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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background

The community education concept has spread rapidly across the United States. In the early 1960's, only a handful of school districts had adopted the concept. During 1972, community education programs were operative in 2,284 school buildings in 528 school districts around the nation (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, 1973b). In these school districts there were more than six million people, among whom hundreds of thousands were active participants in community education programs.

The Mott Foundation Five-Year Plan (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, 1973a) projected that by 1977 there will be 7,946 community schools within 2,600 community school districts in the United States. Projections indicated that these community schools would be staffed by 6,020 trained community school directors and supported by $139 million in public tax monies. These projections, together with increased state and federal support for the concept, indicate continued rapid growth for community education.
Perhaps the primary reason for this growth has been the widespread acceptance of the community education philosophy among educators and lay persons. This philosophy is based upon the belief that the educative process is a function of the entire community (Totten, 1970). The philosophy holds that it is no longer sufficient to think in terms of education from kindergarten through 12th grade. The educational needs of all members of the community, young and old, must be served. The philosophy provides that the local school 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" (Minzey & LeTarte, 1972, p. 19).

Although the school is only one agent of education at work in the community, it generally assumes the catalytic role described above because of the unique advantages it affords the community. These advantages, peculiar to the school, include common onwership by all the people, centralized (neighborhood) locations, political neutrality, and availability of a multiplicity of physical and human resources (Totten, 1970). Hence, the community school, in
fulfilling its function in community education, becomes a human development laboratory serving the learning needs of all the people from their birth to their death. In short, the community education philosophy envisions a new role for the school.

Specifically, this new role provides for an extension of the traditional school day. No longer is the school program confined to specific hours of the day. No hours of the day or week are inappropriate for serving community educational needs. This expanded use of the school provides for activities—enrichment, remedial, vocational, and recreational—which might not otherwise be undertaken during the limited hours of the school day. Additionally, the philosophy allows for the school's involvement in helping to provide for preschool and adult education, health services, recreational activities, community problem-solving, and coordination of the efforts of community agencies and organizations.

Inherent in the philosophy is the idea that the community education process will affect the normal, daily K-12 program of the school system. It is not an "add-on" adult program which begins when the regular school day ends. Kerensky and Melby (1971) pointed out that to think of
community education as a separate program superimposed upon the existing school is to destroy the concept at its inception.

Minzey and Olsen (1969) cautioned that "in creating a community education climate, one must not lose sight of the basic purpose of the school in education of the school-age student . . . this task must take priority over all others" (p. 36). They further stated that the successful implementation of a community education program will bring about an integration of the regular program with all other programs so that the entire day-school program is enhanced. Indeed, community education seeks to integrate the life of the school with the life of the community.

This philosophy of integrating the school's life with the life of the community dictates requirements for performance of teachers which are broader than, and different from, the requirements of the traditional school. These requirements include (1) being aware of and using community resources on a regular basis, (2) demonstrating a willingness to study the community and view it as a laboratory for learning, (3) being aware that the classroom is only one of many educative processes in the community, (4) a willingness to share school and classroom facilities with others,
and (5) acceptance of the potential of lay participation in the educational process (Keidel, 1969).

In addition to placing new requirements for teacher performance, the philosophy demands a new role of the teacher. Minzey and Olsen (1969) outlined this new role:

The role of the teacher in community education will differ from that of the teacher in the traditional setting. In addition to his responsibilities as a teacher, he will need to be informed and supportive of the existing programs. His knowledge of outside programs will help him to select and utilize those activities that will enhance the educational experiences of his students. He will need to develop an attitude toward community involvement that will foster and promote the basic ideas of community education. His role will represent a key position in the development of a sense of community in the students he teaches and the parents with whom he works. This role will consist of being involved in extra-school activities, both as a teacher and as a participant, and fostering professional and social activities which tend to bring his services more in contact with the community. Parent conferences, home visits, and community service will be integral parts of the teacher's role in community education. (p. 37)

Perhaps the most important difference between the teacher in the traditional school and the teacher in the community school can be found in the attitude of the teacher. Kerensky and Melby (1971) held that the teacher in the community school possesses an unusual amount of faith in people. Community school teachers assume that
people (particularly youngsters) can be trusted, want to be successful, and will be successful if given the opportunity. According to Whitt (1971), the teacher within a system of community education recognizes individual differences in children, believes all children can learn, and is concerned about the self-concept of the child. Finally, Hiemstra (1972) wrote that the community school teacher (1) relates what happens in the classroom to the home and community, (2) is willing to work with parents and students in supplemental educational activities in the home and community, and (3) is willing to visit homes to better determine and understand educational needs.

If community education is to affect the K-12 program, it must have the support and acceptance of professional public school educators. Minzey and Olsen (1969) held that school staff support is absolutely crucial to success of the community education program. They added that staff members who are possessive about their facilities, are threatened by outside contact, or are jealous of their control of the education process will be detriments to the development of the program.

The teacher, more than any other staff person, will determine the impact of community education upon the K-12
program. It appears that teachers who fail to understand and accept the community education philosophy will be a hindrance to their community in its efforts to implement the concept. Hanna (1972) reported that analysis of case studies of abandoned community school efforts seem to point to "the lack of understanding of the goals (of community education) and inadequate or inappropriate content and method on the part of the teaching profession" (p. 17).

Kerensky and Melby (1971) contended that in order for community education to develop an open, positive learning atmosphere, the schools must have teachers with goals, methods, and attitudes which can produce the proper climate for learning. They warned that teachers who do not understand and accept the philosophy are often the major "roadblock" to its affecting the K-12 program:

Many teachers see a community school as a mere addition to the usual K-12 program. It may be viewed as a good addition to the "regular" program. It is sometimes seen as a good program to be paid for by special funds. In many established "community schools," this inadequate perception prevails. The school is "lighted" and open in the evening. Interesting activities are conducted in the afternoon and evening, but the school for children during the day is untouched by the concept. (p. 182)

Keidel's (1969) comments also pointed to the importance of teacher understanding and acceptance of the
philosophy. He wrote that teachers must be cognizant of, and willing to use, community resources in the classroom. Further, Keidel stressed that teachers must be aware of and accept the fact that the teacher is not the sole educational and social catalyst in a child's life and that the classroom is no longer the sole domain of the teacher. In short, the teacher must understand the concept and identify his role within it, if it is to affect the K-12 program.

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) postulated that "the basic difference between educational personnel in the traditional school and a community school will center around the difference in basic philosophy as to the role of the school in education" (p. 162). More specifically, they held that teachers in community schools see education in a wider role than do those of traditional schools. Community school teachers are better able to understand that their duties "are not the total educational operation but rather are a part of it and that other educational needs have equal demands on finances, facilities and other resources of the community" (p. 168). In summary, Minzey and LeTarte held that educational personnel in community schools espouse a different educational philosophy than those in traditional schools.
Several authorities in the community education field postulated that this acceptance of the community education philosophy is the result of the presence of a community education program in the local school district. Whitt (1971) argued that community education programs have a very positive effect on the regular school program because they offer an opportunity for growth in the child. He further argued as this growth begins to contribute to the educational development of the child, there is a distinct carry-over into regular school classes. Whitt pointed out that after a period of time teachers will recognize this positive effect and will become more accepting of the community education concept.

Kerensky and Melby (1971) reasoned that community education is not only a means for educating children and parents, but is also a means for educating school personnel. They added that when school personnel become involved with community education, their attitudes toward the concept become positive. Finally, Clark (1972) wrote that faculty attitudes become positive when they realize community education is a process for putting the ideas, wants, and needs of the people into the system that serves them.

The literature cited above makes clear the claim of
community educators that teachers employed within a system of community education adhere to and espouse a different educational philosophy than those who teach in traditional school settings. In reality, there is a dearth of research in the entire area of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy. In view of the paucity of information relevant to teacher acceptance of this philosophy, it is believed that a study of the extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy is needed and is of value.

Study results would be of both theoretical and practical value. From a theoretical point of view, the results of the study would provide research information which would add to the body of knowledge already available in the field. Weaver and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) pointed out the need for this kind of research when they wrote:

A plethora of claims for its efficacy by proponents of community education may be found throughout the literature--claims ranging from an increase in the use of school facilities by adults to a guarantee of the good society. Yet, faced with the challenge to substantiate their claims with data gathered under conditions of reasonable objectivity, the proponents of community education admit that much more substantive evidence is needed. (p. 397)

From a practical point of view, study results would
be of considerable help to the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University and to community education directors in southwest Michigan. Results of the study would enable these educators to determine if the message of community education is reaching elementary school teachers. This information would have implications for the methodology employed by the Development Center in dissemination of information to teachers. Additionally, results of the study would aid community education directors in planning in-service training programs for teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The focus of the study was the systematic investigation of the extent of elementary teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy in southwest Michigan. The purpose of the study was to provide attitudinal data about elementary school teachers which, prior to the investigation, had been unknown. Specifically, the goals of this study were:

1. To develop and test an instrument which would be useful in measuring the extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy.

2. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the community education
philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs.

3. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the six components of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs. The six components are as follows:

a. The traditional day-school program
b. Extended use of community facilities
c. Additional programs for school-age children
d. Programs for adults
e. Delivery and coordination of community services
f. Community involvement

4. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of program aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs.

5. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of process aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs.

6. To determine which components of the community education philosophy received the greatest and least acceptance among all elementary teachers surveyed.

The data for this study were obtained from the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI) on which
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elementary school teachers indicated the extent of their acceptance of the community education philosophy (see Appendix A).

The CEPI was developed by the writer based upon a review of current community education literature. It contained a series of statements judged by a panel of experts to be representative of the community education philosophy. Teachers responded to each statement on a scale of responses ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Teacher responses to the statements were compared to determine the extent of teacher acceptance of the philosophy.

Definition of Terms

Community education.--Since this study focused upon teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy, the definition of community education presented by Minzey and LeTarte (1972) is used. Minzey and LeTarte's definition emphasizes the catalytic role played by the school in community education:

Community education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all of its community 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 philosophy.**—The community education philosophy is the basic beliefs, principles, and concepts upon which community education is based. For the purposes of this investigation, community education philosophy is defined operationally as the composite of the statements contained in the CEPI (Appendix A).

**Components.**—Components of the community education philosophy, as used in this study, are the basic elements which comprise a community education program in a given school district. These six basic elements, identified by Minzey (1974), include (1) the traditional day-school program, (2) extended use of community facilities, (3) additional programs for school-age children, (4) programs for adults, (5) delivery and coordination of community services, and (6) community involvement.

**Program aspects.**—The literature of community education is replete with references to a dichotomy between "programs" and "processes" in community education activities (Kerensky, 1972; Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Seay, 1953; Seay & Associates, 1974). Weaver and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) held that this dichotomy can be
explained in terms of goal expectations. They noted that programs are activities directed toward a goal but restricted by time, place, and clientele. Processes are also activities directed toward a goal; however, they are not subject to the limitations of time, place, or clientele.

In this investigation, program aspects of the community education philosophy are defined operationally as statements in the CEPI which refer to specific, overt activities of participation by community members which are subject to limitations of time, place, or clientele.

Process aspects.—In this study, process aspects of the philosophy are those statements in the CEPI which refer to extensive community involvement in planning, decision-making, and problem-solving. Specific examples include those processes outlined by Weaver (1972) in his "National Study of Community Education Goals": coordinating, surveying, demonstrating, training, and promoting.

Southwest Michigan.—Southwest Michigan is defined as the 134 school districts located within the service area of the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University.

Elementary teacher.—An elementary teacher is an
adult, certified to teach by the State of Michigan, who directs the learning activities of children in any public elementary school in southwest Michigan.

**Districts with community education programs.**—In this investigation, districts with community education programs are those school districts which have employed a full-time community education director for a minimum of 3 years.

**Districts without community education programs.**—Districts without community education programs are those districts which do not currently employ a full-time community education director.

**Limitations of the Study**

One limitation of this study involved the basic instrument used to gather the data. Prior to this investigation, an instrument which reduced the community education philosophy to a series of statements had not been developed. Hence, the writer developed the instrument used in this study based upon a review of current community education literature and submitted it, for content validation, to experts in the field. These experts included graduate students in community education,
university professors, community education directors, and directors of regional centers for community education. Since this broad spectrum of educators was involved in the content validation process, the problem of developing a new instrument was not considered to be a serious limitation.

A second limitation of the study was the attempt to reduce community education to a series of components. Because of the dynamic nature of the concept, it could be argued that it cannot be reduced to a number of components. In truth, however, a number of writers in the field have done so in order to make it possible to measure the development of community education within a given community. In this study, the components outlined by Minzey (1974) were used in order to facilitate the comparison between teachers in districts with community education programs and those in districts without community education programs.

A third limitation of the study was that attempts could not be made to generalize the results of the study beyond the teachers in the 134 school districts in southwest Michigan which constituted the population of the study. Since the population for the study was limited to this area, it makes no claim that studies in other areas would produce
identical results. It is believed, however, that similarities exist to a degree and that the findings provide some understanding of the general extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy.

Overview

This chapter has provided background related to the study, a statement of the problem of the study, definitions of terms used throughout the study, and limitations of the investigation.

Chapter II of this investigation is devoted to a review of the literature pertinent to the problem.

The design of the study is presented in Chapter III. The population studied, the method of sampling, the instrument used, and the methods of analysis are covered in detail.

Chapter IV provides an analysis of the data collected, and details the findings of the study.

A summary of the study, and conclusions and recommendations derived from the results of the study, are found in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review will be concerned with two major areas related to this investigation: a review of the historical development of the community education philosophy, and a review of the current community education philosophy. Throughout the literature review, special attention will be directed to the role of the teacher in community education.

Community Education Philosophy: Historical Development

Community education is not a new concept. Decker (1972) contended that basic elements of the concept can be traced to Greek and Roman civilizations. Several writers (Hunt, 1971; Kliminski, 1974; Solberg, 1970) have demonstrated that the community education philosophy was part of American educational thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These writers have shown that basic tenets of the concept were found in educational mandates and acts of that period in history. Cubberly (1934) and...
Scanlon (1959) held that traces of a number of components of community education can be found in the literature of the nineteenth century.

The early community school movement began to develop in the 1920's and 1930's. Clearly, the major emphasis of the early community school was placed upon meeting the basic needs of people in the community. The reasons for this emphasis could be found in the social and economic conditions of the society. This was a period when many people were jobless or fearful of losing their jobs as economic disaster began to engulf the country. People were concerned with obtaining food, shelter, and clothing to satisfy the basic needs of human existence. These conditions brought about a growing desire for an education which would have an immediate practical value in coping with the problems of the community. It was in this atmosphere of seeking new ways to improve conditions of living that the community school had its beginnings.

Clapp (1939), describing two of these early community schools, pointed to this emphasis upon meeting basic needs when she wrote:

What does a community school do? First of all, it meets as best it can, and with everyone's help, the urgent needs of the people, for it
holds that everything that affects the welfare of children and their families is its concern. Where does school life end and life outside begin? There is no distinction between them. A community school is a used place, a place used freely and informally for all the needs of living and learning. It is, in effect, the place where living and learning converge. (p. 89)

The community school placed additional demands upon the teacher. The teacher, often the best-educated person in the community, was called upon to organize the community's problem-solving efforts. Clapp (1939) outlined the role of the teacher in a community school:

A teacher who enters community education surrenders prerogatives. His authority is the authority not of position, but of usable knowledge confirmed by action and events. Community education is not brought into being by the putting over of a plan, or by the imposing of ideas. It requires that full recognition be given to people's desires and needs, feelings and opinions, ways of doing and thinking; and that the relation of any particular enterprise to other enterprises and to the whole be currently understood. The demands on anyone directing it is to recognize opportunities when they appear—usually unlabeled—and to use the capacities of everyone—including himself—at the time and in the way that will help the enterprise and the people in it; to discern new developments, fresh approaches to the problem, and different ways of getting past obstacles. (p. 170)

These broadened definitions of the role of the school and the teacher were related to a change in educational .
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philosophy on the part of many citizens of that day. As people began to look to the school for help in solving urgent economic and social problems, the school became less textbook-centered and more life-centered. Everett (1938) summarized this broadened educational outlook when he compared the philosophies of the community school and the traditional school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All life is educative</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Education is gained only in formal institutions of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education requires participation</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Education is adequately gained through studying about life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and children have fundamental common purposes in both work and play</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Adults are primarily concerned with work and children with play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school systems should be primarily concerned with improvements of the social order</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>School systems should be primarily concerned with passing on the cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum should receive its social orientation from major problems and areas of community living</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>The curriculum should be oriented in relation to the specialized aims of the academic subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education should be founded upon democratic process and ideals</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>The belief should be that most children and most adults are incapable of intelligently either running their own lives or participating in common group efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress in education and community living best comes through the development of common concerns among individuals and social groups.

Public schools should be held responsible for the education of both children and adults.

Teacher-preparatory institutions should prepare youth and adults to carry on a community type of public education.

Thus, the community school concept was characterized by concern for meeting the needs of all individuals in the community. It mandated a close working relationship between school, home, and community and was dedicated to the improvement of the entire social order.

This concern for service to the entire community continued as the community education philosophy became more sophisticated in the late 1930's and early 1940's. Seay (1945), writing in the 44th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, held that community schools had two distinctive purposes. These purposes were service to the entire community, not merely to children of school age,
and use of the resources of the community as part of the educational facilities of the school. Hence, the community school, accepting the improvement of community life as the major aim of its entire program, began to evaluate its effectiveness based upon how well it achieved this aim. The many activities of the school were focused upon this common aim, and this focus became "a means for overcoming a common defect of many schools, namely, isolated subjects, unrelated courses, and nonconsequential experiences" (Seay, 1945).

The teacher played a vital role in helping meet this major aim of improving the life of the community. Seay (1945) provided a cogent description of this role:

In addition to knowing children and the subject matter to be taught, teachers of schools which emphasize community resources and needs must know the interests and the customs of the people whom they serve, their problems, and how they make a living. They must know the organizations and methods of the other public services of the community. They must know how the problems of patrons and the agencies of the community relate to problems and agencies elsewhere in the state, in the nation, and in the world. Above all they must know how to study a local community so as to identify its problems and resources. (p. 226)

Hence, teachers were called upon to know a great deal about community life and resources, as well as traditional
subject matter.

In 1935, an experimental program in Flint, Michigan, provided for the opening of school facilities after the normal school day had ended. Charles Stewart Mott donated $6,000 so that the schools could remain open in an effort to reduce juvenile delinquency, improve safety conditions for children, and provide recreational activities for all age groups in the community (Campbell, 1962). This initial donation marked the prototype of what is now known as the "Flint Model of Community Education."

The apparent success of this initial program prompted Flint school officials to send six members of the 1938 teaching staff into the community to determine how the school could strengthen family life through services to parents (Manley, Reed, & Burns, 1961). The report of these visiting teachers brought about a change in community education philosophy:

As the visiting teachers went into the homes and discovered the complexity and seriousness of the problems there, they began making reports on what they saw. The recreation and physical education program had been established to help correct the social ills of the community. It was assumed, very logically, that planned recreation programs for children and adults would eliminate many of the social problems in Flint. However, although the program had been in operation for several years, the work of the visiting
teachers revealed that there were some serious unsolved problems. (Manley, Reed, & Burns, 1961, pp. 37-38)

The work of teachers helped Flint officials realize that there could be no one specific cure-all for community problems.

The new philosophy which developed from the findings of the visiting teachers provided for a cooperative planning process in which teachers, parents, social agencies, and interested lay citizens began to work together to find solutions to community problems. The community education philosophy in Flint had changed from one in which recreation was viewed as a cure-all to a new philosophy which called for united community action in problem-solving.

The philosophy continued to mature as programs developed outside of Flint. Seay (1953) held that the community school of the 1940's was characterized by an educative process which related the resources of people and communities in order to accomplish a higher standard of living. He held that the force which put this process in motion was an understanding by educational leaders and laymen of the power of education in promoting social progress.

Hanna and Naslund (1953) echoed Seay's description when they wrote:
A community school is a school which has concerns beyond the training of literate, "right-minded," and economically efficient citizens who reflect the values and processes of a particular social, economic, or political setting. In addition to these basic educational tasks, it is directly concerned with improving all aspects of living in the community in all the broad meaning of that concept in the local, state, regional, national, or international community. (p. 52)

Thus, the role of the school in community education had changed from concentration upon meeting basic needs to emphasis upon providing people with a higher standard of living. The community school, in the post-World War II years, was viewed as an agent of both social and economic progress.

Again, the teacher was highly important to the practical application of the philosophy to classroom and community activities. Muntyan (1953) listed a multiplicity of skills to be mastered by the community school teacher: (1) mastery of subject area; (2) ability to work with groups; (3) expertness in the application of philosophy, sociology, and the biological sciences as they underlie the educative process; (4) ability to help students evaluate themselves and the social process; and (5) an ability to understand and interpret the society in which they teach. Additionally, Muntyan mused that "the teacher must become at least a
minor prophet, since he must, in a very real sense, predict the direction in which the community wants to move" (p. 44).

As one might imagine, teachers of this ability were often difficult to find. When qualified teachers were found, the strain of the job was often too much for the teacher to tolerate:

Perhaps the most difficult problem is finding professional staff members who have the needed competencies and characteristics. Reports are legion of staff members who have asked to be transferred or who resign from community schools after one year's experience because the strain of the program is too great. (Drummond, 1953, p. 121)

Seay and Wilkinson (1953), commenting upon barriers to the development of community schools, postulated that the effectiveness of a community school is, in large measure, dependent upon the cooperation and support of the school staff. They pointed out that a critical barrier arises when teachers are unable or unwilling to change their customary ways of doing things. They added that it is a primary responsibility of leaders in the community school to get teachers to accept the community education concept. Finally, Seay and Wilkinson contended that many community school efforts have been abandoned due to lack of support from the teaching staff.
During the 1950's, proponents of the concept began to recognize fully the importance of working with community agencies in the solution of social problems. Goodykoontz (1953) held that community schools began to share the common philosophy that "schools can, and should, make a difference for good in the lives of the people they serve; that school programs are greatly improved through the contributions of community resources of people and things; and that these results can be achieved only by a partnership of schools and other community agencies" (p. 68).

Communities began to put this philosophical ideal into practice. The goal statements of the Stevenson, Michigan, Community Education Program provided evidence that schools intended to work with local agencies. Seay and Crawford (1954) pointed out that the Stevenson Program advocated: (1) cooperative efforts with all community organizations; (2) coordination of the efforts of existing community agencies; (3) community surveys to determine local resources, conditions, and needs; and (4) democratic action in meeting the needs of the community through the legal and established community agencies.

As the community school concept became more widely recognized across the country, it attracted the attention
of professional educators. Olsen (1953) listed 16 characteristics of community education as identified by the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. These 16 characteristics are noteworthy because they provide a thorough synopsis of the community education philosophy of that time. Olsen's list clearly indicated the community education philosophy: was school-based; viewed education as a lifelong process; sought to meet the needs of all the people in the community; advocated full use of community resources; sought the cooperation of other agencies in the community; provided for full use of school buildings, equipment, and grounds; and made unusual demands upon the school teaching staff.

What were the demands upon the community school teaching staff? Melby (1955) summarized them by writing:

Widespread community participation in educational policy determination and in the conduct of educational programs cannot be brought about without the widespread participation of teachers in these same activities. This calls for a redefinition of the role of the teacher in terms of an active participant in community affairs. Whereas in the past we assumed that the teacher is one who knew how to teach subjects, we are now assuming that the teacher is one who knows how to release the creative capacities of her pupils and who knows how to work creatively with the parents of these same pupils, so that, together, she and the parents have the most creative possible impact on the pupils. The
teacher must now become a student of the community. She must become a student of children as they are growing up in the community and must constantly be appraising the impact of the total community and the school upon the growth and development of individual children. *(pp. 251-252)*

Having traced the historical development of the community education philosophy and its implications for the teaching profession, the writer now turns his attention to the current community education philosophy.

**The Current Community Education Philosophy**

The most recent definition of community education was proposed by Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974), in *Community Education: A Developing Concept*. He defined the concept as a "process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people— all the people— of the community" *(p. 11)*. Notably absent in this definition is any direct reference to the school. Seay contended that the community *school* concept became a true community *education* concept with the recognition, by educators of the 1960's, that the school was only one of many educational forces in the community.

McCluskey (1967) appeared to have a similar view when he wrote:
The concept of the Educative Community is based on the single premise that the community itself is educative. . . . the Educative Community proposes that most persons and agencies in the community have a potential if not an actual capacity for education. And even more important, these same persons and agencies should assume a responsibility for their educative role and implement that assumption by making their educational contribution as explicit and effective as possible. (p. 1)

Additionally, a national study of community education goals conducted by Weaver (1972) indicated that many community educators saw the concept moving from its traditional base within the school to a base within the entire community. One of the implications of Weaver's "Emerging Model of Community Education" was the indication that future community education programs would be cooperative developments of the community, social agencies, and the school.

In spite of the claims of the educators cited above, a review of recent community education literature indicated that many authorities (Hickey & Van Voorhees, 1969; Hiemstra, 1972; Kerensky & Melby, 1971; Minzey, 1972; Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Totten, 1970; Totten & Manley, 1969; Whitt, 1971) believed the concept continues to be rooted firmly in a school base. Totten (1970) wrote that the school was the logical choice to be the leading agent in the implementation of community education because it is the agent of education.
with the greatest political neutrality in the community. In addition, Totten held that the school, the only element of the community commonly owned by all the people, should stimulate and coordinate the educational contributions of other agencies in the community.

Minzey (1972), writing in *Phi Delta Kappan*, further clarified the school's role in the concept:

Community education is an educational philosophy which permeates basic beliefs. It enlarges and enhances the role of the public school so that it is quite different from before. The school becomes responsible for all aspects of education as it relates to the community. To further enlarge the conceptual base, education is no longer interpreted to mean formal types of classes but any experience leading to the more successful handling of experience. Thus the public schools have some kind of responsibility for almost all activities that take place within a community. The school, however, does not become all things to all people. It attempts to act as the coordinator, facilitator, or initiator to see that these needs are met. The school plays a catalytic role, serving an organizing function. (p. 152)

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) summarized the relationship between the school and the community education concept when they pointed out that the school is the delivery system for the concept. They held that, philosophically, community education is concerned with the problems and needs of the community. The authors added that the school, because of
its unique location and good facilities, is the base for community education's problem-solving activities.

Community education's philosophical concern for the problems and needs of the community indicates the concept involves processes as well as programs. Martin and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) maintained community education is a process by which the educational or social environment of the community provides an opportunity for involvement of people in assessing needs, identifying problems, and proposing solutions to problems. They further held that community education programs should evolve from this process; they should not be imposed on the community.

Other sources have stressed the dual importance of process and programs in the community education concept. Minzey and LeTarte (1972), writing in Community Education: From Program to Process, stated that there is a vital difference between process and program. They added that this difference is so important that without an awareness on the part of community educators of the meaning and potential of each term, community education will probably not make the significant changes which it is capable of making. Hickey and Van Voorhees (1969) identified this difference by stating that "programs are overt activities which are designed
Van Voorhees (1971) proposed that community education programs and processes can be related to five basic premises which undergird the community education philosophy:

1. In every community every person has unmet needs.

2. In every community there are currently untapped skills and talents.

3. In every community there is unused and available space and equipment.

4. In every community every agency and every institution desire to serve the people.

5. In every community, premises 1-4 can be coordinated through the community education process. (p. 3)

What can happen in a community when the community education process coordinates the first four premises outlined by Van Voorhees? Gregg (1969), commenting upon the everyday operations of a community education program, provided some suggestions. He indicated that community education provides for (1) extensive community involvement in improving the K-12 instructional program, (2) preschool learning experiences for 3- and 4-year-olds, (3) programs for the enrichment of children and youth, (4) adult and senior-citizen activities, and (5) involvement of the community in problem-solving.
The literature of community education is replete with descriptions of programs and processes similar to the list offered by Gregg (1969). Minzey (1974) hypothesized that the community education concept can be divided into six components which encompass all its programs and processes. The six components he identified included (1) the traditional day-school program, (2) extended use of community facilities, (3) additional programs for school-age children, (4) programs for adults, (5) delivery and coordination of community services, and (6) community involvement. Because of the importance of these six components to the goals of this study, literature pertinent to each component will be examined.

**Traditional day-school program**

Philosophically, community education demands changes in the traditional day-school program. Olsen (1972) commented upon the need for this change:

What really needs changing is not testing or report-carding or tracking or class size or disciplinary procedures or school publicity or any other limited factor or combination of factors. What must be changed is the basic curriculum purpose and pattern—not by tinkering around the edges, not by dropping this subject and adding that unit, but rather by redesigning the whole youth curriculum in a new and really relevant way. (p. 8)
The community school curriculum demands that teachers and students move out from the "four walls" of the classroom, into the larger classroom of the community:

The community is the classroom. Children are learning as they live. The natural learning environment is a rich one indeed, yet today many children are experiencing difficulty with a school curriculum which makes limited use of this valuable resource. A major problem in education is that present-day instructional programs are not related to children's home and community experiences. For many children the community and the classroom are two different, unrelated worlds. Perhaps these two worlds can become one if the community is used effectively and extensively as a learning laboratory. (Irwin & Russell, 1971, p. 3)

Such changes in curriculum, according to Harris (1971), must come about as the result of teacher-pupil planning of learning experiences. He wrote that the curriculum in a school committed to community education is centered around the problems of the community which are discovered by the students through studies and surveys. Further, Harris contended that this approach permits the student to learn subject matter in conjunction with the skills needed to reach decisions and solve problems.

Finally, the community education philosophy directs the traditional day school to realize that it is only one of many agents of education at work in the community.
Boles and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) wrote that the philosophy directs the school to recognize the following: (1) it is not solely responsible for all educational functions in the community; (2) it is not the sole agent of education in the community; and (3) it may not even be the primary educational influence in the life of the child. Hence, it can be seen that the philosophy envisions basic changes in the traditional day-school program.

Extended use of community facilities

Community education advocates a sharing of community facilities. Minzey (1974) wrote:

It has long been a contention of community educators that school buildings are used only a fraction of the time that they could be used. Many communities build additional facilities such as recreation buildings, community centers, and boys clubs to be used while the school buildings stand idle. There is often an abundance of unused space in most communities in school buildings, fire halls, churches, city buildings, and recreation facilities and maximum use should be made of these facilities before new ones are constructed. School buildings, in particular, should become a focal point for community activities and services. (p. 58)

Additional rationale for broadened use of school facilities was offered by Musmanno (1968) when he maintained
that the school should be the most effective community center in town because "it is nonsectarian, it is nonpartisan and is a truly public building" (p. 55). Cowan (1966), writing in the American School Board Journal, offered similar testimony by contending that full use of school facilities provides taxpayers with a better return on their investment in schools.

The philosophy not only encourages a sharing of school and community resources, it also calls attention to the total needs of the community in planning new facilities. Zirkel (1965) discussed the importance of this kind of planning:

In planning any kind of school building it is the duty of every school board and superintendent to find out the educational and social needs of the people in the community. These needs should be incorporated into the plan of every building so that the taxpayer can get the greatest return from the investment in the building. (p. 34)

Additional programs for school-age children

The community education concept assumes that there is an ever-increasing need for additional activities and education for children. Totten and Manley (1969) explained that the concept allows children to use schools and other
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community facilities during their unscheduled hours to satisfy curiosities and creative interests. They held that, where needed, the school should provide recreational, avocational, cultural, enrichment, and remedial learning activities for youngsters.

Hovis (1974) warned that in providing such activities, the school and community agencies must know one another's strengths and weaknesses in order to provide youngsters with the best services possible. He contended that a coordinating agency in every community should be responsible for the identification and inventory of services available to the community in order to avoid unnecessary duplications in services to community members.

The community education process advocates cooperation and coordination, not only to avoid waste, but also to assure improved programs for youngsters. Martin and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) advanced the notion that no one agency, not even the school, can do the job of total education for the community. They added that the school must relinquish activities to other agencies better equipped to provide the activity. In short, the community education philosophy envisions an appropriate community agency providing needed programs for school-age children.
Programs for adults

The basic fact that education is a continuous process lies at the heart of the community education philosophy. Poster (1971), an English community educator, commented upon the concept of continuous education:

Education is a continuum. "While I live, I learn" should be the aim of every man. To learn is not merely to acquire knowledge, however. Learning is a currency which rapidly becomes debased if it is not kept in constant circulation. (p. 116)

Programs for adults, therefore, are considered highly important to the community educator.

Burrichter (1971), writing about community-adult education, pointed out that the community education process concerns itself with "whatever is required to help an individual achieve a more rewarding and productive life for himself, his family and society . . . " (p. 18). Some examples of the kinds of adult programs which might evolve from such a philosophy were provided by Gregg (1969):

Any adult activities can be developed where a need is shown. Activities may range from a desire to develop greater sensitivity in human relations to a class in grooming dogs. That is to say, adult activities, as well as those of children and youth, can vary from those dealing with some of man's most basic needs and desires to those encompassing some of his most frivolous leisure-time activities. (p. 109)
Delivery and coordination of community services

One of the process activities of community education involves the delivery and coordination of community services. Moon (1969) wrote that implicit in the concept is the proposition that community agencies must cooperate to promote the educative community. He further held that to deny the necessity of cooperation for the growth of community education is to deny the feasibility of community education.

Minzey (1974) pointed out that the need for cooperation should be obvious. He held that in most communities there is not a shortage of community services, but there is a lack of proper coordination. He further maintained that the school, by means of its school buildings and community resource personnel, can help identify problems and resources and provide the coordination necessary to bring these two together.

The philosophy behind the school's involvement in resource coordination was further defined by Boles (1973):

Community educators . . . believe in using the schools in better fashion and for more purposes than they have generally been used, but also in using all of the educative agencies of the community to help all of the people. They see the
community itself as an educational agency. (p. 85)

Hiemstra (1972) summed up the importance of coordination and delivery of community services when he contended that the development of the community into a living learning laboratory is simply not possible without close cooperation and coordination among community agencies.

Community involvement

The community education philosophy advocates the participation of community residents in the identification and solution of community problems. A recent publication of the National School Public Relations Associations (1973) conjectured that there is a rapidly spreading belief that this kind of citizen participation is vital to education within the community:

The fact is that school authorities have discovered they have at their disposal an abundant supply of public talent, time and willingness to work. Further, most school people believe this reservoir of public energy and wisdom can be useful to the school system, the community and the children. This usefulness is most often described in terms of "improved two-way communication," "school community interaction" and "participatory school administration."

Under the rhetoric lie practical results, dollar-and-cents achievements. (p. 5)

Kerensky (1968) provided a persuasive account of the
practical results of involvement:

The Community School Concept presents us with an alternative that can make a difference. It begins suggesting that until we get out into the community and become involved with all the people, we will only think we know what problems exist within the community. Once the problems that confront a community are identified, the school facility and its human resources become the focal point for the solution of these problems. The schools become immersed in the problems of the people. The schools become involved with the people who are involved in their schools. Given an environment for growth, communities will grow. (p. 1)

The kind of citizen involvement outlined above is often provided for in the community education concept through one or more citizen advisory councils. Parson and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) wrote that advisory councils have the effect of putting the community into the community education process. They held that a representative advisory council does more than just involve people for the sake of involvement: "Their participation in assessing needs, planning programs, and evaluating programs actually does produce better decisions . . . and results in better educational programs" (p. 171).

Sumption and Engstrom (1966), summarizing the importance of community involvement, also summarized much of the community education philosophy when they wrote that community involvement provides a wealth of sound advice on
community problems; provides a direct, continuing, organized contact with all the community; provides for wider community understanding of local problems, and enables lay persons to contribute to the full extent of their abilities.

With the philosophical concepts cited above in mind, the writer will now turn his attention to the importance of the teacher to the community education process.

**Importance of the teacher**

Melby (1968) argued that community education cannot achieve its goals without proper teacher attitudes. He indicated that teachers must become willing to view the community as a learning laboratory, address themselves to community problems, assume that all children can learn, be humble enough to learn with the children, and truly care about each child as a person. He held that these kinds of attitudes comprise the basis for true community education and that the "teacher we have described is a symbol of the spirit of the true community school" (p. 4).

Hence, the community education philosophy ascribes a different role for the teacher. Commenting upon this role, Campbell (1971) wrote that the traditional school was concerned about what the teacher taught, while the community
school is concerned about what and how children learn. He continued to describe this role of the teacher by indicating that the teacher "should be a diagnostician, a prescriber, and an evaluator" (p. 32). Further, Campbell held that the teacher must realize that the student gets motivation from a great many different sources and that some lay people may be more successful than the teachers themselves in teaching youngsters certain things.

Manley, Reed, and Burns (1969) offered an apt description of the kind of teaching staff sought in one community dedicated to the community education philosophy:

Flint wants a staff that is sensitive to community needs, problems, and concerns. There must be a willingness to listen, a genuine concern for the ideas and interests of others. The staff member must be a "team worker" willing to use the human and material resources in the community to solve problems and meet the various needs. An effective community-school staff will sense, encourage and develop resources. It will have the ability to make changes as new needs arise. It will have an interest in experimenting with new ideas and new methods. (p. 101)

Clancy (1972), a superintendent of schools, summarized the importance of teachers in community education:

That's the first firing line—the teacher in the classroom. That's where it is at. That is why we're all here. The relationship that exists between the teacher and the student is the school system. What happens there is most critical. Everything else that happens is
designed to support that and to make that real and relevant and meaningful. (p. 2)

In spite of the importance of the teacher to the concept, many regular day-school programs have failed to adopt the philosophy:

Probably the biggest frustration to active community educators today is the lack of acceptance of basic community education principles into the regular school day instructional programs. Many school systems across this nation have expanded their educational services by providing exciting after school, evening and summer learning experiences for community members of all ages. However, in most cases these same school systems continue to maintain very conventional and static regular school day programs oriented to "book learning." (Clark, 1974, p. 33)

Melby (1971), writing in the Community Education Journal, appeared to agree with Clark's assessment of the situation. He held that there is often too much of a separation between the evening program for adults and the day program for children. He added that teachers of the day program have little contact with the evening program and hence miss many opportunities to interact with parents of children they instruct during the day.

Again addressing himself to this problem, Melby (1971) expressed the frustration of many community educators when he questioned how a community school with a successful evening program could continue to produce drop-outs,
children with poor self-images, and children with no saleable skills. He answered his own query by pointing out that there is a lack of acceptance on the part of teachers of basic tenets of the community education philosophy.

Many community educators have pointed out that steps must be taken to integrate the normal day program into the community education process. Totten and Manley (1970) held that a primary task facing adherents to the philosophy is to eliminate the dichotomy between the K-12 and evening programs. They wrote that community education must be viewed as all of the learning activities that take place in the community from early in the morning until late at night. They affirmed that the core program for children must become part of the community education concept.

It would appear that teacher commitment to the community education philosophy is the vital step in efforts to eliminate this dichotomy. Moore (1971), citing "Strategies for Making Community Education Work," asserted that one of the weaknesses of many otherwise well-conceived community education programs is the failure to recognize the important role of the teacher. He argued that the work of the teacher often goes on with little or no change despite the commitment of the school district to community education.
Finally, he wrote that it is the joint responsibility of school administrators and teachers to deal with this problem and incorporate the teaching staff as part of the community education team.

The literature cited above and in Chapter I provides evidence of the claims of community educators that the teacher in a true system of community education encounters unique performance requirements; accepts a different and unique pedagogical role; maintains a different attitude toward students, adults, and the community; and espouses and accepts the philosophy of community education. An extensive literature review revealed little research related to teachers in systems of community education and a dearth of research related to the specific area of teacher attitude toward the community education concept.

Four studies, however, appear worthy of note. Patterson (1969) compared teacher attitudes toward innovation in six traditional schools and six innovative schools in Alabama. He found that teachers in innovative schools demonstrated more positive attitudes toward innovation than did teachers in traditional schools. Patterson concluded that the type of school organization, innovative or traditional, affected the teacher's willingness to innovate.
Dean (1971) compared graduates of Michigan State University's Mott Institute for Community Improvement (a community-education-oriented program) and graduates of the regular teacher preparation program at the same school. He found that graduates of the Institute demonstrated more understanding of urban community needs; were more concerned about these needs; were more apt to accept an urban teaching assignment; and remained in these assignments longer than graduates of the regular teacher preparation program.

Comparing community opinion leaders in the State of Michigan, Stark (1974) discovered that opinion leaders from communities with community education programs were more supportive of certain community education concepts. Specifically, opinion leaders from districts with community education programs showed more approval of the school's involvement in expanded recreational and social activities; efforts to solve or lessen social problems in the community; the full utilization of school facilities and equipment; and meeting the needs of school children, youth, and adults.

Finally, McGuire (1966) studied the school system in Flint, Michigan, to determine if elementary school teachers perceived a positive relationship between the day and
evening (community education) programs. McGuire found that less than a majority of the teachers sampled perceived that a student could benefit in the regular day program as a result of participation in the evening program. He did find, however, that teachers who were actively involved in the evening program perceived significantly greater student benefits from the evening program than teachers who were not active in the evening program.

Summary

Chapter II has traced the historical development of the community education philosophy and outlined the current community education philosophy. In both areas, special attention has been directed to the teacher's role in the concept. The literature outlined in this chapter demonstrates a void in the area of teacher understanding and acceptance of the community education philosophy. This study represents one attempt to fill this void.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Review of the Problem

The focus of the study was the systematic investigation of the extent of elementary teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy in southwest Michigan. The purpose of the study was to provide attitudinal data about elementary school teachers which, prior to the investigation, had been unknown. Specifically, the goals of this study were as follows:

1. To develop and test an instrument which would be useful in measuring the extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy (Appendix A).

2. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs.

3. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the six components of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs. (The items which comprise the six components are shown in Appendix B.)
4. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of program aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs. (The items which comprise the program aspects are shown in Appendix C.)

5. To determine the extent of differences in acceptance of process aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with community education programs and districts without community education programs. (The items which comprise the process aspects are shown in Appendix D.)

6. To determine which components of the community education philosophy received the greatest and least acceptance among all elementary teachers surveyed.

The Population and Sampling Methods

Population

The population for this study consisted of public elementary school teachers in the 134 school districts in southwest Michigan served by the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University. Excluded from the study were eight districts which had community education programs operative for less than 3 years. These districts were excluded because it was felt that 1 or 2 years of exposure to the community education philosophy was too
short a time period to produce significant changes in teacher attitudes. The writer anticipated that a minimum exposure of 3 years to the community education concept would provide a useful dichotomy for measuring differences between the two groups of teachers involved in the study.

The Community School Development Center's records indicated that 71 of the remaining 126 districts did not have community education programs, while 55 of the districts had programs operative for a minimum of 3 years (Appendix E).

The 1973-74 Michigan Professional Personnel Report, obtained from the Teacher Certification Office of the Michigan Department of Education, revealed that 5,704 elementary teachers were employed during 1973-74 in the 126 districts included in the study. The 55 districts with community education programs employed 3,137 (55 percent) of these teachers, while the districts without operative programs employed the remaining 2,567 teachers (45 percent).

**Sample**

The formula outlined by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was used to determine the sample size needed to be representative of the teacher population. Computations based upon this formula revealed that a sample size of 258 teachers
was large enough to permit the researcher to test for differences at the .05 level of significance.

A total of 142 teachers (55 percent of the original sample size) were selected at random from the 3,137 teachers in districts with community education programs, and 116 teachers (45 percent of the original sample size) were randomly selected from the 2,567 teachers in districts without operative community education programs. The teachers were selected from the State Alpha File, maintained by the Michigan Department of Education.

Description of the Instrument

Since no questionnaire suitable for measuring teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy could be found, the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI) was developed (Appendix A). The CEPI, a 63-item questionnaire, required respondents to react to each statement on a 5-point scale which measured the extent to which each statement reflected their own personal educational philosophy.

Responses to the CEPI were weighted numerically, with the following values: strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; no opinion = 3; disagree = 2; and strongly disagree = 1. Of
the 63 items, 5 were framed so that the response most in agreement with the community education philosophy was that under the heading of "strongly disagree." Because these 5 items were directionally reversed, their numerical weighting had to be reversed in order to keep them consistent with the other items.

Content validity

The original questionnaire was developed by the writer based upon a review of current community education literature. The CEPI was then reviewed by one member of the writer's doctoral committee. The committee member offered several suggestions for revision, which were incorporated into the questionnaire.

According to Lyman (1971), content validity is determined by the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content of a test. For the CEPI, content and face validity were determined by the use of feedback from (1) six professors of community education, (2) six directors of university regional centers for community education development, (3) five community-education doctoral students, and (4) five district-wide directors of community education.

These individuals were asked to decide if each of the
items was a part of the community education philosophy and if the instrument, as a whole, was reflective of the community education philosophy. In order for an item to be retained for use in the CEPI, a minimum of 90 percent of the individuals listed above had to "agree" or "strongly agree" that the item was a part of the community education philosophy. Four items were deleted because they did not meet the criterion outlined above. Hence, the final form of the instrument contained 63 items which were judged by the evaluators as being comprehensive, relevant, and reflective of the philosophy.

Reliability

Lyman (1971) held that it is generally recognized that reliability refers to the consistency of measurement of an instrument. Reliability for the instrument in this study was determined by the test-retest method, using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 113).

The CEPI was administered to 20 teachers. After 2 weeks had elapsed, the CEPI was again administered to the same individuals. Coefficients of reliability were determined for each of the six components being considered in
this investigation. The Pearson formula yielded the following correlations: Component 1, $r = .93$; Component 2, $r = .99$; Component 3, $r = .93$; Component 4, $r = .68$; Component 5, $r = .85$; and Component 6, $r = .96$. These generally high reliability coefficients, ranging from .68 to .99, indicate that the responses are fairly stable over a period of time.

Collection of Data

The data for this study were collected by means of a mail questionnaire. The mail questionnaire was used because of the large size of the sample and the geographic locations of the individuals to be surveyed. The researcher anticipated that a reasonable response to the survey would be possible because of the relative simplicity of the instrument and because of his belief that the opinions of elementary school teachers have been sought infrequently during recent years.

On November 14, 1974, the researcher sent a package of materials to each of the teachers in the sample. Included in this mailing were a cover letter which explained the purpose of the study, a copy of the questionnaire, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the
completed questionnaire. Each of the questionnaires was color- and number-coded to enable the researcher to cross-check the returns against the original mailing list.

On November 29, 1974, a follow-up set of materials was sent to all teachers who had not returned the original questionnaire. This second mailing included a personal, handwritten note to each teacher, asking for cooperation in returning the instrument. December 20, 1974, was selected as the cutoff date for returned questionnaires. The original mailing produced 126 returns, while the second mailing produced an additional 63 returns. In total, 189 questionnaires (73 percent of the original sample size) were returned.

Nonrespondents

Kerlinger (1973) indicated that a major problem with the mail survey often is a relatively low rate of return of questionnaires. He advised that, in cases where the returns are less than 80 percent, efforts should be made to learn something of the characteristics of the nonrespondents. In view of the return rate in this study, comparisons were made between respondents and nonrespondents on the following criteria: classification of school districts.
according to the presence or absence of community education programs, as shown in Table 1; sex of teacher, as shown in Table 2; and highest level of education attained, as shown in Table 3.

In analyzing respondent and nonrespondent groups, the first comparison utilized was the classification of the school districts according to the presence or absence of community education programs. The data in Table 1 indicated that teachers in districts with and without community education programs responded in similar proportions. Of the respondents, 53.9 percent were teachers from districts with programs, while 46.1 percent were teachers from districts without operative programs.

Table 1

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents by School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>With Program</th>
<th>Without Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondent</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\text{Total N = 258.}\)
The second comparison considered was sex. Table 2 indicated that females constituted 83 percent of the respondent group and 82.6 percent of the nonrespondent group. The Lawshe-Baker Nomograph (Lawshe, 1950), for testing differences between percentages, was used to determine that there was not a significant difference between the percentages of females and males in respondent and nonrespondent groups.

Table 2

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondent</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTotal N = 258.

The third comparison considered in the analysis of respondent and nonrespondent groups was that of highest level of education attained. The data in Table 3 indicated that teachers with the Bachelor of Arts degree accounted for 77.2 percent of the respondent group and 82.6 percent of the nonrespondent group. Teachers with the Master of
Arts degree accounted for 22.8 percent of the respondent group and 17.4 percent of the nonrespondent group. The Lawshe-Baker Nomograph, for testing differences between percentages, was used to determine that there was not a significant difference between the levels of education attained in the respondent and nonrespondent groups.

Table 3

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents by Level of Education Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Bachelor of Arts</th>
<th>Master of Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrespondent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Total \(N = 258\).

Kerlinger (1973) held that a response rate of 80 percent represented a very good rate of return for studies using the mail-questionnaire technique. The preceding analysis of respondent and nonrespondent groups, together with the overall response rate for this study (73 percent), suggested that the potential source of sampling error associated with the nonreturn of 69 out of 258 questionnaires would be relatively slight.
Data Analysis

The data were analyzed with the aid of the computer center facilities at Western Michigan University. Each response to the CEPI was coded and keypunched according to the numerical weights assigned each response alternate on the questionnaire. In addition, responses were coded by school district (presence or absence of a community education program) to enable the researcher to separate the data for purposes of analysis.

The t test for independent samples (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 295) was utilized to determine if a significant difference in acceptance of the community education philosophy existed among teachers in districts with and without community education programs. Mean scores for these groups on each of the 63 items on the CEPI were compared at the .05 level of significance.

The t test for independent samples was also utilized to test for the presence of significant differences in acceptance of the six components of the community education philosophy among the two groups of teachers. Mean scores for those items comprising each of the six components were compared at the .05 level of significance. In addition,
an overall mean score for those items comprising each component was obtained in order to determine which components of the philosophy received the greatest and least acceptance among all teachers surveyed.

Finally, the t test for independent samples was employed to analyze the extent of differences in acceptance of program and process aspects of the philosophy among the two teacher groups. Mean total scores for all items comprising the program aspects of the philosophy were compared. Further, mean total scores for all items comprising the process aspects of the philosophy were compared. In both cases, the .05 level of significance was utilized.

This chapter has provided a review of the problem of this study, a description of the source of the data for the investigation, a description of the instrument used in the study, a review of the procedures used in collecting the data for the study, and a résumé of the methods of data analysis employed in this investigation. Chapter IV provides an analysis of the data collected, and details the findings of the study.
CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

The present study was designed to determine the extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy in southwest Michigan. Specifically, the investigation compared elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs to determine the extent of differences in acceptance of (1) the community education philosophy, (2) the six components of the philosophy, (3) the program aspects of the philosophy, and (4) the process aspects of the philosophy.

The data utilized in the study were analyzed by use of appropriate correlation coefficients and the t test for independent samples. The results of these analyses are presented below with appropriate tables and discussion.

Findings

Goal one

The first major goal of this study was to develop and
test an instrument which would be useful in measuring the extent of teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy. This goal was achieved by the development of the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI).

The CEPI, a 63-item questionnaire, was developed by the writer based upon a review of current community education literature. Content and face validity for the instrument were determined by the use of feedback from 22 professionals in the field of community education. The test-retest method, utilizing the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, was employed to evaluate the reliability of the instrument. Based upon the procedures outlined above, the CEPI was judged to be comprehensive, relevant, and reflective of the philosophy.

**Goal two**

The second major goal of the investigation was to determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs. Table 4 presents the t test on each of the 63 items in the CEPI.

Statistically significant differences were found
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Districts with Programs</th>
<th>Districts without Programs</th>
<th>t(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.69 .547</td>
<td>4.37 .733</td>
<td>3.39b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.41 .655</td>
<td>4.30 .946</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.16 .829</td>
<td>4.05 .926</td>
<td>0.90c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.55 1.066</td>
<td>3.19 1.006</td>
<td>2.36c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68 .967</td>
<td>3.55 .949</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.76 .757</td>
<td>3.56 .808</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.40 .493</td>
<td>4.33 .787</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.79 .876</td>
<td>3.73 .975</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.14 .689</td>
<td>4.00 .863</td>
<td>1.25c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.54 .875</td>
<td>3.23 1.081</td>
<td>2.14c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.09 .770</td>
<td>3.97 .784</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.63 .545</td>
<td>4.28 .830</td>
<td>3.44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.98 .691</td>
<td>3.77 .949</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.10 .963</td>
<td>2.72 1.005</td>
<td>2.56c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.60 .770</td>
<td>3.71 .776</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.57 .516</td>
<td>4.51 .588</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.20 .716</td>
<td>3.95 .761</td>
<td>2.22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.42 .784</td>
<td>3.71 1.200</td>
<td>4.84b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.90 .931</td>
<td>3.90 .876</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.04 .891</td>
<td>4.25 .735</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.20 .772</td>
<td>4.28 .777</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.21 1.341</td>
<td>2.49 1.036</td>
<td>4.08b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.23 1.198</td>
<td>2.86 1.101</td>
<td>2.09c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.92 .610</td>
<td>3.85 .843</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.70 .806</td>
<td>3.54 .929</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.13 .552</td>
<td>4.08 .686</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.44 .886</td>
<td>3.19 1.050</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.84 .846</td>
<td>3.45 1.041</td>
<td>2.79b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.41 .494</td>
<td>4.43 .622</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.12 .777</td>
<td>3.67 .926</td>
<td>3.57b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.51 .595</td>
<td>4.44 .659</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.17 .496</td>
<td>4.19 .695</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.37 .946</td>
<td>3.56 .949</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.74 .736</td>
<td>3.74 .888</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.40 .846</td>
<td>3.19 .964</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Districts with Programs</th>
<th>Districts without Programs</th>
<th>t&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N (N = 186) and degrees of freedom (df = 184) may vary slightly on some items due to nonresponse.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .01 level; t = 2.59.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at the .05 level; t = 1.97.
between the mean item scores of the two teacher groups on 15 of the 63 items. Responses to items 4, 10, 14, 17, 23, 44, 55, and 62 were significantly different at the .05 level, while responses to items 1, 12, 18, 22, 28, 30, and 48 were found to be significantly different at the .01 level. On each of these 15 items, mean item scores of teachers from districts with community education programs were higher than mean item scores of teachers from districts without operative programs. This demonstrates greater acceptance of these items on the part of teachers from districts with community education programs.

Item 4 posited that "the school should be responsible for identifying community resources and coordinating these resources to attack community problems." Item 14 held the school responsible for organizing the community on a local level in order to develop the "community into the best it is capable of becoming." Items 10 and 55 concerned the school's role in the provision of cultural and avocational activities for adults.

Item 17 contended that "the school should provide a full program of intramural athletic activities for boys and girls"; item 23 held the school responsible for the provision of preschool activities for 3- and 4-year-olds.
Item 44 asserted that "authority for education should rest only in the hands of professional educators." Item 62 advocated that the needs of the entire community be considered in planning the construction of new facilities.

Of the seven items to which responses were found to be significantly different at the .01 level, five related to extended usage of community facilities. Item 1 held that "the school plant belongs to the community and its use should be maximized beyond the academic school day."

Items 12 and 30 urged that the school building be kept open beyond the hours of the "normal" school day. Item 18 stated that "school buildings which are used only by school-age children represent a wasted community resource"; item 22 posited that "school buildings should be thought of as community centers."

Items 28 and 48, which also showed significant differences at the .01 level, related to the school's role in adult education. Item 28 maintained that the school is responsible for providing all adults with a basic education. Item 48 contended that the school is responsible for providing adults with recreational activities. The implications of the 15 intergroup differences outlined above are discussed in Chapter V.
The mean total score on the CEPI for the two groups of teachers was computed and analyzed (Table 5). Results of this analysis revealed a significant difference between the mean total scores of the two groups at the .05 level (two-tailed test). The mean total score of teachers from districts with operative programs was higher than the mean total score of teachers from districts without programs.

Table 5

Mean Total Scores for Instructional Staff Groups on Community Education Philosophy Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With programs</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>2.48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without programs</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186  df = 184

a Significant at the .05 level; t = 1.97.

Goal three

The third major goal of this study was to determine the extent of differences in acceptance of the six components of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs.
The 63 items of the CEPI were grouped into the six components of the philosophy. Component 1 (traditional day-school program) contained 13 items; Component 2 (community facilities) contained 10 items; Component 3 (additional programs for school-age children) contained 9 items; Component 4 (adult programs) contained 10 items; Component 5 (delivery and coordination of community services) contained 9 items; and Component 6 (community involvement) contained 12 items. A listing of the items which comprise the six components can be found in Appendix B.

Mean total scores of the items which comprise each of the components are shown in Table 6. Statistically significant differences were found between the mean component scores of the two teacher groups on four of the six components. Responses to Components 3, 4, and 6 were significantly different at the .05 level, while responses to Component 2 were found to be significantly different at the .01 level.

Component 3 concerned the school's role in providing programs for school-age children in addition to programs provided during the "normal" school day. Component 4 was related to the school's responsibility in providing a wide range of programs for adults. Component 6 concerned the
Table 6

Mean Component Scores for Instructional Staff Groups on Community Education Philosophy Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp.</th>
<th>Districts with Programs</th>
<th>Districts without Programs</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186  df = 184

^a Significant at the .01 level; t = 2.59.

^b Significant at the .05 level; t = 1.97.

role of the school in promoting the involvement of the citizenry in school and community activities and problems. Component 2 was related to the extended usage of community facilities. In each of these four components, mean scores of teachers from districts with programs were higher than mean scores of teachers from districts without programs.

Goal four

The fourth major goal of the investigation was to
determine the extent of differences in acceptance of program aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs.

Program aspects of the philosophy were defined operationally as those items in the CEPI which refer to specific, overt activities of participation by community members which are subject to limitations of time, place, or clientele.

The items which comprise the program aspects of the philosophy are listed below and can be read in Appendix C. These items include numbers 8, 10, 16, 17, 23, 28, 29, 34, 47, 48, 54, 55, and 58. Mean total scores for those items comprising the program aspects of the community education philosophy are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7**

Program Aspect Mean Total Scores for Instructional Staff Groups on Community Education Philosophy Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With programs</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without programs</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>2.59a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186 df = 184

aSignificant at the .01 level; \( t = 2.59 \).
The $t$ test for independent samples revealed significant differences (.01 level) between the two teacher groups in responses to the program aspects of the philosophy. Mean total scores of teachers from districts with operative programs were higher than mean total scores of teachers from districts without programs.

Goal five

The fifth major goal of the study was to determine the extent of differences in acceptance of process aspects of the community education philosophy among elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs.

Process aspects of the philosophy were defined operationally as those items in the CEPI which refer to extensive community involvement in planning, decision-making, and problem-solving. Specific examples include those processes outlined by Weaver (1972) in "National Study of Community Education Goals": coordinating, surveying, demonstrating, training, and promoting.

Of the 63 items in the CEPI, 11 were considered to meet the criteria outlined above: items 4, 11, 13, 14, 35, 37, 49, 50, 56, 57, and 60. (The process aspects are
shown in Appendix D.) Table 8 shows mean total scores for those items comprising the process aspects of the philosophy.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With programs</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>2.11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without programs</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186  df = 184

*Significant at the .05 level; t = 1.97.*

Statistically significant differences (.05 level) were found between the mean total scores of the two teacher groups on the items comprising the process aspects of the community education philosophy. Mean total scores of teachers from districts with community education programs were higher than those of teachers from districts without programs. This demonstrated greater acceptance of the process items on the part of teachers from districts with community education programs.
Goal six

The sixth goal of this study was to determine which components of the community education philosophy received the greatest and least acceptance among all elementary school teachers surveyed. An overall mean score for each component was calculated to facilitate a rank ordering of the data.

This ranking of overall mean scores of teachers on each of the six components is shown in Table 9. For purposes of comparison, rankings of mean component scores of teachers from districts with and without operative programs are also included in Table 9.

Table 9

Rankings of Mean Component Scores for Instructional Staff Groups on Community Education Philosophy Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts with Programs</th>
<th>Districts without Programs</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Comp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 9 revealed that Components 2 and 1 (means of 4.04 and 4.02, respectively) received the greatest acceptance from all elementary teachers surveyed. Component 2 concerned extended usage of school and community facilities. Component 1 related to the traditional day-school program.

Components 6 and 5 (means of 3.73 and 3.55, respectively) received the least acceptance among all teachers surveyed. Component 6 related to community involvement, while Component 5 concerned the delivery and coordination of community services. Overall mean scores of teachers on the six components ranged from 3.55 to 4.04. This range of scores indicated moderate to strong acceptance of the six components of the philosophy.

The data in Table 9 were also utilized to determine the relationship between the rankings of the mean component scores of teachers from districts with and without operative programs. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient formula (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 174) was used to calculate the correlation between the rankings of the mean component scores of the two teacher groups. The Spearman rho formula revealed a strong direct relationship (.89) between the two groups of rankings. This correlation, significant
at the .05 level (two-tailed test), showed that rankings of mean component scores of teachers from districts with and without operative programs were very similar.

Summary

Statistical analysis of the study data suggested the following conclusions:

1. Based upon analysis of individual items in the CEPI, significant differences in mean item scores of teachers from districts with and without community education programs were found on items 1, 4, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 23, 28, 30, 44, 48, 55, and 62.

2. The analysis of mean total scores on the CEPI revealed significant differences between the two teacher groups. Mean total scores of both groups of teachers, however, demonstrated a general acceptance of the entire philosophy.

3. Based upon analysis of the items grouped into components, significant differences were found in mean total scores of the items comprising Components 2, 3, 4, and 6. These components related to extended use of facilities, programs for school-age children, programs for adults, and community involvement. Overall mean scores of teachers on the six components revealed moderate to strong acceptance of the components.

4. Significant differences were found in mean total scores of the two teacher groups on items defined as program aspects of the philosophy.
5. Significant differences were found in mean total scores of the two teacher groups on items defined as process aspects of the philosophy.

6. Components related to extended usage of facilities and the traditional day-school program received the greatest acceptance among all teachers surveyed. Components related to community involvement and delivery and coordination of services received the least acceptance among all teachers surveyed.

7. The Spearman rho formula revealed a strong direct relationship between rankings of mean component scores of teachers from districts with and without operative programs.

This chapter has provided an analysis of the data collected for the study and has detailed the findings of the investigation. Chapter V provides a summary of the study and presents conclusions and recommendations derived from the findings of the investigation.
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The focus of this study was the systematic investigation of the extent of elementary teacher acceptance of the community education philosophy in southwest Michigan. The purpose of the study was to provide attitudinal data about elementary school teachers which, prior to the investigation, had been unknown.

Specifically, the investigation compared elementary school teachers in districts with and without operative community education programs to determine the extent of differences in acceptance of (1) the community education philosophy, (2) the six components of the philosophy, (3) the program aspects of the philosophy, and (4) the process aspects of the philosophy.

The population for the study consisted of public-school elementary teachers in the 134 school districts served by the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University. The population sample used in the study was
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comprised of 258 teachers selected at random from over 5,700 teachers employed in these school districts.

The instrument used in the investigation was the Community Education Philosophy Instrument (CEPI), developed by the writer. The CEPI, a 63-item questionnaire, required respondents to react to each statement on a 5-point scale which measured the extent to which each statement reflected their own personal educational philosophy. The data utilized in the study were analyzed by use of appropriate correlation coefficients and the t test for independent samples.

Analysis of teacher responses to the CEPI yielded the following results:

Mean total scores on the CEPI.--Analysis of the mean total scores on the CEPI for the teacher groups revealed a significant difference between the two groups of teachers at the .05 level (see Table 5, p. 71). The mean total score of teachers from districts with operative programs in effect for a minimum of 3 years was higher than the mean total score for teachers from districts without programs. These results indicated greater acceptance of the philosophy as a whole by teachers from districts with community education programs. It is important to note, however, that the mean total scores of both instructional staff groups
demonstrated a moderate acceptance of the entire philosophy.

**Individual items in the CEPI.**—Statistically significant differences were found between the mean item scores of the two teacher groups on 15 of the 63 items. Responses to 8 of the items were significantly different at the .05 level, while responses to 7 of the items were significantly different at the .01 level (see Table 4, p. 67).

On each of these 15 items, mean item scores of teachers from districts with community education programs were higher than mean item scores of teachers from districts without operative programs. This indicated that teachers from districts with programs were more accepting of these 15 items than were teachers from districts without programs. Mean item scores of teachers from districts without programs, however, demonstrated moderate to strong acceptance of 13 of the 15 items. In other words, even though significant differences were found between responses, both instructional staff groups indicated at least moderate acceptance of almost all of these items.

**Six components of the CEPI.**—Statistically significant differences were found between the mean component scores of the two teacher groups on four of the six components.
(see Table 6, p. 73). Responses to Component 3 (additional programs for school-age children), Component 4 (programs for adults), and Component 6 (community involvement) were significantly different at the .05 level. Responses to Component 2 (extended use of community facilities) were found to be different at the .01 level of significance.

In each of these four components, mean scores of teachers from districts with programs were higher than mean scores of teachers from districts without programs. Mean component scores for both instructional staff groups, however, revealed moderate to strong acceptance of each of the six components.

A comparison of the rankings of the mean component scores (Table 9, p. 77) revealed a strong direct relationship (significant at the .05 level) between the rankings of the mean component scores of teachers from districts with and without operative programs. In other words, the rankings of the degree of acceptance of the six components by the two teacher groups were very similar.

Program aspects of the CEPI.—Data analysis revealed significant differences (.01 level) between the two teacher groups in responses to the program aspects of the philosophy (see Table 7, p. 74). Mean total scores of teachers
from districts with operative programs were higher than mean total scores of teachers from districts without programs. This indicated greater acceptance of the program aspects of the philosophy by teachers from districts with community education programs. Program-aspect mean total scores for both instructional staff groups, however, indicated a general trend of moderate acceptance of the program aspects of the philosophy.

Process aspects of the CEPI.—Statistically significant differences (.05 level) were found between the mean total scores of the two teacher groups on the items comprising the process aspects of the community education philosophy (see Table 8, p. 76). Mean total scores of teachers from districts with programs were higher than those of teachers from districts without operative programs. This demonstrated greater acceptance of the process aspects by teachers from districts with operative programs. Again, it should be noted that process-aspect mean total scores indicated a general trend of moderate acceptance of the process aspects of the philosophy by both groups of teachers.
Discussion of Findings

Differences in acceptance of philosophy as a whole

The results of the study revealed that there were differences in the extent of acceptance of the community education philosophy among instructional staff groups from districts with and without community education programs. In general, teachers from districts with programs in existence for at least 3 years showed greater acceptance of the philosophy than did teachers from districts without operative programs. These results appear to confirm the claims of Kerensky and Melby (1971), Whitt (1971), and Clark (1972) that teachers who are exposed to community education programs within their own school district tend to be more supportive of the concept.

It is important to note, however, that both teacher groups consistently demonstrated moderate to strong acceptance of the philosophy. Both groups indicated at least moderate acceptance of the philosophy as a whole, the six components of the philosophy, the program aspects of the philosophy, and the process aspects of the philosophy. This general acceptance of the philosophy by both instruc-
tional staff groups provided evidence that, in a geographic area well saturated with community education programs, most teachers are aware of the concept and, as a result of this awareness, tend to be more accepting of the concept.

The general findings of the study do not support the contention of Melby (1971) and others that there is a lack of acceptance on the part of teachers of the basic tenets of the philosophy. Quite to the contrary, responses to the CEPI revealed, among teachers in southwest Michigan, that there was moderate to strong acceptance of these basic tenets.

Additionally, study results indicated that proponents of community education in southwest Michigan need not fear, as did Kerensky and Melby (1971) and Hanna (1972), that a lack of teacher acceptance will hinder the development of community education programs. Indeed, the study revealed that at least a modicum of teacher acceptance exists even in those districts without programs. In short, it does not appear that a lack of teacher acceptance of the concept will be a roadblock to efforts to begin new programs.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the findings of this investigation do not lend credence to the argument of Minzey and LeTarte (1972) that the major difference
between teachers in traditional schools and community schools can be found in their philosophies of education. Although the present study revealed greater acceptance of the philosophy on the part of community school teachers, it did not reveal that the two instructional staff groups espoused fundamentally different educational philosophies.

Differences in acceptance of individual items in CEPI

The significant differences between instructional staff group responses to 15 of the 63 items in the CEPI were perhaps the most important discovery of this investigation. The isolation of these 15 items was crucial to the study because they represent the specific parts of the philosophy in which differences between groups were detected. Teachers from districts with operative programs showed significantly greater acceptance of each of these items than did teachers from districts without programs.

If the two teacher groups were to be viewed as an external criterion for purposes of item validation of the instrument, then these 15 items might be considered the specific parts of the philosophy which demonstrate its uniqueness. Stated differently, the 48 other items in the
CEPI might be viewed as general statements which can be accepted by any teacher regardless of philosophical orientation.

Of the 15 items, 6 related to extended usage of facilities. Specifically, these items focused upon maximizing the usage of local school buildings by keeping them open for extended periods of time, viewing school buildings used only by children as wasted community resources, thinking of school buildings as community centers sometimes used for educating children, and considering all the educational needs of the community when planning the construction of new school facilities.

It is not surprising that differences in teacher responses were found in the area of extended school facility usage. The "lighted school," open at night, is perhaps the best-known characteristic of community education in southwest Michigan. The little red schoolhouse, with lights ablaze, has become a widely recognized symbol of community education as a result of extensive media campaigns conducted by local community education directors.

When a local school district adopts the community education concept, the change most apparent to the teacher is probably the extended usage of school and classroom
facilities once thought to be the private domain of the "regular school" teacher. The results of this study have provided evidence that teachers have accepted this change. Again, these results supported the contention of Kerensky and Melby (1971), Whitt (1971), and Clark (1972), that exposure to the concept tends to bring about acceptance.

Of the 15 items in which significant differences were found, 4 related to the school's provision of adult basic education and cultural, recreational, and avocational activities for adults. These differences were not unexpected, because community educators have placed a great deal of emphasis upon adult programming. Community education, as a result, is viewed by many educators in southwest Michigan as a process of keeping the schools open in the evening to provide educational opportunities for adults.

Further, state and federal funds are available in abundance for adult basic education and high-school completion programs. The availability of these monies has prompted community educators to offer cultural, recreational, and avocational activities for adults in order to get them into the building and perhaps, later, into adult basic education or high-school completion programs. Study results indicated that teachers in southwest Michigan
exposed to adult programming have accepted, and are supportive of, this emphasis.

Significant differences were discovered in teacher responses to five other items in the CEPI. Three of these items concerned the process-related activities of organizing the community on a local level, identifying and coordinating community services, and involving lay people in educational decision-making. The final two items related to the school's responsibility for providing preschool and intramural activities. Greater acceptance of these five items by teachers in districts with community education programs may be attributed to emphasis in these districts upon expanded programming in nontraditional areas (preschool), close relationships with local agencies, and the establishment of community councils to promote citizen involvement.

Differences in acceptance of six components

Teachers from districts with community education programs showed significantly greater acceptance of components related to extended facility usage, programs for adults, additional programs for school-age children, and community
involvement. These results lend further support to the conviction of Kerensky and Melby (1971), Clark (1972), and Whitt (1971), that exposure to community education programs will result in greater acceptance of the concept.

Perhaps the most surprising result of the analysis of differences in acceptance of the six components of the philosophy was that differences did not exist in teacher acceptance of the items comprising the traditional day-school program. Keidel (1969), Melby (1968), Hiemstra (1972), Irwin and Russell (1971), and others have steadfastly maintained that community school teachers are unique because they (1) advocate the use of community resources in the classroom, (2) view the community as a laboratory for learning, (3) bring the "community into the classroom" and the "classroom into the community," (4) understand that life experiences teach more than academic study, (5) show great concern for the self-concept of the child, and (6) adhere to other aspects of the community education philosophy.

The present study revealed that teachers from districts with and without community education programs demonstrated a high level of acceptance of items such as those listed above. In fact, teachers from districts without
programs showed slightly more acceptance of items of this nature than did teachers from districts with programs.

The conclusion of the researcher is that the community education philosophy, as it relates to the traditional day-school program, is a collection of general pedagogical principles which are espoused and accepted by most of the elementary school teachers in southwest Michigan. It would appear that proponents of community education have a great deal of work to do in defining the uniqueness of the philosophy as it relates to the traditional day-school program.

Minzey (1974) held that, historically, community education has developed along a continuum from Component 1 (the traditional day-school program) through Component 6 (community involvement). He pointed out that administrators and school board members are most comfortable with Components 1, 2, 3, and 4, which are dramatic, highly visible, and relatively nonthreatening to the community. Components 5 and 6, process-oriented and threatening, have tended to develop slowly.

The overall rankings of the mean component scores (see Table 9, p. 77) suggested that teacher acceptance of the components follows a similar continuum. Overall instructional staff group acceptance of the six components
demonstrated that Components 1, 2, and 3 received the greatest support, while Components 5 and 6 garnered the least support.

Further, the Spearman rho formula revealed that whether the teacher was employed in a district with or without an operative program made little difference in the rankings of the relative degree of acceptance of the six components. Both instructional staff groups tended toward acceptance of the components along the continuum from one to six. These results appeared to indicate that the teacher groups, like administrators and school board members, are more supportive of the dramatic, highly visible, and relatively nonthreatening components of community education.

**Differences in acceptance of program and process aspects**

Teachers from districts with community education programs demonstrated significantly greater acceptance of both program and process aspects of the philosophy. However, both instructional staff groups affirmed a general moderate level of support for both program and process aspects of the philosophy.

Weaver and Seay (Seay & Associates, 1974) and Minzey
and LeTarte (1972) have contended that most school districts first develop programs and then move into process activities. These authorities have maintained that many school districts experience difficulty and frustration in attempts to move from programs to processes. Minzey (1974) held that this difficulty and frustration reflects a "blockage" between programs and processes which is a result of the controversial nature of many process activities.

Interestingly, both instructional staff groups in this study showed greater acceptance of the program aspects of the philosophy. These results may reflect the fact that the program aspects of the philosophy are much more tangible and visible to the teacher. More likely, programs are not only more tangible and visible, but, due to the difficulties outlined above, schools included in the present study are emphasizing "program" more than "process"; hence there are many more programs for teachers to see and experience and, consequently, accept.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study dispelled any myths that teachers are by nature antithetical to the community education philosophy or that teachers within community education
districts adhere to and espouse a unique educational philosophy. Investigation findings suggested at least moderate acceptance of the community education philosophy on the part of almost all elementary school teachers in southwest Michigan. These findings have several important implications for the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University and for the community education concept.

Implication 1

Elementary school teachers are not adversaries of the community education movement. These teachers, the largest single professional educational group in southwest Michigan, are accepting and supportive of the community education concept. As such, they represent a largely untapped resource to proponents of community education.

It would appear that there are a myriad of ways in which this resource could be tapped in districts with community education programs. Elementary teachers might serve on advisory councils; help identify and recruit adult students for adult basic education and high-school completion classes; provide a communication link with parents; verbalize support for the concept to community residents, board
members, and school administrators; aid in the training of evening-program teachers; and share ideas and resources with the community education director. In districts without community education programs, teacher support would be an invaluable resource in convincing community residents, board members, and school administrators of the value of the concept.

The Community School Development Center should give serious attention to the identification and establishment of better channels of communication with teachers. Efforts should be made to use these channels of communication to fully determine how the center can better serve teachers and how teacher support might be directed toward further development of community education in southwest Michigan.

Implication 2

Little in-service training related to community education has been provided for teachers in southwest Michigan. In spite of this scarcity of in-service efforts, teachers in this study indicated a moderate level of acceptance of the community education philosophy. These results suggest that strong in-service training programs might increase teacher support of the concept.
The Community School Development Center should identify local community education directors who have attempted to develop an in-service program for their instructional staffs. The in-service methodologies of these directors should be reviewed, evaluated, and collated into a training model which could be made available to all local community education directors.

Special emphasis should be placed upon increasing teacher awareness and acceptance of those parts of the philosophy which received less than strong acceptance from teachers in this investigation. Specifically, these would include the process aspects of the philosophy as well as Components 5 and 6. Strong teacher acceptance and support in these areas would greatly aid efforts on the part of the community education director to move the school district in the direction of process-related activities.

Implication 3

Each year, hundreds of students graduate from Western Michigan University and enter the teaching profession. Many of these students have little knowledge or awareness of the community education concept. In an effort to rectify this situation, the Community School Development Center
should increase its efforts in dissemination of community education information to undergraduate teacher candidates at the university.

Special attention should be given to increasing rapport and communication with teacher education faculty members in order to increase opportunities to familiarize them with the concept. Further, center staff members should endeavor to make themselves available to present the community education concept to every section of the required course in "Teaching and Learning." In lieu of this, the center should develop and make available a community education curricular module designed for use by the teacher education department. This module would outline appropriate methods of introducing the concept during one 90-minute class session.

In addition, the center should expand and promote the community education option available as part of the student's directed teaching experience. The center should develop a plan for making every student teacher aware of the option to spend a portion of his directed teaching time working with an experienced community education director.
Implication 4

The CEPI should be further tested in the field and perhaps revised. These field tests should include other teacher groups, community education directors, and school district administrators. Additional field testing with teacher groups should give consideration to the 15 items in which significant differences between groups were discovered. Efforts should be made to determine if responses to these 15 items can be viewed as predictors of whether or not a teacher is employed in a district with an operative community education program. In addition, the 48 other items in the CEPI should be reviewed to determine if revision or exclusion is necessary.

Implication 5

Critics of the community education concept have often maintained that it is too general, seeks to do everything, and, hence, does nothing. The development of the CEPI represented the first attempt, that the researcher is aware of, to reduce the concept to a series of specific philosophical statements. The development of this instrument should not be the final attempt to focus upon the speci-
ficity of the concept. Additional research should be directed toward further clarification of the philosophy.
REFERENCES


Kerensky, V. M. What type of community education can make the difference? Unpublished manuscript, Florida Atlantic University, 1968.


Olsen, E. G. Dare we develop a relevant curriculum? *Community Education Journal*, 1972, 2(1), 8-12; 63.


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


Weaver, D. C. The emerging community education model. Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, 1972.


APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION
PHILOSOPHY INSTRUMENT
JOHN B. JEFFREY
2821 HEATHERDOWNS LANE
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49001

November 14, 1974

Dear Teacher:

Attached to this letter you will find a questionnaire which seeks your opinion on several issues related to education in your community. This questionnaire, basic to my doctoral dissertation at Western Michigan University, is designed to examine the educational philosophy of elementary school teachers in southwest Michigan.

This study is in no way designed to evaluate you as a teacher. Your responses will be treated confidentially and will be analyzed only as part of a group. Notice that your name is not required, but that a code number in the upper right-hand corner will be used to cross-check the returns against the original mailing list.

With this information in mind, may I ask for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire? Because you are one of a small number of teachers randomly selected for inclusion in this study, your response is highly important to the usefulness of the investigation. Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is included for your convenience.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John B. Jeffrey
Dear ________,

Several weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire which sought your opinion on several issues related to education in your community. As one of 250 professional educators chosen from over 5,000 teachers for inclusion in this study, your response is needed to make the results worthwhile.

As a former elementary school teacher, I realize how busy you are at this time of year. I am hoping, however, that you will take 15 minutes and complete this questionnaire. Your help is greatly appreciated!

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John B. Jeffrey

Note: This letter was written in longhand and attached to the original cover letter. A second copy of the questionnaire was included.
Community Education Philosophy Instrument

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

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
NO = No opinion
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree

1. The school plant belongs to the community and its use should be maximized beyond the academic school day. SA A NO D SD

2. There is an ever increasing need for additional educational opportunities for youngsters. SA A NO D SD

3. Public schools should be responsible for the education of both children and adults. SA A NO D SD

4. The school should be responsible for identifying community resources and coordinating these resources to attack community problems. SA A NO D SD

5. People want to make an input into the educational system which serves them. SA A NO D SD

6. The curriculum should receive its social orientation from major community problems and areas of community living. SA A NO D SD

7. People learn from their total environment, hence, the entire community should be considered a laboratory for learning. SA A NO D SD
8. If recreational activities for school-age children are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.

9. There should be ample opportunity for all members of the family to participate together within the school program.

10. If cultural activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.

11. Administrators, teachers, counselors, and community members should work together to develop educational goals and objectives in order to make community-centered learning experiences available to people of all ages.

12. The school building should be used only 6 or 7 hours per day.

13. The school district should have a citizen's advisory council that serves to inform school personnel of the community's needs, desires, and expectations.

14. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to develop community power and work toward developing the community into the best it is capable of becoming.

15. The school should share its resources with local social and governmental agencies.

16. Public schools should provide opportunities for adults to complete high school (earn a diploma).
17. The school should provide a full program of intramural athletic activities for boys and girls.

18. School buildings which are used only by school-age children represent a wasted community resource.

19. Enrichment experiences for children should be limited to what can be worked into the required class day.

20. All life experiences are educative.

21. The use of lay people in the classroom can be a great help to the classroom teacher.

22. School buildings should be thought of as community centers which are sometimes used for the education of children.

23. The school should be responsible for providing preschool activities for 3- and 4-year-old children.

24. The school should provide a wide variety of educational offerings for all members of the community.

25. The school, as a social institution serving the needs of the child and the community, has an obligation to work to improve the physical, social, economic, and psychological environment of the community.

26. People can and should make an input into the educational system which serves them.

27. The school should assume a leadership role in the solution of social problems.
28. The school should be responsible for providing all adults with a basic education.

29. The school should provide a remedial learning program for children who need such a program.

30. The school building should be open 12 or more hours per day in order to satisfy community learning needs.

31. Communication, by the school, with the community as a whole is not necessary.

32. The community is a resource for enriching the school program.

33. Life experiences teach more than academic study.

34. If vocational training for adults is not provided by another community agency, it should be provided by the school.

35. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to increase communication between the school and the community.

36. People, given an opportunity to sit down and discuss their problems, will work at finding solutions to those problems.

37. Because it can extend itself to all people, the school should marshal forces in the community and provide leadership in mobilizing community resources to identify and solve community problems.
38. The school should be closed to community groups needing a meeting place.

39. Education which occurs outside the school has a greater impact on the total development of the child than the "regular school" program.

40. Educational activities should be based upon the interests, needs, and problems of those for whom they are planned.

41. The student body which the school should be concerned about is all members of the community.

42. Community members who do not have children in school should have just as much voice in school affairs as do parents with children in school.

43. Every person, regardless of age, economic status, or educational background, has unmet needs and wants which require the help of others for solution.

44. Authority for education should rest only in the hands of professional educators.

45. The educational program can be made more relevant by bringing "the community into the classroom" and "the classroom into the community."

46. Maximum use should be made of existing community facilities (educational, religious, recreational, etc.) before new facilities are constructed.

47. The school should provide avocational (hobby) activities for children after the "normal" school day has ended.
48. If recreational activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.

49. The school should be a human resource center through which local agencies funnel their resources to the people of the community.

50. School personnel should help identify community problems and should provide the coordination necessary to bring these two together.

51. People in every community have untapped skills, talents, and services to share with others.

52. Teachers should concern themselves not only with what goes on in school, but with what goes on in every phase of community life.

53. The physical facilities of the school should be made available for use by any interested community group.

54. The school should provide additional enrichment activities for youngsters after the "normal" school day has ended.

55. If avocational (hobby) activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.

56. The school should cooperate with other agencies in developing common goals, identifying overlapping responsibilities, and recognizing voids in services provided.
57. The school should be responsible for providing each citizen with an opportunity to voice his own particular wants and needs.

58. The school should provide additional cultural activities for children after the "normal" school day has ended.

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

60. The school should seek the cooperation of all agencies dedicated to improving educational, cultural, recreational, and social life in the community.

61. Learning by the people of the community should be a lifelong process and a balanced program of learning experiences for all people should be provided by the school.

62. In planning the construction of a new school facility, the total learning needs of the community should be given consideration.

63. Parent conferences, home visits, and community service are an integral part of the job of the elementary teacher.

Thank you for your cooperation in providing this information. Please return the questionnaire in the envelope provided.
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APPENDIX B

SIX COMPONENTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY
Six Components

**Component 1: Traditional day-school program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The curriculum should receive its social orientation from major community problems and areas of community living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>People learn from their total environment, hence, the entire community should be considered a laboratory for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>All life experiences are educative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The use of lay people in the classroom can be a great help to the classroom teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Communication, by the school, with the community as a whole is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>The community is a resource for enriching the school program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Life experiences teach more than academic study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Education which occurs outside the school has a greater impact on the total development of the child than the &quot;regular school&quot; program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Educational activities should be based upon the interests, needs, and problems of those for whom they are planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>The educational program can be made more relevant by bringing &quot;the community into the classroom&quot; and &quot;the classroom into the community.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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No.  Item

52. Teachers should concern themselves not only with what goes on in schools, but with what goes on in every phase of community life.

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

63. Parent conferences, home visits, and community service are an integral part of the job of the elementary teacher.

Component 2: Extended use of community facilities

1. The school plant belongs to the community and its use should be maximized beyond the academic school day.

9. There should be ample opportunity for all members of the family to participate together within the school program.

12. The school building should be used only 6 or 7 hours per day.

18. School buildings which are used only by school-age children represent a wasted community resource.

22. School buildings should be thought of as community centers which are sometimes used for the education of children.

30. The school building should be open 12 or more hours per day in order to satisfy community learning needs.

38. The school should be closed to community groups needing a meeting place.

46. Maximum use should be made of existing community facilities (educational, religious, recreational, etc.) before new facilities are constructed.
No. Item

53. The physical facilities of the school should be made available for use by any interested community group.

62. In planning the construction of a new school facility, the total learning needs of the community should be given consideration.

Component 3: Additional programs for school-age children

2. There is an ever increasing need for additional educational opportunities for youngsters.

8. If recreational activities for school-age children are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.

17. The school should provide a full program of intramural athletic activities for boys and girls.

19. Enrichment experiences for children should be limited to what can be worked into the required class day.

23. The school should be responsible for providing preschool activities for 3- and 4-year-old children.

29. The school should provide a remedial learning program for children who need such a program.

47. The school should provide avocational (hobby) activities for children after the "normal" school day has ended.

54. The school should provide additional enrichment activities for youngsters after the "normal" school day has ended.

58. The school should provide additional cultural activities for children after the "normal" school day has ended.
**Component 4: Programs for adults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public schools should be responsible for the education of both children and adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If cultural activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Public schools should provide opportunities for adults to complete high school (earn a diploma).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The school should provide a wide variety of educational offerings for all members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The school should be responsible for providing all adults with a basic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>If vocational training for adults is not provided by another community agency, it should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>The student body which the school should be concerned about is all members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>If recreational activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>If avocational (hobby) activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Learning by the people of the community should be a lifelong process and a balanced program of learning experiences for all people should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Component 5: Delivery and coordination of community services

No. Item

4. The school should be responsible for identifying community resources and coordinating these resources to attack community problems.

15. The school should share its resources with local social and governmental agencies.

25. The school, as a social institution serving the needs of the child and the community, has an obligation to work to improve the physical, social, economic, and psychological environment of the community.

27. The school should assume a leadership role in the solution of social problems.

37. Because it can extend itself to all people, the school should marshal forces in the community and provide leadership in mobilizing community resources to identify and solve community problems.

49. The school should be a human resource center through which local agencies funnel their resources to the people of the community.

50. School personnel should help identify community problems and resources and should provide the coordination necessary to bring these two together.

56. The school should cooperate with other agencies in developing common goals, identifying overlapping responsibilities, and recognizing voids in services provided.

60. The school should seek the cooperation of all agencies dedicated to improving educational, cultural, recreational, and social life in the community.
Component 6: Community Involvement

No. Item

5. People want to make an input into the educational system which serves them.

11. Administrators, teachers, counselors, and community members should work together to develop educational goals and objectives in order to make community-centered learning experiences available to people of all ages.

13. The school district should have a citizen's advisory council that serves to inform school personnel of the community's needs, desires, and expectations.

14. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to develop community power and work toward developing the community into the best it is capable of becoming.

26. People can and should make an input into the educational system which serves them.

35. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to increase communication between the school and the community.

36. People, given an opportunity to sit down and discuss their problems, will work at finding solutions to those problems.

42. Community members who do not have children in school should have just as much voice in school affairs as do parents with children in school.

43. Every person, regardless of age, economic status, or educational background, has unmet needs and wants which require the help of others for solution.
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44. Authority for education should rest only in the hands of professional educators.

51. People in every community have untapped skills, talents, and services to share with others.

57. The school should be responsible for providing each citizen with an opportunity to voice his own particular wants and needs.
APPENDIX C

PROGRAM ASPECTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY
Program Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If recreational activities for school-age children are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If cultural activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Public schools should provide opportunities for adults to complete high school (earn a diploma).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The school should provide a full program of intramural athletic activities for boys and girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The school should be responsible for providing preschool activities for 3- and 4-year-old children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The school should be responsible for providing all adults with a basic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>The school should provide a remedial learning program for children who need such a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>If vocational training for adults is not provided by another community agency, it should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The school should provide avocational (hobby) activities for children after the &quot;normal&quot; school day has ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>If recreational activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>The school should provide additional enrichment activities for youngsters after the &quot;normal&quot; school day has ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>If avocational (hobby) activities for adults are not provided by another community agency, they should be provided by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>The school should provide additional cultural activities for children after the &quot;normal&quot; school day has ended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

PROCESS ASPECTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY
Process Aspects

No. Item

4. The school should be responsible for identifying community resources and coordinating these resources to attack community problems.

11. Administrators, teachers, counselors, and community members should work together to develop educational goals and objectives in order to make community-centered learning experiences available to people of all ages.

13. The school district should have a citizen's advisory council that serves to inform school personnel of the community's needs, desires, and expectations.

14. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to develop community power and work toward developing the community into the best it is capable of becoming.

35. School personnel should be responsible for organizing the community on a local level (area representatives) in order to increase communication between the school and the community.

37. Because it can extend itself to all people, the school should marshal forces in the community and provide leadership in mobilizing community resources to identify and solve community problems.

49. The school should be a human resource center through which local agencies funnel their resources to the people of the community.

50. School personnel should help identify community problems and resources and should provide the coordination necessary to bring these two together.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>The school should cooperate with other agencies in developing common goals, identifying overlapping responsibilities, and recognizing voids in services provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>The school should be responsible for providing each citizen with an opportunity to voice his own particular wants and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>The school should seek the cooperation of all agencies dedicated to improving educational, cultural, recreational, and social life in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY
## Districts with Community Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegan</th>
<th>Niles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek Harper Creek</td>
<td>Niles Brandywine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek Lakeview</td>
<td>Okemos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belding-Greenville</td>
<td>Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Paw Paw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgman</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Saranac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassopolis</td>
<td>Spring Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Springs</td>
<td>Sturgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Tekonsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>Three Oaks River Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock</td>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delton</td>
<td>Union City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Rapids</td>
<td>Vermontville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsburg</td>
<td>Whitehall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Haven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Kenowa Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Northview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Odessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleville</td>
<td>Thornapple Kellogg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskegon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskegon Mona Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskegon Orchard View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskegon Reeths-Puffer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Districts without Community Education Programs

Albion
Allendale
Athens
Bangor
Battle Creek
Battle Creek Pennfield
Benton Harbor
Bloomingdale
Bronson
Camden
Centreville
Climax
Coloma
Colon
Comstock Park
Constantine
Coopersville
Covert
Decatur
Dowagiac
East Grand Rapids
Eau Claire
Forest Hills
Galesburg
Gobles
Grand Ledge
Hamilton
Hartford
Haslett
Hastings
Holland
Holton
Hopkins
Hudsonville
Ionia
Jonesville
Kent City
Lawrence
Lawton
Lowell
Marcellus
Martin
Mason
Mattawan
Mendon
Muskegon Heights
Nevaygo
New Buffalo
North Adams
North Muskegon
Oakridge Park
Otsego
Parchment
Pittsford
Plainwell
Portland
Potterville
Quincy
Richland
St. Joseph
Saugatuck
South Haven
Stevensville Lakeshore
Stockbridge
Vicksburg
Watervliet
Waverly
West Ottawa
White Pigeon
Wayland
Zeeland
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