

(OVER)
Part II-B—Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas that could be utilized by community education directors. First, please carefully read the descriptions of all twelve skill areas. Second, based upon how important you perceive each skill to be, please distribute 100 points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100.

Please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas, except in those cases where you believe that two skill areas actually are of equal importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pts</th>
<th>Skill Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicating—Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluating—Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessing Needs—Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying Resources—Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coordinating—Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Programming—Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Involving Community—Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training—Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organizing—Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leading—Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations—Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return to:
Duane D. Gates
Route No. 2, Box 122
Monticello, Minnesota 55362
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the entire population (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,000 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. ________ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.
   a) Community education director % of time
   b) Superintendent % of time
   c) Principal % of time
   d) Athletic director % of time
   e) Teacher % of time
   f) Vocational director % of time
   g) Other % of time
   (Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelor's Degree completed
   d) Master's Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.

   Degree                                      Major

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list)

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban

(OVER)
Part II—Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas that could be utilized by community education directors. First, please carefully read the descriptions of all twelve skill areas. Second, based upon your perceived need for additional training in each skill, please distribute 100 points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100.

Please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas, except in those cases where you believe that you actually do need an equal amount of training in each of two skill areas.

____ pts 1. Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)

____ pts 2. Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

____ pts 3. Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

____ pts 4. Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

____ pts 5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

____ pts 6. Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

____ pts 7. Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

____ pts 8. Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.

____ pts 9. Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

____ pts 10. Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.

____ pts 11. Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.

____ pts 12. Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.

100 pts = Total

Please return to:
Duane D. Gates
Route No. 2, Box 122
Monticello, Minnesota 55362

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. How many years experience do you have as a community education center director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

2. Are you employed in the community education field full or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time.

3. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelors Degree completed
   d) Masters Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

4. Please list each of your degrees and major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

6. By whom are you employed?
   a) University or College
   b) Other (please list) __________________________________

7. Are the communities served by your center primarily rural, suburban or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban

(OVER)
Part 11B—Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas that could be utilized by community education directors. First, please carefully read the descriptions of all twelve skill areas. Second, based upon how important you perceive each skill to be, please distribute 100 points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100.

Please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas, except in those cases where you believe that two skill areas actually are of equal importance.

1. Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)

2. Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

3. Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

4. Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

6. Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

7. Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

8. Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.

9. Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

10. Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.

11. Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.

12. Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.

100 pts = Total

Please return to:
Duane D. Gates
Route No. 2, Box 122
Monticello, Minnesota 55362
APPENDIX E

POSSIBLE TAXONOMY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT
BY KAUFMAN AND ENGLISH (1979)
A possible taxonomy of needs assessments. Possible needs assessment tools and strategies are their possible relationship to the system approach model. Each is concerned with discrepancies, but might define the term "need" differently.

### POSSIBLE NEEDS ASSESSMENT MODELS AND THEIR SUGGESTED RELATIONSHIP TO A SYSTEM APPROACH REFERENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Approach Functions</th>
<th>Needs Assessment Type</th>
<th>Possible Characteristics</th>
<th>Possible Assumption Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 IDENTIFY PROBLEM BASED UPON NEED</td>
<td>ALPHA</td>
<td>External utility plus partnership based perceived needs referent for survival and contribution. Single emphasis upon &quot;need&quot; as an outcome gap.</td>
<td>Almost anything may be changed and questioned, there are no &quot;sacred cows,&quot; even laws can be added, deleted, modified. Organizations may be challenged, dismantled, reshuffled, or eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 DETERMINE SOLUTION REQUIREMENTS AND IDENTIFY SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>BETA</td>
<td>Partnership based, analysis of output gaps of the system; analysis of process and product gaps within the system.</td>
<td>Work is to be conducted within a context, usually organizational, and for the most part, the rules, policies, goals and objectives of the organization, as they now exist, are the ground rules for planned change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 SELECT SOLUTION STRATEGIES FROM AMONG ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>GAMMA</td>
<td>Ranking of solutions by partners: Cost efficiency models, cost effectiveness models, etc. Emphasis on processes and inputs.</td>
<td>The existing organizational goals and objectives are useful and appropriate, and the change is to find the most efficient and effective manner to meet the objectives. The purpose is to develop products rising effective and efficient processes and outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 IMPLEMENT</td>
<td>DELTA</td>
<td>Determination of gaps in specified performances. Management by objectives, management by exception, scheduling.</td>
<td>It is known what is to be done and how to do it, the important function here is to successfully administer the plans to be done and manage the resources to help accomplish the overall organizational mission and identified products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 DETERMINE PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>EPSILON</td>
<td>Determine discrepancies between results and objectives for the end of term. Identifying gaps in outputs and outcomes evaluated.</td>
<td>The jobs have been done, this function is to determine the goals between the goals and objectives, and the accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 REVISE AS REQUIRED</td>
<td>ZETA</td>
<td>En route evaluation of both processes and progress toward outcomes, with identifiable changes of inputs, processes, outputs, and or outputs.</td>
<td>While the jobs are getting done, or after we have finished any segment of one or more jobs, discrepancies between our goals and objectives (usually in mind) are determined, and corrective action is initiated, or a decision not to change is accepted and implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

ROLE DESCRIPTIONS
Role 1

Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30-8:30 You attended a meeting of the administrative council to coordinate the use of the school building by community agencies during the next week.

8:30-8:40 You approved 20 purchase orders for supplies.

8:40-8:45 You analyzed the evaluations of the college credit classes that were completed last month.

8:45-8:50 You reviewed a brochure on an inservice opportunity for your secretary.

8:50-9:00 You met with the county parks administrator to discuss including the new county park in the upcoming issue of the Community Resources Booklet. The park is one of the few new resources you have been able to identify.

9:00-11:00 You spent this time in your office writing letters and talking on the telephone.

11:00-12:00 You attended a ministerial association meeting to coordinate the programming of activities for youth during the next vacation period.

12:00-1:15 Over lunch, you met with a group of community residents and businessmen who asked you to chair the upcoming community wide celebration. Of course, you accepted.

1:15-2:15 As president of the area community education directors, you chaired a meeting of this group. The purpose of this meeting was to coordinate the printing of a brochure.

2:15-3:00 You spent this time expressing you sorrow to an area director whose father just died.

3:00-4:00 You develop four new programs to meet the educational, recreational and cultural needs for individuals of all ages in the community.

4:00-4:10 You started to structure the activities necessary to implement the four programs just developed.

4:10-5:10 You attended a meeting of the executive committee of the community education advisory council which you established five years ago. The last ten minutes of the meeting dealt with assessing the needs of the community.
Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30-8:30 You spend this time alone structuring activities to implement the community education programs you developed.

8:30-8:40 You attended the first 10 minutes of an administrative council meeting to coordinate community activities in the building.

8:40-9:00 You wrote three letters and made a couple of telephone calls. You also sent a sympathy card to a faculty member whose father died.

9:00-11:00 You spend your time approving timecards for staff, approving expenditures and reviewing the budget and daily financial records.

11:00-12:00 You worked on a new community needs assessment instrument by yourself.

12:00-1:00 You had lunch with three potential resource persons to help with the community education program.

1:00-3:00 You visited one of the afternoon classes to evaluate the instructor and the content of the program.

3:00-3:20 You attended a short meeting of the community education program task force to discuss the addition of one new activity for next session's program.

3:20-3:30 You worked 10 minutes on a presentation for community residents regarding your leadership role within the community.

3:30-5:10 You continued to develop the inservice training program that all staff and community volunteers are required to take.
Role 3

Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30-7:45 You stopped in the office and received everything on your "to do" list and then prioritized them into three categories; must be done, should be done and don't have to be done today.

7:45-9:00 You attended an administrative council meeting of senior high to coordinate the use of the school by community agencies. As usual you left the meeting frustrated because you were going to have to call back half of the community groups and cancel their facility reservations.

9:00-11:00 You composed two short letters for your secretary to type. You were soliciting two more volunteers from the excellent resources list you have compiled over the years. Although you thought the letters were perfect, your secretary asked you if she should change the five grammatical and punctuation errors you made in each letter.

11:00-12:00 You met with a group of area wide community educators. Although you were elected the chairman of the group nine months ago, under your leadership they have not achieved one of the three goals established for the year.

12:00-1:00 Although you had several opportunities to extend sympathy to a faculty member whose father had just died, you didn't do so because you didn't like to get involved in personal matters with people.

1:00-1:30 You spent this time approving purchase orders and reviewing the budget. The system you develop seemed to be working quite effectively.

1:30-3:30 You attended a Program Task Force meeting. The purpose of the group is to involve the community in the development of programs for individuals of all ages. However, only four of the twelve members attended, which is about average. The only programs that were discussed were for youth which account for 90% of the department's current services and programs.

3:30-4:30 You reviewed the content of the community needs assessment, recent staff evaluations and the content of a training program you had just developed for your staff. You were pleased with all the documents.
Role 4

Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30-8:30 You stopped in your office before the administrative council meeting to develop a "to do" list for the day and make a priority listing the various activities. However, you saw a note on your desk that a custodian wanted to see you and that the superintendent had called. A teacher stopped by to chat. Eventually it is time for the administrative council meeting and you never did have time to develop a structured "to do" list.

8:30-9:00 You attended the administrative council meeting to coordinate the use of the school by community agencies. It went very well as usual.

9:00-11:00 You composed ten letters for your secretary to type. In proofreading them, you found an error in one of them which was unusual for you. Most of the time they were perfect. The letters were to area directors asking them to share the process they use for identifying resources in their communities.

11:00-12:00 You met with the group of area wide community educators. Since you took over as chairperson 9 months ago, the group had achieved four of it's major goals which they had been working on for two years. In the next three months, the group should also achieve the other two goals you helped them establish.

12:00-1:00 During your lunch break you made a point of extending your condolences to a staff member whose father had died. Although you had sent flowers you knew how important it was to let that staff member know that you wanted to help.

1:00-1:30 You reviewed purchase request forms, computed the weekly payroll and tried to interpret the computer printout. It appeared that you would have to meet with the business manager again to get straightened on the financial aspect of the program.

1:30-2:30 You worked on the fourth draft of the evaluation instrument to be utilized for a special program.

2:30-3:30 You worked on a new strategy for assessing needs in the community. At the last meeting of the community advisory council, it was mentioned that none of the methods that had been used during the past five years had been very good.

3:30-4:30 You conducted a training program for new staff members. The evaluation indicated that your delivery of the material was excellent but that the content of the training program left much to be desired.
Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30-8:00 You arrived at work and thought about developing a "to do" list. However, you had several notes on your desk. You started responding to these and never did develop a "to do" list.

8:00-9:00 You attended the meeting of the community coordinating council, a group which you started five years ago. The purpose of the group is to coordinate the activities of all the various groups in the community.

9:00-11:00 You were invited to attend a meeting for all administrators concerning the financial future of the school district and the use of the new accounting code book. However, you decided to stay in your office to write letters and make telephone calls concerning the expansion of the community education advisory council.

11:00-12:00 Instead of reviewing the staff evaluation instrument, you visited a faculty member whose father had just died. You expressed your concern and had a nice talk about what it means to lose a parent.

12:00-1:30 You attend lunch with several business persons and community members. They asked you to be chairperson of next year's community festival. They thought you could provide the leadership necessary to motivate all community organizations to participate. You were very pleased to be nominated and accepted immediately.

1:30-4:30 Although you needed to work on a new training program for your staff, the new community survey for assessing needs and identifying resources, you decided to spend the rest of the day with the Program Task Force developing ten new programs and services for individuals of all ages.
Role 6

Listed below is the schedule of an average day for the community education director whose role you are assuming for this exercise.

7:30 You arrived at your office and quickly developed your daily "to do" list by reviewing your appointment calendar, and the notes and messages left on your desk by your secretary the previous afternoon. You also took the time to develop a priority listing of these activities from most important to those that could wait. This procedure provided a structure for you to implement programs and services.

8:00-9:30 You reviewed the financial report, budget, purchase order and for payroll information sent to you. Everything appeared to be fine.

9:30-12:00 Instead of attending a meeting of the community coordinating council which coordinates the use of community facilities, you stayed in your office to design an evaluation instrument for the special activities coming up.

12:00-1:00 During lunch, rather than talking to a staff member whose father had just died to express your sympathy, you talked to four other staff members about serving as resource persons for an upcoming special event for teenagers.

1:00-1:30 At the meeting of area wide directors, you turned down a nomination to serve as president for the forthcoming year. You didn't feel that you could help them achieve their goals.

1:30-2:00 You were supposed to meet with the Program Task Force of the community education advisory council. However, only four of the twelve members attended the meeting so those present indicated that the program as it currently exists with 30% youth activities was fine with them.

2:00-3:00 Instead of writing letters you decided to think about different methods of assessing needs in the community.

3:00-4:00 Instead of returning telephone calls, you continued your work on revising the training program for your staff.
APPENDIX G

PILOT TEST COVER LETTER
Dear Community Educator:

I am a practicing community education director on leave from my position in Monticello, Minnesota. At the present time I am a doctoral student in the Community Leadership Training Program at Western Michigan University.

As part of my dissertation, I am in the process of developing several survey instruments to investigate a methodology for determining the training needs of community education directors. As part of this process, I would like to solicit a few minutes of your valuable time to help me pilot test one of the instruments.

The rewards for you are threefold. First, I'd like to buy you a cup of coffee and a roll, hence the enclosed dollar. Second, by participating in various investigations such as my pilot test, you are making a contribution to improving the state of art of community education. Third, when my dissertation is complete, I will send you a copy of the abstract and will be happy to discuss any aspect of my investigation with you.

I'm asking you to assist me in the following manner: (a) complete the instrument according to the directions given; (b) complete the questions regarding the instrument on the Pilot Test Critique Sheet; and (c) return the instrument and critique sheet in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by Thursday, July 23, 1981.

Your reply will be kept confidential. The code number in the right corner will be utilized to check returns and to contact you should I have any questions concerning your comments. If you would like to contact me regarding this survey, please call me at home (616-342-8652) or leave a message for me at the Community Leadership Training Centre (616-383-0047).

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Duane D. Gates

DDG/bf

enc
APPENDIX H

PILOT SURVEY INSTRUMENT A
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the entire population (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,000 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. _______ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.

   a) Community education director . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   b) Superintendent . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   c) Principal . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   d) Athletic director . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   e) Teacher . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   f) Vocational director . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time
   g) Other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . % of time

(Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelors Degree completed
   d) Masters Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.

   Degree
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

   Major
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list) ________________________________

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban
   (over)
Part II-A Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas representative of the skills that could be utilized by community education directors. Please carefully read the description of each skill. Based upon your perception of the amount of time that you utilize each skill during an average work week, please distribute 100 percentage points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100. Unless you feel that you spend an equal amount of time in each of two skill areas, please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas.

___ pts 1. Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)

___ pts 2. Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

___ pts 3. Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

___ pts 4. Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

___ pts 5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

___ pts 6. Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

___ pts 7. Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

___ pts 8. Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.

___ pts 9. Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

___ pts 10. Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.

___ pts 11. Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.

___ pts 12. Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.

100 pts = Total
APPENDIX I

PILOT SURVEY INSTRUMENT B
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the entire population (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,001 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. _______ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.
   a) Community education director % of time
   b) Superintendent % of time
   c) Principal % of time
   d) Athletic director % of time
   e) Teacher % of time
   f) Vocational director % of time
   g) Other % of time
   (Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelors Degree completed
   d) Masters Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.
   Degree Major

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list) __________________________

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban

(over)
Part II-B Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas representative of the skills that could be utilized by community education directors. Please carefully read the description of each skill. Based upon how important you perceive each skill to be, please distribute 100 points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100. Unless you actually feel that two skills are of equal importance, please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas.

___ pts 1. Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)

___ pts 2. Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.

___ pts 3. Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.

___ pts 4. Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.

___ pts 5. Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize both a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.

___ pts 6. Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.

___ pts 7. Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.

___ pts 8. Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.

___ pts 9. Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.

___ pts 10. Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.

___ pts 11. Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.

___ pts 12. Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.

100 pts = Total
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APPENDIX J

PILOT SURVEY INSTRUMENT C
Community Education Survey

Part I—Directions. Please place an (X) in the space by the most appropriate answer for each question or write the information requested in the appropriate space.

1. What is the entire population (not just K-12) of the school district or geographic area for which you are the community education director? Please use most recent data available to you, i.e., 1980 census data.
   a) Under 3,000
   b) 3,000 to 7,000
   c) 7,001 to 15,000
   d) 15,001 to 50,000
   e) Over 50,000

2. How many years experience do you have as a community education director? Please include your experience in other communities as well as your current position and round off to the nearest year as of August 1, 1981.
   a) 1 year or less
   b) 2 years to 4 years
   c) 5 years to 7 years
   d) 8 years to 10 years
   e) 11 years and over

3. Are you employed full time or part time?
   a) Full time
   b) Part time. Please indicate the number of hours per week you are assigned to be community education director. _______ Hours Per Week.

4. If you answered full time to question three, please indicate the areas to which you are assigned and the percent of time you are expected to devote to each area.
   a) Community education director % of time 
   b) Superintendent % of time
   c) Principal % of time
   d) Athletic director % of time
   e) Teacher % of time
   f) Vocational director % of time
   g) Other % of time

(Please list)

5. Please indicate the highest education level you have achieved from the following categories.
   a) High school diploma or equivalent
   b) Attended college
   c) Bachelors Degree completed
   d) Masters Degree completed
   e) Specialist Degree completed
   f) Doctorate Degree completed

6. If you have received one or more college degrees, please list each of your degrees and major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Sex
   a) Male
   b) Female

8. By whom are you employed?
   a) School district(s)
   b) City
   c) Jointly by School district/city
   d) Private non-profit agency
   e) Other (please list) __________________________

9. Do you consider the community you work in to be rural, suburban, or urban?
   a) rural
   b) suburban
   c) urban
Part II-C Directions. Listed below are twelve major skill areas representative of the skills that could be utilized by community education directors. Please carefully read the description of each skill. Based upon your perceived need for additional training in these skill areas, please distribute 100 points among the twelve major skill areas. The total of all the points in the twelve skill areas MUST equal 100. Unless you feel that you actually need an equal amount of training in two skill areas, please avoid assigning the same number to two skill areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Skill Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Communicating—the ability to use appropriate methods (i.e. reading, writing, speaking, listening, etc.) to communicate effectively with individuals and groups (of various ages and/or diverse educational, cultural, occupational, and socio-economic backgrounds.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Evaluating—the ability to: (1) design and utilize appropriate procedures to evaluate community education personnel and programs; (2) analyze the results of the evaluation; and (3) utilize the results of the evaluation to recommend appropriate changes in personnel and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Assessing Needs—the ability to: (1) identify community needs and wants using a variety of methods; (2) involve community members in determining the priorities of need; and (3) develop an action plan to meet identified needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Identifying Resources—the ability to identify the human, physical and financial resources, both within and outside the organization, to meet the identified needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Obtaining and Budgeting Funds—the ability to: (1) utilize a variety of funding sources and methods to obtain the necessary funds to finance the community education program; and (2) develop appropriate procedures for the collection, distribution and supervision of these funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Coordinating—the ability to utilize the resources of both public and private agencies to meet the identified needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Programming—the ability to develop and implement appropriate community services and programs (i.e. educational, recreational, social, cultural, etc.) to meet the identified needs and wants of individuals of all ages within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Involving Community—the ability to use various strategies to increase the opportunity for citizen involvement in the decision making and problem solving process within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Training—the ability to identify the skills needed by staff and community members; and to develop strategies to train individuals in those skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Organizing—the ability to structure activities to implement the programs and services of the community education department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Leading—the ability to: assist individuals and groups to identify and achieve goals, create a positive organizational climate, help people resolve problems, facilitate group process and develop leadership ability among members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ pts</td>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relations—the ability to: (1) be perceived as being patient, caring, understanding and considerate; (2) exhibit the essential qualities of faith, trust and compassion in dealing with people; and (3) demonstrate a high estimate of human potential, believing all can learn and achieve if the opportunity is made available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 pts = Total
APPENDIX K

PILOT TEST CRITIQUE SHEET
Pilot Test Critique Sheet

Directions: Please answer each of these questions to the best of your ability and make comments when appropriate.

1. Are the directions to both Parts I and II clearly stated and complete?
   - Yes  Comments:
   - No

2. Are the items clearly stated?
   - Yes  Comments:
   - No

3. Is the instrument free of errors in the use of language?
   - Yes  Comments:
   - No

4. Can the instrument be completed in a reasonable amount of time?
   - Yes  Comments:
   - No

5. Do you believe that a community educator has enough information to complete the instrument?
   - Yes  Comments:
   - No

(continued)
6. Do you believe that a community educator is likely to be willing to complete the instrument?  
   Yes  Comments:  
   No  

7. Do you believe that a community educator will respond to the instrument honestly?  
   Yes  Comments:  
   No  

8. Do you believe that the general format of the instrument is satisfactory?  
   Yes  Comments:  
   No  

9. Please list any additional comments that you may have regarding this instrument.
APPENDIX L

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTORS
Dear Community Educator:

I am a practicing community education director on leave from my position in Monticello, Minnesota until October 1. Currently I am a doctoral student in the Community Leadership Training Center at Western Michigan University.

WHAT DO I WANT?

At the present time, I am in the process of collecting data for my dissertation, which will investigate the different methods by which trainers might assess the training needs of community education directors. As part of this process, I would like to solicit a few minutes of your valuable time to complete the attached survey instrument.

WHY WERE YOU SELECTED?

Your name was selected at random from a list of individuals who are responsible for the community education programs in their communities. This list was provided by Larry Erie at the Minnesota State Department of Education.

HOW DO YOU BENEFIT?

The rewards for your participation are threefold. First, I would like to buy you a cup of coffee and a roll, hence the enclosed dollar. Second, you are making a contribution to improving the state of the art of community education. And third, when my dissertation is completed, a copy of the abstract will be available to you upon request. Hopefully, these rewards will motivate you to complete the survey instrument immediately, which will help me avoid the time and expense of required follow-up efforts.

HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE UTILIZED?

Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and will be reported only in terms of group scores. The code number in the upper right hand corner will be used to inventory returned survey instruments and provide information for appropriate follow-up procedures.

WHEN AND WHERE DO YOU RETURN THE SURVEY?

I would appreciate receiving your completed survey instrument by Thursday, August 20, in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

QUESTIONS?

Please feel free to call me collect in Michigan until August 15 at (616) 342-8652 or (616) 383-0047. Beginning August 17 you can call me collect at my home in Monticello (612) 295-2925.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Duane O. Gates

DDG/bf
APPENDIX M

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER DIRECTORS
Dear Community Educator:

I am a practicing community education director on leave from my position in Monticello, Minnesota until October 1. Currently I am a doctoral student in the Community Leadership Training Center at Western Michigan University.

WHAT DO I WANT?
At the present time, I am in the process of collecting data for my dissertation, which will investigate the different methods by which trainers might assess the training needs of community education directors. As part of this process, I would like to solicit a few minutes of your valuable time to complete the attached survey instrument.

WHY WERE YOU SELECTED?
You have been recommended by Dr. Donald Weaver as an individual who is highly qualified to serve on a panel of expert trainers. This panel is one of several groups being polled in the present study. Because of the small size of this panel, it is very important that you participate in this study.

HOW DO YOU BENEFIT?
The rewards for your participation are threefold. First, I would like to buy you a cup of coffee and a roll, hence the enclosed dollar. Second, you are making a contribution to improving the state of the art of community education. And third, when my dissertation is completed, a copy of the abstract will be available to you upon request. Hopefully, these rewards will motivate you to complete the survey instrument immediately, which will help me avoid the time and expense of required follow-up efforts.

HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE UTILIZED?
Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and will be reported only in terms of group scores. The code number in the upper right hand corner will be used to inventory returned survey instruments and provide information for appropriate follow-up procedures.

WHEN AND WHERE DO YOU RETURN THE SURVEY?
I would appreciate receiving your completed survey instrument by Thursday, August 20, in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

QUESTIONS?
Please feel free to call me collect in Michigan until August 15 at (616) 342-8852 or (616) 383-0047. Beginning August 17 you can call me collect at my home in Monticello (612) 295-2925.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Duane D. Gates
DDG/bf
enc
APPENDIX N

SURVEY COVER LETTER FOR FOLLOW UP
Dear

On July 31 I mailed you a two-page community education survey instrument, a one-dollar bill and a cover letter explaining the purpose of my study and how you were chosen to be a participant. Since that letter has not been returned to me, I can only assume that you have received it and have been unable to complete the survey instrument to date.

Because of the number of individuals in my sample, your participation in this study is extremely important. In case you have misplaced the original survey, I have enclosed another one for your convenience.

Please return your completed survey instrument by Tuesday, September 1, in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. This will help me avoid the time and expense of additional follow-up efforts.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me collect at my home in Monticello (612-295-2925) or leave a message for me at the Monticello Community Education office (612-295-2915).

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Duane D. Gates

DDG/bf

enc
APPENDIX O

MEDIAN SCORES FOR EACH OF THE
TWELVE SKILL AREAS BY GROUP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill:</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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