A Model for Development of a Community Education Program for Older Adults

Eric Charles Smith
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Adult and Continuing Education Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2944

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.
A MODEL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR OLDER ADULTS

by

Eric Charles Smith

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1975
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The accomplishments and personal growth attained during the last two years, culminating in this dissertation, would be unfulfilled were it not for the love and strength given me by my wife Ronnie and daughter Erin. To my parents, Charles and Verald Smith, go a debt of gratitude for their unceasing faith and support given me throughout 21 years of formal education.

Thanks and appreciation for their expertise, guidance and patience must go to Drs. William P. Viall, Uldis Smidchens, and Ellen Page Robin for overseeing this dissertation. Learning the fundamentals of a relatively new field, aging, was a difficult yet very rewarding experience. It is hoped that this experience and research will somehow manifest itself in quality programs designed for older adults.

My association with Western Michigan University was made possible through the faith and encouragement of Drs. Donald C. Weaver and Gerald C. Martin, two of the most dedicated community educators with whom I have been privileged to be associated.

Eric Charles Smith
INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
SMITH, Eric Charles, 1943-
A MODEL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR OLDER ADULTS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1975
Education, adult

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST OF TABLES | .................. | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | .................. | x |

## CHAPTER

I **THE PROBLEM** ............... 1

- Statement of the Problem .......... 1
- Rationale for the Study .......... 2
- Definition of Terms .......... 8
- Overview .......... 9

II **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE** ............... 11

- Needs and Characteristics of Older Adults .......... 12
  - Older adults in society .......... 12
  - Intelligence and learning ability .......... 15
  - Use of available services .......... 16
  - Director knowledge of older adult opinions .......... 17
  - Educational institutions .......... 18
  - Needs of older adults .......... 20

- Programming for Older Adults .......... 22
  - Present educational efforts .......... 22
  - Age-integration and age-separation .......... 23
  - Recruitment, participation, and involvement .......... 24
  - Community Services .......... 26
  - Needs assessment .......... 27
  - Programming .......... 28
  - Future goals .......... 30

- Community Education Programming .......... 31
  - Community education program components .......... 31
  - Needs assessment .......... 35
  - Community advisory councils .......... 36
  - Community education and older adults .......... 39
Community Education Leadership

Leadership role
Leadership skills

Summary of Findings from the Review of Literature

Characteristics of older adults
Limitations in learning
Needs
Educational response to needs of older adults
Agency cooperation and coordination
Needs assessment
Participant involvement
Facilities usage
Program techniques
Leadership
Goals of community education

III DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Review of the Problem
Selection of the Populations
Michigan directors
Center directors
Experts on aging

Instrument Development

Field survey instrument
Personal interviews with selected experts on aging

Instrumentation

Field survey instrument: part one
Field survey instrument: part two
Field survey instrument: part three
Personal interviews with selected experts on aging

Data Collection

Field survey instrument
Response to the field survey instrument
Personal interviews

Data Analysis

Field survey instrument

iv

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current programming for older adults</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interviews with experts on aging</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV DATA SUMMARY</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban, rural and suburban directors in Michigan</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training level of directors in Michigan</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program years in operation</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of respondents</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic considerations for program development</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and needs assessment processes</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant involvement in programming</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills needed by community educators</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program components</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming priority</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current programming efforts in Michigan districts</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, MODEL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Findings</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic considerations for program development</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and needs assessment processes</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant involvement in programming</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills needed by the community educator</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program components</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Development</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic considerations for program development</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and needs assessment processes</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant involvement in programming</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills needed by the community educator</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program components</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS, LIMITATIONS OF STUDY, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUMMARY</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Findings</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic considerations for program development</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and needs assessment processes</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant involvement in programming</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills needed by the community educator</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program components</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming priority</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Emerging Model of community education</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and center director response patterns</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field testing the model</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs of community educators</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research needs</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the problem</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design and procedures</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A National Study of Community Education Goals</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master List of Gerontology Ideas</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Community School Development Centers in the United States</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Field Survey Instrument for Community Educators</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interview Questions for Selected Experts on Aging</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Personal Interview Responses from Selected Experts on Aging</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Analysis of Respondents</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responses on Use of Facilities for Older Adult Programming by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responses on Age Requirements for Participation by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Responses on Community Education Programming Schedules by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Responses on Role of Community Education in Providing a Specified Service by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Responses on Advisory Councils by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Responses on the Primary Function of Community Education by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responses on Assessing Needs of Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Responses on Concentrating Efforts on a Particular Segment of Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Responses on Program Leadership Among Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Responses on Skills Needed in Directing a Program for Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Responses on Leadership Skill Adjustment Needed in Working with Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Responses on Involving Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Responses on Activity Format by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Responses on Separated or Integrated Activities by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Responses on Programming Priority by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summary of Findings on Part One of the Field Survey Instrument for Community Educators</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Responses on Current Programming Involvement by Michigan Community Educators</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Responses on the Years Michigan Community Education Programs have Served Older Adults</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ranking of Responses about Current Programs of Social Activities for Older Adults in Michigan Community Education Districts</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ranking of Responses about Current Programs of Educational/informational Activities in Michigan Community Education Districts</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ranking of Responses about Current Programs Other than Social or Educational/informational Activities in Michigan Community Education Districts</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Responses to Questions of Proportion of Reported Activities for Older Adults which are Held in School Facilities, Operated by Community Education, and Funded by Community Education</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Responses to Question about Methods Used for Determining the Needs of Older Adults in a Given Area</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE | PAGE
-------|------
1      | The Emerging Model  7
2      | Process for Development of a Community Education Program for Older Adults  140
3      | Programming for Older Adults  147

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to gather and analyze pertinent information on community education and older adults and synthesize it into a model for development of a community education program for older adults.

Information used in this dissertation deals with older adults and community education. Specifically, there are three major concerns of the investigation: (a) program developments in the field of aging pertinent to community education theory and practice, (b) the role of community education in meeting the needs of older adults, and (c) leadership attributes needed by community educators in directing programs for older adults.

Through the process of developing this model, the following questions will be addressed:

1. What are some of the basic considerations which need to be addressed in developing programs for older adults?
2. What communications and needs assessment processes are appropriate in developing programs for older adults?
3. What levels of participant involvement are appropriate in planning and directing programs for older adults?
4. What leadership skills are needed by the community education director in developing programs for older adults?
5. What components are appropriate for inclusion in a community education program for older adults?
6. What priority should programming for older adults have relative to other community education programming efforts?

**Rationale for the Study**

Older adults in the United States comprise one out of ten citizens, and the percentage is increasing. While the increase is more a result of high birth rates sixty and more years ago and increasingly better health standards than of actual increased years of living, society is faced none the less with a growing segment of population with unique needs and characteristics.

In a society which has placed great value on youthfulness and productivity, the needs of older adults are frequently ignored, and are more often than not, given the lowest priority. As awareness becomes ever greater, the needs of older adults will be a mirror upon which all society must reflect. Questions arise concerning older adults and their role in today's society.

Are older adults to become total dependents on society, needing others to supply most of their needs?

Will the older adult be branded useless by society or will they fill useful and needed roles in community life?

A comprehensive review of the field of aging took place in 1971 with the White House Conference on Aging (1971). The purpose of the conference was to bring resources together from throughout the nation to formulate a National Policy on Aging (Fleming, 1971). Recommendations coming from the conference were seen as a new beginning in the approach to, and priority for the needs of older adults.

The education task force, as part of the White House Conference
on Aging, examined the role of educational institutions in providing services to older adults. Recommendation 23 (White House Conference on Aging, 1971) of this task force was that the existing educational system be made responsible for initiation, support and conduct of educational programs for older adults. Furthermore, full time staff devoted to these educational needs was recommended as necessary at both the federal and state levels. Concerning the possible educational agencies which offer the most service potential, Howard McClusky (1971), author of the background paper for the education section wrote:

Another promising development is the widespread development of the community school. Stimulated to a large extent by the example of the public schools of Flint, Michigan, and in part encouraged by subsidies from the Mott Foundation, the Flint type of community school is being adopted as a part of the regular school system in all parts of the country. The essence of the community school idea is that of service to all people of all ages in terms of their needs and preferences, often as a result of their participation in program development. Apparently the community school is more responsive than the traditional K-12 institution. It is quite possible that the community school either alone or in combination with the community college will become the most feasible, responsive and certainly the most universal vehicle for providing educational services for Older Persons. (p. 17)

Mason more recently noted the widespread development of the community
school as a promising development for meeting the needs of older adults (Mason, 1974).

Of the many educational concepts being forwarded today, community education holds great promise in addressing the needs of older adults. Started in 1935 in Flint, Michigan, through the initiative of Frank Manley and with the encouragement of Charles Stewart Mott, the movement has taken great strides since its inception. Primarily through the sponsorship of the C.S. Mott Foundation, community education today is gaining a national acceptance (Porter, 1975). As reported in the Community Education Journal (Tremper, 1974), data from the Mott Foundation indicate in part, the following statistics on community education.

1. 662 public school districts with community education programs.
2. 3,332 individual community schools in operation.
3. 1,496 trained community education directors.
4. 44 regional and cooperating centers located in institutions of higher learning and state departments of education.
5. 9 states providing direct aid for community education.

The philosophy of community education is one of mobilizing community resources toward the betterment of a community. Minzey (1972) describes the two main ingredients of community education as "program" and "process". "Programs" are particular activities designed to meet particular needs. The "processes" of community education are described by Minzey (1972) as (a) formation of representative community councils, (b) use of these councils to develop two-way communication between the council and the community, (c) development of community power, and
(d) exercise of community problem solving techniques. Minzey (1972) further contends that community education is the identification and coordination of community resources and mobilizing these resources toward solving community problems. Weaver (1972) defines the tasks of community education as (a) assisting residents to secure educational services, (b) coordinating community agencies, (c) identifying required resources, (d) surveying attitudes and interests, (e) demonstrating the humanistic approach to education, (f) providing programs for senior citizens, (g) training lay leaders, and (h) improving the public image of the school. Seay, et al. (1974) defines community education as "the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people—all of the people—of the community" (p. 11).

The modern philosophy of community education offers a possible vehicle for addressing the needs of older adults. Kenney (1973) and Showkeir (1974) attest to the use of community education in meeting needs of the older adult population as an integral need in and of itself and as a process for fostering lifelong education. While aluding to lifelong education as a goal, community education literature is largely devoid of specific mention of delivery systems for serving the older adult population. One notable exception is a series of Western Michigan University community education seminars on older adults (Martin and Robin, 1972). Some of the concerns which community educators must deal with if quality programs for older adults are to be developed are:

1. The many stereotypes and misconceptions surrounding older
adults.

2. The need to promote awareness of older adult needs.

3. The development of leadership skills specifically geared to older adult needs.

4. The development of specific goals and a delivery system to deal with local older adult needs.

In 1972, a paper was presented through the National Community School Education Association (now the National Community Education Association) concerning the goals of community education as perceived by leaders in the field (Weaver, 1972). Weaver (1972) found this major theme: While community educators reported program activities reflecting the Conventional Model (Appendix A) of community education, they indicated a desire for community education to move on to another phase reflecting a different model. The Conventional Model represents development of programs which are school-based, school-oriented and dependent upon the school for its facilities and resources. The new, or Emerging Model, reflects a desire on the part of community educators to become community-based, and community-oriented by serving the entire community through a coordination of all available resources (Weaver, 1972).

In developing the Emerging Model, (Figure 1), Weaver (1972) used as a framework the "Tri-Dimensional View of the Social Setting" (The Cooperative Development of Public School Administration in New York State, 1955). Weaver (1972) also incorporated into the model three leadership skill areas (technical, conceptual, human) as defined by Katz (1955).
Figure 1

THE EMERGING MODEL

The Social Setting (community)
1. societal malaise
2. community disorganization
3. dissatisfaction with the school
4. broadened definition of education

The Job (community education)
1. community oriented
2. natural, open-system
3. process-based
4. accountable to community

The Person (community educator)
1. personal requisites
   - objectivity
   - initiative
   - adaptability
2. skills
   - technical (high degree)
   - conceptual (high degree)
   - human
3. knowledges
   - organizational management
   - human behavior
   - social systems

(Weaver, 1972)
In view of the needs of older adults in our communities, Weaver's (1972) Emerging Model offers a sound conceptual base from which to further develop needed programs. The model demonstrates a two-way interaction among the three components (The Social Setting, The Job, The Person), which in turn reflects the environment in which community education must exist if it is to address itself to process. The model and its conceptual framework has been utilized by community education writers in studies of skills needed by the modern community education director (Johnson, 1973; Kliminski, 1974; Mott Leadership Program Handbook, 1970; Seay, et.al., 1974).

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Community Education**—"Community Education is the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people—all of the people—of the community" (Seay, et.al., 1974, p. 11).

   Operationally, a community education program is that program which is identified through listings available from the four regional Community School Development Centers serving local community education programs within the State of Michigan (Appendix B).

2. **Older Adults**—those adults at least 65 years of age. The term "older adult" is a preference of the writer; a neutral term taken from the many used (older person, senior citizen, golden ager, elderly) throughout the literature.

3. **Community Education Program for Older Adults**—the component of a community education program designed to meet the needs of older adults in a local school district area and operating under the
definition of community education.

4. Leadership Attributes- those behaviors of a person in a position of responsibility which lead a group toward goal accomplishment.

Operationally, leadership attributes will be defined as the composite personal requisites, skills and knowledges needed in order to direct a program (Weaver, 1972).

5. Model- McGrath (1972) explains a model as a form for conceptualizing about, and providing for standardizations and control of processes and definitions.

6. Needs of Older Adults- those, according to McClusky (1974), which fall into the categories of: (a) coping needs; needs essential for basic day to day living, (b) expressive needs; needs generally associated with leisure pursuits, (c) contributive needs; needs associated with the leading of a useful life, (d) influence needs; needs which seek change in societal patterns, and (e) transcendence needs; needs designed to achieve fulfillment at the culminating stage in life, to rise above limitations and be better than before.

Overview

This dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter Two presents a review of literature. Chapter Three will describe (a) the study design, and (b) the procedures used in gathering and analyzing various data. Chapter Four will present an analysis of questionnaire and interview responses. Chapter Five will be a presentation of the model program for older adults. The final chapter, Chapter Six, will consist of an interpretation of findings, limitations of the study, and
recommendation for further research.

The next chapter reviews the literature on (a) needs and characteristics of older adults, (b) program developments for older adults from the field of aging, (c) community education programming, and (d) leadership attributes needed by the community educator in developing programs for older adults. The section on needs and characteristics of older adults, while not a primary focus of this study, is included in order to provide a background of information which may be useful in developing the model.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Two contains four sections, consisting of: (a) needs and characteristics of older adults, (b) programming for older adults, (c) community education programming, and (d) leadership in community education.

Sections one and two include selections from the field of aging which appear to be of direct use to community education in developing programs for older adults. Section one on the needs and characteristics of older adults forms a base of information on older adults from which community education programming efforts could develop. Section two includes programming ideas and techniques selected from the literature on aging.

This dissertation developed from a community education orientation and while a thorough search of the literature on aging was undertaken, the sources which appear in this review of literature were selected as being representative of thinking in the field of aging. Only information and research was included which appeared to be (a) representative of current thinking in the field of aging, and (b) useful to community educators in developing programs for older adults.

Sections three and four were developed around theories and research reflecting the entire field of community education. Community education programming efforts have traditionally included participation by older adults as part of the total participation by other age groups within the community. Nevertheless, few studies and program materials are available to community educators in developing programs specifically
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for older adults. The intent in sections three and four is to utilize the most current literature on community education as a base for future older adult programming efforts.

**Needs and Characteristics of Older Adults**

**Older adults in society**

The mixture of myth and reality about the aged population has been of concern to those in the service professions which seek to serve older adults. While the connotation of "old" has been one such concern, commonly held misinformation about the older adult population has been of greater concern.

In the United States today, one out of ten in the population is over 65 years of age. The older adult population is not a homogeneous group. Two-thirds of all older adults live in a family setting, with an older adult as head of household in over 50% of these households. About 28% of the elderly live alone or with non-relatives. The percentage of older adults who live alone or with a relative (12%) is not increasing. Less than five percent of the older adult population live in an institutional setting (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971).

The income levels of most older adults is generally low. About 25% of the families with an older adult as head fall below the poverty line defined for that family type. While 90% of all older adults receive some retirement benefits, those benefits account for only 46% of all income for older adults (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971).

The proportion of older adults over 65 who live in rural areas is
40% as compared with 35% for the under 65 age population. The older adults who reside in metropolitan areas largely reside in the central city while younger adults comprise the majority in suburban areas (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971).

The black aged account for 6.9% of the total black population while the white aged account for 10% of the total white population. The life expectancy of blacks, while increasing, is still not as great as in the white population (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971).

Older adults are under-represented in educational activity participation more than would normally be expected. Adults between 50 years and 59 years of age were under-represented in educational activities, 13% out of an expected 16%, and it dropped thereafter to 6% out of an expected 12% for the 60-69 age group, and finally, to 2% out of an expected 9% of the over 70 age group (Knox, 1965).

In western civilization, old age has been defined formally as a criterion establishing eligibility for government benefits and for separating large numbers of persons from the primary work force (Clark and Anderson, 1967). Chronological old age has come to be synonymous with functional old age. Clark and Anderson (1967) stated the reasons for this as being the weaknesses of kinship ties, the rapid pace of change, the increase in the number of older adults, and the dominant emphasis in society on production.

Societal norms have placed great stress on the aging process in older adults. External elements have been a very efficient means toward producing symptoms of aging (Marcus, 1972). Elements such as
social class, work status and societal expectations all play a role in the aging process. Consequently, individuals who might otherwise experience few if any major changes in personal life style are in effect forced by society to deal with change. Smith (1973) stated that aging was a combination of physical decline plus the interaction between one's view of self and others' responses to the person. In a recent study (Copinger, 1973) it was found that the more socially active a person was, the more likely that person was to come in contact with societal forces which could produce artificial symptoms of aging. Joining the local senior citizens club, applying for discounts, and applying for government benefits might all be examples of contacts which could make an individual more age conscious. Copinger (1973) concluded that the definition of old age has largely been an artificial determination by society.

In summary, older adults are a very diverse population in terms of age, income, race, education, activity level, location, and health. Society often causes unnatural symptoms of aging through age related benefits, removal from the primary work force, and expectations of what changes take place in individuals upon their reaching certain age plateaus. Older adults are largely an independent population as far as maintaining their own households, and being free from disabilities which might warrant institutional care. Those agencies and persons seeking to serve older adults should reflect and consider the wide range of characteristics of this diverse population in developing programs for older adults.
Intelligence and learning ability

In a classic study of adult learning, Thorndike (1928) found the rate of learning ability to decline about one percent a year from age 22 till age 50. Similar results were later recorded by Miles and Miles (1932), Jones and Conrad (1933), and Lorge (1955). These cross-sectional studies lent support to the belief that increasing age is associated with a decline in learning ability. In 1953, a study was reported concerning use of Army Alpha Tests (Owens, 1953) on the same subjects over a period of many years (college freshman year, age 50, age 61). This longitudinal study reversed earlier learning decline theories through findings which supported the idea that intelligence decline was a generational, not an individual factor. In other words, an intelligence difference can be found when comparing two different age groups, say 20 year olds versus 60 year olds. Research indicated however, that comparing an individual's intelligence level over a long period of years will show that individual to have had no decline in intelligence. These findings were later confirmed in studies by Duncan and Barrett (1961), and Eisdorfer (1963).

Differences in learning ability have been found in younger versus older adults. With stress tests, older adults tend to score lower. Stress tests are those which require speed in responding, timed completion, or competitive behavior. When the stress factors are removed, cognitive behavior remains stable with increased age (Shaie and Strother, 1968). Much of the decline in coping with stress reactions comes from the physical decline in visual and aural retention (McGhie, Chapman, and Lawson, 1965). Welford (1958) made similar
observations concerning old age as a factor in diminished sensory and muscular processes, but not as a factor in central cognitive organizing processes.

In summarizing the findings on learning ability and intelligence variance in the aged, there is a need for community educators to consider intelligence development in terms of a specific age level. Intelligence differences between older and younger persons are not a result of decline in intellectual ability. There is also the need for community educators, in developing programs for older adults, to consider the stress factors which may be inherent in many learning situations.

**Use of available services**

What has been found to be true among other age groups concerning knowledge of available services also holds true for the older adult population. Those older adults with the greatest needs (low socio-economic level) had the least knowledge of available services (McCormack, 1972).

The following are other related research conclusions:

1. Sources of high and low morale among the elderly were more a result of health and finance factors than a result of other factors such as availability of services, greater area concentration of older adults or high levels of participation (Gabriums, 1970).

2. Family and friends provided the most information to and influence on older adults, while technical experts (social security, employment and social service personnel) were depended upon for technical advice (Hwang, 1971).
Community educators, based upon research about the availability of services to older adults, should consider that (a) knowledge of services will be directly related to the socio-economic level of the older adult, (b) health and finance factors will have a greater effect on the morale of older adults than other considerations such as availability of services, participation in activities, or living in an area which has a greater concentration of older adults, and (c) while older adults may depend upon technical advice for specific needs, they will gain most information from and be most influenced by family and friends.

**Director knowledge of older adult opinions**

Directors of programs for older adults knowledge of what the opinions of older adult program recipients would be on various questions was found to be inaccurate (Mooers, 1974). Mooers' study was part of a doctoral dissertation utilizing the opinions of four types of service providers in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, area contrasted with opinions of service recipients in a Meals-on-Wheels program. The service recipients were asked their opinions on topical areas, while the service directors were asked to record what they thought the opinions of the service recipients would be. Results showed the following:

1. In problem solving activity, older adults favored asking advice of professional social workers while service directors thought they would favor asking advice of family and friends.

2. In advice seeking activity, older adults favored seeking referral and informational services while service directors projected
their reliance on counseling services.

3. Both groups saw older adults as becoming, with increasing age, disengaged from society. To the older adult disengagement was viewed as a normal process. To the service directors disengagement carried a negative connotation.

Stiles (1971), in a dissertation concerning opinions expressed about the Tacoma, Washington, Public Schools, concluded that educational decision makers were not reliable indicators of either the actual opinions of or the estimates of opinions of community members.

Directors of programs for older adults should not assume, based upon available evidence, that they know what the opinions of program participants will be. Furthermore, directors should not assume that older adults view the aging process in the same positive or negative fashion as do program directors.

Educational institutions

In addressing the needs of older adults, educators have been in a unique position to contribute to the continued growth of older adults. While educational institutions are beginning to respond to these needs, questions do exist about the ability of educational institutions to respond adequately to these needs.

In a survey questionnaire (non-research oriented) mailed to members of the Gerontological Society (Hawkinson, et.al., 1972) concerning gerontologists opinions about the education issues of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, education was seen as a higher priority need area over other service areas such as health, income, and housing. In the 210 returned surveys, over two-thirds of the
respondents indicated that educators lack knowledge of older adult needs and how to meet them. Only one-third of the respondents indicated that the present educational institutions should be responsible for education of older adults (a reversal of delegate opinions at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging). One-half of the respondents supported specialized agencies for meeting educational needs of older adults.

In a study of educational needs of older adults in relation to community colleges, Sarvis (1973), through his review of the literature on program opportunities, found little in the way of adequate program planning, decision making, communications, or programs structured with the older adult in mind. The Sarvis (1973) study was conducted in the State of Washington with a random selection of older adults taken from a list of participants found on area senior center lists. This sample of 330 respondents was above average in educational level (24% completing college) and was not representative of the average older adult due to the fact that persons were not sampled if they did not attend activities in senior centers. The major conclusions were that (a) older adults were reluctant to engage in educational activities unless encouraged to do so by friends, (b) security factors (safety from crime, poor weather) outweighed other factors such as financial limitations, transportation difficulties, or physical handicaps in determining their willingness to participate, (c) activities were preferred which offered opportunities for involvement beyond that of just activity participation, and (d) the term education meant a formalized process primarily reserved for the young. As part of his study, Sarvis (1973) collected information on community college
program activities for older adults from 22 community college administrators. He found that most of these institutions required the older adult to come to the institution, while most of the older adults preferred classes elsewhere.

There is a lack of conclusive evidence in this area to warrant specific conclusions. There are indications that the educational institutions are not making adequate responses to the educational needs of older adults, and that older adults regard education in a narrow rather than broad framework. There is some disagreement as to which institutions and agencies can best serve the educational needs of older adults; specialized agencies or the formal educational institutions.

Security factors (weather, crime) are indicated as important in older adults choosing to attend activities. Security factors, lack of knowledge concerning institutional aims, and preferred location of programs need to be part of the questions addressed in developing programs for older adults through educational institutions.

Needs of older adults

The most poorly educated age segment in society is the older adult (Riley and Foner, 1968). Learning during the later years is more important than ever before and older adults cannot learn in younger life all they need to know in later life (Aker, 1973). Educators should be challenged to regard the need for continued growth for older adults in the same terms as they regard the need for growth among other age groups (Peterson, 1974).

Needs of older adults were described by the U.S. Department of
Health, Education and Welfare (1973) as (a) money, (b) health and health care, (c) living arrangements, (d) transportation, and (e) continuing to participate in community activity through use of personal skills for self and others.

The needs of older adults were described by McClusky (1974) in terms of a needs hierarchy. The most primary of these were termed as coping needs. These constitute the most basic survival needs (food, shelter, clothing, mobility, adequate income) of older adults. Expressive needs are those which relate to the leisure pursuits of older adults. Contributive needs relate to the older adult as a potential community resource. Influence needs are defined as the advocacy role and the need for societal change in values as related to older adults. Recently, McClusky (1974) added a fifth need area of older adults, that of the need for transcendence. Transcendence being related to (a) achieving a sense of fulfillment as the culminating stage in life, (b) being better than before, and (c) rising above limitations.

The basic needs of older adults (mobility, adequate income, adequate housing, health care), while of paramount importance to community educators, do not constitute the only needs of older adults. Educators should regard the need for personal growth as being lifelong in nature. The concept of continued growth includes (a) participating in community life, and (b) gaining new skills and knowledges needed for adjusting to life in later years.

The preceding material offers an insight into the needs and characteristics of older adults. Problems do exist in attempting to
generalize these conclusions either to all older adults, or to older adults living in a particular community.

The study by Hwang (1971) offers an example of the need to consider the diversity of older adults. For instance, would an older adult living in a rural community with few agencies close by still depend on agency advice? Another example is the security factor (Sarvis, 1973) mentioned as being important to older adults in attending educational activities. Are these security factors important to older adults in urban areas only, or are these factors important among older adults in lower income levels? These questions and more are unanswered by research findings. Consequently, community educators and others seeking to serve older adults should view the needs and characteristics of older adults as being multi-layered in diversity. The preceding material, as a beginning point, offers some insight into only the most general layer of diversity.

**Programming for Older Adults**

**Present educational efforts**

Traditionally educators have not structured programs specifically with the older adult in mind. McClusky (1971) pointed out this neglect in his background paper on education at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. Sarvis (1973), in a study previously referred to, came to a similar conclusion. He found that: (a) the term education itself is seen by older adults in the narrow context of formal education, (b) present programs have been structured for younger persons, not older adults, (c) pre-program communication between the community college and the elderly has been poor, (d) little in the way
of data has been available for decision making, (e) most community colleges have required the elderly to come to the institution, (f) there has been little financial assistance available, (g) there has been little planning undertaken, and (h) there have been few opportunities made available for the rural elderly. Additional concerns noted by Youkeles (1974) were the lack of effort being made on behalf of the emotionally or physically disabled older adult.

There is little evidence available, none in regard to the public schools, which supports educational institutions as being a primary force in meeting the needs of older adults.

**Age-integration and age-separation**

Educators of older adults have expressed concern that programs have isolated the older adult from other age groups and have not involved older adults in program planning and development. Educators have debated the merits of programs which have been either totally age-separated or totally age-integrated. The former have been seen as compounding the problems of the already isolated older adult, while the latter have been seen as failing to meet the special needs of the older adult population (Youkeles, 1974).

In a survey referred to earlier, Hawkinson, et al., (1972) found two-thirds of the gerontologists sampled who indicated that education for aging should be integrated with education for other age groups.

In a review of research on the subject of positive and negative aspects to age-separated or age-integrated housing patterns, Rosow (1963) found that age-separated living arrangements were preferred by older adults. Rosow (1963) reported that most gerontologists felt
(at that time) that advocating age-separated patterns would be inherently wrong, even though friendship groups among older adults are naturally peer-oriented. Social status, educational level, stage in life, values, problems and life style are all reasons, according to Rosow (1963) why older adults would look to peer and not to cross-age relationships.

No clear pattern emerges from the review of literature on age-separated versus age-integrated educational activities. Sentiment lies with age-integrated activities, yet some evidence does exist which indicated that older adults would prefer age-separated activities. Care should be taken not to draw too many conclusions from the Rosow (1963) study which dealt with living patterns, not educational activities. It should be noted that positive older adult attitudes on age-separated housing indicates a need for educators to determine if those attitudes are carried over to educational activities.

**Recruitment, participation, and involvement**

Peterson (1974) suggested to adult educators the following four methods for involving older adults in programming efforts: (a) meet personally with area older adult groups, (b) involve older adults in the planning process, (c) develop a group of volunteer recruiters, and (d) utilize existing communication networks in the older adult community.

Two research projects, both doctoral dissertations, have added to present knowledge about participation of older adults in program development. Estes (1972), in a two year field study, found that program administrators generally exclude the older adult from planning
activities. Youkeles (1974) in his survey questionnaire sent to 1244 senior center directors concluded that the greater number of staff personnel, the fewer program and policy decisions were made by older adult participants.

Related to participant program involvement are community volunteer activities. In a research project on volunteerism among older adults, Sainer and Zander (1971) concluded that volunteers could be recruited and retained from lower socio-economic levels. This study involved 642 volunteers and 27 community agencies in the Staten Island, New York area. The older adult volunteers, the majority of whom were classified as being at a low socio-economic level, were surveyed, subsequent to their involvement, on their attitudes toward their becoming involved in volunteer activities. Conclusions reached were that: (a) retired persons felt uncomfortable in retirement and wanted useful roles, (b) at home, personal contacts were the best means of recruitment, (c) visiting agencies and observing the specific volunteer role within that agency should be done prior to getting a volunteer commitment, and (d) recruiting and involving a potential volunteer in a larger group of volunteers is important for purposes of identifying with others who are filling similar roles. Sainer and Zander (1971) also found that the oldest volunteers took on the most assignments. Volunteers, in general, stayed in the program for social reasons and in order to serve in useful roles.

Indications are that recruitment and involvement of older adults in various programs necessitates the developing of a supportive, group atmosphere among participants. Older adults are best involved through
personal contacts coupled with the assurances of being part of a group. It appears, even though older adults have been largely excluded from the planning and development processes, techniques for recruiting and involving older adults are available and have met with some success.

Community services

Communication with the older adult community is a must if services are to be available to the potential consumer. Robinson (1970), through his research, stated that many of the services requested by the older adults had been found to be available in their area. More effective ways need to be developed to communicate with potential service recipients regarding already available services (Mason, 1974). One effort at assisting the older adult in knowing of potential services was contained in the pamphlet, To Find The Way: To Services In Your Community (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973). A checklist of community services was presented along with a section for filling in names and addresses of potential service providers in the community.

Estes (1972), as part of his findings, discussed the type of community agencies which could best represent the interests of older adults. Age-specific organizations (those organizations designed to serve only older adults rather than a cross-section of age groups) were found to have more members on local boards and commissions seeking to serve older adults than other non age-specific organizations. Consequently, age-specific organizations may be better able to fill an advocacy role for older adults (Estes, 1972).

Community educators in directing programs for older adults should
not overlook other agencies which serve older adults. As a non age-
specific organization, community education should make use of the
age-specific agencies which may be more involved in seeking benefits
and services for the older adult population. In addition, communication
with the older adult community concerning already available services
would seem to necessitate the attempt at interagency communication
prior to attempting to communicate available services to community
members.

Needs assessment

Given the potential of various community agencies in serving older
adults, methods must be found to assess the needs of the local older
adult population. Research on methods of and the need for local needs
assessment is scant. While the following material may be useful in
conducting a local needs assessment of older adults, it should be noted
that the information is of a non-research nature.

Kempfer (1953) suggested the following four methods of assessing
needs of a population: (a) use present program personnel as communi-
cation links with other members in the community, (b) maintain wide
community contacts, (c) use census data, and (d) utilize surveys from
other sources. Hand (1960) described a three-tiered method of (a)
analyzing available agencies, (b) seeking out all available demographic
data, and (c) conducting a survey not only as a means for gathering
information but also as a means of communicating to the area adult
population. Knowles (1952) provided a needs assessment checklist as
a means toward gathering data. However local needs are determined,
McMahon (1970) warned that surface needs (wants) should be distinguished
from unfelt needs which may also be present.

The needs assessment process has been widely accepted as a means toward developing programs which are responsive to the populations they seek to serve. A needs assessment process, as described in this section, involves utilization of a variety of information sources, including available surveys, census data, agency records, and contacts with community members.

Programming

Hunter (1974) wrote that the best information programs for older adults were those which emphasized the practical nature of what was to be learned. Programs should be designed around participant concerns, have an informal atmosphere, and depend on personal rather than media contact for recruiting participants. His leisure time program suggestions included the following:

1. Plan with, not for, older adults.

2. Diversify programs not only in type but in degree of proficiency needed.

3. Involve older adults through personal contacts.

4. Avoid valuing certain activities above others.

5. Provide a practical value for products of leisure.

6. Use the talents and skills of the group.

7. Recognize accomplishment.

8. Make sure facilities are accessible and comfortable.

9. Adhere to time schedules.

10. Obtain competent leadership (any age).

11. Face the transportation problem.
In 1970, a study was conducted among 453 older adults in Utah County, Utah (Robinson, 1970). Interviews were used to gather information on the needs, characteristics, and attitudes of older adults for use in planning and developing programs. Institutionalized older adults and those unable to answer questions due to physical or mental problems were not included as part of this study. The population sample was better educated than might be expected (68% attended high school), was homogeneous in terms of religion (92% members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), and did not find finances a great problem. Consequently, the conclusions reached may not reflect the same opinions as perhaps would be reflected in a random survey of older adults in other sections of the country.

Robinson (1970) reported that programs can, due to good health among most older adults, involve more physical activity than previously thought possible. Program participants expressed a desire to do more than just sit and listen. Robinson (1970) stated that "organized activities for mature citizens need the same type of care and thought that are typically given to elaborate programs currently available for the youth of America" (p. 17).

Both the Hunter (1974) suggestions and the Robinson (1970) findings give indications to but not conclusive evidence about what programming techniques for older adults are needed. Hunter (1974) lists only one item, face the transportation problem, which can be said to differentiate programming for older adults from any other type of programming. The Robinson work, while a research project, was conducted among such a select group of older adults that findings about
their physical abilities and participation patterns are suspect in terms of generalizing to most communities within the United States.

Program development involving activities for older adults may not be much different than program development for other age groups. The concentration of programming efforts on older adults may be more significant than attempting to develop unique program formats which are designed only for older adults.

Future goals

Older adults, according to Hunter (1974), must deal with (a) increased time at their disposal, (b) less income, (c) more facts to learn (product buying, availability of services, benefits available), (d) relationship changes with others, and (e) decreased mobility. Programs for older adults, in addressing services to these several areas, must help older adults realize their potential for performing socially active roles in the community and must help older adults improve their skills in relating to others.

McClusky (1974) related three future educational need areas for older adults as: (a) societal recognition of the right, legitimacy and opportunity of older adults to engage in educational pursuits, (b) overcoming the skepticism about the importance of learning in later years, and (c) developing greater confidence in the ability to learn. McClusky (1974) stated future goals of education for older adults as: (a) gaining wider participation of older adults, (b) reaching, recruiting and involving the under- and non-participating older adult, (c) educating younger persons concerning aging, and (d) educating the person who is nearing retirement for successful retirement.
Future goals of education include a three-fold process of (a) educating and involving all older adults in skill development and learning processes which need to take place in the later years, (b) educating all community members on the aging process, and (c) removing the barriers toward participation in educational activities (mobility, income, skepticism of older adults about the need for learning, inability to reach and communicate with all older adults).

Community Education Programming

Community education program components

The following remarks by Decker (1975) represent his viewpoint as to what community education is and what community education seeks to accomplish.

Community education is a concept that stresses an expanded role for public education and provides a dynamic approach to individual and community improvement. Community education encourages the development of a comprehensive and coordinated delivery system for providing educational, recreational, and social and cultural services for all people in a community. . . . Inherent in the community education philosophy is the belief that each community education program should reflect the needs of its particular community. . . . Through cooperation and communication, the schools become community schools which are operated in partnership with civic, business and lay leaders, as well as community, state, and federal agencies and organizations. These community schools offer lifelong learning and enrichment opportunities in education, recreation,
social and related cultural services with the programs and activities coordinated and developed for citizens of all ages, ethnic backgrounds and socio-economic groups. . . . Community schools are open the entire year, 18 hours a day or longer, if necessary. They become a place where people of all ages gather to learn, to enjoy themselves and to be involved in community problem solving efforts. Although activities and programs are provided through school facilities, they are not limited to the school itself because the school extends itself into the community. Agencies, factories, businesses, and the surrounding environment become part of the learning laboratory. (Decker, 1975, p. 5-6)

In terms of specific programming approaches, authorities do not agree as to what constitutes a viable program of community education. Turnridge (1973), in a series of six case studies in communities which operated programs of community education, saw the following factors as leading to successful programs:

1. A trained coordinator (director) staffed in a school administrative position.
2. A community-based group willing to give support to the program.
3. A program which serves all ages.
4. Shared school-community decision making responsibilities.
5. A school board supported program.
6. A coordinated effort in working with the school staff.

Winters (1972) who compared the perceptions of 106 Inter-university and Mott Institute trained directors of community education concerning
community education programming, indicated that programs should involve:
(a) planning and operating programs, (b) community needs assessment,
(c) financial planning, (d) communication, and (e) community involvement.

In a study utilizing a review of community education programming,
Parsons (1974) identified components of community education as (a)
adult education, (b) community involvement, (c) staffing, (d) recreation,
(e) facilities and resource usage, (f) enrichment activities, (g)
coordination, and (h) community education concept formation. In
addition, Parsons (1974) saw the full utilization of facilities for
maximum benefit of the people as a program's first priority. Minzey
(1974) identified the components of community education as (a) a K-12
program, (b) a full utilization of facilities (school and community),
(c) additional programs for school-age youth, (d) programs for adults,
(e) delivery and coordination of community services, and (f) community
involvement.

In a nationwide interview survey conducted by Weaver (1972) and
from which he developed his Emerging Model of community education
(Figure 1, p. 7), he found the following to be the primary tasks of
community education:

1. Coordinating of community agencies.
2. Assisting residents to secure educational services.
3. Identifying required resources.
4. Surveying attitudes and interests.
5. Demonstrating the humanistic approach to education.
6. Providing programs for senior citizens.
7. Training lay leaders.
8. Improving the public image of the school.

It should be noted that community educators singled out older adult programs (item 6) as a high priority task, whereas other age groups were not so named. Weaver's (1972) conclusions were verified by Langs (1974) in a study of the role of the modern community educator.

Much of what is stated in the literature on community education program components is a reflection of the newness, and subsequent lack of identity with what community education is. With the recent (since the mid-1960's) nation-wide dissemination of the community education concept, efforts have been directed toward what constitutes a viable community education program.

Turnridge (1973), Winters (1972), Parsons (1974), and Langs (1974) are examples of research studies which were based on an exploration of what community education is. This type of research draws heavily on other writers in the field (Minzey and LeTarte, 1972; Totten, 1970; Weaver, 1972; Whitt, 1971) who attempted through non-research means to delineate and define the components of a community education program. While these studies are important for establishing an identity for and a base from which to develop community education programs, little in the way of a specific body of knowledge has accumulated into the actual processes and skills needed in developing program activities.

A community education program, in summary, ideally consists of (a) a trained director in an administrative position in a school system, (b) service to all age groups in a community, (c) a process for involving community members in program planning and development, (d) maximum facilities usage (school and community), (e) coordinating
community resources (human and physical), and (f) identifying needs and interests of community members.

These six components seem to all be included in some manner in the works perviously cited. With basic agreement on what community education is, there seems to be little value in further studies which seek to define community education without in turn studying the effects which these components may or may not have on community life.

Needs assessment

One of the primary functions of a process-oriented community education program has been the gathering of information on community needs. Christopher (1972) stated that a needs assessment should follow two stages of development; one being the familiarity stage (meeting with existing agency personnel, surveying personnel resources, surveying community resources, and surveying existing programs), and the second stage being the community needs survey (door to door gathering of information). Minzey (1972) wrote that needs assessments should be an ongoing process involving door to door surveys, advisory council feedback, and feedback from program participants. Seay and Martin (Seay, et.al., 1974) stated that needs assessment was a method for identifying and eventually filling gaps in community services. Needs assessment has been a method for: (a) identifying service gaps, (b) involving people, and (c) coordinating community efforts (Seay, et.al., 1974).

Conclusions on the needs assessment process in community education are based upon non-research related literature. There are indications that needs assessment involves several, rather than a single, technique.
Surveying community resources, communicating with agency personnel, communicating with program participants and identifying gaps in community services are the primary methods identified as the needs assessment process.

There is a lack of substantive research in community education literature on what are the possible outcomes of a needs assessment process and on techniques to interpret information gained through a needs assessment process. The authors cited reflect only the means toward gathering information. They do not account for the skills needed in utilizing these methods, in recognizing needs which may or may not be expressed, and in interpreting the information gathered.

**Community advisory councils**

Community advisory councils have formed vital links in the organizational and administrative structure of community education (Seay, et.al., 1974). The role of advisory councils, according to Seay and Parsons (Seay, et.al., 1974) has been: (a) advising on programs, policies and activities, (b) assessing of educational needs, (c) establishing of priorities, (d) planning of goals and objectives, and (e) participating in community-wide problem solving projects. Wood and Martin (1974) stated "The process of goal setting, needs assessments, and the overall evaluation of the community education operation thus naturally becomes a valid part of the advisory councils contribution" (p. 49). Another community educator identified fact finding, planning, coordinating and communications, activation of resources, and evaluation as the primary roles of advisory councils (Cox, 1974).

Community education advisory councils can take on many structures
in attempting to maintain close community contact. Many councils are composed of lay membership selected from throughout the community. Other councils utilize a combination of lay membership, agency personnel and other possible representations (age related, business related, geographic location). Clark and Shoop (1974) advocated an advisory council structured around standing committees with ad hoc committees formed to meet special needs. They further recommended that standing committees be formed around topical areas (recreation, leisure activities, community services) concerned with a cross-section of age groups rather than structured around age-specific interests.

Another type of council format has been the agency coordinating council designed to provide a communicating and coordinating function specifically for older adults (Martin and Robin, 1972). This type of council would stress agency and community services coordination (Seay, et.al., 1974). Tasse (1972), in a study conducted among agencies and schools in Flint, Michigan, found that community schools occupy a central role in agency-school cooperation. Cooperative efforts: (a) improve services, (b) provide services not ordinarily provided by the school, (c) make the public more aware of the non-school services, and (d) make services more accessible to community members. While many agencies can contribute toward solving community problems, "no one agency or group can undertake the amelioration of needs of the aging [older adult] population any more than it can take on the question of education or pollution" (Smith, 1973, p. 146).

Community advisory councils constitute an unknown in terms of any measurable community improvements which can be attributed to them.
If implications of the functioning of advisory councils are considered, there appears to be two primary functions. One is the advising function of a council as related to the goals, priorities and policies of a community education program. The second function is one of involving local citizenry in providing inputs into program direction.

None of the writers in the field of community education offer evidence to support the claims of either aspect of advisory council functioning. The democratic principle of community involvement may be valid, but community educators should not equate the formation of an advisory council with meeting the needs of all community members. Before advisory councils can be said to be truly representative of a community, methods of choosing representatives for a council, communication patterns from council to community, and training of community leaders have to be evaluated and reported.

Community education literature on community advisory councils is largely void of a research base, other than the agency-school study by Tasse (1972). Conclusions are that community advisory councils can take on a variety of structures, including ad hoc committees, in establishing the goals of a community education program, in assessing of program priorities, and in advising on program direction.

Agency coordinating councils and agency cooperative efforts have been considered a part of the total community education effort. Kinney (1973) stated that community education represents a "significant improvement in the coordination of services to this often underserved population [older adults]" (p. 60). While this statement is not supported by evidence, agency coordination efforts on the part of
community education is seen as a legitimate function.

**Community education and older adults**

In a series of seminars conducted through the Community School Development Center, Western Michigan University (Martin and Robin, 1972), needs of older adults, problems, and resources were analyzed along with suggestions for development of program models for community education. Generated from these four seminars were 133 ideas (Appendix A) for possible program implementation. Suggestions were directed toward:

1. Schools functioning as facilitators for agencies and services.
2. Schools helping older adults prepare for retirement.
3. Schools involving older adults in social and recreational activities.
4. Schools assisting older adults to function as community resources.

Two conclusions reached in these seminars were that personal contacts were the best means to reach older adults and that social activities bring out larger numbers of older adults than informational meetings. Suggestions for the future included: (a) making programs highly visible, (b) overcoming powerlessness of older adults through program identity, and (c) avoiding a welfare emphasis in programs through a wider participation by older adults in decision making (Martin and Robin, 1972).

Showkeir (1974), in an article primarily concerned with older adult volunteer programs, stated that community education is a legitimate vehicle for utilizing older adults in community service. In serving the community and older adults, Showkeir (1974) said that
"an accurate knowledge and understanding of older people is necessary if one is to provide satisfying activities for them" (p. 46). Minzey and LeTarte (1972) stressed the importance of community education involving older adults in planning of activities and of becoming involved in preretirement education for older adults.

To date, these few references, all non-research in nature, comprise the total of specific references in community education to programming for older adults. Of these, only one (Martin and Robin, 1972) contains substantial information which may be of value in developing programs for older adults. One of the conclusions in the seminar series dealt with personal contacts as the best means of communicating with older adults. This means of communication was also indicated as important in the study by Sainer and Zander (1971). A gap in current research is one; why are personal contacts best in communicating with older adults, and two; are personal contacts more important in communicating with older adults than in communicating with other age groups?

A review of the literature suggests that community educators should seek involvement of older adults in the planning and directing of program activities. Involvement of older adults is seen as reaching beyond a passive participation in program opportunities into an active involvement in all phases of program development. Community educators, by involving older adults in all phases of program operation, need to become more knowledgable concerning older adults and be willing to utilize personal contacts and social activities as a means toward gaining involvement of older adults.
Community Education Leadership

The key person in directing the community education effort is the community education director (Keidel, 1969; Minzey and LeTarte, 1972; Whitt, 1971). Community education programs, and consequently the role of the community education director have evolved and changed over the years. The first directors were those in Flint, Michigan, who served on the staffs of public elementary schools as halftime directors. The other half of their assigned duties was as classroom teachers. The job definition at this early stage was one of school-neighborhood liaison person involved in public relations, after school program supervision and program development (Becker, 1972).

During the early 60's, the concept of community education was rapidly developing in other communities outside Flint, Michigan. With this outside development, came a revision in the role of community education to include more and different activities. Consequently, the role of the director has changed also. The trend now is for the community education director to assume full time duties, in an administrative position within the school system. The exact administrative position of a director in a school system will vary depending on the size of school system (larger school systems employing several levels of directors or smaller school systems employing only one director) and the job description as defined by the particular school system.

The following review of literature is based upon the community education director and his/her leadership role in working with community groups, in particular, groups of older adults. A distinction
needs to be made between the administrative role of the director and
the leadership role. Weaver (1974) described the distinction as
"the role of the community educator requires that he manage the
organization (control and allocate resources to accomplish goals)
and that he provide leadership (assist groups toward the accomplish­
ment of mutually acceptable goals). . . . What is required of the
community educator is that he manage his own behavior in such a way
that the conflict between managing and leading is minimized while
he provides both effective management and positive leadership" (p. 29-30).

This review of literature is confined to leadership per se, and
thus some of the material available is not relevant due to its
management or administrative character.

Leadership role

The community education director is someone who "should work well
with people and be able to establish good rapport in a short time. He
should be a good administrator, able to organize, execute, delegate,
and plan. He should relate well to adult, youth and children. He
should possess leadership characteristics which will make it possible
for him to play both active and passive roles according to what is
needed to bring the community into successful interaction" (Minzey and
LeTarte, 1972, p. 64).

The leadership role of the community educator has been seen by
some writers as that of a facilitator (Wood and Martin, 1974). The
role of facilitator is contrasted with that of program director.
The latter emphasizes the role of director as operating a specific
program which has been planned, administered and supervised by the
director or other community education personnel. The role of facilitator is one of defining the particular task to be accomplished and providing the technical and informational assistance needed to complete the task. This role may or may not include a direct program responsibility by the community education director. It could be that other agencies or various community members could plan, develop and execute a program with the community educator playing only a supportive role.

A primary role of the community education director is to develop leadership ability on the part of community members (Totten, 1970). Ellis and Sperling (1973) defined the leadership role of the community educator as seeing that tasks are accomplished, but accomplished in a way that involves community members to the greatest extent possible. The definition of community education leadership as developed by Boles (Seay, et.al., 1974) is "a process in which an individual takes the initiative to help a group in using available resources to learn to solve problems held in common" (p. 93).

The material on leadership lacks a clear direction. The definition by Boles (Seay, et.al., 1974) is relatively meaningless in terms of specific leadership actions. The role of facilitator, while defining directions (greater participant responsibilities), does not offer specific, recognizable situations when this role would be appropriate. If one goal is to involve older adults in program responsibilities, how does a program director recognize and develop leadership potential?

The leadership role of the community education director has been based on philosophical, rather than research-based constructs. A
review of the most up-to-date literature defines the role of the community education director as working with the development of leadership in others whenever possible. The emphasis on working with others calls for the director to want to and be able to relate well to community members.

Leadership skills

The Katz (1955) theory of leadership skills has been utilized in three recent works by community educators: Johnson (1973), Kliminslcki (1974), and Weaver (1972). As a background to the review of literature on leadership skills, the following material by Katz (1955) is presented.

In a theory of leadership having broad implications toward community education research, Katz (1955) identified three skill areas which he believed to be important in leadership development. These skill areas are as follows:

1. Technical skill- the specialized knowledges and use of tools needed in carrying out a particular operation. Examples of such skills are listening, speaking, writing, demonstrating, chairing a meeting, and reading.

2. Human skill- the ability of the leader to build cooperative effort among group members, to perceive and recognize group needs, and to act according to the needs of the group. Examples are interviewing, observing, leading discussions, empathizing, and participating in discussions.

3. Conceptual skill- the ability to see program and organizations in their entirety and to be able to relate the interdependent
parts of an organization to the whole. Examples are analyzing, diagnosing, synthesizing, and questioning.

In a survey referred to in Chapter I of this study, Weaver (1972) surveyed 245 community educators across the country concerning the goals of community education. From this survey Weaver (1972) identified 23 major goals of community education (Appendix A). He subsequently categorized these goals into the human, technical and conceptual skill areas (Katz, 1955) according to the amount of training emphasis needed in each. Weaver's (1972) overall conclusions, as reflected in the Emerging Model of community education (Appendix A), were that training of community education directors in technical and conceptual skills is needed to a greater degree than training in human skills.

Johnson (1973), developing a training model for community educators, identified twelve director job roles. These were (a) administering, (b) involving community, (c) coordinating, (d) demonstrating leadership, (e) financing, (f) managing personnel, (g) planning, (h) programming, (i) relating to the public, (j) recruiting, (k) surveying, and (l) training. These job roles were drawn in part from the Weaver (1972) survey, which itself relied heavily on the Katz (1955) theory. The twelve job roles appear in the Johnson (1973) study without explanation as to the meaning of each. The items were taken from an extensive review of the literature on leadership, but are relatively meaningless unless accompanied by an explanation of the contributing author's intent.

Kliminski (1974) compared community education directors identified
as successful with a control group of community education directors, all in Michigan. For comparison purposes Kliminski (1974) used a rating sheet consisting of 40 skills, each defined according to the Katz (1955) theory of human, technical and conceptual skills. Results showed that directors seen as being successful exhibited higher levels of technical, human and conceptual skills when rated by themselves and their superordinates. Related results showed the "successful" directors to have had (a) longer time on the job, (b) more college course work in community education, and (c) more training (two week training program, six week training program, year long internship, university degree program) in community education.

Conclusions reached by Kliminski (1974) are valuable in that some factors have been identified which distinguish successful directors from other directors. Cause and effect relationships are not clear though. Does the potentially successful director seek out further training or is it the training which assists the director in becoming successful? In addition, are successful directors successful with all phases of program development, or is specific training needed for specific programming purposes (older adults in particular)?

The manipulation of skill areas according to the importance of each (Johnson, 1973; Kliminski, 1974; Weaver, 1972) does not seem to have any further utility. Skill areas need to be defined according to specific skills needed in working with specific groups, then further delineated according to the training needed in developing a skill.

In summarizing the review of literature on leadership skills needed by community education directors, the lack of precise definition
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of the skills makes definite conclusions difficult. Compounding the problem is the distinction between leadership and administration. In using Weaver's (1974) leadership criterion as working and assisting groups toward some type of goal, the following leadership skills may be drawn from the preceding discussion.

The leadership skill of involving others, and in particular, the training of lay leadership in planning, developing and executing their own programs was mentioned most frequently by the authors. Also labeled as an important leadership skill was the need to relate well with people. There is some indication that an active or passive leadership role flexibility is needed by the director in working with groups. This involves the ability of the community education director to correctly perceive the situation and the need for an active or passive style of leadership. The leadership role of "facilitator" implies the need for a flexible stance and an accurate perception of the group situation.

There exists a conflict between the perceptions of Weaver (1972) and others in describing the leadership skills needed by a community education director. Weaver (1972), in relating to Katz's (1955) theory, saw less of a need for training in human skills. Other authors felt strongly about the need for skills which are human related according to the definition by Katz (1955). Good rapport, relating well to others, and accurate perceptions of group needs are all examples of a human skill orientation rather than a technical or conceptual skill orientation.
Summary of Findings from the Review of Literature

The following is a summary of the four sections of literature reviewed: needs and characteristics of older adults, programming for older adults, community education programming, and community education leadership. Whenever possible, summaries from these four areas will be combined in order to present a concise and usable summary for subsequent use in developing a model community education program for older adults.

Characteristics of older adults

An initial phase in developing a community education program is a consideration of the characteristics and needs of the population to be served. Older adults, while in some instances having special needs, are largely an independent, and heterogeneous population. Not only is this population diverse in terms of age span, but is diverse in racial characteristics, income levels, activity levels, geographic location, and health needs.

Limitations in learning

Community educators, in developing programs for older adults should be aware of the limitations of older adults. Limitations not only brought on by the aging process, but limitations imposed by society. Physically, the aging process brings with it a decline in sensory and muscular processes. This decline has implications for educators in terms of visual and aural processes which may hinder the older adult in using some media (small print, diminished sound quality). Stress situations (speed of response, competitive behavior) will generally result in learning difficulties for older adults.
These blocks toward effective learning are controllable in most instances, if correctly perceived and acted upon. The community educator should not respond to learning difficulties in older adults as a decline in intellectual ability, but instead attempt to minimize the effect of elements which may be hindering their understanding.

Needs

Community educators, in attempting to meet the needs of older adults, should realize that older adults have levels of needs. Some are basic needs such as adequate housing, mobility, money, health care, while other needs exist for personal growth. New skills are needed, beyond those for just "coping" with life, such as those needed for adjustment in later life, and for achieving and living a meaningful existence.

Educational response to needs of older adults

In addressing specific program opportunities to older adults, community educators should be aware that educational institutions have not responded in the past to the needs of older adults, and that older adults may misinterpret the aims of educational institutions. This problem of lack of response by educational institutions and lack of understanding on the part of older adults is compounded by indications that opinions of directors of programs may not accurately reflect the opinions of program participants.

Agency cooperation and coordination

A community education program is based upon service to all members (non age-specific) in a community. Community educators need to relate to other agencies and groups which relate specifically (age-specific) to older adults.
Agency cooperation and coordination have been identified as primary roles of community education. As older adults are often unaware of services which are available in a given area, inter-agency coordination and cooperation could be a valuable first step in communicating available services to the older adult population. An outgrowth of inter-agency cooperation could be establishment of an agency coordinating council (composed of agency personnel) to address needs of older adults on a continuous basis.

**Needs assessment**

Writers in the field of community education are in agreement on the needs assessment process being one of the primary components of a community education program. The needs assessment process involves several, rather than a single technique. Two stages of needs assessment seem to be indicated. Stage one being the information gathering on the community as related to older adults. Meeting with agency personnel who serve older adults, analyzing available surveys, surveying existing programs, surveying existing resources, and surveying personnel resources would all be examples of this initial stage. The second stage would be the gathering of data on a door to door basis, communicating directly with older adults, and working with community advisory councils and/or agency coordinating councils. Needs assessment should serve the two-fold purpose of gathering information on the needs of older adults, and identifying gaps in existing services available to the population of older adults.

**Participant involvement**

Another primary component of community education is the involvement
of community members in the processes of not only program participation but in program planning, developing, and executing. Older adults can be recruited from low socio-economic groups by developing a supportive group atmosphere, utilizing personal contacts with older adults, and by making opportunities available for the older adult to serve in useful roles. Stressing the social aspects of program participation may be a method for initially involving older adults.

Facilities usage

Community educators advocate the maximum usage of facilities; both educational facilities and facilities located throughout the community. Definite conclusions on the best facilities to use in developing programs for older adults cannot be made based on available information. There are indications that older adults misunderstand what the term "education" stands for. It is unclear if these attitudes concerning education would affect participation in programs held in school facilities. Personal security is a large concern among older adults in regard to attending any facility. Program participants may not attend programs in facilities if the surrounding environments are not considered as being safe. Proximity of a facility to the older adult population should also be a concern in terms of transportation needs of older adults.

Program techniques

Programs developed for older adults do not need great amounts of special techniques or special considerations for program participants. More important may be that community educators recognize and consider the diversity of the older adult population and develop programs based
on this diversity, much as would be done to develop programs for other age groups in a community. A question, at present unresolved, is whether or not to program activities specifically for older adults (age-separated) or to program age-mixed activities (age-integrated).

**Leadership**

Leadership in community education indicates a need for the director to be able to relate well to program participants, develop leadership involvement by others, and be able to correctly perceive (by directors) situations in which an active or passive leadership role is called for. Most authors conclude that a community education director needs more human, rather than more technical or conceptual skills in working with community groups.

**Goals of community education**

Goals for community educators in developing programs for older adults are indicated as (a) seeking extensive involvement of older adults in all phases of program development, (b) becoming more knowledgable (community educators) themselves, as well as educating all community members, concerning the aging process, needs, and characteristics of older adults, and (c) removing the barriers toward participation by older adults in educational activities.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Review of the Problem

This study utilizes a three part design in development of a model community education program for older adults. The initial source is information from the review of literature found in Chapter Two. Subsequent data were obtained from (a) community educators, and (b) selected experts in the field of aging.

A field survey instrument was developed to gather data from Michigan community education directors and center directors across the country. This instrument was mailed to the community educators along with completion instructions and a return, stamped envelope.

A second, and separate source of data came from six experts in the field of aging. These experts were personally interviewed through use of a structured interview format.

The survey instrument and interview questions were developed to gather data on (a) basic considerations for program development, (b) communication and needs assessment processes, (c) participant involvement in programming, (d) leadership skills needed by the community educator, (e) program components, and (f) programming priority.

Selection of the Populations

The population included in this study were 240 community educators. There were 186 system-wide community educators representing all the school districts in the State of Michigan classified by the four regional community school development
centers in Michigan as having community education programs. There were 54 community education center directors located in centers throughout the United States.

Experts in the field of aging included six persons; five from Michigan and one from Indiana.

**Michigan directors**

The Michigan directors were selected from lists of names provided by the four Michigan Community School Development Centers. These centers are housed in four Michigan institutions of higher education (Appendix B) and throughout the country for the purpose of developing and disseminating information on community education and training community education directors for working in local school districts. Each of the four Michigan centers serves a specified area within the State of Michigan. Each center supplied a list of directors categorized by the districts being served. When more than one name was listed per district, the community educator with the highest job classification was selected. The total Michigan survey population consisted of 186 community education directors representing all the districts in Michigan identified as operating community education programs.

**Center directors**

The community education center director population was determined by the fall, 1974, C.S. Mott Foundation listing of all community school development centers in the United States. The population included 54 directors, located in 37 states and the District of Columbia (Appendix B).
In all, this dual population of community educators represented the viewpoints of (a) practicing community educators in the field (Michigan directors), and (b) viewpoints of center directors charged with implementing the concept of community education in regional or state-wide areas throughout the United States.

Experts on aging

The six experts in the field of aging were selected from: (a) prominent names appearing in the literature on aging, (b) discussions held with doctoral committeeperson, Dr. Ellen Robin, and (c) suggestions subsequently offered through contacts with some of the already selected experts on aging.

There were six experts on aging chosen for inclusion in this study. They are:

Dr. H. Mason Atwood
Associate Professor of Adult and Community Education, Ball State University
- coordinator of Title IV of Older Americans Act for Eastern Indiana
- director of teacher education program on older Americans

Mr. Leonard Gernant
Dean of Academic Services, Western Michigan University
- former (and first) director of Michigan Commission on Aging
- representative to 1971 White House Conference on Aging

Mr. Woodrow Hunter
Director of State-wide Programs for Aging, Institute of Gerontology, University of Michigan and Wayne State University

Dr. Howard McClusky
Chairman of Program for Educational Gerontology, University of Michigan
- Professor Emeritus, Educational Psychology and consultant to Community and Adult Education
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Field survey instrument

The various questions and concerns addressed in the field survey instrument for community educators were developed from the conceptual framework used throughout this dissertation (page one of Chapter One). The two populations of community educators, 54 center directors and 186 Michigan directors, were utilized in order to contrast areas of agreement and/or disagreement on development of programs for older adults. The Michigan directors represent the viewpoints of the practicing community educators who develop local programs for older adults. Center directors represent the viewpoints of community educators charged with implementing and disseminating information on community education in regional or state-wide areas throughout the United States.

Field survey instrument: part one

This section of the field survey instrument was responded to by both Michigan and center directors. The 15 response items were developed from the six major areas addressed throughout this dissertation.
1. Basic considerations for program development
2. Communication and needs assessment processes
3. Participant involvement in programming
4. Leadership skills needed by the community educator
5. Program components
6. Programming priority

Each of the 15 response items provided a range of response choices. This range was developed from (a) what appeared to be a logical range of alternatives, and (b) information and research from the literature on aging and community education. A third and vital consideration was the range of response choice alternatives in terms of the specific areas addressed in this dissertation. The overall purpose of this dissertation is to develop a model which community educators can relate to in terms of viable community education strategies. Consequently, it was important to develop response choice alternatives which community educators could relate to as being within the framework of community education.

Field survey instrument: part two

Part two of the field survey instrument was responded to by Michigan directors only. In terms of implementing programs for older adults in local communities, no research is available. Consequently, it was seen as important to begin to identify more specifically areas in which programming strategies might differ from one community education program to another.

Michigan directors were asked to indicate their current status by (a) type of district (urban, rural, suburban) being
served by their community education program, (b) the years which their school district has operated a community education program (0-2 years, 2-5 years, 5-8 years, 8 years or more), and (c) their individual training level in working with older adults (formal graduate level course work, inservice training or seminars, information sharing sessions with local older adult groups or agency personnel, no specific training).

The breakdown by type of district was determined by what appeared to be a logical geographic contrast in terms of population characteristics, number of residents in the population, and local economic structures.

The breakdown by years of operation was determined by the years of community education development in Michigan districts. This development has largely taken place since the mid-1960's, approximately 10 years. The designation of the four operational categories was an arbitrary determination.

The categories by level of training were determined by current training programs known to be available to most community educators in Michigan.

Field survey instrument: part three

Part three of the field survey instrument was responded to by Michigan directors only. Information sought in this section dealt with current practices in programming for older adults in Michigan community education districts. Gathering data from local Michigan community education programs was seen as a means to contrast what community educators see as the best development
of programs for older adults with program opportunities currently available in Michigan community education programs. This discrepancy analysis between theory and practice could offer valuable information as a means toward program improvement.

The field survey instrument for community educators was reviewed by several experts in the field of community education. Their comments were analyzed and several changes in the survey instrument resulted from their suggestions.

Personal interviews with selected experts on aging

The six selected experts on aging were utilized in order to contrast areas of agreement and/or disagreement on programming for older adults. This contrasting was necessary in order to avoid a slanted, biased viewpoint which might be manifested in data gathered only from community educators. In addition, the experts on aging could offer alternatives which to date have not been considered by community educators.

Instrumentation

The instruments developed for this study were the field survey instrument for community educators and the personal interview questions for the selected experts on aging. Of the three part field survey instrument for community educators, parts one, two and three were responded to by Michigan directors while center directors responded only to part one of the instrument.

Field survey instrument: part one

The survey instruments mailed to Michigan and center directors included an identical 15 item section (part one).
These items (Appendix C) addressed the following:

1. Basic considerations for program development (Appendix C, items 6, 8, 10).
2. Communication and needs assessment processes (Appendix C, items 1, 7, 9, 15).
3. Participant involvement in programming (Appendix C, items 2, 12).
4. Leadership skills needed by the community educator (Appendix C, items 3, 4).
5. Program components (Appendix C, items 5, 11, 14).
6. Programming priority (Appendix C, item 13).

Section one consisted of a series of statements (15), each of which was followed by several possible response choices. Directions called for the respondent to read each statement, then choose the one response choice thought to be the most appropriate. Each statement also included a choice labeled "other", whereby the respondent could write in a response not available from the listed choices.

Field survey instrument: part two

Section two of the survey instrument was responded to by Michigan community education directors only. Section two (Appendix C) was designed to determine:

1. The type of district being served by community education: rural, urban, or suburban.
2. The number of years the particular school district has operated a community education program: 0-2 years, 2-5 years,
5-8 years, or 8 years or more.

3. The level of training of the director in working with older adults: formal graduate-level course work, inservice training or seminars, information sharing sessions with local older adult groups or agency personnel, or no specific training.

Field survey instrument: part three

Part three, responded to only by Michigan community education directors (Appendix C), was a series of seven open-ended questions designed to yield information on: (a) extent of present older adult programming efforts in Michigan community education districts, (b) structure of current older adult programming efforts in Michigan community education districts, and (c) extent of plans for future older adult programming efforts in Michigan community education districts. Conclusions from this section were primarily utilized in Chapter Five.

Personal interviews with selected experts on aging

The interview questions (Appendix C) were designed to yield information on the following:

1. Basic considerations for program development (Appendix C, items 1D, 2, 3).

2. Communication and needs assessment processes (Appendix C, items 5, 5A).

3. Participant involvement in programming (Appendix C, items 1A, 6).

4. Leadership skills needed by the community educator (Appendix C, items 7, 7A).

5. Program components (Appendix C, items 1B, 1C).

Data Collection

Field survey instrument

The field survey instrument for community educators was mailed on November 11, 1974, and included a return, stamped envelope along with a cover letter (Appendix C) explaining the rationale for the study and directions for completing the instrument.

Each of the mailed questionnaires was coded and a followup request on non-returned questionnaires was made by postcard on December 12, 1974. The coding was designed as a means toward identifying non-returnees from the initial mailing. Coding was also used as a means toward determining if non-respondents were part of any discernible pattern which may have affected some of the conclusions. Coding was not used for any other purpose.

The anonymity of individuals and districts was maintained on the various response items in the questionnaires and no individuals or program districts have been named in this dissertation.

Response to the field survey instrument

The following (Table 1) shows the breakdown, by area, of the community educators who returned the field survey instrument.
Table 1
Analysis of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center directors</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan directors</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial questionnaire mailing elicited just over a 66% response from the combined group of community educators. The followup request by postcard to non-returnees elicited just under a 10% response. The final return rate on the questionnaires was 75%.

The percentages of returns revealed a higher return rate for center directors. This higher rate (87%) over the return by Michigan directors (71.5%) can be partially explained by the cover letter for the mailed instrument. This cover letter was identified as coming from a regional center of which all of the centers in the study relate to as being part of a network of centers throughout the United States.

**Personal interviews**

The selected experts on aging were personally interviewed, at their places of work during the months of December, 1974, and January, 1975. Prior to each interview, a copy of Chapter One of this study, along with a list of question areas to be covered, was sent to each interviewee. It was not known at the time of selection...
how much knowledge the interviewee had concerning community education. Chapter One was used as a means of helping the interviewee become acquainted with the basics of community education, and in particular, become acquainted with this dissertation.

The interviews, scheduled in advance, were recorded on audio tape for later analysis. The purpose of these interviews from outside the field of community education was to gather information and opinions of experts on aging as a contrast to the surveyed opinions of community educators.

Data Analysis

Data gathered from Michigan and center directors of community education, and from selected experts on aging were analyzed as each related to:

1. Basic considerations for program development.
2. Communication and needs assessment processes.
3. Participant involvement in programming.
4. Leadership skills needed by the community educator.
5. Program components.
6. Programming priority.

A second source of data, from Michigan community education directors concerning current efforts in programming for older adults, was analyzed for use in contrasting information gathered from the field survey instrument, parts one and two.

Field survey instrument

The 15 items contained in the field survey instrument were analyzed through use of frequency and percentage breakdowns.
Analysis included a comparison of the following group breakdowns of Michigan directors:


2. Michigan directors of community education in urban, rural, and suburban districts.

3. Michigan districts operating programs in community education from 0-2 years, 2-5 years, 5-8 years, and 8+ years or more.

4. Michigan directors of community education with extensive training in working with older adults, with some training in working with older adults, with little training in working with older adults, and with no training in working with older adults.

Directors having "extensive training" were determined by responses from the field survey instrument which indicated the director to have had formal graduate course work, inservice training or seminars, and information sharing sessions with local older adult groups or agency personnel. "Some training" was determined by the director responding to two of the three possible training levels. "Little training" was determined by the director responding to one of the three possible training levels. "No training" was a response category by itself.

Current programming for older adults

The open-ended items in the survey instrument were only answered by Michigan directors. The item responses were analyzed on a descriptive basis. Responses were first categorized according to similarity of content, and subsequently ranked according to the frequency with which each appeared. This method
provided a means by which the most common practices in current programming for older adults in Michigan could be identified, as well as a means to compare current programming efforts with various aspects of the model for development of a community education program for older adults.

**Personal interviews with experts on aging**

The interview questions were analyzed in a similar manner as the section on current programming for older adults. The taped responses were initially categorized according to similarity of content, and subsequently ranked according to the frequency with which each appeared, on a question by question basis. These interview responses appear in Appendix D. This method of analysis facilitated the means by which the majority responses of the selected experts on aging could be contrasted with the results from the questionnaire statements responded to by the community educators.

**Summary**

There were five major sections in Chapter Three concerned with the design of the study. These sections dealt with the selection of populations, instrument development, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. This design is utilized in the subsequent chapter (Chapter Four) on Data Summary.

Chapter Five is the development of the model, based upon a summary of information and data from Chapters Two, and Four. Chapter Six is concerned with the interpretation of findings, limitations, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER IV
DATA SUMMARY

This chapter contains a report of the findings from data submitted by community educators and experts on aging.

Non-Respondents

The analysis of respondents revealed an even response rate (Table 1, Chapter Three) for Michigan directors (68%-75.4%) while center directors responded at an 87% rate. Seven center directors did not respond (47 out of 54) to the mailed questionnaire. No information on the individual characteristics of center directors was solicited. The information available on the center directors (geographic location within the United States) did not reveal any consistent pattern. There are centers located in 37 of the 50 states. The thirteen states not represented by centers are: Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Of the seven center directors who did not respond to the questionnaire, four were from states represented by more than one center (Appendix B). In total, there were 34 of the 50 states represented.

Geographically, non-responding Michigan directors were spread evenly throughout the state. The four regional areas in Michigan represented a total of 186 surveyed directors, of which 132 responded to the questionnaire. There were 28.5% of the Michigan directors who did not respond, or 54 directors.

In the four regional areas in Michigan, 5 out of 20
directors (25%) failed to respond in the northern area, 14 out of 57 directors (24.6%) failed to respond in the eastern area, 15 out of 50 directors (30%) failed to respond in the central area, and 19 out of 59 directors (32%) failed to respond in the western area. The percentage of non-respondents ranged from a high of 32% in the western area to a low of 24.6% in the eastern area.

The Michigan directors were requested in the field survey instrument to indicate two district characteristics and one personal characteristic. The three characteristics are represented in the dissertation by the following breakdown.

**Urban, rural and suburban directors in Michigan**

Of the 132 Michigan directors who responded to the mailed questionnaire, nine or seven percent classified themselves as representing urban districts, 75 directors, or 57%, classified themselves as rural directors, and 42 directors, or 31%, classified themselves as suburban directors. There were six Michigan directors, or five percent, who did not respond.

**Training level of directors in Michigan**

This item dealt with the level of training directors have in working with older adults. If directors checked all three levels of responses (graduate level course work, inservice training/seminars, and information sharing sessions with local older adult groups or area agency personnel) they were classified as having extensive training in working with older adults. For those directors checking only one or two training levels, they were classified respectively as having little or some training in working with older adults. A fourth classification was no
specific training.

Michigan directors responded to this item as follows: (a) 15, or 11%, of the directors had extensive training, (b) 33, or 25%, of the directors had some training, and (c) 42, or 32%, had little training, while (d) 32, or 24%, had no training. Of the total respondents, 10, or eight percent of the directors did not respond to this item.

Program years in operation

This survey item requested the respondent to indicate the years the program he/she directs has been in existence. The following is the breakdown of the responses: (a) 25, or 19%, indicated a program existence of less than two years, (b) 43, or 32%, indicated a program existence of between two and five years, (c) 35, or 27%, indicated a program existence of between five and eight years, and (d) 23, or 17%, indicated a program existence of over eight years. There were 6, or 5%, of the directors who did not respond to this item.

Summary of respondents

Michigan directors of community education are mostly from rural districts. Very few of the districts (seven percent) were classified as urban. These few urban districts may represent though, a majority of population. The 1972 Michigan Statistical Abstract reports that 6.5 million of the 8.8 million people in Michigan live in urban areas. Statistics were described only in terms of urban and rural areas, not suburban.

In terms of training levels of directors in working with
older adults, few directors classified themselves as having extensive training. The majority of directors indicated some or little training.

A majority (59%) of districts have operated community education programs from two to eight years.

Data Summary

The following section presents a summary of data from the field survey instrument for community educators and personal interviews with the six selected experts on aging. The summary data is presented according to the major areas addressed throughout this dissertation and as outlined in Chapter Three.

Basic considerations for program development

Basic considerations for program development addresses three main areas: (a) the best facilities for use in programming for older adults, (b) age criterion for participation in programming, and (c) time scheduling of programs for older adults.

Facility use

Item six of the field survey instrument addressed the question of what community facilities are best utilized in programming for older adults.

6. Use of facilities for older adult programming

   ___ a. Community educators should make primary use of educational facilities for older adult programming

   ___ b. Community educators should make primary use of traditional gathering places for older adult programming (clubs, churches, housing projects)
c. Community educators should make primary use of facilities nearest the central shopping areas for older adult programming

d. Other, please explain

The combined population of community educators (Michigan and center directors) indicated (51%) that those facilities presently in use (clubs, churches, housing projects) should be utilized in programming for older adults (Table 2). A large percentage (23%) of the respondents chose to write in their own responses. Analysis of these written in responses indicates that the most "accessible facilities" should be used in programming.

Among Michigan and center directors, both groups chose responses ("those presently in use" and "other") which indicated using facilities that older adults find convenient (accessible) and familiar. Neither group indicated making primary use of educational facilities (16% for Michigan directors and 13% for center directors).

The breakdown of Michigan directors (excluding non-respondents) revealed a similar pattern for most groupings, except for directors with extensive training, and those directing programs of less than two years. Directors with extensive training in working with older adults chose "shopping areas" (33%) over "those facilities presently in use by older adults" (20%). Directors of programs of less than two years chose "those facilities presently in use by older adults" (76%) to a larger extent than did other groups.
Table 2
responses on use of facilities for older adult programming by Michigan and center directors and Michigan directors by type of district, training level, and years in operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Educational Older Adults</th>
<th>Nearest Central Shopping Areas</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Type of District</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Training Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were three non-respondents to this item; two Michigan directors and one center director. In the breakdowns of Michigan directors, six directors did not indicate type of district or years in operation. There were 10 directors who did not indicate training level. Analysis of these non-respondents reveal the choice of "those facilities presently in use by older adults" was most indicated in each of the three breakdowns.

Selected experts on aging indicated that facility comfort, as perceived by the older adult, was generally most important. Convenience and proximity of the facility to the older adult was also mentioned by respondents. One respondent indicated that community education should make greatest use of the school facility. Two respondents indicated that while schools and churches offer available facilities, both are often negatively reacted to by some segments of older adults.

**Age criterion**

This question appeared as item eight in the field survey instrument.

8. Age requirements for participating in older adult activities
   ____ a. 65 years and older
   ____ b. 60 years and older
   ____ c. 55 years and older
   ____ d. Upon retirement
   ____ e. Other, please explain

The most frequent response (37%) choice by community educators was 55 years and older (Table 3) as the age requirement for
Table 3
Responses on Age Requirements for Participation by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Criterion</th>
<th>65 n</th>
<th>60 n</th>
<th>55 n</th>
<th>Retirement n</th>
<th>Other n</th>
<th>Response n</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
<td>45 (34)</td>
<td>25 (19)</td>
<td>24 (18)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>21 (45)</td>
<td>7 (15)</td>
<td>14 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>39 (22)</td>
<td>66 (37)</td>
<td>32 (16)</td>
<td>38 (22)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>20 (27)</td>
<td>27 (36)</td>
<td>15 (20)</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>12 (29)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>1 (16)</td>
<td>1 (16)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>9 (27)</td>
<td>10 (30)</td>
<td>7 (21)</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>13 (31)</td>
<td>17 (40)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (22)</td>
<td>7 (22)</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>10 (31)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>16 (38)</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>7 (16)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (26)</td>
<td>8 (23)</td>
<td>9 (26)</td>
<td>9 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>11 (48)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>4 (66)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participation in activities. There was an equal preference (22%) for both the response choices of "60 years and older" and "Other". Of the written responses, most indicated that there should be no age criterion for participation.

Center directors and Michigan directors indicated different choices. Center directors chose "55" (45%) and "Other" (30%) most frequently, while Michigan directors chose "55" and "60" most frequently. Both groups of community educators were least likely to choose "65" (21% and 0%).

On the breakdown of Michigan directors, the trend was "55" years as the most frequently chosen, with "60" and "retirement" following in order of preference. Directors of programs less than two years old indicated a preference (40%) for "60" years. The lack of choosing "65" years remained consistent except for the urban directors who indicated "65" more (13%) than did other groups.

There was one Michigan director who did not respond to item eight. For those Michigan directors who did not indicate type of district, training level, or years in existence, their response pattern to item eight indicated "55" years, although non-respondents by type of district indicated "60" and "55" years equally (33%).

All six of the selected experts on aging agreed that whenever possible, age requirements should be avoided. If an age requirement is needed for specific circumstances, retired, 60 years, and 55 years were suggested.

**Programming schedules**

There were two questions addressed with programming schedules: (a) programming times during the year, and (b) programming times
during the day or evening. Community educators responded to a question about schedules during the year. Selected experts on aging responded to the best times to schedule activities during a given day.

Question 10 dealt with the scheduling of programs for older adults by community educators.

10. Length and time of older adult programming

___a. Programming for older adults should be on a regular seasonal basis and coincided with K-12 schedules

___b. Programming for older adults should be on a year round basis

___c. Programming for older adults should be designed around specific needs as they arise

___d. Programming for older adults should be scheduled on a similar basis as other advertised community education activities

___e. Other, please explain

The majority (62%) of community educators chose "year round" programming (Table 4). Center directors chose "based on specific needs of older adults" more than did Michigan directors (28% as compared to 17%). Michigan and center directors indicated both "year round" and "based on specific needs of older adults" more than "same as other community education activities".

The "year round" choice was consistent among the other breakdowns for Michigan directors. Differences were found in comparing the relationship between "based on specific needs of older adults" and "same as other community education activities".
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### Table 4

Responses on Community Education Programming Schedules by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Schedules</th>
<th>Based on Specific Needs of Older Adults</th>
<th>Same as Other C.E. Activities</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonal Needs of Older Adults</td>
<td>Same as K-12</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>88 (67)</td>
<td>23 (17)</td>
<td>18 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>23 (49)</td>
<td>13 (28)</td>
<td>7 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>111 (62)</td>
<td>36 (20)</td>
<td>25 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Michigan Directors: Type of District | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban                               | 0 (0) | 5 (56) | 2 (22) | 2 (22) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (100) |
| Rural                               | 1 (1) | 55 (73) | 11 (15) | 7 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 75 (100) |
| Suburban                            | 0 (0) | 25 (60) | 8 (19) | 8 (19) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 42 (100) |
| No Response                         | 0 (0) | 3 (50) | 2 (33) | 1 (17) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 (100)  |
| Totals                              | 132 (100) | | | | | | | |

| Michigan Directors: Training Level | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extensive                          | 0 (0) | 10 (67) | 2 (13) | 2 (13) | 1 (7) | 0 (0) | 15 (100) |
| Some                               | 0 (0) | 22 (67) | 6 (18) | 5 (15) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 33 (100) |
| Little                             | 0 (0) | 29 (69) | 7 (17) | 5 (12) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 42 (100) |
| None                               | 1 (3) | 21 (68) | 6 (17) | 4 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 32 (100) |
| No Response                        | 0 (0) | 6 (60) | 2 (20) | 2 (20) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 10 (100) |
| Totals                             | 132 (100) | | | | | | | |

| Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-2 Years                                                | 0 (0) | 18 (72) | 3 (12) | 4 (16) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 25 (100) |
| 2-5 Years                                                | 1 (2) | 27 (63) | 7 (16) | 7 (16) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 43 (100) |
| 5-8 Years                                                | 0 (0) | 22 (62) | 9 (26) | 3 (9) | 1 (3) | 0 (0) | 35 (100) |
| 8 Years or More                                          | 0 (0) | 18 (71) | 2 (8) | 4 (21) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 23 (100) |
| No Response                                              | 0 (0) | 4 (67) | 2 (33) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 (100)  |
| Totals                                                   | 132 (100) | | | | | | | |
Michigan directors in districts "0-2 years" in operation and "8 years or more" chose "same as other community education activities" more frequently than "based on specific needs of older adults".

All 179 of the community educators responded to this question. Of the Michigan directors who responded to this question but did not indicate type of district, training level or years in operation, the "year round" choice was indicated in each case.

On the interview question relating to the best time to schedule activities during a day, five out of six selected experts on aging indicated that daytime activities are best. Respondents mentioned that night activities should not be totally eliminated without first asking participants. Late afternoon and early evenings were suggested by three respondents as the best time to get several age groups together.

**Communication and needs assessment processes**

This section deals with (a) amount of direct or supportive involvement community educators should have in programming for older adults, (b) type of advisory council format best suited for use in programming for older adults, (c) best means with which to communicate with older adults on a day to day basis, and (d) needs assessment processes best utilized in determining needs of older adults.

**Direct or supportive involvement**

Question one related to the type of involvement community educators should seek in providing a specific service need of older adults.
1. Transportation services as an example of a high priority need area of older adults

   a. Community educators should not address this need
   b. Community educators should initiate some type of community forum or discussion in addressing this need
   c. Community educators should contact and help coordinate services with other area agencies in addressing this need
   d. Community educators should initiate their own programs in addressing this need
   e. Other, please explain

Community educators indicated (82%) "assist other agencies" as a means of meeting a specific service need. Both choices of "should not address" and "provide the service" were indicated by only one percent and five percent respectively (Table 5).

Center directors totally concentrated their choices into two categories; "assist other agencies" (91%) and "community discussions" (9%). Michigan directors were more spread in their responses, indicating "assist other agencies" (79%), "community discussions" (8%) and "provide the service" (7%).

In the breakdown of Michigan directors, only urban directors, those with extensive training, and those whose programs were eight years or more old revealed a different response pattern. Urban directors indicated "community discussions" (22%) more than did other groups. Directors with extensive training and those in districts operating 8 years or more indicated "other" (20% and 12% respectively) more frequently than did other groups. Analysis
Table 5
Responses on Role of Community Education in Providing a Specified Service by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response to Providing Transportation Services</th>
<th>Should Not Address Discussions</th>
<th>Assit Other Agencies The Service</th>
<th>Provide Other Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n %</th>
<th>n %</th>
<th>n %</th>
<th>n %</th>
<th>n %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
<td>104 (79)</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>43 (91)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
<td>147 (82)</td>
<td>9 (5)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>58 (77)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>34 (81)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (83)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (97)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>32 (76)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>26 (82)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>20 (80)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>35 (81)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>29 (82)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>16 (67)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (66)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of "other" responses indicated the response to a specific service need should depend on the local situation.

There were no non-respondents to item one. The Michigan directors who responded to item one but did not indicate type of district, training levels or years in operation indicated "assist other agencies". Michigan non-responding directors by training level indicated "provide the service" more (30%) than did other non-respondent groups.

Selected experts on aging were not asked to respond to this specific question area.

**Advisory councils**

Directors in item nine were given the choice of five types of advisory councils which could be utilized in serving older adults.

9. Advisory councils and older adults

   a. Community wide council: represents a broad cross section of the community; advisory capacity to community education on older adults

   b. Special interest council: represents specifically the older adult population in advising community education; older adults widely represented on the council

   c. Agency coordinating council: represents a means to coordinate area activity in meeting older adult needs; agency personnel primary representatives along with some older adults

   d. Ad hoc action council: formed to meet a specific older adult need and is dissolved upon action being taken;
membership reflected by the particular action needed

e. Ad hoc advisory council: formed to advise and recommend action on older adult needs to community education and is dissolved upon recommendations being made; membership reflected by the needs at the time

f. Other, please explain

A majority of all directors (51%) indicated the community-wide council as most appropriate (Table 6). The special interest council (specifically representing older adults) and agency coordinating council both (19% and 14% respectively) were indicated as well. Both types of ad hoc councils received little support.

Michigan directors indicated "agency coordinating councils" (17%) to a greater extent than did center directors (7%).

Michigan directors in the three breakdowns indicated a preference for "community-wide" councils, while also supporting the use of "special interest" and "agency coordinating" councils. Two differences occurred with directors classified by training level. Directors with extensive training gave less support to "special interest" and "agency coordinating" councils (7% for both) while indicating "ad hoc advisory" councils more than did other groups. Directors with no training indicated "agency coordinating" councils less (9%) than did other groups.

There were no non-respondents on item nine. Among the Michigan directors who responded to this item but did not indicate background characteristics, responses were between "community-wide" councils and "agency coordinating" councils. Non-respondents did not choose
### Table 6
Responses on Advisory Councils by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Community Wide</th>
<th>Special Interest</th>
<th>Agency Coordinating</th>
<th>Ad hoc Action</th>
<th>Ad hoc Advisory</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td>65 (49)</td>
<td>26 (20)</td>
<td>23 (17)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>27 (58)</td>
<td>8 (16)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>92 (51)</td>
<td>34 (19)</td>
<td>26 (14)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>11 (7)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Type of District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>41 (54)</td>
<td>13 (18)</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>17 (40)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Training Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>17 (52)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>17 (40)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>10 (25)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17 (53)</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>21 (49)</td>
<td>11 (25)</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>16 (46)</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>7 (20)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 (67)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"special interest" councils in any of the three groupings of non-respondents.

The six selected experts on aging were not asked to respond to advisory council formats.

**Day to day communication**

For establishing the most effective day to day communication patterns, four of the selected experts on aging felt that older adults could best reach other older adults. As such, they felt that establishing communication with a small group of those already participating would serve to spread messages to other non-participating older adults. Those media which reach most homes, especially radio and television, were also mentioned by three respondents as possible communication devices.

Michigan directors were not requested to respond to a question specifically on establishing a communications network.

**Needs assessment**

Item seven addressed possible areas of involvement by community educators in programming for older adults.

7. The primary function of community education in meeting needs of older adults

   ____a. The primary function should be gathering of information on area older adults and identifying need areas for community planning purposes

   ____b. The primary function should be programming of older adult activities

   ____c. The primary function should be educating the area
citizenry and agencies on older adult needs
d. The primary function should be providing a link between the K-12 program and the needs and interests of area older adults
e. Other, please explain

Needs assessment was selected (36%) by community educators as the primary function of community education, although all other response choices were between the 10% and 20% level (Table 7). Written responses indicated that a combination of all four responses were most appropriate.

Differences in response choices existed between Michigan and center directors. Michigan directors spread their responses over all four response choices (excluding "other") while indicating "needs assessment" most frequently (30%). A majority of center directors (55%) indicated "needs assessment" while also indicating "other" more than did Michigan directors (28% as compared to 8%).

The breakdown of Michigan directors revealed a mixed pattern with no one response choice being clearly indicated. Urban directors indicated "link with K-12" less (11%) than did other groups. Directors with extensive training indicated "direct programming" less (7%) than did other groups. Directors with no training indicated "educating community members" less (9%) than did other groups. Directors in programs operating 0-2 years indicated "educating community members" less (8%) while indicating "link with K-12" more (52%) than did other groups. Directors in programs operating 5-8 years indicated "educating community members" less (9%) than did
### Table 7

Responses on the Primary Function of Community Education by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Direct Programming</th>
<th>Educating Community Members</th>
<th>Link With K-12</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>39 (30)</td>
<td>26 (20)</td>
<td>21 (15)</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>26 (55)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>13 (28)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>65 (36)</td>
<td>29 (16)</td>
<td>25 (14)</td>
<td>35 (20)</td>
<td>24 (13)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>3 (34)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22 (29)</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>13 (17)</td>
<td>22 (29)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>15 (36)</td>
<td>10 (23)</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>4 (37)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>9 (27)</td>
<td>10 (30)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
<td>5 (15)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>10 (24)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>1 (26)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14 (44)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>11 (34)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>8 (52)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>14 (33)</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>7 (20)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (23)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other groups.

There was one Michigan director who did not respond to item seven. The Michigan non-respondents by type of district, training level and years in operation revealed an uneven pattern. By type of district, "direct programming", "link with K-12" and "other" all elicited the same proportion of response (33%). By training level, all choices were responded to (20% to 30%) except "direct programming". By years in operation, all choices were responded to (17% to 33%) except "needs assessment".

In a related item (15), community educators were requested to respond to conducting a needs assessment.

15. Assessing needs of older adults
   _____a. Community educators should utilize area agencies as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____b. Community educators should utilize area older adult groups as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____c. Community educators should utilize some type of advisory council as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____d. Community educators should utilize individual older adults as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____e. Other, please explain

Community educators did not indicate a majority (over 50%) for any one response choice (Table 8). "Groups of older adults"
Table 8
Responses on Assessing Needs of Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Needs Assessment Sources</th>
<th>Groups of Agencies n</th>
<th>Groups of Older Adults n</th>
<th>Advisory Councils n</th>
<th>Individual Older Adults n</th>
<th>Other n</th>
<th>No Response n</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
<td>50 (38)</td>
<td>37 (28)</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>13 (28)</td>
<td>12 (26)</td>
<td>7 (15)</td>
<td>10 (21)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21 (12)</td>
<td>63 (35)</td>
<td>49 (27)</td>
<td>21 (12)</td>
<td>22 (12)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michigan Directors: Type of District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>9 (12)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td>17 (41)</td>
<td>0 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (27)</td>
<td>1 (31)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
<td>2 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michigan Directors: Training Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>7 (22)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>11 (33)</td>
<td>19 (45)</td>
<td>10 (31)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>9 (27)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (14)</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (14)</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-2 Years</th>
<th>2-5 Years</th>
<th>5-8 Years</th>
<th>8 Years or More</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>18 (42)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>8 (34)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>13 (30)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>4 (18)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (100)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(35%) and "advisory councils" (22%) were the two most popular choices.

Michigan directors indicated "groups of older adults" (38%) more than did center directors (28%). Center directors indicated "other" more frequently than did Michigan directors (21% and 9% respectively).

In the breakdowns of Michigan directors, urban directors, suburban directors, and directors with extensive training varied from the pattern established by the combined group of community educators. Urban directors indicated "agencies" and "groups of older adults" (33%) with the same frequency. Suburban directors indicated "advisory councils" more frequently (41%) than they did "groups of older adults" (37%). Directors with extensive training indicated "groups of older adults" by a larger frequency (60%) than did other groups.

There were three Michigan directors who did not respond to item 15. Of these three, one failed to respond to either the background information or to item 15. Among all three breakdowns of Michigan directors by type of district, training level, and years in operation, non-respondents indicated "other" most frequently.

Social clubs, churches, personal contacts with older adults were all mentioned as possible means of assessing needs of older adults by all the selected experts on aging. Specifically, developing an agency advisory council and using present participants as sources for needs assessment information were mentioned by four respondents.
One person indicated that needs assessment was not needed as information on the needs of older adults is already available.

A specific technique mentioned by one respondent for assessing needs was to survey and select a representative sample of older adults from a community and conduct in-depth interviews with each one selected.

**Participant involvement in programming**

There were two survey items and two personal interview items which related to the question of participant involvement. The first item relates to what segment of older adults should be involved in programming.

2. Concentrating efforts on a particular segment of the older adult population
   
   ___a. Community educators should seek out and involve the hidden, uninvolved older adult
   
   ___b. Community educators should seek out and involve all older adults
   
   ___c. Community educators should seek out and involve those older adults with specific needs
   
   ___d. Community educators should seek out and involve the under-educated older adult
   
   ___e. Other, please explain

Both groups of community educators indicated (69%) that "all" older adults should be sought out and involved (Table 9).

Center directors indicated "all" older adults (74%) to a greater extent than did Michigan directors (68%). Michigan directors in turn
Table 9

Responses on Concentrating Efforts on a Particular Segment of Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

| Group                                  | Currently Uninvolved n | % | All n | % | Those In Need n | % | Under-educated n | % | Other n | % | No Response n | % | Total n | % |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------|----|-----------------|---|-----------------|----|---------|---|...............|----|---------|---|
| **Michigan and Center Directors**      |                        |   |       |    |                 |    |                 |    |         |   |                 |    |         |   |
| Michigan                               | 19 (14)                | 60 | 90 (68) | 72 | 6 (12)          | 72 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 7 (5)   | 56| 0 (0)       | 0  | 132 (100) | 100 |
| Center                                 | 6 (13)                 | 12 | 35 (74) | 70 | 2 (4)           | 40 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 4 (9)   | 80| 0 (0)       | 0  | 47 (100)  | 100 |
| **Totals**                             | 25 (14)                | 62 | 125 (69) | 70 | 8 (10)          | 80 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 11 (6)  | 60| 0 (0)       | 0  | 179 (100) | 100 |
| **Michigan Directors: Type of District** |                        |   |       |    |                 |    |                 |    |         |   |                 |    |         |   |
| Urban                                  | 3 (33)                 | 33 | 3 (33) | 33 | 2 (22)          | 22 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (11)  | 11| 0 (0)       | 0  | 9 (100)   | 100 |
| Rural                                  | 8 (11)                 | 11 | 50 (78) | 75 | 13 (17)         | 17 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 4 (5)   | 50| 0 (0)       | 0  | 75 (100)  | 100 |
| Suburban                               | 6 (14)                 | 14 | 33 (79) | 79 | 1 (2)           | 2  | 0 (0)           | 0  | 2 (5)   | 10| 0 (0)       | 0  | 42 (100)  | 100 |
| No Response                            | 2 (33)                 | 33 | 4 (67) | 67 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 0 (0)           | 0  | 0 (0)   | 0 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 6 (100)   | 100 |
| **Totals**                             | 132 (100)              |   |       |    |                 |    |                 |    |         |   |                 |    |         |   |
| **Michigan Directors: Training Level**  |                        |   |       |    |                 |    |                 |    |         |   |                 |    |         |   |
| Extensive                              | 2 (13)                 | 13 | 9 (60) | 60 | 3 (20)          | 20 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (6)   | 6 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 15 (100)  | 100 |
| Some                                   | 6 (18)                 | 18 | 23 (70) | 70 | 3 (9)           | 9  | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (3)   | 3 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 33 (100)  | 100 |
| Little                                 | 4 (9)                  | 9  | 32 (76) | 76 | 4 (9)           | 9  | 0 (0)           | 0  | 2 (5)   | 5 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 42 (100)  | 100 |
| None                                   | 3 (9)                  | 9  | 21 (66) | 66 | 6 (19)          | 19 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 2 (6)   | 6 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 32 (100)  | 100 |
| No Response                            | 4 (40)                 | 40 | 5 (50) | 50 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (10)  | 10| 0 (0)       | 0  | 10 (100)  | 100 |
| **Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation** |                       |   |       |    |                 |    |                 |    |         |   |                 |    |         |   |
| 0-2 Years                              | 1 (4)                  | 4  | 20 (80) | 80 | 3 (12)          | 12 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (4)   | 4 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 25 (100)  | 100 |
| 2-5 Years                              | 6 (14)                 | 14 | 30 (70) | 70 | 5 (12)          | 12 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 2 (5)   | 5 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 43 (100)  | 100 |
| 5-8 Years                              | 4 (11)                 | 11 | 23 (66) | 66 | 5 (14)          | 14 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 3 (9)   | 9 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 35 (100)  | 100 |
| 8 Years or More                        | 6 (26)                 | 26 | 13 (57) | 57 | 3 (13)          | 13 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 1 (4)   | 4 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 23 (100)  | 100 |
| No Response                            | 3 (50)                 | 50 | 2 (33) | 33 | 1 (17)          | 17 | 0 (0)           | 0  | 0 (0)   | 0 | 0 (0)       | 0  | 6 (100)   | 100 |
indicated "those in need" (12%) to a greater extent than did center directors (4%). Both groups chose "currently uninvolved" to some degree (14% Michigan and 13% center directors).

Among Michigan directors, urban and suburban directors indicated responses which were different from other groups. Urban directors indicated "currently uninvolved" (33%) to a greater degree than other groups. Suburban directors indicated "those in need" (2%) less than other groups, although this percentage was similar to that of center directors (4%).

There were no non-respondents to this item. For those who did not indicate background characteristics, the majority response was similar to that for all directors.

Four of six selected experts on aging indicated that some emphasis should be placed on concentrating efforts on target groups or problems, but not as the singular involvement of programming efforts. The other two respondents indicated that all older adults should be involved.

Another related item (12) is that of developing leadership responsibilities among older adults and how much older adults should be involved in program direction.

12. Developing older adult program leadership

   a. Community educators should primarily train older adults in operating and planning activities
   b. Community educators should primarily share equal responsibility with older adults in operating and planning activities
   c. Community educators should primarily assume responsibility
in operating and planning activities, along with support help from older adults
d. Community educators should primarily assume responsibility in operating and planning activities for older adults
e. Other, please explain

Most (52%) of the community educators indicated that community educators should share equal responsibility with older adults in providing program leadership (Table 10).

Center directors indicated "most planning and directing by older adults" to a larger degree (30%) than did Michigan directors (23%). Michigan directors indicated "mostly community educators" to a greater extent (23%) than did center directors (2%).

Analysis of Michigan directors revealed that differences occurred in the response items of urban directors, directors with no training, and directors in programs operating eight years or more. Urban directors indicated "mostly community educators" (33%) as the appropriate planners. Directors with no training indicated "most planning and directing by older adults" as the most frequent choice (38%). Directors of programs in operation eight years or more indicated "mostly community educators" (52%).

One Michigan director did not respond to item 12. Michigan non-respondents who did not indicate background characteristics revealed that "most planning and directing by older adults" was most frequently mentioned by directors by training level and program years in operation. Non-respondents by type of district indicated "equal with community educators".
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Table 10

Responses on Program Leadership Among Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Councils for Possible Use in Community Education</th>
<th>Michigan and Center Directors</th>
<th>Michigan Directors: Type of District</th>
<th>Michigan Directors: Training Level</th>
<th>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Planning Equal With Mostly Only</td>
<td>Michigan (139)</td>
<td>Michigan Directors</td>
<td>Michigan Directors</td>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And Directing By Older Adults And Directing Community Community Community Other No Response Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td>44 (25)</td>
<td>95 (52)</td>
<td>31 (17)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>30 (23)</td>
<td>66 (30)</td>
<td>30 (23)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>14 (30)</td>
<td>29 (62)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2 (23)</td>
<td>2 (23)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
<td>38 (51)</td>
<td>18 (24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>22 (52)</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>4 (67)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>23 (70)</td>
<td>5 (15)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>21 (50)</td>
<td>13 (32)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12 (38)</td>
<td>11 (34)</td>
<td>7 (22)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
<td>14 (56)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>28 (65)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>10 (29)</td>
<td>13 (37)</td>
<td>8 (23)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132 (100)
All of the selected experts on aging felt that programs should and could involve older adults to a large degree in program planning and development. It was mentioned that directors may have to take the initiative, at first, in gaining a wider participation. Also mentioned was the importance of training older adults in program leadership; not expecting them, or any other age group for that matter, to be able automatically to assume leadership. One respondent indicated that directors need to be patient with this process of greater participant involvement, and make sure the chances for success are great.

**Leadership skills needed by community educators**

Leadership skills needed by the community educator in working with older adults as perceived and reported by community educators are divided into two sections: (a) skills needed, and (b) skills adjustment. Skills adjustment is the perceived amount of change in knowledge needed by community educators in working with older adults.

**Skills needed**

4. Skills needed in directing the day to day operation of an older adult program

   ___a. Community educators should know the characteristics of older adults and have a high degree of programming skill [Technical skill area]

   ___b. Community educators should know how the needs of older adults relate to community education processes and how societal forces affect the older adult [Conceptual skill area]
c. Community educators should relate well with older adults and build cooperative relationships within the older adult group [Human skill area]

d. Other, please explain

The combined group of community educators indicated "human" skills (46%) and "conceptual" skills (44%) most frequently (Table 11). Michigan directors chose "human" skills (52%) to a greater extent than did center directors (28%).

The breakdown of Michigan directors revealed that urban directors, suburban directors, directors with some training and directors in districts operating eight years or more responded in a different pattern than did Michigan directors as a total group. Urban directors indicated "conceptual" skills (67%) more than "human" skills. Suburban directors, directors with some training, and directors in districts operating eight years or more also indicated "conceptual" skills more frequently than "human" skills.

There was one center director who did not respond to this item. Among Michigan directors who did not indicate background characteristics, all three groups indicated "human" skills most frequently.

The most frequently mentioned leadership attributes by the selected experts on aging were sensitivity toward needs, people oriented, directness, respect for autonomy of older adults, and knowledge of older adults and the aging process. According to the use of "human" skills (Weaver, 1972) as used in item four of the field survey instrument, "sensitivity toward needs", "people oriented" are both related to this area. "Directness", "respect for
Table 11

Responses on Skills Needed in Directing a Program for Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>53 (40)</td>
<td>69 (52)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>26 (55)</td>
<td>13 (28)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>79 (44)</td>
<td>82 (46)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (67)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>25 (33)</td>
<td>46 (61)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>21 (50)</td>
<td>17 (40)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>17 (52)</td>
<td>13 (39)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>16 (38)</td>
<td>23 (55)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>13 (40)</td>
<td>17 (53)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>17 (40)</td>
<td>25 (58)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>13 (37)</td>
<td>20 (57)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or more</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>13 (57)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
autonomy", and "knowledge of older adults and the aging process" are not directly related to the three skill areas, but were mentioned by respondents as needed skills.

**Skill adjustment**

Item three of the field survey instrument addressed the amount of knowledge needed by community educators in working with older adults.

3. Leadership skill adjustment needed in working with older adults
   ___ a. Community educators need the same leadership skills for working with an older adult group as are needed for working with any other community group
   ___ b. Community educators need to have background and needs assessment information available in order to adjust leadership skills for working with older adults
   ___ c. Community educators need both background information, needs assessment information and inservice training in order to adjust leadership skills for working with older adults
   ___ d. Other, please explain

Community educators indicated (Table 12) that "much" (71%) adjustment was needed in working with older adults, such as background information on older adults, inservice training, and needs assessment information.

Michigan and center directors indicated "much" adjustment (73% and 66% respectively) was needed.

The breakdown of Michigan directors revealed few differences
Table 12
Responses on Leadership Skill Adjustment Needed in Working with Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Amount of Adjustment</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None  n %</td>
<td>Some   n %</td>
<td>Much  n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
<td>21 (16)</td>
<td>96 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>9 (19)</td>
<td>31 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18 (10)</td>
<td>30 (17)</td>
<td>127 (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Michigan Directors: Type of District       |          |          |          |          |          |
| Urban                                     | 0 (0)    | 2 (22)  | 7 (78)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 9 (100)   |
| Rural                                     | 9 (12)   | 11 (15) | 53 (71) | 2 (3)   | 0 (0)   | 75 (100)  |
| Suburban                                  | 3 (7)    | 4 (10)  | 34 (81) | 1 (2)   | 0 (0)   | 42 (100)  |
| No Response                               | 0 (0)    | 4 (67)  | 2 (33)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 6 (100)   |
| Totals                                    | 132 (100) |        |        |          |          |

| Michigan Directors: Training Level         |          |          |          |          |          |
| Extensive                                 | 2 (13)   | 2 (13)  | 10 (67) | 1 (7)   | 0 (0)   | 15 (100)  |
| Some                                      | 3 (9)    | 6 (18)  | 23 (70) | 1 (3)   | 0 (0)   | 33 (100)  |
| Little                                    | 4 (9)    | 5 (12)  | 32 (76) | 1 (2)   | 0 (0)   | 42 (100)  |
| None                                      | 3 (9)    | 5 (16)  | 24 (75) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 32 (100)  |
| No Response                               | 0 (0)    | 3 (30)  | 7 (70)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 10 (100)  |
| Totals                                    | 132 (100) |        |        |          |          |

| Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation |          |          |          |          |          |
| 0-2 Years                                               | 5 (20)   | 2 (8)   | 17 (68) | 1 (4)   | 0 (0)   | 25 (100)  |
| 2-5 Years                                               | 4 (9)    | 8 (19)  | 31 (72) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 43 (100)  |
| 5-8 Years                                               | 2 (6)    | 7 (20)  | 25 (71) | 1 (3)   | 0 (0)   | 35 (100)  |
| 8 Years or More                                         | 1 (4)    | 2 (9)   | 19 (83) | 1 (4)   | 0 (0)   | 23 (100)  |
| No Response                                             | 0 (0)    | 2 (33)  | 4 (67)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 6 (100)   |
| Totals                                                  | 132 (100) |        |        |          |          |
from the two combined groups of community educators. Directors in
districts operating 0-2 years indicated "none" (20%) to a larger
extent than did other groups.

There were no non-respondents to this item. Among those
directors who did not indicate background characteristics, the non­
respondents by type of district indicated "some" (67%) adjustment.
Other non-respondents indicated "much" adjustment was needed.

All of the selected experts on aging interviewed felt that
community educators need to have some knowledge and sophistication
on the needs and characteristics of older adults. Also, it was
felt by three respondents that extensive training in this area was
not needed. It was indicated by one respondent as helpful if the
community educator has an appreciation and some knowledge of the
periods of time which older adults have lived through and often
relate to.

Program components

There are two elements addressed in this section: (a) social
or educational activity format, and (b) age-integrated versus age­
separated activities.

Social or educational activities

Item five of the field survey instrument addresses the area
of scheduling social and/or educational activities.

5. Methods of involving older adults in activities

   a. Community educators primarily should schedule social
      activities for older adults to be held at the same time
      as educational/informational activities for older adults
b. Community educators primarily should schedule social activities for older adults to be held at different times from educational/informational activities for older adults

c. Community educators should primarily schedule older adult educational/informational activities

d. Community educators should primarily schedule older adult social activities

e. Other, please explain

Community educators indicated "separately at different times" (42%) more frequently than "together at same time" (35%). Data from Table 13 reveal that "other" (11%) and "educational only" (9%) were also indicated to some extent. "Social only" was indicated by few respondents (2%).

Center directors indicated "together at same time" (45%) more often than did Michigan directors (31%). Center directors also indicated "other" (19%) to a larger extent than did Michigan directors (8%). Responses written in the "other" category indicated that both social and educational activities were appropriate.

Among Michigan directors, only directors of programs in operation 5-8 years indicated choices which were different from the response pattern of all Michigan directors. Directors of programs in operation 5-8 years indicated "together at the same time" (46%) more frequently than did other Michigan directors.

There were three directors (one Michigan and two center) who did not respond to this item. The response pattern of Michigan directors who did not indicate background characteristics indicated
Table 13
Responses on Involving Older Adults by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

| Scheduling Social and/or Educational Programs | To1|时间为 | To1|时间 | 只有 | 只有 | 另外 | 不 | 总 |
|--------------------------------------------|----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|------|
| Group                                      | n  | %   | n  | %   | n  | %   | n  | %   | n  | %   | n  | %   |
| Michigan and Center Directors              |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |
| Michigan                                   | 41 | (31)| 63 | (48)| 13 | (10)| 3  | (2) | 11 | (8) | 1  | (1) | 132 | (100)|
| Center                                     | 21 | (45)| 13 | (28)| 2  | (4) | 0  | (0) | 9  | (19)| 2  | (4) | 47  | (100)|
| Totals                                     | 62 | (35)| 76 | (42)| 15 | (8) | 3  | (2) | 20 | (11)| 3  | (2) | 179 | (100)|
| Michigan Directors: Type of District        |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |
| Urban                                      | 2  | (22)| 4  | (44)| 2  | (22)| 0  | (0) | 1  | (11)| 0  | (0) | 9   | (100)|
| Rural                                      | 26 | (35)| 38 | (51)| 3  | (4) | 1  | (1) | 6  | (8) | 1  | (1) | 75  | (100)|
| Suburban                                   | 13 | (31)| 18 | (43)| 6  | (14)| 2  | (4) | 3  | (7) | 0  | (0) | 42  | (100)|
| No Response                                | 0  | (0) | 3  | (50)| 2  | (33)| 0  | (0) | 1  | (17)| 0  | (0) | 6   | (100)|
| Michigan Directors: Training Level         |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |
| Extensive                                  | 5  | (33)| 6  | (40)| 2  | (13)| 0  | (0) | 2  | (13)| 0  | (0) | 15  | (100)|
| Some                                       | 11 | (33)| 13 | (39)| 4  | (12)| 2  | (6) | 2  | (6) | 1  | (3) | 33  | (100)|
| Little                                     | 11 | (26)| 25 | (60)| 3  | (7) | 0  | (0) | 3  | (7) | 0  | (0) | 42  | (100)|
| None                                       | 10 | (31)| 17 | (53)| 2  | (6) | 1  | (3) | 2  | (6) | 0  | (0) | 32  | (100)|
| No Response                                | 4  | (40)| 2  | (20)| 2  | (20)| 0  | (0) | 2  | (20)| 0  | (0) | 10  | (100)|
| Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |    |     |
| 0-2 Years                                  | 8  | (32)| 13 | (52)| 1  | (4) | 0  | (0) | 3  | (12)| 0  | (0) | 25  | (100)|
| 2-5 Years                                  | 11 | (26)| 23 | (53)| 3  | (7) | 2  | (5) | 4  | (9) | 0  | (0) | 43  | (100)|
| 5-8 Years                                  | 16 | (46)| 14 | (40)| 1  | (3) | 1  | (3) | 2  | (6) | 1  | (3) | 35  | (100)|
| 8 Years or More                            | 3  | (13)| 13 | (57)| 5  | (22)| 0  | (0) | 2  | (9) | 0  | (0) | 23  | (100)|
| No Response                                | 3  | (50)| 0  | (0) | 3  | (50)| 0  | (0) | 0  | (0) | 0  | (0) | 6   | (100)|
| Totals                                     | 132| (100)|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
a pattern similar to that of center directors. Non-responding Michigan directors by training level and years in operation both indicated "together at same time" most frequently. The directors by type of district indicated "separately at different times" most frequently.

In this question area, all selected experts on aging indicated that older adults need both social and educational activities. Social activities were indicated by two respondents as a good way to lead into informational programs. One respondent stated that older adults have enough social activities and that schools should concentrate on educational programs.

In a related item (11), community educators were asked to indicate general types of activity formats which they perceived to be most appropriate for older adults.

11. Activity format for older adult programming

___a. Activities primarily should be leisure time activities/ personal enjoyment

___b. Activities primarily should be informational activities/ personal adjustment

___c. Activities primarily should be skill development/ job rehabilitation

___d. Activities primarily should be constructive use of time/ volunteerism

___e. Other, please explain

Community educators indicated "leisure" activities (39%) as most appropriate (Table 14). A nearly equal percentage (34%) of the
Table 14

Responses on Activity Format by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity Emphasis</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Informational</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Constructive Use of Time</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>60 (45)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
<td>30 (23)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>9 (19)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>31 (66)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>47 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>69 (39)</td>
<td>24 (13)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>20 (11)</td>
<td>61 (34)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>179 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Type of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Directors: Training Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directors indicated "other".

Center directors indicated "other" (66%) to a greater extent than did Michigan directors (23%). The written in responses indicated that all four activity formats were appropriate (leisure time/personal enjoyment, informational/personal adjustment, skill development/job rehabilitation, constructive use of time/volunteerism). Michigan directors indicated "leisure" activities (45%) as most appropriate.

The breakdown of Michigan directors revealed differences with urban directors, directors with no training and directors in programs operating 8 years or more. Urban directors indicated "other" more frequently (44%) than did other Michigan directors. Directors with no training indicated "leisure" (28%), "constructive use of time" (25%), and "other" (28%) on a nearly equal basis. Directors in programs operating 8 years or more indicated "constructive use of time" more frequently (22%) than did most other groups.

There was one Michigan non-respondent to item 11. Michigan respondents who did not indicate background information on training level and years in operation indicated "informational" most frequently. Directors by type of district indicated "other" (44%).

The selected experts on aging were not specifically requested to address this question area.

Age-integrated or age-separated

Item 14 addressed the area of mixing activities for older adults with other age groups.

14. Separated or integrated activities for older adults
a. Older adult activities should generally be combined with activities for other age groups

b. Older adult activities should generally be separated from activities from other age groups

c. Other, please explain

Community educators indicated "primarily separated" activities most frequently (41%). Both the other response choices ("primarily integrated" and "other") were also frequently mentioned (Table 15). "Other" responses indicated both types of activities were appropriate.

Michigan directors indicated "primarily separated" (47%) more frequently than did center directors (21%). Center directors indicated most frequently "primarily integrated" (45%) and "other" (32%).

The breakdown of Michigan directors reveals a pattern similar to that of the combined group of Michigan directors.

There were two non-respondents, one Michigan director and one center director, to item 14. Michigan non-respondents on all three background characteristics indicated "primarily integrated" most frequently. This was in contrast to the other Michigan directors who indicated "primarily separated".

All selected experts on aging commented that programming should involve both types of activities, age-integrated and age-separated. Two respondents mentioned that educators should perhaps consider separating social activities while integrating informational activities.

Programming priority

One survey item (13) and one personal interview item related to
Table 15
Responses on Separated or Integrated Activities by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

| Group                      | Activity Mixed with Other Age Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                            |                                     | Primarily Integrated | Primarily Separated | Other | No Response | Total |
|                            | n | %  | n | %  | n | %  | n | %  |
| Michigan and Center Directors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Michigan                   | 43 (33) | 63 (47) | 25 (19) | 1 (1) | 132 (100) |
| Center                     | 21 (45) | 10 (21) | 15 (32) | 1 (1) | 47 (100) |
| Totals                     | 64 (36) | 73 (41) | 40 (22) | 2 (1) | 179 (100) |
| Michigan Directors: Type of District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban                      | 3 (33) | 5 (56) | 1 (11) | 0 (0) | 9 (100) |
| Rural                      | 26 (35) | 34 (45) | 15 (20) | 0 (0) | 75 (100) |
| Suburban                   | 11 (26) | 22 (52) | 9 (21) | 0 (0) | 42 (100) |
| No Response                | 3 (50) | 2 (33) | 0 (0) | 1 (17) | 6 (100) |
| Michigan Directors: Training Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extensive                  | 3 (20) | 9 (60) | 3 (20) | 0 (0) | 15 (100) |
| Some                       | 9 (27) | 18 (55) | 6 (18) | 0 (0) | 33 (100) |
| Little                     | 13 (31) | 22 (52) | 7 (17) | 0 (0) | 42 (100) |
| None                       | 12 (38) | 14 (44) | 6 (18) | 0 (0) | 32 (100) |
| No Response                | 6 (60) | 0 (0) | 3 (30) | 1 (10) | 10 (100) |
| Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-2 Years                  | 8 (32) | 13 (52) | 4 (16) | 0 (0) | 25 (100) |
| 2-5 Years                  | 16 (37) | 18 (42) | 9 (21) | 0 (0) | 43 (100) |
| 5-8 Years                  | 8 (23) | 20 (57) | 7 (20) | 0 (0) | 35 (100) |
| 8 Years or More            | 8 (35) | 12 (52) | 3 (13) | 0 (0) | 23 (100) |
| No Response                | 3 (50) | 0 (0) | 2 (33) | 1 (17) | 6 (100) |
| Totals                     | 132 (100) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
the priority which programming for older adults should have in relation to other community groups.

13. Priority of older adult programming
   ___a. The priority of older adult programming should be higher than that of other population groups
   ___b. The priority of older adult programming should be lower than that of other population groups
   ___c. The priority of older adult programming should be equal to that of other population groups
   ___d. Other, please explain

Center directors indicated (85%) "equal" in terms of priority for programming for older adults (Table 16). Michigan directors indicated (77%) "equal" also.

The breakdown of Michigan directors revealed the choice of "equal" as most frequently chosen.

There were two Michigan directors who did not respond to this item. The response choice of "equal" was most frequently chosen by non-respondents on all background characteristics.

Five of the six experts on aging indicated that neglect of older adults has been a problem, and as such, older adults should be given a greater consideration. Most felt that a higher priority was a way of gaining parity with other population groups.

Summary of findings on data submitted by community educators

The following is a summary of findings from part one of the field survey instrument, on an item by item basis. These findings are from data submitted by 179 community educators who responded to
Table 16

Responses on Programming Priority by Michigan and Center Directors and Michigan Directors by Type of District, Training Level, and Years in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Priority of Programming for Older Adults in Relation to Other Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Center Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Type of District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors: Training Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Community Education Districts: Years in Operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–2 Years</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5 Years</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–8 Years</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years or More</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 15 items on the field survey instrument. Table 17 summarizes these findings.

Table 17
Summary of Findings on Part One of the Field Survey Instrument for Community Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic considerations for program development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Use of facilities for older adult programming</td>
<td>Most directors (51%) indicated that facilities presently in use by older adults (clubs, churches, housing projects) are the best to utilize. Few directors (16%) chose educational facilities as the primary programming facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Age requirements for participation</td>
<td>Among the age choices available, 55 years received the most support (37%) among directors. Directors indicated 60 years (22%) and &quot;other&quot; (22%) as well. Written in responses indicated that no age criterion should be established. Only two percent of the directors chose 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Community education programming schedules</td>
<td>The majority of directors (62%) indicated that programming should be on a year round basis. Center directors indicated that programming schedules should be based on specific needs of older adults more frequently (28%) than did Michigan directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication and needs assessment processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role of community education in providing a specified service</td>
<td>Most (82%) of the community educators indicated their role in providing a specific service should be in support of other agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primary function of community education</td>
<td>Although &quot;needs assessment&quot; was the most frequent choice (36%), other response choices were between 10 and 20%. Center directors indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"needs assessment" at a greater percentage (55%) than did Michigan directors.

9. Advisory councils

The community-wide advisory council was most frequently indicated (51%) by community educators.

15. Assessing needs of older adults

Groups of older adults (38%) and advisory councils (28%) were indicated by community educators as best to utilize in assessing needs of older adults. Michigan directors in urban areas indicated agencies (33%) at a greater percentage than did other Michigan groups. Michigan directors with extensive training in working with older adults indicated "groups of older adults" at a greater percentage (60%) than did other Michigan groups.

---

Participant involvement in programming

2. Concentrating efforts on a particular segment of older adults

Directors indicated (69%) that all older adults should be sought out and involved rather than concentrating efforts on a particular segment of older adults.

12. Program leadership among older adults

Directors indicated (52%) that community educators should share equal responsibility with older adults in providing program leadership. Center directors also indicated (30%) a greater than equal responsibility by older adults. In contrast, Michigan directors indicated (23%) a greater share of responsibility should be assumed by community educators.

---

Leadership skills needed by the community educator

3. Leadership skill adjustment needed in working with older adults

Directors indicated (71%) that "much" skill adjustment was needed in working with older adults (background information, inservice training and needs assessment information).
4. Skills needed in directing a program for older adults

Among all directors, there was nearly an even split between the need for "conceptual" skills (44%) and "human" skills (46%). Center directors, Michigan directors in urban areas, suburban areas, those with some training in working with older adults, and those directors in districts operating community education programs eight years or more all indicated "conceptual" skills more frequently than "human" skills.

Program components

5. Involving older adults

Directors indicated a small preference for holding social and educational/informational activities for older adults at separate (42%) rather than at the same time (35%). Center directors preferred (45%) "together at the same time" more than did Michigan directors (31%).

11. Activity format

Among the four activity choices of leisure time, information, skill development, and constructive use of time, directors indicated a preference (39%) for programming leisure activities. A large percentage of "other" responses (34%) indicated that all four choices were appropriate.

14. Separated or integrated activities

In terms of integrating activities for older adults with other age groups or separating these activities, center directors and Michigan directors responded differently. Center directors indicated (45%) integrated activities. Michigan directors indicated (47%) separated activities.

Programming priority

13. Programming priority

Directors indicated (85%) that programming efforts for older adults should be equal to the efforts given to other community groups.
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Current programming efforts in Michigan districts

This section addresses current programming efforts for older adults being conducted throughout the State of Michigan through the efforts of community education programs. These findings are summarized in the order in which they appear in the field survey instrument (Appendix C).

How actively involved is your program in meeting the needs of older adults in your area?

This item was placed in part two (Appendix C, item four) of the field survey instrument. Upon refinement of this study design, this item is now included (due to its relationship to current programming) with the analysis of current programming efforts. Table 18 summarizes the responses made by Michigan directors.

Table 18

Responses on Current Programming Involvement by Michigan Community Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Involvement</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Directors</td>
<td>57 (43)</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
<td>33 (25)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many Michigan community educators who responded to this survey (43%) indicated a direct coordination and involvement in delivering of services. Few (5%) indicated no involvement in delivering of services to older adults.

These results only reflect 70% of the possible Michigan directors
(130 out of a possible 186), and as such should not be interpreted as representing the entire community education effort for older adults in Michigan.

Indicate how long your program has served older adults in your area?

Only 118 directors responded to this item out of a possible 132 Michigan directors who returned the survey instrument.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Number of Programs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most community education programs in Michigan (79%) have served older adults less than five years.

Indicate the proportion and/or percentage of older adults in your area in relation to the rest of the population.

Upon analyzing these responses, it was found that respondents either did not fill in any response, or indicated figures which could not be measured against any standard. There were 107 respondents to this item out of 132 possible respondents to this item. The range of percentages was from one to 50% of older adults in relation to the rest of the population.
List the primary agencies in your area which seek to serve older adults.

Responses are divided into agencies serving older adults according to urban, rural and suburban districts. These agencies are listed in descending order, from the most to least frequently mentioned agencies. Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents mentioning this item.

Urban Districts

1. Parks and recreation departments (5)
2. Government social service agencies (4)
3. Area senior centers (3)
4. Public schools (community education) (3)
5. Local housing commissions (2)
6. Employment security commission (2)
7. Others: health department, YMCA/YWCA, churches, labor unions, councils on aging, service clubs, cooperative extension (1)

Of the nine urban respondents who returned this survey, six responded to this particular item.

Rural Districts

1. Government social service agencies (41)
2. Public schools (community education) (38)
3. Area senior centers (25)
4. Churches (15)
5. City councils (12)
6. Service clubs (11)
7. Community colleges (11)
8. Local housing commissions (11)
9. Councils on aging (8)
10. Cooperative extension (4)
11. Others: health department, employment security commission, mental health department, hospitals (1)

Of the 75 rural directors who returned this survey, 51 responded to this item.

Suburban Districts
1. Public schools (community education) (21)
2. Churches (18)
3. Recreation departments (14)
4. Area senior centers (13)
5. Councils on aging (9)
6. Government social service agencies (8)
7. Local service groups (4)
8. City government (2)
9. Others: YMCA, cooperative extension, nursing homes, community colleges (1)

Of the 42 suburban directors who returned this survey, 26 responded to this particular item.

Governmental service agencies, public schools, and area senior centers were written in frequently (all in the top five of each list) by all the respondents. While churches were frequently mentioned by rural and suburban directors, they appeared well down the list for urban directors. Parks and recreation departments
were mentioned frequently by urban and suburban directors, yet this agency does not appear on the rural list.

**List or describe your older adult program activities and/or involvement in the following areas.**

In this section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to describe activities and/or involvement with social and/or recreational programming for older adults. In descending order, from most to least frequently mentioned, Table 20 presents data on these activities.

In categorizing the various responses, five major groupings were used to represent the various responses. In addition to the combined ranking in Table 20, the items are further ranked by urban, rural and suburban districts.

**Urban Districts**

1. Leisure time classes, and recreational activities (44%)
2. Potlucks, dinners and games, and unclassified (33%)
3. Bus trips and tours (11%)

The "unclassified" category for urban districts was that other area agencies meet these needs of older adults.

**Rural Districts**

1. Bus trips and tours (48%)
2. Potlucks, dinners and games (45%)
3. Leisure time classes (31%)
4. Recreational activities (20%)

**Suburban Districts**

1. Potlucks, dinners and games (57%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Number Mentioning</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Potlucks, dinners</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bus trips and tours</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leisure time classes</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(arts, crafts, hobbies)</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recreational activities</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(physical conditioning)</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unclassified</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Bus trips and tours (50%)
3. Leisure time classes (24%)
4. Unclassified (17%)
5. Recreational activities (14%)

The "unclassified" responses were that other agencies met these needs.

In comparing these classifications, "bus trips and tours", and "potlucks, dinners and games" were mentioned at a lower percentage by urban directors than among rural and suburban directors. Among urban and suburban directors there was mention of other area agencies ("unclassified") which provide the social and/or recreational activities.

Except in the instance of suburban directors who indicated "potlucks, dinners and games" (57%) and "bus trips and tours" (50%), all other activities were responded to by less than 50% of the total respondents classified as urban, rural and suburban. There were six directors who did not indicate type of district or social and/or recreational activities.

In this section, directors were asked to indicate current informational/educational programs for older adults in their districts (Table 21). In addition to the ranking of these activities for all Michigan directors, these activities are further ranked by urban, rural and suburban districts.

**Urban Districts**
1. Preparation for retirement, and information dissemination (44%)
Table 21
Ranking of Responses about Current Programs of Educational/informational Activities in Michigan Community Education Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>5 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>21 (28)</td>
<td>54 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>14 (33)</td>
<td>28 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (30)</td>
<td>93 (70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Health programs               | Urban            | 2 (22) | 7 (78) | 9 (100) |
|                                  | Rural            | 7 (9)  | 68 (91)| 75 (100) |
|                                  | Suburban         | 5 (12) | 37 (88)| 42 (100) |
|                                  | No Response      | 6 (100)| 6 (100)|          |
| **Total**                        |                  | 14 (11)| 118 (89)| 132 (100) |

| 3. Travelogue films              | Urban            | 2 (22) | 7 (78) | 9 (100) |
|                                  | Rural            | 4 (5)  | 71 (95)| 75 (100) |
|                                  | Suburban         | 5 (12) | 37 (88)| 42 (100) |
|                                  | No Response      | 6 (100)| 6 (100)|          |
| **Total**                        |                  | 11 (8) | 121 (92)| 132 (100) |

| 4. Preparation for retirement   | Urban            | 4 (44) | 5 (56) | 9 (100) |
|                                  | Rural            | 4 (5)  | 71 (95)| 75 (100) |
|                                  | Suburban         | 2 (5)  | 40 (95)| 42 (100) |
|                                  | No Response      | 6 (100)| 6 (100)|          |
| **Total**                        |                  | 10 (8) | 122 (92)| 132 (100) |

| 5. Adult basic education/high school completion classes | Urban | 3 (33) | 6 (67) | 9 (100) |
|                                                        | Rural | 3 (4)  | 72 (96)| 75 (100) |
|                                                        | Suburban | 2 (5) | 40 (95)| 42 (100) |
|                                                        | No Response | 6 (100)| 6 (100)|          |
| **Total**                                             |      | 8 (6)  | 124 (94)| 132 (100) |

| 6. Unclassified                                      | Urban | 3 (33) | 6 (67) | 9 (100) |
|                                                    | Rural | 0 (0)  | 75 (100)| 75 (100) |
|                                                    | Suburban | 7 (17)| 35 (83)| 42 (100) |
|                                                    | No Response | 6 (100)| 6 (100)|          |
| **Total**                                            |      | 10 (8) | 122 (92)| 132 (100) |
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2. Adult basic education/high school completion, and unclassified (33%)
3. Travelog films, and health programs (22%)

In the "unclassified" category urban directors mentioned that other agencies met these activity needs.

Rural Districts
1. Information dissemination (28%)
2. Health programs (9%)
3. Travelog films, and preparation for retirement (5%)
4. Adult basic education/high school completion (4%)

Suburban Districts
1. Information dissemination (33%)
2. Unclassified (17%)
3. Travelog films, and health programs (12%)
4. Preparation for retirement, and adult basic education/high school completion (5%)

Those suburban directors in the "unclassified" category mentioned that other agencies met these needs.

Among all three groups, "information dissemination" was most frequently mentioned. Urban directors also mentioned "preparation for retirement" as frequently as they indicated "information dissemination". "Adult basic education/high school completion" was ranked higher by urban directors than the ranking given by other groups. Over 50% of the respondents in each of the three groups did not respond to this item. There were six respondents who did not indicate type of district or educational/informational activities.
Under the heading of other activities and/or involvement, the following is a ranking of activities which are currently programmed but not classified as either social or educational in nature (Table 22). In addition to the ranking for all Michigan directors, these activities are further ranked by urban, rural, and suburban districts.

**Urban Districts**
1. Free passes to school events and classes (56%)
2. Specific service delivery, volunteer activities, and unclassified (33%)

In the "unclassified" category urban directors mentioned that other agencies met these needs.

**Rural Districts**
1. Free passes to school events and classes (31%)
2. Specific service delivery (9%)
3. Volunteer activities (8%)
4. Unclassified (1%)

The one "unclassified" rural respondent indicated a farm program for older adults.

**Suburban Districts**
1. Free passes to school events and classes (31%)
2. Specific service delivery (21%)
3. Unclassified (17%)
4. Volunteer activities (10%)

In the "unclassified" category suburban directors indicated that other agencies met these needs of older adults.

Among all Michigan directors, "free passes to school events
### Table 22

**Ranking of Responses about Current Programs Other than Social or Educational/Informational Activities in Michigan Community Education Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Number Mentioning</th>
<th>Number Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Free passes to school events and classes</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specific service</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivery (meals,</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation,</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telephone reassurance, health clinics</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volunteer activities</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(school aides,</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S.V.P., community</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service projects)</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unclassified</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and classes" was most frequently mentioned (31%). The three group breakdowns reveal "free passes to school events and classes" to be most frequently mentioned. Urban directors indicated "free passes to school events and classes" as a majority (56%) response.

All the various breakdowns revealed non-respondents to be over 50%, except for urban directors who indicated "free passes to school events and classes".

In this section of the field survey instrument, Michigan directors were requested to indicate what percentage of their current involvement in programming for older adults is held in school facilities, operated by community education personnel, and funded by community education (Appendix C, part three, item 4D).

Data in Table 23 indicates the responses in these three areas according to urban, rural and suburban districts.

The combined group of Michigan community educators indicated that (a) "few" of the activities (27%) were held in school facilities, (b) "most" of the activities were operated (36%) by community education personnel, and (c) "most" of the activities were funded by community education (32%).

Urban directors indicated "most" were held in school facilities (33%), operated by community education personnel (56%), and funded by community education (56%). Rural and suburban directors followed the pattern for the combined groups of "few" held in school facilities, "most" operated by community education personnel, and "most" funded by community education.

There were 34 non-respondents on the question of percentage
Table 23

Responses to Question of Proportion of Reported Activities for Older Adults which are Held in School Facilities, Operated by Community Education, and Funded by Community Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Activities</th>
<th>Few (0-25%)</th>
<th>Some (25-50%)</th>
<th>Much (50-75%)</th>
<th>Most (75-100%)</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Held in School Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22 (29)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>10 (13)</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
<td>18 (24)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>12 (29)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>8 (19)</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36 (27)</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
<td>27 (20)</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operated by Community Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>5 (56)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11 (15)</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>27 (36)</td>
<td>19 (25)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>16 (38)</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
<td>13 (10)</td>
<td>48 (36)</td>
<td>35 (27)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded by Community Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (56)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15 (20)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>27 (36)</td>
<td>20 (26)</td>
<td>75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>9 (21)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>7 (17)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26 (20)</td>
<td>13 (10)</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
<td>43 (32)</td>
<td>38 (29)</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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held in school facilities: one urban, 18 rural, and nine suburban, and
six who did not indicate either type of district or percentage of
activities held in school facilities. There were 35 non-respondents
on the question of percentage operated by community education
personnel: one urban, 19 rural, and nine suburban, and six who
did not indicate either type of district or percentage of activities
operated by community education personnel. There were 38 non­
respondents on the question of percentage funded by community
education: one urban, 20 rural, and 11 suburban, and six who
did not indicate either type of district or percentage of activities
funded by community education.

List or describe the methods you use for determining the needs
of older adults in your area.

Table 24 is a ranking of the needs assessment methods utilized
by Michigan community educators. These items are further ranked
according to urban, rural and suburban districts.

Urban Districts

1. Agency personnel (56%)
2. Personal contacts with older adults, and community
   surveys (44%)
3. Community advisory councils (22%)
4. Advisory councils for older adults (11%)
5. Groups of older adults, commissions on aging,
   and census data (0%)

Rural Districts

1. Personal contacts with older adults (35%)
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Table 24
Responses to Question about Methods Used for Determining the Needs of Older Adults in a Given Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number Mentioning Activity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community surveys</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal contacts with older adults</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community advisory councils</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Groups of older adults</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agency personnel</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advisory councils for older adults</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commissions on aging</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Census data</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Community advisory councils (33%)
3. Community surveys (31%)
4. Groups of older adults (25%)
5. Agency personnel (17%)
6. Commissions on aging (9%)
7. Advisory councils for older adults (8%)
8. Census data (3%)

Suburban Districts
1. Community surveys (38%)
2. Personal contacts with older adults (29%)
3. Groups of older adults (26%)
4. Community advisory councils (24%)
5. Agency personnel (12%)
6. Advisory councils for older adults (10%)
7. Commissions on aging (7%)
8. Census data (0%)

The top ranked methods for determining needs of older adults among Michigan community educators were "community surveys" (33%), "personal contacts with older adults" (32%), and "community advisory councils" (28%).

All three groups (urban, rural and suburban) mentioned a different needs assessment method as the one most frequently utilized. Urban directors mentioned "agency personnel" most frequently (56%), rural directors mentioned "personal contacts with older adults" most frequently (35%), and suburban directors mentioned "community surveys" most frequently (38%). "Community surveys" and
"personal contacts with older adults" were ranked in the top three by all three groups of Michigan community educators.

Non-respondents comprised over 50% on all the group breakdowns, except for urban directors who indicated "agency personnel".

**List or describe your program and/or ideas for older adults which are in the planning stage for future development.**

The following list, ranked by the frequency with which each item was mentioned, represents future community education programs and/or ideas for older adults.

1. Utilizing older adults in volunteer activities (22 responses)
2. Assisting with development of drop-in centers (17 responses)
3. Developing outreach activities to involve non-participating older adults (11 responses)
4. Developing day trips by bus (10 responses)
5. Developing transportation services (10 responses)
6. Developing lunch programs (9 responses)
7. Developing physical education classes (8 responses)
8. Developing social activities (7 responses)
9. Developing health programs (6 responses)
10. Developing leisure classes (6 responses)
11. Developing free passes to events (5 responses)

This list represents a variety of possible programs. Over half (61%) of the respondents chose not to fill in any information on this item. This list does not, therefore, represent a large number of Michigan community educators.
Summary of findings on current programming efforts

Most of the Michigan community educators who responded to this survey indicated either a direct or supportive role in delivering services to older adults. Very few of these respondents (5%) indicated no involvement in delivering of services. Respondents indicated that involvement by community educators in delivering of services to older adults has mostly developed within the last five years.

Michigan directors were asked to indicate the percentage or proportion of older adults in their service area. Upon analyzing these responses, it was found that most directors did not indicate any figure. Those who did respond indicated figures which could not be measured against any standard.

Agencies most frequently mentioned as serving older adults were governmental service agencies, public schools (community education), and area senior centers. Urban and suburban directors frequently mentioned, in addition, parks and recreation departments. Rural and suburban directors frequently mentioned churches.

In describing the various program activities currently being programmed in Michigan districts, directors indicated more social activities than educational/informational activities. Of the five most frequently mentioned items, potlucks, dinners and games, bus trips and tours, and leisure time classes are classified as social activities. The fourth ranked item, information dissemination, was classified as being educational/informational, while the third ranked item, free passes to school events and classes, was classified
as being program involvement other than social or educational/informational.

Of the top five items listed by urban directors, two were in the social activity area (leisure time classes, and recreational activities), two in the educational/informational area (preparation for retirement classes and information dissemination), and one in the "other" category (free passes to school events and classes). Three of the top five items ranked according to the rural classification (bus trips and tours, potlucks, dinners and games, and leisure time classes) were social in nature. The fifth ranked item (information dissemination) was educational/informational. The third ranked item (free passes to school events and classes) was in the "other" category. Items ranked one, two and five by suburban directors were classified as social activities (potlucks, dinners and games, bus trips and tours, and leisure time classes). The item ranked third was educational/informational (information dissemination). The item ranked fourth was labeled as an "other" activity (free passes to school events and classes).

All three groups of Michigan community educators had "free passes to school events and classes", and "information dissemination" among their most frequently mentioned activities. Suburban and rural directors both mentioned "bus trips and tours" and "potlucks, dinners and games" in their top five. Urban directors identified "recreational activities" and "preparation for retirement classes" in their top five.

Michigan directors were asked to indicate the extent to which
activities were (a) held in school facilities, (b) operated by community education personnel, and (c) funded by community education. Rural and suburban directors indicated that "few" activities were held in school facilities, "most" activities were operated by community education personnel, and "most" activities were funded by community education. Urban directors indicated "most" for all three categories.

In terms of current programming in Michigan districts, directors were requested to indicate needs assessment methods presently utilized. The five most frequently mentioned methods were: (a) community surveys (33%), (b) personal contacts with older adults (32%), (c) community advisory councils (28%), (d) groups of older adults (23%), and (e) agency personnel (17%).

Rural and suburban directors both indicated the same five items, although not in the same sequence. Urban directors ranked "advisory councils for older adults" among their top five. Urban directors also indicated "agency personnel" as the most frequently utilized needs assessment method, while both rural and suburban directors ranked this item as fifth.

In the final item of the section on current programming, Michigan directors were asked to indicate programs which are in the planning stages for future development. Volunteer activities were most frequently mentioned (22 times). Items which appeared on this listing which did not appear on previous lists of current activities were (a) assisting in the development of drop-in centers, and (b) developing outreach activities.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, MODEL DEVELOPMENT

This chapter contains two sections: (a) summary of the findings to be used in developing the model, and (b) the model for development of a community education program for older adults.

Summary of Findings
Sources for this summary of findings are: conclusions from the review of literature, conclusions from the field survey instrument responded to by community educators, and conclusions on findings from interviewed experts in the field of aging.

Basic considerations for program development

The most appropriate facilities to use in developing programs for older adults are those with the most comfort, and accessibility to older adults. Community educators indicated those facilities presently in use by older adults and accessible gathering places as most appropriate for holding activities. Schools and churches were seen as a possible resource, but have limitations as far as being accepted by all older adults. Whatever facilities are utilized, factors of personal security (Sarvis, 1973) and transportation ease (Hunter, 1974; U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973) should be taken into consideration.

All respondents indicated that programming for older adults should be available on a year round basis, rather than based upon institutional schedules. In terms of day or evening schedules, day was seen as the best time, although evenings should not be
eliminated altogether. The best time for involving a cross-section of age groups was indicated as the late afternoon or early evening.

There were indications that programming for older adults should involve no age restriction. If a specific age requirement is needed in order to determine benefit or service eligibility, 55 years of age was selected by community educators. The selected experts on aging did not have a consensus on a particular age, mentioning 55 years, 60 years, and retired.

Communication and needs assessment processes

There was a consistent pattern among all three sources of findings in regard to establishing a communication link with older adults. Of primary importance in the communication process is establishing personal contacts with older adults (Hunter, 1974; Sainer and Zander, 1971), groups of older adults, and agencies which serve older adults.

Needs assessment was selected by community educators as the primary function of community education in serving older adults. The needs assessment process is one of gathering information about community members (older adults) and subsequently identifying areas of need. The literature indicates that needs assessment should utilize several techniques rather than a single one. Community educators indicated that groups of older adults should be the primary sources for information about the needs of older adults. Specific groups of community educators indicated support for other needs assessment sources such as advisory councils (suburban directors), and area agencies (urban directors).
An outgrowth of this communication process is the establishment of a vehicle for gathering of information from these sources and interpreting this information. Community-wide advisory councils (Seay, et.al., 1974; Wood and Martin, 1974) and agency coordinating efforts (Hand, 1960) were seen in this capacity. Community educators indicated that primary use be made of the community-wide advisory council, while the selected experts on aging indicated a need for an agency coordinating effort. It may well be that two types of councils are needed. A community-wide advisory council could function as an advisory body to community education on programming for older adults, while an agency coordinating council could serve to coordinate efforts in serving area older adults and in developing a communication link between these agencies and older adults.

Establishing some type of a regular communication with local agencies becomes more important when considering how community educators perceive their role. Most community educators indicated their role as assisting other agencies when there is a need for providing a specific service for older adults.

Participant involvement in programming

All older adults within a community are regarded by community educators as a potential participant in program activities. Involvement is seen as going beyond the participation phase into the phase of program planning and development (Estes, 1972; Hunter, 1974; Martin and Robin, 1972; Minzey and LeTarte, 1972; Sarvis, 1973). Community educators indicated that older adults should share equal
responsibility with program directors in planning and developing programs.

The nature of the leadership role of the community educator is that of facilitator (Ellis and Sperling, 1973; Minzey and LeTarte, 1972; Seay, et al., 1974; Wood and Martin, 1974). A facilitator is flexible in assuming a direct or supportive role in providing group direction. Selected experts on aging mentioned that leadership development should be a gradual process with older adults; initial program leadership will be the responsibility of the community educator, but gradually, older adults should assume more and more of a planning and directive responsibility. Leadership training is thought by community educators (Weaver, 1972) to be a necessary element in assuring a greater program leadership role for community members (specifically older adults).

Reaching and recruiting older adults for involvement in program activities is a necessity if community educators are to involve those older adults who do not normally participate. Utilizing present program participants to reach other non-participating older adults was indicated in the review of literature (Peterson, 1974) and by interviewed experts on aging as a valuable recruiting technique.

Important considerations to this recruiting process are establishing a supportive group of older adults which the potential recruit can identify with, a group who in turn can identify with being involved in a common activity (Sainer and Zander, 1971). Recruitment efforts can be further enhanced by older adults.
recruiting other older adults through personal contacts, by making opportunities available for the recruit to serve in useful roles, and by stressing the social aspects of program involvement (Sainer and Zander, 1971).

**Leadership skills needed by the community educator**

There is general agreement as to the leadership qualities needed by a community educator in directing a program for older adults. From the review of literature, leadership qualities identified as necessary were ability to relate well to program participants, developing leadership in others, and being able to correctly perceive situations in which an active or passive leadership role (facilitator role) is called for.

The interviewed experts on aging identified sensitivity to needs of older adults, people oriented, respect for autonomy of older adults, and knowledge of the aging process, needs and characteristics of older adults, and times which older adults have lived through (historical perspective). Results from the field survey instrument for community educators indicated that human skills (interviewing, observing, empathizing, leading group discussions and participating in discussions) and conceptual skills (analyzing, diagnosing, synthesizing, and questioning) were most needed by community educators in directing programs for older adults. Also indicated as necessary were needs assessment information and background information, along with inservice training.

Both community educators and the interviewed experts on aging
indicated that training is needed by community educators in working with older adults. Interviewed experts on aging felt that while some training in working with older adults is needed, extensive training is not required.

**Program components**

Three basic program components can be identified from the various inputs in this study: (a) social and educational programming for older adults, (b) educational and social programming for age-integrated versus educational and social programming for age-separated activities, and (c) programming designed to educate the area citizenry on the aging process, and needs and characteristics of older adults.

Results taken from all three sources of findings were consistent in indicating that both social and educational programming activities should be available to older adults through community education. Community educators did not specify any definite support for programming social and educational activities together or at different times.

Social programming was seen as a good leadin to educational programming (Martin and Robin, 1972). To date, types of social programs, as disclosed by Michigan community educators, have been potlucks, dinners and games, bus trips and tours, leisure time classes, and recreational activities. Indicated by Michigan community educators as types of educational programs were information dissemination, health programs, travelog films, and preretirement classes. Findings reveal a tendency for community educators
Both interviewed experts on aging and community educators specified that programming for older adults should be both age-integrated and age-separated. Age-integrated activities were primarily seen by selected experts on aging as more appropriate for educational rather than for social programming.

The need to educate the area citizenry concerning the aging process and needs and characteristics of older adults was a result of conclusions by McClusky (1974). Society often places limitations on older adults, and a goal of community education should be to educate all community members concerning the aging process, needs, and characteristics of older adults.

Model Development

This model describes the following elements as being basic processes and components in developing a model community education program for older adults.

1. Basic considerations for program development
2. Communications and needs assessment processes
3. Participant involvement in programming
4. Leadership skills needed by the community educator
5. Program components

Of these basic elements, the first four are the processes from which the fifth is developed. Figure 2 represents this developmental process.

All four processes described (basic considerations for program development, communication and needs assessment processes, participant
Figure 2

Process for Development of a Community Education Program for Older Adults
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Basic Considerations for Program Development

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Communication and Needs Assessment Processes

Leadership Skills needed by the Community Educator
Involvement in programming, leadership role of the community educator), provide the primary means through which programming goals can be realized.

The total model, including the four processes and program components, represents the ideal in development of a community education program for older adults.

**Basic considerations for program development**

The basic considerations for program development are represented by the separate processes of (a) developing and identifying the best facilities to use in programming efforts, (b) identifying the best time schedules for programming, and (c) establishing an age criterion for participation by older adults.

**Basic Considerations for Program Development**

- **Facilities Usage**
  - comfort
  - accessibility
  - personal security
  - ease of transportation

- **Programming Times**
  - year round
  - generally daytime

- **Age Criterion**
  - generally no age criterion
  - 55 years of age, if required

Developing and identifying facilities for use in programming for older adults involves four primary factors: comfort of the facility, accessibility of the facility to the older adult, security and safety of the facility as perceived by the older adult, and ease by which the facility can be reached through available transportation means. The primary facilities used in programming efforts can be located
anywhere within the bounds of the community, providing these basic criteria are met.

Program time schedules should be on a year round basis, and primarily scheduled during daytime hours. Evening hours should not be totally eliminated from consideration without first assessing the opinions of potential participants.

An age criterion for participation by older adults should be avoided. In the instances involving a specific benefit or service eligibility, 55 years of age is a reasonable cut-off point.

Communication and needs assessment processes

The processes involved in communicating with, and subsequently determining the needs of an older adult population are: initiating personal contacts with older adults, initiating contacts with groups of older adults within the community, establishing a communication link with an agency coordinating council, and utilizing a community education community-wide advisory council as a source of advice and direction.

Communication and Needs Assessment Processes

Personal Contacts with Older Adults
Contacts with Groups of Older Adults
Contacts with an Agency Coordinating Council
Contacts with a Community-wide Advisory Council

Personal contacts with older adults by community educators and through other older adults already involved should be the primary means of communication, followed by communication with groups of older adults within the community.
A secondary means toward establishing communication links with older adults would be through involvement in community-wide and agency advisory councils. Community-wide advisory councils would serve as an advisory body in interpreting sources of information (needs assessment) gathered from the other needs assessment sources, and in turn advising the community education director on program direction.

An agency coordinating council would function as an information gathering and service coordinating body for the entire community. An agency coordinating council would be in the position to evaluate services available to older adults, and identify areas of service needs.

Information should flow freely between the two councils. The community education director should be an integral member of both councils. Both councils should include representation by older adults as regular members.

Participant involvement in programming

The processes for developing participant involvement are: reaching and recruiting efforts, participation by older adults in programming, and leadership training as a means toward greater program involvement on the part of older adults.

Participant Involvement in Programming

Recruitment
- personal contacts through other older adults
- supportive group
- social involvement
- serving in useful roles
The initial step in participant involvement is the recruitment phase. Recruitment is necessary if community educators are to reach and involve those older adults who are either unaware of available services, or who traditionally are not participation oriented. A system should be developed whereby older adults already involved will contact and communicate with other non-involved older adults.

Recruitment efforts are enhanced if the potential participant is able to relate to other older adults already involved in the program. Social activities are a valuable means toward gaining initial involvement.

Many community education activities will seek to involve older adults in community service projects, volunteer activities, aide programs, or a number of other possible activities. These activities will be worthwhile to older adults if they are able to see these activities as being useful roles to fill. Older adults will more readily seek involvement in these activities if they can fulfill useful roles and be part of a larger group of older adults involved in similar activities.

Greater involvement by older adults beyond the participant level will not be automatic. Leadership training is a process whereby older adults can be encouraged and assisted in becoming
more involved in program developing and directing. Phase one, program developer, is a process in which the person becomes active in the planning phases of programming. Serving on committees with other older adults, serving on a community-wide advisory council, or serving on an agency coordinating council would all be examples of this program developer role.

Phase two, program leader, represents a role in which the participant takes responsibility for gathering resources together for accomplishing a goal, directing an activity, or using personal skills and expertise to lead others. The ultimate goal of greater involvement by older adults should be the sharing of equal responsibility with the community education director in program planning and development.

Leadership skills needed by the community educator

The leadership skills and knowledges needed by the community educator in working with older adults are in three phases: human skills, accurate role perception, and knowledge needed in working with older adults.

Leadership Role of the Community Educator

Human Skills
- able to relate
- sensitive to needs
- respect for autonomy

Role Perception
- directive or supportive (facilitator)

Knowledge needed in Working with Older Adults
- aging process
- needs and characteristics
- historical perspective
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Human skills are the most fundamental skills needed in working with older adults. Being able to relate to older adults as individuals, and in turn being respected by older adults is all part of relating well. Working with older adults requires someone who is sensitive to needs of older adults and someone who respects the rights of older adults to govern their own existence.

Accurate role perception requires the community educator to be sensitive toward the amount of control which is needed in program development. In pursuing the goal of sharing equal responsibility with older adults in program planning and directing, the community educator needs to facilitate planning and directing opportunities (leadership training in many instances) which are both meaningful and insure great chances for success.

Community educators, in working with older adults, need specific knowledge in terms of the (a) aging process, both from an individual and societal standpoint, (b) needs and characteristics of older adults, and (c) periods of time which older adults have lived through (historical perspective).

**Program components**

The four part process of (a) basic considerations for program development, (b) communication and needs assessment, (c) participant involvement in programming, and (d) leadership skills needed by the community educator, all serve as primary inputs into developing specific activities for older adults. Outcomes of this developmental process fall into three areas of: programming exclusively for older adults, both social and educational; programming for older adults, both social and educational; programming for older adults, both social and educational;
adults involving mixed age groups, primarily educational in nature; and programming for area citizenry concerning the aging process.

Figure 3

Programming for Older Adults

Programming exclusively for older adults includes both social and educational programming. While the specific activities will be determined from inputs established by the entire developmental process, consideration should be given toward developing more participation in educational activities such as health care programs, retirement living classes, and government benefit eligibility. Older adults need a variety of educational experiences which are presently not being provided. Community educators, due to their access to the resources and facilities of the local educational institutions, should use this to the advantage of older adults. Community educators should also make use of social activities as a means toward gaining participation of older adults in educational activities.

Social and educational programming should include some age mixing. Programming for older adults involving other age groups is valuable in maintaining contacts between age groups. Such can serve to facilitate communication and understanding between age groups. In determining which activities to integrate, older adults may prefer that most social
activities be among peers (age-separated).

Educating the area citizenry can either be a separate element altogether, or it can be part of the age-mixed activities for older adults. Much as the director of community education needs to know about older adults, community members need similar knowledge concerning the aging process and characteristics of older adults. Included in these programs should be an emphasis on preretirement education. This educative process, including preretirement education, can serve the two-fold purpose of (a) removing some of the limitations placed upon older adults and their ability to lead a meaningful life, and (b) assisting community members to become more knowledgable concerning the aging process.
CHAPTER VI
INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS, LIMITATIONS OF STUDY, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUMMARY

Interpretation of Findings

The model for development of a community education program for older adults was developed from data and information from: (a) review of literature on community education and aging, (b) a field survey instrument for community educators, and (c) personal interviews with selected experts on aging.

The following is an analysis of and conclusions about the model, findings from the field survey instrument and personal interviews with selected experts on aging. This discussion will contrast the various sources of input with the ideas and conceptual framework included in the model. Whenever appropriate, data from current programming for older adults in Michigan will be drawn into this analysis. This will serve to bridge the gap between current practice and theory in community education programming for older adults.

Basic considerations for program development

The component on basic considerations is related to the idea that barriers are often present in programming efforts which inhibit participation. The intent of community educators should be to maximize the possibilities for participation by older adults through identifying and removing as many of these barriers as possible. Daytime hours, year round programming, no age criterion, and facility accessibility and comfort constitute some of the prime considerations.
directed toward eliminating barriers to participation by older adults.

In describing which facilities are best suited to programming for older adults, selected experts on aging and community educators did not specify particular facilities. Community educators, in selecting "those presently in use by older adults" as best, and selected experts on aging, in selecting comfort, convenience and proximity, were both indicating that participant considerations should be the primary determiners of what facilities to use in programming.

Educational facilities were not considered as the best to use. It might be expected that a school-based and school-funded program such as community education would indicate a high use of educational facilities. There may be several reasons why community educators do not consider educational facilities as best to use. Community educators may perceive older adults as being unwilling to make use of these facilities due to an unwillingness to move out of familiar surroundings, and being uncomfortable in the school facility. Directors may also regard school facilities as unsuited to the needs of older adults. A final consideration may be usable space in the school facility. If most programming for older adults is to take place during the day, many educational facilities would be available only to the K-12 students.

The whole question of age criterion for participation needs to be explored further. Little of what appears in the literature relates to the implications of what "no age criterion" would mean to programming efforts for older adults. Both selected experts on aging and community educators strongly indicated that whenever possible, no
age criterion should be imposed on participation in activities for older adults. The choice of 55 years by many community educators may indicate some awareness of the trends toward preretirement education, and early retirement opportunities available in some industries.

The choice of year round programming for older adults is in contrast to the scheduled, seasonal type of activities generally associated with community education programs. Directors apparently perceive programming for older adults as being different than other types of programming. More data is needed in order to determine if year round programming represents a current reality or if year round programming represents an ideal.

One of the goals of community education in developing activities might be to program preretirement education activities (McClusky, 1974). Preretirement education would be a way to broaden the age groups which would be attracted to programs for older adults. The idea of opening up programming for older adults to a broader age range appears to be both needed and accepted by community educators, yet there is little evidence that this concept is presently emphasized or included in future plans. Community educators did not list preretirement education as a major emphasis in present programming. In terms of future programming plans, community educators did not list any reference to preretirement education or toward seeking involvement of any age groups other than older adults.

Communication and needs assessment processes

Results from the various sources of input into the model are consistent in terms of personal contacts with individual older adults,
groups of older adults, and community agencies being important communicative devices in reaching older adults. These results, while important, do not extend far enough in terms of what network and relationships should exist between community education, agencies and older adults. In addition, needs assessment, as an extension of the communicative process, has very little foundation beyond the fact that sources (Christopher, 1972; Minzey, 1972; Seay, et.al., 1974) indicate needs assessment as an important function of community education.

The literature and general thrust of modern community education places an emphasis on implementing programs by first assessing the needs of community members. This emphasis on needs assessment is reflected by the center directors who indicated this response choice (needs assessment) to a greater degree than did Michigan directors. Center directors, charged with implementing community education, training directors and disseminating information on community education, provide a contrast to Michigan directors who are involved in the practical aspects of day to day program operation in a local school district.

It can be understood that center directors would take a more philosophical stance on how community educators should meet the needs of older adults. It is not as apparent as to why Michigan directors would place needs assessment over a direct programming function in serving older adults? Michigan directors (and center directors) chose a direct programming function less frequently than they indicated non-programming functions of assisting other agencies and
needs assessment.

Community education programs seek to serve all age groups in a community. This very general approach to meeting community needs may be the reason so few directors revealed a desire to become part of a specific service delivery for older adults. Community educators need to explore their role within communities in order to better determine in which areas community education can best function. There is evidence presented in the section on current programming in Michigan districts that community education is providing direct programming services to older adults. It appears that a conflict exists between actual practices and the perceived tasks of community education.

In assessing and ultimately meeting the needs of older adults, community educators should concentrate on establishing a communication network and role definitions within that network as a first step. Results from the field survey instrument indicate that community educators view community-wide advisory councils (non-age-specific) as the best means of advising on program direction. The fact that many of the directors are already working with this type of council could account for its acceptance for use with older adults. The exact role of the council and its function as a link with the older adult community in particular, needs to be investigated further. The role of community-wide advisory councils as a direct advocate of the needs of older adults is in question. Findings from the literature indicate that age-specific agencies (Estes, 1972) will be more committed to an advocacy role for older adults than non-age-specific agencies.
Community educators work with a variety of community groups and may not be as perceptive and up-to-date on current trends which specifically affect older adults. Therefore, maintaining close contacts with those agencies which specifically serve older adults appears to be one method for community educators to keep current on programs and trends which are affecting older adults.

Agency planning and coordinating was indicated by selected experts on aging and community educators (particularly center directors) as important, yet few community educators chose agency coordinating councils for use in meeting needs of older adults. A possible reason for this discrepancy may be that directors are unfamiliar with agency coordinating councils.

There is no evidence from responses by community educators on agencies serving older adults that discloses the extent to which those agencies serve older adults or the extent to which community educators communicate with those agencies. There is evidence that the type of agencies serving older adults may differ depending on the size of community. Urban and suburban directors mentioned "parks and recreation departments" most frequently, while rural directors did not mention these agencies. Rural and suburban directors ranked "churches" high as compared to urban directors. It appears that churches may be a more viable or perhaps more important service agency for older adults in rural and suburban areas. Recreation departments probably do not exist in most rural communities which would account for their absence on the rural list of agencies.

Results taken from the field survey instrument on current programming indicate that urban directors utilize agency contacts
in assessing needs to a greater extent than do rural and suburban directors. These findings are consistent with results from the 15 item questionnaire section of the survey where urban directors indicated that "agencies" should be the primary means of assessing needs of older adults. On the same item comparison with rural and suburban directors, both groups were inconsistent. Rural directors utilize "personal contacts with older adults" most frequently, while indicating that "groups of older adults" would be the best to utilize in needs assessment. Suburban directors utilize "community surveys" most frequently, while indicating that "advisory councils" would be the best to utilize. Agency influence and visibility may be greater in urban areas as a needs assessment source. Agencies may not be as useful to rural and suburban directors due to problems of agency accessibility.

"Community surveys" were ranked high by all three groups of urban, rural and suburban directors, yet this method may be least effective (assuming a paper rather than personal interview format) in assessing the needs of older adults. The older adult population is the most undereducated in society (Riley and Foner, 1968) and many older adults may experience difficulty with printed material. The problem of surveys may be compounded by reaching an accessible population of older adults (housing projects, clubs, activity centers) who might not be representative of all older adults in a district.

Participant involvement in programming

The model for development of a community education program for
older adults conceptualizes a sequence for involvement of older adults in programming efforts. This sequencial development is an extension of findings related to the older adult as a potential participant, as a resource person, and as a program leader. Methods of recruiting older adults were largely drawn from the study of Sainer and Zander (1971). Older adults as potential resources was addressed by Martin and Robin (1972), McClusky (1974), Robinson (1970), Sainer and Zander (1971), and Showkeir (1974). Participation of older adults in program planning and development (leadership phase) was viewed as important by both community educators and selected experts on aging.

The design of the field survey instrument did not seek out information on current recruiting efforts in Michigan programs. There was some mention by Michigan directors of future plans for developing programs to reach non-involved older adults.

Sources utilized in the review of literature did not relate to the leadership phase of involvement, only to the resource phase. There needs to be a distinction made in programming between the various levels of participant involvement. Older adults becoming involved as program resources should not be equated with older adults participating as program leaders. Findings on current programming efforts for older adults reveals there currently is some participation by older adults as volunteers, but not to a great extent. The most frequently mentioned plan for future programming efforts by Michigan community educators was to encourage greater participation by older adults in volunteer activities.
Research in the area of participant leadership is non-existent. Leadership involvement on the part of older adults was seen as important by both selected experts on aging and community educators, with the caution that these efforts should proceed slowly and with proper leadership training for participants. As for the community educator assuming most of the responsibility for program directing, only Michigan directors indicated this to any degree. The majority of directors felt that the responsibility for program planning and directing should be shared equally with older adults. Allowing and training others to assume program responsibilities is not an easy task and the Michigan directors, the field practitioners in this study, may be reflecting this difficulty.

Among the various groups of Michigan directors, those in programs operating eight years or more responded that directors should assume most responsibility in planning and directing activities. The experiences over the years of these directors in developing lay leadership may be the reason so few indicated that older adults should assume primary responsibility for planning and directing activities.

The response by community educators of involving all older adults is consistent with community educators seeking to serve all community members. It is unclear however, how involving all older adults is consistent with the non-direct programming function designed to explore specific needs of older adults and work with area agencies? A summary of findings seems to indicate that community educators would assess the needs of all older adults in a community, and upon
finding specific needs, would work with other area agencies in programming for that specific need.

Leadership skills needed by the community educator

The leadership role of community educators in working with older adults is a three phase process: (a) possess human skills, (b) work in a facilitative role with older adults, and (c) gain knowledge of the aging process, needs, and characteristics of older adults, and an historical perspective on the times which older adults have lived through.

The literature and research in community education on leadership is inadequate in dealing with specific leadership skills needed by community educators. According to study findings, the need for human skills (able to relate, sensitive to needs, respect for autonomy) in working with older adults is most important. Beyond these findings there are no indications as to why these skills are important or what aspects of program development are likely to be affected by human skills.

The three skill areas of "human", "technical" and "conceptual" have been a focus of writers in community education seeking to determine training needs for developing community education directors. By first determining the amount of skills needed in each of the three areas, training can then be focused on a particular need area. The focus of current research should be to extend these three skill areas into a more detailed analysis of training programs which can help build particular skill competencies.

Community educators in this dissertation indicated a need for
"human" and "conceptual" skills in working with older adults. Center
directors indicated more "conceptual" skills are needed, while most
Michigan directors noted a greater need for "human" skills. For
the center director role in programming, non-direct in nature,
"conceptual" skills seem consistent with this stance. The Michigan
directors who indicated "human" skills may feel the face to face
dealings with older adults are most important in a direct programming
effort.

Responses by urban directors in Michigan revealed "conceptual"
skills as most important. The urban directors surveyed represent
the top director in a hierarchy of community education personnel in
a district. These urban directors may be more removed from direct
interaction with older adults than directors in smaller districts.

Facilitative leadership skill is widely accepted in community
education literature (Ellis and Sperling, 1973; Minzey and LeTarte,
1972; Seay, et.al., 1974; Totten, 1970; Wood and Martin, 1974).
This role is one of helping community members (older adults) become
involved in the processes of program planning and development. In
addition, a facilitative role calls for the director to foster this
participation and be able to recognize situations which call for
a greater or lessor leadership by participants. This facilitator
role is a natural link to the greater participant involvement process
by older adults. With this role so widely accepted in community
education, the facilitative role needs further definition as to its
application. Research should begin to define this role and begin to
analyze its potential. At present there is no research on the
effectiveness or use of the facilitator role.
Community educators indicated that much adjustment is needed in working with older adults (background information, needs assessment information, inservice training). The training of community educators in working with older adults, although needed, was not seen by selected experts on aging as an extensive process. This difference can in part be a matter of defining "much" and "not extensive training". For community educators, "much" adjustment meant background information on older adults, inservice training and needs assessment information. For the selected experts on aging, "not extensive training" meant knowledge and sophistication on needs and characteristics of older adults and on historical perspective of the times older adults have lived through. These two views on adjustment are not that different. What remains is to determine the type and amount of training needed for community educators to gain these knowledges.

There are indications from data on current programming that many community educators may lack the basic information on older adults needed in order to serve this group. When asked to indicate the percentage of older adults in their area, estimates ranged from 1 to 50%. Census statistics (1970) reveal that older adults comprise approximately 13% of the total Michigan population (Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1972).

Program components

The results of the developmental processes within the model which relate and interact together are programs. These outcomes, or programs, of this interactive process cannot be isolated from the
processes, nor should programs be determined apart from the developmental process.

Of the programming framework presented in the model for developing a community education program for older adults (social, educational, and educating the area citizenry), there is evidence that social programming is presently receiving greater emphasis in Michigan districts. These findings on current programming activities revealed that three of the five most frequently mentioned activities were classified as social in nature (potlucks, dinners and games, bus trips and tours, leisure time classes). "Free passes to school events and classes" was the third ranked activity. An educational program (information dissemination) was ranked as the fourth most frequently programmed activity.

Among the groups of urban, rural and suburban directors in Michigan, some differences existed in the type of current programming being conducted. Only "information dissemination" and "free passes to school events and classes" were ranked in the top five activities by all three groups. Rural and suburban directors indicated "bus trips and tours" and "potlucks, dinners and games" in their top five activities. Urban directors indicated "recreational activities" and "preparation for retirement classes" as part of their top five activities. The funding and operating of current programs in Michigan districts is presently maintained by community education. Of urban, rural, and suburban directors, rural and suburban directors noted that "few" current activities are held in school facilities, while urban directors indicated "most" are held in school facilities. More
data is needed to determine if school facilities use in urban, rural, and suburban areas is consistent with the findings that the best facilities to use in programming for older adults are those which are accessible and comfortable. In addition, there appears to be a difference between urban and other directors in terms of the type of facility use. The greater emphasis on "potlucks, dinners and games" in rural and suburban areas may indicate these schools operate more as community gathering centers. The "social" emphasis appears to be greater in rural and suburban areas than in urban districts.

Educational activities, for older adults and area citizenry, should be given a higher priority by community educators. Writers in the field of aging found common agreement on the need for older adults to continue to grow in later years (Aker, 1973; McClusky, 1974; Peterson, 1974). All age groups should be educated on the aging process, in addition to the need for a stronger emphasis for preretirement education (McClusky, 1974). Assuming these educational needs to be a higher priority for older adults, as well as other age groups, educational institutions, and in particular community educators, are in a unique position to meet these programming needs. Community educators are legitimately involved in addressing the needs of and programming for older adults. Community educators have access to the resources (facilities, media tools, personnel) which are designed for educative purposes. This educative advantage of community education should not be lost through too great a programming emphasis on social activities.

There is a need for community educators to more closely define
their role within the community, and in particular, working with older adults. There may be some question as to the ability of community educators to meet the needs of all older adults through a needs assessment process and agency coordinating function. In addition, community educators need to analyze their role in providing a direct program service. If a direct program function (one which directly involves older adults) is seen as appropriate, community educators need to consider if they are able to provide both social and educational programs to the same extent. Social programming may serve a valuable function in any efforts to reach older adults but perhaps social programming should be as a supplement to education/informational programming.

Community educators and selected experts on aging specified that both age-separated and age-integrated activities were appropriate. Michigan directors revealed a trend toward age-separated activities to a greater extent than did center directors. Michigan directors may be reflecting a lack of age-integration of activities in current programming.

Programming priority

Community educators stated the priority of programming for older adults should be "equal" to that of other age groups. The selected experts on aging indicated the priority for older adults should be higher due to neglect of the needs of older adults. Both groups reflect their particular program backgrounds. Community educators are generalists who seek to reach and involve many age groups in a community, while the selected experts on aging reveal
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their speciality in working with older adults.

In current programming, Michigan community educators indicated a "direct" involvement in delivering of services to older adults. Only five percent of the directors indicated no involvement in programming for older adults. Michigan community education programs are relatively new (since the mid-1960's) and programs for older adults have developed largely within the last five years (79%).

From present data on current activities and from lack of data on other community education programming efforts, little is known of the present status of programming for older adults other than (a) programming is taking place in Michigan districts, and (b) community educators view programming for older adults as a legitimate function.

The Emerging Model of Community Education

Weaver (1972) made the observation that community educators expressed a desire to move to a new model of community education. While this desire was expressed, Weaver (1972) observed that community educators continued to report traditional types of activities.

Findings from this dissertation indicate that although community educators do relate to the concept of The Emerging Model, most of the current programming for older adults still reflects the traditional practices of school-based programs which are largely operated and funded through community education. There are indications though, that programming for older adults in Michigan districts does reflect movement toward some of the concepts included in The Emerging Model.
The most significant indication that some of the emphasis in programming for older adults is changing is in the amount of school-based programming. Community educators reported most of the activities for older adults, while community education funded and operated, are held in non-school facilities. Other findings reveal that Michigan directors are placing a greater emphasis on utilizing a variety of needs assessment techniques, and cooperating with area agencies in providing services. These findings, while not conclusive, reflect greater amounts of community inputs into community education program operations.

Community educators and selected experts on aging specified that "human" skills (also "conceptual" skills by community educators) are most needed by community educators in directing programs for older adults. Leadership skills most needed, as reflected in The Emerging Model, were technical and conceptual skills.

Community education development in Michigan was the first in the nation. As a result, if the philosophy is evolving, it might well be manifested in the Michigan districts. As noted, there is some evidence that Michigan community educators are moving toward an operation as reflected in The Emerging Model, although this movement can hardly be described as significant. As part of the national study of community education by Weaver (1972), he described six major processes of community education. These six processes were further described in terms of specific goals which were rated by community educators as appropriate to community education. Findings from this study reveal that some progress is being made with the process
areas of "coordinating" (agency relationships), "programming educational opportunities" (current programs for older adults), and "training" (older adults as volunteers).

These conclusions are tentative in that some efforts are being made, but little is known about the extent of efforts in these areas. It will remain to be seen if this evolution toward concepts in The Emerging Model will continue or will remain as an unrealized goal.

**Michigan and center director response patterns**

The differences in response patterns among various groupings of Michigan directors was previously analyzed in the findings section of Chapter Five. This particular section will analyze the response trends of Michigan and center directors in answering the items from part one of the field survey instrument.

Some response differences occurred among several groups, both Michigan and center directors. Many of these differences occurred with one group on only one survey item. Three groups in particular revealed response differences on several survey items; center directors, urban directors, and directors of programs operating eight years or more.

Response patterns of center directors revealed a tendency to write in responses more than did other groups. In seven of the 15 items, center directors wrote in "other" at a greater percentage than did other groups. In most instances these written in responses were to state preferences toward a combination of already stated response choices rather than to indicate a new response. Center directors, due to their positions as spokespersons for the community education
concept, may have been more inclined to critically analyze the response choices and be less inclined to commit themselves to a single, and in their view, perhaps limited response choice.

Urban directors were included in five instances where their responses differed from the majority responses for all Michigan directors. Specifically, urban directors indicated: (a) "educating community members" rather than "needs assessment" as the primary function of community education, (b) "agencies" and "groups of older adults" rather than just "groups of older adults" in gathering information on needs of older adults, (c) "currently uninvolved" and "all" rather than just "all" regarding which older adults to involve, (d) "mostly community educators" rather than "equal" in programming responsibilities, and (e) "conceptual" skills rather than "human" skills.

It appears as if the urban environment may present conditions which call for adjustments in development of programs for older adults. In particular, area agencies may have a more prominent role in urban areas due to the amount of agencies present in urban areas and the inability of community educators to relate individually to the large numbers of urban older adults. In a related response, urban directors responded that "currently uninvolved" older adults, rather than "all" older adults, should be the target group to reach in programming efforts. The large numbers of older adults in urban areas may make the goal of "all" older adults an impractical goal.

A note of caution needs to be given with the analysis of data on urban districts. Nine urban directors responded to the survey instrument and each respondent accounted for approximately 11% of a given response choice. These nine urban respondents are contrasted
with the 75 rural directors and 42 suburban directors who responded to the field survey instrument.

Directors of programs in operation eight years or more responded differently on three items from the responses recorded for the majority of Michigan directors. Two responses appear to be related: (a) "direct programming" rather than "needs assessment" as the primary function of community education, and (b) "mostly community educators" rather than "equal" responsibilities in program development. Directors of longer operating programs appear to view the more traditional types of program operation as more appropriate in working with older adults. Traditional programming is considered as offering a specific program which is largely directed by community education personnel within the educational facility. The third response difference was an indication that "conceptual" skills are more needed by community educators in working with older adults than are "human" skills.

Limitations of the Study

Three areas are considered as limitations which may affect the ultimate value of study findings: (a) respondent populations chosen for this study, (b) background characteristics of Michigan directors, and (c) field survey instrument pretest procedures.

There were three population groups included in this study; (a) six selected experts on aging, (b) 186 Michigan community educators, and (c) 54 community education center directors. Surveys were sent to all center and Michigan directors. Center directors are from throughout the United States while Michigan directors represent only
one state. Subsequently, findings from this study may not be
generalizable to other programs in other states. The selected
experts on aging were personally selected by the writer and are
not necessarily representative of the field of aging.

Due to the numbers of Michigan directors who responded to the
field survey instrument (132), response frequencies in items with
many response choices were often low and subsequent analysis was
less meaningful. Only nine urban directors responded to the survey
making findings on urban districts less conclusive.

The field survey instrument, while reviewed by several experts
in community education, was not formally pretested. Therefore,
assumptions of validity and reliability of the instrument cannot be
assumed.

Recommendations

Field testing the model

The model for development of a community education program for
older adults needs to be field tested in urban, rural and suburban
community education districts outside the State of Michigan. The
model, to this point, represents a broad range of input from community
educators and selected experts on aging. Reflected in this dissertation
are findings as to the gaps which exist between current programming
efforts (in Michigan) and program development as reflected in the
model. A crucial research process should address the applicability
of the model to local settings. The following are some of the
concerns which need to be addressed through research in order to
(a) determine the usefulness and applicability of the model in local
settings, and (b) fill in missing data on current programming efforts which either were not dealt with in this dissertation or were part of inconclusive results.

1. The model should be field tested in a variety of situations to determine its applicability.

2. It should be determined what differences exist between programs located in urban, rural and suburban settings. In addition, it should be determined if programs which have served older adults over a longer period of time operate differently than programs which are in an early developmental stage.

3. Data should be gathered on programs for older adults concerning use of age criteria for participation, programming schedules, and current levels of program involvement contrasted with other levels of community education involvement with other community members.

Training needs of community educators

A basic need in community education in developing programs for older adults is the training of directors concerning the needs and characteristics of older adults, aging process, and historical perspective on the times older adults have lived through. A vehicle already exists through which such training could take place. National workshops for community educators are scheduled on a biannual basis. There also is a national convention for community educators which includes training workshops. A third vehicle for training would be the periodic (monthly in Michigan) seminars for community educators held under the auspices of university Community
School Development Center personnel. A fourth possible vehicle would be to include training on older adults as part of the pre-service graduate training needed, in most instances, to become a director of community education.

Specific training is needed in the following areas:

1. Needs and characteristics of older adults, the aging process, and historical perspective on the times older adults have lived through.

2. Development of lay leadership responsibilities among older adults in terms of program planning and directing.

3. Development of programs to specifically meet the educational/informational needs of older adults.

4. Development of educational programs for the area citizenry with an emphasis on preretirement education and education on aging.

Research needs

The following are some of the other gaps in current research which became apparent through the process of developing this dissertation:

1. Needs assessment methodologies and interpretation of needs as related to older adults.

2. Situations in programming for older adults which are appropriate for age-integrating of activities and situations which call for an age-separating of activities.

3. Relating leadership skills (human, technical, conceptual) to the specific tasks and components within a community education program for older adults.
Summary

Overview of the problem

The purpose of this dissertation was to formulate a model for development of a community education program for older adults. Community education programs have traditionally included, as part of their emphasis, programming opportunities for older adults. With the relatively recent national growth of community education programs, little material and no research in community education has been reported which specifically addresses community education programming for older adults.

In developing this model, three major concerns were investigated: (a) program developments in the field of aging pertinent to community education theory and development, (b) the role of community education in meeting the needs of older adults, and (c) leadership attributes needed by the community educator in directing programs for older adults. These major concerns were addressed in terms of the following questions:

1. What are some of the basic considerations which need to be addressed in developing programs for older adults?
2. What communication and needs assessment processes are appropriate in developing programs for older adults?
3. What levels of participant involvement are appropriate in the planning and directing of programs for older adults?
4. What leadership skills are needed by the community educator in developing programs for older adults?
5. What components are appropriate for inclusion in a community
education program for older adults?

6. What priority should programming for older adults have relative to other community education programming efforts?

The sources of input and data utilized in this dissertation were:
(a) review of literature in the field of aging and community education, (b) surveyed opinions of Michigan community educators, and center directors from throughout the United States, and (c) interview data from selected experts on aging.

Research design and procedures

Instruments used in gathering data from the two populations of community educators and selected experts on aging were:

1. For community educators, a three-part field survey instrument to which Michigan community education directors responded to all three parts, and center directors responded to only part one.

2. For selected experts on aging, a seven item personal interview questionnaire.

The field survey instrument was sent to all district-wide community education directors in the State of Michigan. Of the 186 surveyed, 132 responded, a 71% return. The center directors numbered 54, of which 47 responded, an 87% return.

Six selected experts on aging were interviewed.

The field survey instrument parts one and two were designed to yield data on what community educators indicated is the role of community education in meeting the needs of older adults. Data from the 15 item field survey instrument for community educators was analyzed according to the following breakdowns:
1. Center directors and Michigan directors of community education.

2. Michigan directors of community education in urban, rural and suburban districts.

3. Michigan directors in districts operating programs in community education from 0-2 years, 2-5 years, 5-8 years, and 8 years or more.

4. Michigan directors with extensive training in working with older adults, those with some training in working with older adults, those with little training in working with older adults, and those with no training in working with older adults.

Part three of the field survey instrument was designed to yield data on current programming efforts for older adults in Michigan community education districts.

The personal interview questions for selected experts on aging were designed to yield data on what these experts indicated as current thinking from the field of aging on programming efforts for older adults. This source of data served as a contrast to data gathered from community educators.

Data were analyzed using frequency and percentage breakdowns.

Findings

The model developed from the various sources of data represents four interactive processes (basic considerations for program development, communication and needs assessment processes, participant involvement, and leadership skills needed by the community educator) which are manifested in program outcomes for older adults in local communities. Program components, or outcomes, of this developmental
process are social and educational programs for older adults. Part of the program emphasis should include educative programs for area citizenry on the aging process, needs, and characteristics of older adults.

Specific findings indicate the following on programming for older adults:

1. Programs should be free of any age criterion for participation, held during the day, and on a year round schedule.

2. Programs should function primarily in support of other area agencies in providing specific services to older adults.

3. Programs should seek to involve all older adults in a community. Older adults should share equal responsibility with community educators in planning and directing activities.

4. The perceived leadership role of the community educator is that of a facilitator. A facilitator is one who is sensitive toward taking a direct or indirect role in program development.

5. Programs should include both social and educational activities, with an emphasis on educational programming.

6. Programs for older adults should have an equal priority with programming efforts for other age groups in a community (a higher priority was indicated by the six selected experts on aging).

Data were submitted by community educators on current programming efforts for older adults in Michigan districts. The following is a summary of these findings:

1. Most of the respondents indicated their programs provide either a direct or supporting role in serving area older adults.
2. Social activities are programmed to a greater extent than are educational programs for older adults.

3. Community surveys, personal contacts with older adults, community advisory councils and groups of older adults were indicated as the primary sources of needs assessment information on older adults.

Findings from data reveal that while programming for older adults is seen by community educators as important, wide gaps exist between perceived and actual programming functions. Community educators indicate a need for agency coordinating and cooperating efforts, while in reality, most program operation stresses social activities. There appears to be a lack of specific direction and rationale as to what constitutes a viable community education effort for older adults.
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NATIONAL STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION GOALS

THE CONVENTIONAL MODEL

THE SOCIAL SETTING (COMMUNITY)

1. Stable Society
2. Community Organization
3. Congruence of School and Community Goals
4. Education and Schooling Synonymous

THE PERSON (COMMUNITY EDUCATOR)

1. Personal Requisites
   - Charisma
   - Loyalty
   - Dedication
2. Skills
   - Technical
   - Conceptual
   - Human (high degree)
3. Knowledges
   - Educational Programming
   - Public Relations

THE JOB (COMMUNITY EDUCATION)

1. School-based
2. Rational, Bureaucratic, Closed-system
3. Program-oriented
4. Accountable to the School

Donald C. Weaver
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
1972
THE EMERGING MODEL

THE SOCIAL SETTING (COMMUNITY)

1. Societal Malaise
2. Community Disorganization
3. Dissatisfaction with the School
4. Broadened Definition of Education

THE PERSON (COMMUNITY EDUCATOR)

1. Personal Requisites
   - Objectivity
   - Initiative
   - Adaptability

2. Skills
   - Technical (high degree)
   - Conceptual (high degree)
   - Human

THE JOB (COMMUNITY EDUCATION)

1. Community-oriented
2. Natural, Open-system
3. Process-based
4. Accountable to Community

Donald C. Weaver
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
1972
### GOALS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

**REPORTED AS PRIMARY BY 50 PERCENT OR MORE OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinates efforts of community agencies</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Provides effective communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Eliminates duplication among agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Assists residents to secure educational services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provides forum for community problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Identifies community problems</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Surveys attitudes and interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Identifies required resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Demonstrates humanistic approach to education</td>
<td>Demonstrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Demonstrates methods of social change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Provides model for community living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Demonstrates principles of educational leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extends use of school facilities</td>
<td>Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increases multi-age and cross-cultural contacts</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Provides programs for senior citizens</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provides teen-age enrichment and recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Provides recreation programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Provides high school completion program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Improves educational opportunity for minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Develops leadership among lay citizens</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Increases participation in existing school program</td>
<td>Promoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promotes school as primary educational agency</td>
<td>The School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Improves public image of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donald C. Weaver  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
1972
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>SKILL MIX</th>
<th>TRAINING COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COORDINATING</td>
<td>Concept. 40%</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; Behavioral Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 20%</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 40%</td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Social Work Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING</td>
<td>Concept. 20%</td>
<td>Survey Research &amp; Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATING</td>
<td>Concept. 20%</td>
<td>Theory of Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 40%</td>
<td>Group Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 40%</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMING ED. OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td>Concept. 20%</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; Behavioral Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 60%</td>
<td>Programming Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 20%</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td>Concept. 33 1/3%</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; Behavioral Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 33 1/3%</td>
<td>Group Process Learning Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 33 1/3%</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTING THE SCHOOL</td>
<td>Concept. 20%</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; Behavioral Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech. 20%</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human 60%</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donald C. Weaver  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
1972
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MASTER LIST OF GERONTOLOGY IDEAS

Brainstormed at Community Education Seminars of November 9
(Mack's Airport Inn, Coldwater) November 11 (Springlake Country Club)

HOW CAN SCHOOLS FUNCTION AS FACILITATORS FOR AGENCIES AND SERVICES?

May be effectively implemented by Community Education personnel and programs (in instances of their being identified as separate from K-12):

1. Create a crisis center
2. Set up meetings between agency people and senior citizens
3. Use church activities and religious services
4. Develop Community Services List for senior citizens
5. Take Community Education courses to nursing homes
6. Appoint a senior citizen as full time director of Community Education Senior Citizens activities
7. Have meeting of all agencies to compare services and make summaries for senior citizens

Should be implemented through cooperative efforts of all school personnel and programs in the community:

1. Help provide transportation to agencies and services
2. Provide income tax assistance
3. Provide counseling
4. Cooperative extension services
5. Build support for community chest drives
6. Provide a clearing house for pamphlets and other materials dealt with senior citizens needs & activities
7. Young students and adults go to various senior citizen homes and residences to discuss travel experiences, show slides, etc.
8. Decorate nursing homes for birthdays and times other than holidays
9. Conduct a survey to see where senior citizens are located and what their interests are
10. Provide box library on wheels
11. Hold scout meetings in nursing homes
12. Use school groups to entertain
13. Children raise money and decorate nursing homes
14. Take kindergarten children to nursing homes occasionally
15. Have a particular class adopt a senior citizen
16. Have students do beauty aid work
17. Use students industrial-vocational skills to help senior citizens maintain their homes
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HOW CAN SCHOOLS HELP SENIOR CITIZENS PREPARE FOR RETIREMENT?

May be implemented by Community Education personnel and programs (in instances of their being identified as separate from K-12):

1. Compilation and utilization of experiences of other retired citizens
2. Coordinated printed retirement information
3. Create awareness of continued work experiences, part time jobs
4. Follow-up on senior citizens who may not have been in community education programs
5. Provide agency and community services information
6. Help establish cooperative exchange of services that senior citizens can provide for each other
7. Provide vacation information service
8. Seek free or discounted personal care services, products
9. Provide survey of local recreational facilities
10. Work with local industry on retirement process
11. Produce Senior Citizen Guidebook on things like: saving money, vacations, etc.
12. Create a class or meetings where senior citizens explore writing to form political influence group
13. Offer classes and programs on subject of psychological change implications of retirement
14. Create a single club for senior citizens
15. Offer hobby-oriented teaching
16. Provide information on utilization of multiple housing
17. Help establish senior citizens clinic
18. Prepare wife to have husband around home all day and vice versa
19. Establish forums on various aspects of death

Should be implemented through cooperative efforts of all school personnel and programs in the community:

1. Offer training in management of financial resources
2. Offer training in food preparation
3. Provide materials and training in "Fashions for Senior Citizens"
4. Provide information on maintaining good health
5. Get schools (including universities) to waive entrance requirement or standards for senior citizens
6. Find ways to take the school and school activities into the houses of senior citizens
7. Teach the legal aspects of retirement, use community lawyers
8. Have courses about social security, other retirement programs
9. Prepare list of people with special skills who might act as consultants
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10. Educate youth to think long-range, in terms of future retirement
11. Create social interactions with all age groups
12. Create interests in "lifetime" sports
13. Provide assistance in understanding attitudes and behavior of young people

HOW CAN SCHOOLS ASSIST SENIOR CITIZENS IN SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES?

May be effectively implemented by Community Education personnel and programs (in instances of their being identified as separate from K-12):

1. Organize senior citizens talent show
2. Run telephone reassurance program
3. Operate social and recreational information center
4. Organize parent sitter services
5. Disseminate money-raising ideas for finding senior citizen activities
6. Secure use of community buildings (church, etc.) in addition to school buildings
7. Compile scrapbooks
8. Have classes for senior citizens only
9. Organize day camps for senior citizens
10. Plan senior citizen trips
11. Organize neighborhood senior citizen groups to plan activities
12. Establish annual leadership clinic for senior citizens
13. Hold card parties
14. Advise special senior citizen rules for regular sports
15. Secure special rates for senior citizens use of golf courses, etc.
16. Put out news bulletins

Should be implemented through cooperative efforts of all school personnel and programs in the community:

1. Provide senior citizens passes to school activities
2. Provide use of school facilities
3. Provide hot lunch "meal on wheels" program
4. Offer course on great books
5. Help senior citizen with personal correspondence
6. Get senior citizens involved in drama
7. Have senior citizens operate concessions at games
8. Promote regular radio program
9. Help with transportation for trips
10. Provide more enrichment offerings for senior citizens
11. Increase number of student programs for senior citizen audiences in school or in community
12. Promote home visits by senior citizens to other senior citizens
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13. Create a mobile library
14. Provide an inventory of opportunities and equipment in schools that senior citizens might use
15. Promote interaction between older people and younger people
16. Provide reading service to people who need it
17. Get senior citizens involved in planning of community and school recreation programs
18. Compile great recipes
19. Offer sex education for senior citizens
20. Promote more open houses by schools and departments within schools

HOW CAN SCHOOLS ASSIST SENIOR CITIZENS TO FUNCTION AS COMMUNITY RESOURCES?

May be effectively implemented by Community Education personnel and programs (in instances of their being identified as separate from K-12):

1. Establish a Senior Citizen Social Agency Advisory Board
2. Involve senior citizens in Scouting (Merit badge counselors, etc.)
3. Encourage senior citizens to man Legislative Research committees
4. Assist them to be "parent sitters", chauffeurs, etc.
5. Participate in City Planning Commissions
6. Use them as recruiters and aids in adult education, high school completion, etc.
7. Have them establish Welcome-Wagon-type services in communities
8. Have them conduct community needs surveys
9. Employ them as volunteers in hospitals & nursing homes
10. Have them on Community Ed Advisory Councils
11. Facilitate retired skilled tradesmen aid to other senior citizens
12. Arrange for senior citizens to do handicraft work with hospital patients
13. Have them run "Dial-a-Friend" service, telephone the homebound
14. Use them as sources of transportation when possible
15. Have them as nucleus of garden clubs
16. Use as grocery shoppers for the homebound
17. Involve as 4-H leaders
18. Have some become experts on services available to senior citizens
19. Involve in day-care work

Should be implemented through cooperative efforts of all school personnel and programs in the community:

1. Become proposal researchers and writers
2. Involve senior citizens in a Santa Clause Answering Service
3. Involve as part time teachers, teachers aides
4. Involve as counselors in crisis centers
5. Use them in collecting material, writing school newsletters
6. Have them compile a community resource list for the school system
7. Have them compile a history of the community and keep it current each year
8. Have as school or community museum directors
9. Have them share the history they have experienced with students
10. Have them share travel experiences with students
11. Involve some as foster grandparents
12. Have them educate students about forgotten trades
13. Employ them as interpreters and advocates of millage campaigns in their peer group
14. Have them making mittens, etc., for school children
15. Use as readers to children and as tutors
16. Involve in library programs
17. Use as teachers of child care skills
18. Use as sources of background information in area projects, activities
19. Use as school crossing guards
20. Employ as ticket takers
21. Involve in administering of community attitudes survey
22. Have students learn home skills in houses of senior citizens
C. S. MOTT FOUNDATION

CENTERS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

Alabama
University of Alabama - Birmingham

Arizona
Arizona State University

Arkansas
University of Arkansas

California
California State University - Los Angeles
California State University - San Jose
Department of Education - San Diego County

Colorado
Colorado State University
Colorado Department of Education

Connecticut
University of Connecticut
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Florida Atlantic University
University of Florida
University of West Florida

Georgia
Georgia Southern University

Idaho
Idaho State University

Illinois
Illinois Community College Board
Southern Illinois University

Indiana
Ball State University
Indiana State Department of Public Instruction

Iowa
Drake University

Kansas
Kansas State University
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Louisiana  
Southeastern Louisiana University

Maryland  
Maryland State Department of Education

Massachusetts  
Worcester State College

Michigan  
Alma College  [regional center]
Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University  [regional center]
Michigan State University
Northern Michigan University  [regional center]
Western Michigan University  [regional center]

Minnesota  
College of St. Thomas

Missouri  
University of Missouri

Nebraska  
University of Nebraska

Nevada  
Western Nevada Community College

New Jersey  
Montclair State College

New Mexico  
New Mexico State University

New York  
Syracuse University

North Carolina  
Appalachian State University
North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction

Ohio  
Kent State University
Miami University

Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State University
Oregon
  University of Oregon

South Carolina
  University of South Carolina

Tennessee
  University of Tennessee - Nashville

Texas
  Texas A & M University

Utah
  Utah State Department of Education
  Brigham Young University

Vermont
  University of Vermont

Virginia
  University of Virginia
  Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Washington
  Washington State Department of Education

West Virginia
  West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

Wyoming
  University of Wyoming

Washington, D.C.
  Gallaudet College
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A Study in Developing a Model
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR OLDER ADULTS
November, 1974

TO: Selected Community Educators

I am writing this letter to request your assistance in helping me gather opinions of leading community educators regarding programming for older adults.

The purpose of this study is to draw information from the areas of community education leadership, community education program development, and program development in the field of aging for a model community education program for older adults. Information gained from this study will offer much needed direction to community educators in defining their role in working with older adults. The field of aging is receiving increasing national attention, consequently it is vital that community educators be aware of and in the forefront of current developments.

You will notice that throughout the questionnaire the term older adult is referred to. This term should be thought of as being synonymous with such other terms as senior citizen, golden ager, elderly, or senior adult. In addition, you will notice in reading through the questionnaire items that for any given statement there may be more than one response item which will appeal to you. For purposes of this study, please indicate the one response which you think is the most appropriate. It will not be assumed that by indicating one response item that you think the others unimportant. Space is also provided with each item to add your own different response, if needed.

Your reply to this questionnaire is important. As only a selected population is being sampled, accurate results will be achieved only if everyone in the sample returns this questionnaire. No names of individuals or schools will be identified in the study. All replies will be strictly confidential.

Thank you very much, in advance, for your cooperation. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Eric C. Smith
Doctoral Intern
Community School Development Center
Western Michigan University
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COMMUNITY EDUCATION AND OLDER ADULTS

PART I COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMMING FOR OLDER ADULTS

Directions: Each of the next 15 items contains possible responses of community educators toward meeting the needs of older adults. Read the opening statement with each numbered item, then check the response which you think is most appropriate.
Please check only one response per item.

1. Transportation services as an example of high priority need area of older adults
   a. Community educators should not address this need
   b. Community educators should initiate some type of community forum or discussion in addressing this need
   c. Community educators should contact and help coordinate services with other area agencies in addressing this need
   d. Community educators should initiate their own programs in addressing this need
   e. Other, please explain

2. Concentrating efforts on a particular segment of the older adult population
   a. Community educators should seek out and involve the hidden, uninvolved older adult
   b. Community educators should seek out and involve all older adults
   c. Community educators should seek out and involve those older adults with specific needs
   d. Community educators should seek out and involve the undereducated older adult
   e. Other, please explain

3. Leadership skill adjustment needed in working with older adults
   a. Community educators need the same leadership skills for working with an older adult group as are needed for working with any other community group
   b. Community educators need to have background and needs assessment information available in order to adjust leadership skills for working with older adults
   c. Community educators need both background information, needs assessment information and inservice training in order to adjust leadership skills for working with older adults
   d. Other, please explain
(Please check only one response per item)

4. Skills needed in directing the day to day operation of an older adult program
   ___ a. Community educators should know the characteristics of older adults and have a high degree of programming skill
   ___ b. Community educators should know how the needs of older adults relate to community education processes and how societal forces affect the older adult
   ___ c. Community educators should relate well with older adults and build cooperative relationships within the older adult group
   ___ d. Other, please explain

5. Methods of involving older adults in activities
   ___ a. Community educators primarily should schedule social activities for older adults to be held at the same time as educational/informational activities for older adults
   ___ b. Community educators primarily should schedule social activities for older adults to be held at different times from educational/informational activities for older adults
   ___ c. Community educators should primarily schedule older adult educational/informational activities
   ___ d. Community educators should primarily schedule older adult social activities
   ___ e. Other, please explain

6. Use of facilities for older adult programming
   ___ a. Community educators should make primary use of educational facilities for older adult programming
   ___ b. Community educators should make primary use of traditional gathering places for older adult programming (clubs, churches, housing projects)
   ___ c. Community educators should make primary use of facilities nearest the central shopping areas for older adult programming
   ___ d. Other, please explain

7. The primary function of community education in meeting needs of older adults
   ___ a. The primary function should be gathering of information on area older adults and identifying need areas for community planning purposes
   ___ b. The primary function should be programming of older adult activities
   ___ c. The primary function should be educating the area citizenry and agencies on older adult needs
(Please check only one response per item)

_____ d. The primary function should be providing a link between the K-12 program and the needs and interests of area older adults

_____ e. Other, please explain

8. Age requirements for participating in older adult activities

_____ a. 65 years and older

_____ b. 60 years and older

_____ c. 55 years and older

_____ d. Upon retirement

_____ e. Other, please explain

9. Advisory councils and older adults

_____ a. Community wide council: represents a broad cross section of the community; advisory capacity to community education on older adults

_____ b. Special interest council: represents specifically the older adult population in advising community education; older adults widely represented on the council

_____ c. Agency coordinating council: represents a means to coordinate area activity in meeting older adult needs; agency personnel primary representatives along with some older adults

_____ d. Ad hoc action council; formed to meet a specific older adult need and is dissolved upon action being taken; membership reflected by the particular action needed

_____ e. Ad hoc advisory council: formed to advise and recommend action on older adult needs to community education and is dissolved upon recommendations being made; membership reflected by the needs at the time

_____ f. Other, please explain

10. Length and time of older adult programming

_____ a. Programming for older adults should be on a regular seasonal basis and coincided with K-12 schedules

_____ b. Programming for older adults should be on a year round basis

_____ c. Programming for older adults should be designed around specific needs as they arise

_____ d. Programming for older adults should be scheduled on a similar basis as other advertised community education activities

_____ e. Other, please explain
11. Activity format for older adult programming
   _____a. Activities primarily should be leisure time activities/personal
          enjoyment
   _____b. Activities primarily should be informational activities/personal
          enjoyment
   _____c. Activities primarily should be skill development/job rehabilita-
          tion
   _____d. Activities primarily should be constructive use of time/volunteerism
   _____e. Other, please explain

12. Developing older adult program leadership
   _____a. Community educators should primarily train older adults in
          operating and planning activities
   _____b. Community educators should primarily share equal responsibility
          with older adults in operating and planning activities
   _____c. Community educators should primarily assume responsibility in
          operating and planning activities, along with support help from
          older adults
   _____d. Community educators should primarily assume responsibility in
          operating and planning activities for older adults
   _____e. Other, please explain

13. Priority of older adult programming
   _____a. The priority of older adult programming should be higher than
          that of other population groups
   _____b. The priority of older adult programming should be lower than
          that of other population groups
   _____c. The priority of older adult programming should be equal to that
          of other population groups
   _____d. Other, please explain

14. Separated or integrated activities for older adults
   _____a. Older adult activities should generally be combined with
          activities for other age groups
   _____b. Older adult activities should generally be separated from
          activities for other age groups
   _____c. Other, please explain
(Please check only one response per item)

15. Assessing needs of older adults
   _____a. Community educators should utilize area agencies as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____b. Community educators should utilize area older adult groups as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____c. Community educators should utilize some type of advisory council as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____d. Community educators should utilize individual older adult contacts as their primary means of assessing needs of older adults
   _____e. Other, please explain

______________________________

______________________________
PART II BACKGROUND INFORMATION

**Directions:** Check the one appropriate response from each of the 4 items presented

1. The district which is served by your community education program is considered which one of the following?
   - a. Urban
   - b. Rural/small town
   - c. Suburban

2. How long has the community education program which you direct been in existence?
   - a. 0-2 years
   - b. 2-5 years
   - c. 5-8 years
   - d. 8 years or longer

3. In terms of any training which you may have received in the area of working with older adults, check the appropriate item(s) below.
   (For this item, more than one may be checked)
   - a. Formal graduate level course work
   - b. Inservice training/seminars
   - c. Information sharing sessions with local older adult groups or area agency personnel
   - d. No specific training

4. How actively involved is your program in meeting the needs of older adults in your area?
   - a. Direct coordination and involvement in delivering of services
   - b. Involvement is in a supportive role to other agencies in delivering of services
   - c. Occasional programming and involvement in delivering of services
   - d. Not involved in delivering of services

PART III CURRENT PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER ADULTS

**Directions:** The following section calls for brief written responses. Please answer each section in terms of the activities which your program is involved in at present.

1. Indicate how long your program has served older adults in your area.

2. Indicate the proportion and/or percentage of older adults in your area in relation to the rest of the population.
3. List the primary agencies in your area which seek to serve older adults.

4. List or describe your older adult program activities and/or involvement in the following areas.
   
   A. Social and/or recreational programming:
   
   B. Informational and/or educational programming:
   
   C. Other activities and/or involvement:
   
   D. Based on items A, B, and C from above, what approximate percentage of the activities for older adults:
      ____% are held in school facilities,
      ____% are operated by yourself or through your program personnel, and
      ____% are funded by your community education program?

5. List or describe the methods you use for determining the needs of older adults in your area.

6. List or describe your programs and/or ideas for older adults which are in the planning stage for future development.
Personal Interview Questions for Selected Experts on Aging

1. In terms of the following, what should be the emphasis in programming for older adults?
   A. Involve all older adults or a particular needy segment?
   B. Program social activities or informational activities?
   C. Should activities for older adults be age-integrated or age-segregated?
   D. Should programming for older adults be only during the day?

2. What are the best community facilities to use in programming for older adults?

3. What would be a logical age requirement for participating in activities for older adults?

4. Should older adults receive a higher priority in terms of programming efforts than other population groups in a community?

5. What methods are best for assessing the needs of an older adult population?
   A. What methods are best for day to day communication with an older adult population

6. How should and how much should older adults be involved in program planning and development?

7. What leadership techniques and/or attributes are needed in directing programs for older adults?
   A. As a person who deals with many age groups in a community, how much should a community educator know about the needs and characteristics of older adults?
### SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED EXPERTS ON AGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response Summary</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>In terms of the following, what should be the emphasis in programming for older adults?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Involve all older adults or a particular needy segment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- community education by definition should involve all older adults</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- in developing educational programs, select target groups to program for, although programs should be available to all older adults</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Program social activities or informational activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- older adults need both types of programming</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- social and informational programs should both be included. Social activities are a good way to lead into information programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a lot of community groups have social programs, schools should stick to informational types of programming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Should activities for older adults be age-integrated or age-separated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- both options should be available</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- integrate formal educational activities and separate social activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Should programming for older adults be only during the day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- day only is generally accepted and is best for most older adults</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- for age-integrated activities, 4-6pm is best for getting age groups together</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- do not eliminate evenings altogether without first asking older adults</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evenings present security problems (crime)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2
What are the best community facilities to use in programming for older adults?
- friendly, comfortable atmosphere is the best 6
- use the facility with the most convenience and proximity to older adults 3
- churches, schools are often negatively reacted to 2
- schools should be used if community education is the agent 1

Question 3
What would be a logical age requirement for participation in activities for older adults?
- no age requirement should be imposed; use one only if specific circumstances require it 6
- 60 years is best 1
- 55 years is best 1
- retired is best 1

Question 4
Should older adults receive a higher priority in terms of programming efforts than other groups in a community?
- priority should be higher in order that older adults can reach a parity with other groups 5
- with the amount of resources channeled to youth and amount of space presently unfilled in the schools, it would seem reasonable to rechannel some of these resources to older adults 1

Question 5
What methods are best for assessing the needs of an older adult population?
- use personal contacts with older adults 4
- develop an advisory council for older adults composed of agency personnel 4
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- put a roster together of older adults, along with contacts with churches, agencies, clubs  
- obtain a good sample of older adults, then personally interview each older adult in the sample  
- needs assessment of older adults is not needed as information on older adult needs is available  

A. What methods are best for day to day communication with an older adult population?  
- utilize present older adult participants as contacts in reaching other, non involved older adults  
- use radio and television as the media reach most homes of older adults  

Question 6 How should and how much should older adults be involved in program planning and development?  
- older adults should participate in such activities as a matter of principle  
- director should take initiative at first and bring older adults into the planning and directing processes gradually  
- training is needed in developing leadership, as with any age group  
- directors should make sure the chances for success are great  

Question 7 What leadership attributes and/or techniques are needed in directing programs for older adults?  
- person must be sensitive to needs of older adults  
- people oriented  
- knowledge of older adults and the aging process  
- directness; respect for the autonomy of older adults
A. As a person who deals with many age groups in a community, how much should a community educator know about the needs and characteristics of older adults?

| -directors need to know the needs and characteristics of older adults | 6 |
| -gaining knowledge and understanding of older adults does not take extensive training | 3 |
| -leaders should understand the periods of time the older adult has lived through and often relates to | 1 |