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A STUDY, IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, OF THE EFFECTS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION ON THE ATTITUDES OF SELECTED OPINION LEADERS TOWARDS PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

Stephen L. Stark Ed.D.
Western Michigan University, 1974

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the influence of community education on the attitudes to selected opinion leaders towards public school education and the extended use of school facilities. Specifically, it sought to obtain two measures of the educational attitudes of opinion leaders in school districts having no community education programs, and in school districts operating an identified community education project.

Data were gathered by means of a Likert-type summated rated scale questionnaire which was mailed to 210 opinion leaders in thirty Michigan communities. A computer program (ANOVAR) was used to analyze the attitude scores for each opinion leader. A t-test was used to test for differences in attitudes of opinion leaders from different school district types. Opinion leader responses to the total test, to clustered items and to individual items were analyzed to determine if opinion leader's attitudes were influenced by the presence or absence of community education in the school district. Other attitude data was presented in the form of 3x3 contingency tables for each of the eight additional attitudinal items included on the instrument, and data analysis involved use of chi-square test of independency of contingency classification.
Most results concerning the attitudes towards the extended use of public school facilities were not sufficiently large to support the hypothesis that community education would affect the attitudes of these opinion leaders in districts with and without community education projects. However, there were areas dealing with specific items on the questionnaire that showed significant differences to be present in opinion leader's attitudes. These areas included the school's provision of leadership in (1) expanded recreational and social activities, (2) efforts to solve or lessen social problems in the community, (3) the full utilization of school facilities and equipment and (4) meeting the needs and interests of children, youth and adults. Opinion leaders in community education districts, however, did appear to be more often involved in school-based activities and programs. The results of the study further suggested that differences between the educational attitudes of opinion leaders towards public school education were not sufficiently large to support the hypothesis that community education would be associated with differing educational attitudes in these persons.

Such results suggested three major educational implications.

1. The study made it clear that the local community opinion leader is an important figure in local educational matters. Generally, he is likely to be a supporter of education, informed on educational matters and is likely to have had direct involvement with school-based programs and activities.

2. The opinion leaders in this study indicated some reluctance to become directly involved in boards of education and PTA type organizations. Accordingly, the community educator may find it necessary to
provide a less structured or alternative mode of input than that provided by formal community education advisory councils to tap the views and reactions of opinion leaders as referred to in this study. 3 The key role played in local educational affairs by opinion leaders pointed to the need for some revision in training programs attended by community educators. In the present academic and field training required for community educators, there is little, if any, stress placed upon the identification or characteristics of local opinion leaders. This study pointed to the social role played by and potential function of opinion leaders that could serve in the development of the community education concept in the future. The training of community education leaders should focus more directly on this area.
CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

The problem under investigation in this study concerned the influence of community education on the educational attitudes of identified opinion leaders in Michigan school districts. Specifically, it sought to obtain two measures of the educational attitudes of opinion leaders in school districts having no community education programs, in districts where community education was under the direction of one person only and in those districts where there was a community education coordinator and additional building-level directors of community education in various school locations within the district.

Factors Determining The Study

One of the major characteristics of education in the United States is the part played by the local community in the educational process. Citizens are directly involved at the policy-making, funding, curriculum development and school governance levels.

Because of this, community attitudes have a greater impact upon education in the United States than in many other countries (Phenix, 1961). These attitudes are especially important when questions of school financing arise. Millage campaigns and school bond issues involve a direct appeal to local citizens concerning education, and it
is generally agreed that there is a direct causal relationship between the public's attitude towards education and the success or failure of millage proposals (Brazer, 1971; Gallup, 1969). For example, Gallup (1969) said that "... a realistic measure of the public's attitude towards their schools is the willingness of the people in a community to vote tax increases when there is a need for greater financial assistance (p. 1)." Since 1969, the Gallup organization has been involved in a measurement of public attitudes towards public schools. This survey material has focused attention upon the importance, in a localized education system, of public attitudes concerning education.

These Gallup reports have served two major functions

... they alert educators and interested laymen to overall public reaction to many aspects of school programs and policies. And they serve as a national benchmark against which local attitudes may be measured (Elam, 1971, p. 33).

In this context, the views of community opinion leaders become important. Research from the fields of sociology and public opinion analysis has suggested that general public attitudes are significantly affected by the views held and expressed by community leaders (Agger, 1964; Presthus, 1964; Sanders, 1950). Stearns (1955), in a survey of community relations and the public schools, concluded that "... some persons are known to be expert analysts of public reaction, and opinions expressed by them will bear more weight than irresponsible street corner chatter (p. 336)."

Indeed, local school boards have recognized this fact and frequently use statements and expressions of support from leading
citizens. For example, in its last millage campaign, the Flint, Michigan Board of Education enlisted the aid of the local postmaster, president of a local radio station, a leading physician (and ex-school board president) and a prominent clergyman as co-chairmen of the campaign (Superintendent's Bulletin, Flint, May 10, 1973).

One of the reasons for this influence of leaders on public opinion was pointed to by Presthus (1964). In a study of community power he reported

... that no more than one percent of the population is involved in community decision-making in most American cities. Since only a small segment of the community is actively involved in decision-making, one can conclude that the involvement of key community leaders is essential to effect successful community action (p. 405).

Other evidence pointing to the influence of leadership opinion on groups or community opinion and belief, is found in several studies of group psychology (Adams and Romney, 1959; French and Raven, 1959). This tendency to look to leadership for direction and opinion has been shown to be especially marked in situations characterized by ambiguity (Sherif and Sherif, 1956). For many citizens, the complexities of educational financing and general issues are often confusing matters (Gallup Poll on Education, 1972).

Again, the high-power group member has been found to be "... the target of more deferential, approval-seeking behavior than low-power group members (Shaw, 1971, p. 285)." The research of Agger (1964) and Presthus (1964) supported the view that position-holders such as those involved in this study were perceived as being in high-power positions.

Additional to the evidence concerning the local power and influence of opinion leaders, the other major factor which determined
the nature and direction of this study was the basic philosophical belief of the community educational concept that involvement of people will result, among other things, in more favorable attitudes to education (Melby, 1955; Minzey and LeTarte, 1972; Olsen, 1953).

However, this belief which is widely held among community educators, had not been supported with a base of research data. Indeed, statements of community education goals continued to stress the aim of improving public attitudes to education. Minzey and LeTarte (1972) concluded that

... as community members are more involved in assisting in the educational and community programs, there is a personal satisfaction gained by those individuals who are involved and the result is often a more positive attitude towards the educational system and its personnel (p. 130).

Representative Donald Riegle (D-Mich.) told the House Education and Labor Committee that improved student attitudes can result from community education. He said that

... successful programs in community education have been shown to improve the attitude and performance of regular students, provide better coordination and use of community resources and enhance the lives of all members of the community (Minnesota Community Education Newsletter, 2: 1, October 1973, p. 3).

Furthermore, the experience of communities such as Springfield, Ohio, in which the introduction in the late sixties of a substantial program of community education was followed by trend-breaking successes of school millage proposals, was another influence which led to this study.

This study, then, will test the belief that one important effect of community education is the improvement of public attitudes (as expressed by community opinion leaders) towards the extended use of school facilities and to education in general.
Community Education: An Overview

If community education is defined broadly as all those activities involving the public's use of school facilities, the community education movement began in the colonial period in the northeastern United States (Glueck, 1927). The precedent was set for the use of school facilities for general community purposes at this time, and it has carried over to the present. While some activities were not formally educative in nature, the concept of community education was involved, for many components for community activity were present.

Cubberly (1934) stated that "... the first recorded use of school facilities for adult evening school was reported in Providence, Rhode Island in 1810 (p. 587)." Approximately thirty years later, the Cincinnati public schools initiated adult programs, and these were followed by programs in Cleveland and Chicago.

Public funds for the support of evening adult programs were first initiated, in 1865, by the Chicago Board of Education, and following their lead permissive laws were passed by several state legislatures for the purpose of providing public support for evening programs (Mann, 1956).

The period from 1900 through the early 1930's was significant in the later development of community schools and community education. During this period, great stress was placed on relationships between education and the community at large. The importance of the child's environment was discussed in relationship to his total education. In this light, Dewey (1916) wrote
... the development within the young of the attitudes and dispositions necessary to the continuous and progressive life of a society cannot take place by direct conveyance of beliefs, emotions, and knowledge. It takes place through the intermediary of the environment. The environment consists of the sum total of conditions which are concerned in the execution of the activity characteristic of the living being. The social environment consists of all the activities of fellow beings that are bound up in the carrying on the activities of any one of its members. It is truly educative in its effect, in its efforts, in the degree in which an individual appropriates the purposes which actuates it, becomes familiar with its methods and subject matters, acquires needed skill, and is saturated with its emotional spirit (p. 26).

Hart (1924), writing during the same period, emphasized the educative community as the major factor in the education of the child. He stressed that total education could not be produced by the schools alone, thus it had to be a joint operation of schools and community. Hart wrote

... the problem within education is not in training children, but in the development of a community in which children can grow up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined to freedom, reverent to the goals of life, and eager to share in the tasks of the age. Schools cannot produce the result; nothing but the community can do so (p. 382).

Thus, an underlying principle of community education—the inseparability of school and community—was set during this 1900-1930 period.

As the economic situation changed in the United States during the end of the period, the schools became more actively engaged in meeting the needs of the people. As the depression deepened, schools became the center of the community in offering expanded programs of home economics, agriculture education and community improvement.

Citizens became interested in "what the schools could do for them" and citizen-planning councils became active. Evening schools
were extended into new categories, curricula were broadened and for the first time adult education administrators became common (Mann, 1956).

The community school movement 1930's-present

The social and economic forces of the 1930's gave a considerable boost to the concept of the community school. It was during this period in Flint, Michigan that the efforts of Manley and Mott started what was later to become the "new" community education model for many United States communities. The new function of these schools, which evolved during the early depression days and the emerging philosophy of a democratic and social education, began to replace the school-centered, traditional, authoritarian education which had formerly characterized the American system of education. Now, the traditional notion of education was described as undemocratic and not in keeping with the basic learning processes. Definitions of education were expanded to embody a new philosophy of education which acknowledged a broader social force. For example, Everett (1938) compared the newer attitudes to the old in listing a range of education alternatives.

... all life is educative vs. education is gained only in formal institutions of learning. Education requires participation vs. education is adequately gained through studying about life. Public school systems should be primarily concerned with the improvement of community living and the improvement of the social order vs. school systems should be primarily concerned with passing the cultural heritage. The curriculum should receive its social orientation from major problems and areas of community living vs. the curriculum should be oriented in relation to the specialized aims of the academic subject (p. 10).

With the onset of World War II and as America turned to total mobilization for the war effort, educational and economic activities...
turned towards the needs of the times. War production training programs deeply involved the community and the schools during the period. Descriptive literature of community school programs concerned activities aiding in the war efforts (Berridge, 1969).

Much was written concerning community education in the years following World War II. The Forty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education was American Education in the Postwar Period, Part I, Curriculum Reconstruction, contained several references to community education. In a chapter of the book entitled "The Community School Emphasis in Postwar Education," Seay (1945) defined community school/community education. He wrote that a "community school" was

... the term currently applied to a school that has two distinctive emphases--service to the entire community, not merely to the children of school age; and discovery, development and the use of resources of the community as part of the educational facilities of the school. The concern of the community school with local community is intended, not to restrict the schools attention to local matters, but to provide a focus from which to relate study and action in the larger community--the state, the region, the nation and the world (p. 209).

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, of 1947, called for organization of the schools to provide for cooperative planning of a school-community program in which the school would serve the needs of all the people. Such writings of the immediate postwar period closely reflected the philosophy of the writers prior to the war.

Nevertheless, despite the abundance of writings on community education and presence of many individual components that existed in the local schools during that era, few school districts adopted the
community school program to the extent that it has been embraced today.

The Flint model

The Flint, Michigan Community School Program is one model that has been documented heavily in the literature. A brief look at its development finds the initial action of involvement into this philosophy started in 1926. At this time, a automotive pioneer, Charles Stewart Mott, established a family philanthropy, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. According to Beavers (1972), it was founded "... for the purpose of supporting religious, educational and recreational activities for the public benefit (p. 29)."

Nine years later, in 1935, the first "seed" for the development of community education was planted in the form of a $6,000 grant to the Flint, Michigan's Board of Education for after-school recreational activities. This grant marked the beginning of the Mott Foundation thrust into community education.

The original idea that spurred this partnership emerged from Frank Manley, who at that time was a physical education supervisor for Flint public schools. His idea was that the public schools belonged to the taxpayers of the community and that a wider range of service should be provided by these facilities which, for the most part, lay locked and idle for most of the time that they might be in use.

The Mott financial support and the Manley energy began a very basic program of extended use of public school facilities in the
after-school and evening hours for recreational programs. As the demand increased for expanded use of the facilities, and as the potential was appreciated, so did the Mott Foundation support. The following year saw a grant of $15,000 and five school sites in operation.

As the program grew in participation, the Foundation was the potential of using the existing school facilities in other education-related areas. These areas included the implementation of the largest adult education program per capita in the United States in 1940 (Beavers, 1972). Entering into the area of health education, the Mott Children's Health Clinic was established in 1948. This new agency led to even more involvement via breakfast programs in elementary schools for poverty children, summer camps for school-age children and rehabilitation programs for inmates in county and state prisons.

In 1951, as the role of the school continued to expand into many areas of community living, a new position was created by the Flint Board of Education, that of "community school director."

This person's assignment was to coordinate and administer the total community education programs at the neighborhood-school level. This director was responsible for bringing the resources of the community to bear on the individual problems of the community members in the area of the school district.

From 1951 to 1972, over 173 community school directors were employed to work in the fifty-five ongoing community school education programs in Flint, Michigan. In addition, through the foundation influence, other parts of the State of Michigan were in the process of developing community education programs patterned after the Flint
model with the Foundation support in the form of training and "seed" money for implementation.

In 1961, the Flint model of community education made its first thrust using Mott financial support outside the State of Michigan. Miami, Florida, New Haven, Connecticut and Atlanta, Georgia were a few of the larger cities that adopted the Flint model of community education. This gradual growth, which started in 1961, led to many school districts across the United States becoming involved in community education.

What began in Flint predominately as a recreational program developed into a process of community involvement with the potential of unifying a community, and of coordinating capacities to solve problems facing society today. This process is being accomplished through the utilization of the leadership and facilities of the public schools by using them as the delivery system for solving community programs (Minzey and LeTarte, 1972).

The Present Situation and Developmental Trends

A review by Pendell (1972) of the current status of community education on the national and international level showed a rapidly increasing number of districts becoming involved in the community education concept. Countries including Portugal, Italy, Spain, Japan together with Canada and the United States are adopting community education in community after community.

The Mott Foundation 1972 annual report disclosed that
... in 1972 there were 528 school districts in the United States in which community education, in its strictest sense, was in operation. In these districts there were 2,284 school buildings considered to be community schools. And at these schools there were 1,424 trained community school directors (p. 30).

This growth has been stimulated by the establishment of a network of University Centers for Community Education nationwide assisted by the financial support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan. A total of fourteen Regional Centers currently are in operation and they have five principal functions. These functions are (a) consultative services to help communities understand and initiate community education; (b) training for community school personnel and others interested in the community education concept; (c) funding assistance to local school districts; (c) evaluation of community resources, needs and existing programs; (e) research information and assistance (Berridge, 1971).

Fellowships at the masters and doctoral levels have been added to the University Center's role to help solve the increasing demand for trained personnel in the field of community education leadership.

In addition to these fourteen University Centers, there are also Cooperating Centers for Community Education established in twenty universities across the country. These Cooperating Centers have similar functions as the University Centers; the principal difference being in the funding and financial basis of the Center.

According to the Mott Foundation Report, 1972

... cooperating centers work within the sphere of regional centers. Each is responsible for the functions of dissemination, implementation, and training, but with the regional center serving as the team coordinator for an entire area. Thus, the cooperating centers serve as a multiplying factor for the regional center with which they serve (p. 30).
Some of the current national trends in support of community education include funding by state legislature for community education programs. Currently six states, Michigan, Utah, Washington, Florida, Maryland and Minnesota are funding local school districts who have adopted the community education philosophy (Pappadakis, 1971).

A more recent development in favor of community education is the proposed Federal legislation currently being debated in Washington that would consist of a 46.6 million dollar package for national support of community education (Riegle, 1974).

When the impact that community education has made in the United States in a few short years is considered alongside the fact that only 3% of the school districts in the United States are currently involved in this movement (Watt, 1973), it appeared that the potential power of community education is indeed a substantial one. Pendell (1971) declared that community education "... in its increasing acceptance and expansion is a growing force in American education that cannot be halted (p. 23)." Pendell continued by suggesting that

... if a partnership of the people, educators, local, state and federal officials can combine to produce the necessary cooperation, then we can hopefully look forward to the diminishing of the problems facing America, the alleviation of many vexing frustrations and the realization of a new horizon of hope for everyone (p. 22).

Whether such a partnership of people is able to realize the potential as envisaged by Pendell, remains to be seen. However, with the recent trend of support for community education at the local, state and national level for community education, there is now some evidence
to support the belief that the United States is coming to accept the value of this educational philosophy for today's rapidly changing society.

Community Education: The Educative Community

As society has changed, the school has been assigned greater responsibilities in the development of the social characteristics of communities. Goslin (1965) stated

... the school is charged with the responsibility of inculcating basic social norms, the responsibility of providing the new members of the society with information to assume their proper role in the democratic process, the responsibility to prepare individuals for job opportunities and the responsibility for the basic education of youth and the reeducation of adults. The school cannot perform these tasks alone; however, these objectives may be fulfilled by the development of a truly educative community (p. 55).

Melby (1958) argued that the school is but one institution in the community, but that it along with the family, exerts the most influence. He further stated that the school is in a unique position to function as the coordinator of all community agencies and institutions by providing leadership, direction and support. Any contribution that a single agency can make is partial in its influence; however, the coordinated efforts of all agencies could make a difference in the cultural and educational environment of the community. He concluded by saying that some people feel that a fully mobilized community would take over the professional functions of the schools, but instead of de-emphasizing education in the schools, a new vitality and emphasis would result.
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Yaeger (1951) also has summarized the role of the school in the development of the educative community:

... as the eye cannot get along without the hand, neither can the school without the home, nor the school and the home without the community. Each becomes necessary to the welfare of the others; all must work together in the interests of childhood and of desirable living for all men in every community. Although the leadership belongs to public education, the responsibility belongs to all (p. 18).

The community school, operating morning to night throughout the week and year, may be a potent factor in drawing the school and community together.
Summary: Chapter I

Although elements of the present community education concept have been in existence in the United States for over a hundred years, the gradual development and the evaluation of a unified philosophy has been most evident in the past 35 years or so. In its belief that education is an ongoing process which should extend beyond the walls of the formal classroom and which should not be restricted to people aged five to eighteen, the community education philosophy has greatly increased the involvement of community people, organizations and facilities.

With the extension of education to all segments of the community, questions about public attitudes towards an input into educational policies and activities have become even more important than in former times.

School superintendents, principals, community educators and lay citizens have given verbal testimony to attitudinal changes which have come about in local communities where this concept has been implemented. Statements of student attitudes toward the schools and parents attitudes toward the school administration are common testimonials heard in behalf of the community education concept.

In such a context, the role of the community opinion leaders becomes more critical. The opinion leader's effect on community attitudes have been documented by many writers. This study examined the influence of community education on the attitudes of these leaders towards education. The prime purpose of this study was to obtain
evidence to determine whether the existence of community education programs in a district resulted in a more positive attitude towards education on the part of opinion leaders.
CHAPTER II
RATIONALE FOR THEORETICAL HYPOTHESES

Introduction

This study adopted the broad theoretical position of Minzey and LeTarte (1972) and other writers in the field that the community education concept will result, among other things, in more favorable attitudes towards public school education.

The second factor which determined the position assumed in the theoretical hypothesis of the study was the primary belief evident in a review of related literature that the use of public school facilities is a basic component of the community education concept. These positions were considered in the context of an increasingly evident trend in education--the measurement of attitudes of communities towards public school education (Gallup, 1969).

The Opinion Leader

Frequent references to the influence and characteristics of the public opinion leaders have appeared in the field of sociology, business and public affairs. Most studies concerning the opinion leader have agreed on two basic points: (a) there was a small identifiable group of persons in communities who are generally referred to and recognized as opinion leaders; and (b) these persons have considerable influence on views, beliefs and attitudes of other
members of their social group.

For example, Lazarsfeld (1948) stated that

... many community studies show that in every area and for every public issue there are certain people who are most concerned about the issue as well as most articulate about it. We call them the 'opinion leaders' (p. 49).

Since only a small segment of the community was seen to be involved in decision-making, it was concluded that the involvement of key community leaders was essential to the effect of successful community action. Rogers and Cartano (1962) concurred that

... opinion leaders and the people whom they influence are very much alike and typically belong to the same primary groups of family, friends and co-workers. While the opinion leader may be more interested in the particular sphere in which he is influential, it is highly unlikely that the persons influenced will be very far behind the leader in the level of interest (p. 97).

Research evidence gathered from several investigations of opinion leaders were synthesized in three generalizations by Rogers and Cartano. These generalizations were that

... (a) opinion leaders deviate less from group norms than the average group member; (b) there is little overlap among the different types of opinion leaders; (c) opinion leaders differ from their followers in information sources, cosmopolitanism, social participation, social status and innovativeness (p. 437).

A summary of these three statements indicated that opinion leaders exemplified the values of their followers; that they used more impersonal and technically accurate sources of information, and that they tend to be more cosmopolitan in their communication behavior and social relationships.

Katz (1957) analyzed the process by which the opinion leader received his source of information and he related that
... influences stemming from the mass media first reach 'opinion leaders' who, in turn, pass on what they read and hear to those of their everyday associates for whom they are influential (p. 61).

Carter (1966) supported this contention by stating that the

... opinion leader has more exposure to the media than other citizens, but yet he has many of the same characteristics as the people he conveys information to and influences (p. 6).

The nature of this sequential flow to communities from the opinion leader to those he influences also was pointed to by Lazarsfeld (1962), and Rogers and Cartano (1962).

The opinion leaders in a given community were also identified in a study by Blakcwell (1955). He wrote that a sociological analysis of the nature of a local community revealed at least seven factors operating in the dynamics of community structure and function. An important one relevant to this study concerned the community power structure. Blackwell stated that

... the focus of power may be in the political or economic organization of a community, the labor union, the management of a big business or an industry, in the church or in an individual who may control two or more medias of communication (p. 128).

More recently, Minzey and LeTarte (1972) concluded that any attempt to identify community leadership should include representation from many diverse community groups including "... government, business, banking, industry, social service and health (p. 71)."

McMahon and Strauss (1967) in a study titled The Public Image of Education in Maryland based their collection of data about community opinion leaders on those groups outlined by Blackwell (1955) and which were later also referred to by Minzey and LeTarte (1972). Although
Rope and Sawyer (1950) warned that the application of opinion-polling techniques to educational issues has been limited, they stated that "... there is a need in education to relate opinion polling to the structure of opinion leaders in the community (p. 898)."

In the area of community education, this statement was seen to be relevant. Opinion leaders are in key positions in the community structure and are well aware of issues of public concern. As such, the community opinion leader was considered to be in an especially important position to provide an evaluation of an existing educational program or of the deficiencies in it.

Again, during the implementation of the community education program, the opinion leaders have been instrumental in explaining and conveying information about this concept to those they influence. In addition, the opinion leaders are in key positions to assist in developing the process phase of community education. They can be most valuable in identifying key people in the neighborhood level who might serve as block leaders in developing the grass-root communication of the concept. The opinion leader is usually aware of business and industrial resources available, and of persons who might be ready to serve on an advisory committee to help plan the program in the various communities.

In the area of evaluation, the opinion leader also occupies a central role of providing feedback from the people he influences to the local school administrators who are responsible for evaluating the progress of the developing program.
Studies currently being undertaken in the area of public attitudes toward public school education by the Gallup organization are an indication of concern for continual evaluation of local school districts. The views and the attitudes of the opinion leader offer a more direct source of information to the community educator in the field who may desire some immediate feedback as to the effectiveness of his program on the local community. The opinion leader's role related to community education is a new dimension in the area of implementation and evaluation of community education programs, but one that may hold tremendous potential for those community education directors who have the foresight to pursue it.

The Pluralistic Community

While this study adopted the opinion leader identification technique and the findings about their influence on community attitudes which was reported in the studies referred to above, it was also acknowledged that a recent analysis of community power structures by Straayer (1973) provided an additional dimension of community influence. This analysis will be considered fully in the discussion of the findings of this study in Chapter V.

Straayer's basic concern was with community power structures, and his basic thesis was that societies were pluralistic in nature and that community power was distributed among specialized power elites--each with a relatively specific area of influence. He agreed with Dahl (1967) that "... influence tended to be specialized, that is, not everybody was interested in an active on every issue (p. 274)."
The present study accepted the general position of Straayer in that is was concerned with a specific elite—the educational elite as perceived by two educators, the Superintendent of Schools and the Director of Community Education, and by the executive officer of the local Chamber of Commerce. This study did not attempt to identify local power bases, the principal concern of Dahl, but rather was concerned with leaders of opinion.

These persons may or may not be the holders of community power. Indeed, Straayer, made the distinction between "influential members of the community," "decision makers" and the "power elite." Influence over community opinion, not the possession of community power, was the prime variable in the present research study.

The other factor which distinguished this study from that of Dahl and from the general position taken by Straayer, was that the present investigation focused upon communities of less than 10,000 pupil population. Dahl's study was of the city of New Haven, Connecticut—student population in excess of 20,000 and, in general, Straayer's analysis of the pluralistic nature of power also was supported by reference to the situations in much larger communities such as Atlanta, Georgia. In the smaller communities used in the present study, the distribution of influence was not likely to be spread across as many power elites as Straayer argued was the case in the larger communities referred to.

While this study incorporated some theoretical modifications based upon the analysis of community social structure proposed by Straayer, there was general agreement in the literature and research concerning the community opinion leader's characteristics and influences.
Theoretical hypothesis I

Community education will have a positive effect on the attitudes of community opinion leaders towards the increased (extended) use of school facilities.

Again, while the studies cited below considered the attitudes of various groups to the increased use of school facilities, there was no research evidence that considered such attitudes in the context of community education.

One of the most extensive studies which dealt with the extended use of schools for community involvement was that conducted by the School Management Magazine in 1962. Here, it was reported that extracurricular use of schools creates problems, both for the teachers, students and principals in an individual building, and for the board members and superintendents who must make and enforce rules for the building's use (p. 96).

Because of the controversial nature of the problems related to this issue, the School Management Magazine staff sought to find out how school districts around the nation were handling them. A random sample of 250 public school districts around the country were surveyed. This study analyzed the extent of the use of school facilities in communities with less than 6,000 students. The results showed that while most school buildings were available to community or civic organizations and that rental fees charged were minimal, there was a reluctance on the part of schools to permit the use of school equipment. The results of the survey also indicated that while
90% of school districts over 6,000 students in size had a standard policy set down to govern use of school facilities, only 56% of the smaller school districts had such a policy.

While the School Management Magazine study sought to provide a measure of the extent of the usage of school facilities, the present study, however, extended this to include also a survey of attitudes of opinion leaders to such school facility usage.

Additional indirectly-related material, offered by non-community education oriented writers, was found to be numerous in the past twelve years. Grieder (1962) wrote that

... we should begin to think in terms of school buildings that will never be locked--they'll be open 24 hours a day. Full use by the school and community will require it. And it will obviate a lot of the problems--that we've been talking about (p. 83).

Zirkel (1965) discussed the inefficient planning of new school buildings. He wrote that

... in planning any kind of a school building it is the duty of every school board and superintendent to find out the educational and social needs of the people in the community. These needs should be incorporated into the plan of every building so that the taxpayer can get the greatest return from the investment in the building--an investment that will run as high as one million to five million dollars in the average community. It is the duty of the school board and superintendent to see that the community gets the most for the vast amount of money spent (p. 34).

Nolte (1966) reported that the courts were becoming more liberal in permitting non-school use of public school buildings. He stated that

... the number of groups in our society has increased tremendously. As taxpayers, members of these groups look to the public schools as public property available for the asking. The result has been increasing pressure on school boards to use public school facilities for collateral purposes (p. 63).
Concerning the court's interpretation, Nolte wrote "... the majority of the courts are in favor of non-school groups using school buildings for meetings provided there is no interference with the central objective of the buildings for public school purposes (p. 63)."

Musmanno (1966) offered the basic rationale of community educators concerning use of public schools when he stated that

... the public schoolhouse should be the most effective community center in town. As public property it is ideally suited for this function. It is nonsectarian. It is nonpartisan. It is truly a public building, which should be used by all citizens.

Public school buildings represent a major investment by the taxpayers of every community in our nation. The use of these buildings after school hours by adults and elder citizens, as well as by children, should be commensurate with this tremendous investment (p. 55).

Cowan (1966) and Chase (1966) offered similar testimony by mentioning that the schools "... can enhance the return to the public for its financial investment in school-owned physical assets (p. 12)."

In the area of adult education and the use of schools, Watson (1964) and Pierce (1966) both made note of the positive influence of adults returning back to school and the utilization of schools as cultural and community adult learning centers.

Thompson (1967) in an article entitled "After Hours Building Use Poses Problems" outlined some negative aspects of this philosophy in relation to some concerns raised by business groups in Crestline, Ohio. In defense of the program, he stated that after implementation of school programs was fully explained to the negative groups that "... it brought them closer together and together they accomplished a lot for the good of the schools and the community (p. 37)."
In Alpena, Michigan, Mueller (1969) related that to put an end to vandalism, a school district needs only to open the school doors in the after-school and evening hours. Mueller stated that by "... throwing its doors open to the public every afternoon and evening, vandalism has been reduced almost to the vanishing point (p. 25)."

Current authors in the field of community education also have addressed themselves to the extended use of public school facilities. Totten (1970), in the opening chapter of his book, stressed the importance of the school as "... the hub of community education (p. 3)." He related that the school is the only element that is commonly owned by all people in the community. Totten described the school as "... a catalyst agent for setting in motion many programs for individual and community betterment, it must become multi-purpose in nature (p. 5)." He concluded by envisaging that the schools must ultimately be used 24 hours a day for 365 days in the year.

Clark (1969) wrote that

the facilities of the schools are extremely important to the community education program. Schools have been traditionally inefficient in school plant. Any system can commit itself to community education by first accepting the concept that the school plant belongs to the community and that its use should be maximized beyond the academic school day (p. 96).

Whitt (1971) also looked toward the school and its facilities to meet the dilemma of over half the student population in our country. He stated that "... hidden in the slums of America are half the children of this land. The 'children without' suffer the deprivations that come from lack of stimuli that are so readily available to the more affluent (p. 4)." Whitt (1971) saw the schools as year-round
community centers that have the potential of solving many of the problems of the inner-city youth. He concluded by saying that

... the school must reach outside and embrace the total community. Education must run along a continuum that incorporates young and old, learning at all levels, recreation and leisure at its best, and a concern for the well-being of every member of society. This means that the Community School Program must become the basic educational plan for every school district in this country (p. 8).

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) offered a different view concerning the use of public school facilities. Although they stated that "... the community education is the over-arcing concept and the community school is the device, the system which provides for the carrying out of this concept (p. 11)," they also discussed alternative site locations for community education programs. They stated that few districts have met with success outside the realm of the public school facilities. Reasons offered included the political aspect of governmental and other agencies operated on public money, lack of coordinating capacity over other agencies and governmental units and finally, the financing of the program. Existing tax laws made it difficult for other funding sources, such as business, industry and particularly foundations, to give money to any group, other than public schools without special government tax exemption. They concluded by stating

... as a public tax-supported agency which has a common denominator through the children of the community, it is the most acceptable, non-threatening institution to the citizens and other agencies within the community (p. 12).

Berridge (1973) concurred with the previous writers of community education on school facility use. He, however, extended the support of attitudinal change in relation to the public school facilities by
saying that community education programs "... begin in the school and then spread to other facilities to meet the wants and needs of the people (p. 36)."

Research from various disciplines had made frequent references, then, to the functions and influences of opinion leaders, to public attitudes towards education, and to the apparent influence of community education on public attitudes.

The two theoretical hypotheses examined in this investigation combined these two variables and sought to provide research data relating to them.
Theoretical hypothesis II

Community education will have a positive effect on the attitudes of community opinion leaders towards public school education.

The most significant ongoing studies of measuring public attitudes and opinions toward education are those being conducted by Gallup. Commissioned by the Kettering Foundation in 1969 to do a national study of the public schools in the United States, Gallup has completed five such studies. The conclusion of the Gallup study (1969) showed that there are three major tasks of the public schools in the United States. These were

... first, to interest a greater number of citizens in the public schools; second, to increase financial support as needs grow; and third, to create a climate in the community and in the schools favorable to an improvement in the quality of education (p. 23).

The Gallup report continued by stating that

... the public schools do a reasonably good job of interesting parents in school affairs. They do a very poor job in reaching those who do not have children attending the schools. A better way must be found to reach those persons in the community who do not happen to have children in public schools, so that these persons may become informed, involved and active. The future of the schools to a great extent depends on success in achieving this goal (p. 24).

Gallup found that only 16% of parents without children in school had ever attended a school board meeting. In addition, it was found

"... that most citizens think that the school buildings should be used for community purposes as well as students (p. 16)."
A study completed by Gish (1971) was a spin-off of Gallup's work. In his study of "How the Citizens of Richmond, Virginia View Their Public Schools," Gish took the national results of the Gallup study and compared them with the local results of his study. Among other findings, Gish concluded that Gallup's instrument was a valid one for measuring public attitudes toward education.

In a study having more direct relationship to the present investigation, Nagle (1968) warned that "... school boards get meaningless, sometimes dangerous results from their polls because they ignore two-thirds of the rules for effective polling (p. 10)." Nagle supported the idea of polling citizens of the community who were knowledgeable of the objectives and programs operating in the schools. He concluded by saying "... ignorance, unfortunately can only breed misunderstanding (p. 10)."

Other indirectly related research that supported the theoretical hypotheses included that by McMahon and Strauss (1967) who were interested in "The Public Image of Education in Maryland" and who pointed to the necessity of determining exactly what were the attitudes and opinions of community leaders in Maryland toward public education. Strauss stated that

... our study was concerned with those community leaders whose opinions are most vital to educational policy-making in Maryland, and was a rigorous polling of a broadly representative cross section of those leaders in order to achieve a rather complete picture of the elements of their opinions (p. 3).

The procedures outlined by McMahon and Strauss were similar to those adapted by the present study. However, no evidence was found to show that a study had ever been completed that used the variable
of the community education concept affecting the attitudinal changes toward public school education.

Additional support that directly influenced the position taken in the theoretical hypothesis of this study and which concerned the attitudinal effects of community education on public school education came from studies such as that by Kerensky and Melby (1971). They stated that

... were we to enlarge the scope of our educational activities, widen the range of the groups of people with whom we maintain relationships, the effect of all this would change our behavior and our attitude. Thus, community education is not only a means of education the children and parents but is also a means of educating school personnel, teachers, principals and superintendents. Once this involvement takes place, changed attitudes will be forthcoming (p. 154).

Again, Minzey and LeTarte (1972) declared that

... as community members are more involved in assisting in the educational and community programs, there is a personal satisfaction gained by those individuals who are involved and the result is often a more positive attitude toward the educational system and its personnel (p. 28).

Importantly, they further stated that "... extended programs in community education assist in improving attitudes toward school and developing positive feelings toward education (p. 30)."

In the area of compensatory education programs tied in with community education, Minzey said that "... participants enrolled in a basic literacy program will improve their attitudes towards education and become more receptive to education (p. 218)."

In the joint report of the Texas Association of School Administrators and School Board Association Convention Report in San Antonio, Texas (1973), the following statement appeared in connection with the
community education session

... community education is the process of bringing the total community resources into the scheme of education. The school acts as the catalyst in the relationship between community resources and the individual. As a result, more positive attitudes are developed toward education. Students begin to take more pride in their education, and the public becomes more interested in promoting school projects. The school and community become educational resources that can be used by many members of the community (p. 20).

Totten (1970) in speaking on the effect of community education in the area of funding public school education wrote

... when everyone goes to school, there is a good chance that the values held for education will be high. This belief is supported by the fact that people who live in communities which have highly developed community education programs consistently vote favorable on millage and bonding issues for school improvement (p. 157).

Gallup (1969) also supported the position, later assumed by Totten, by mentioning "... the best measure of attitudes of the general public toward the public school system in America is its readiness to support the schools financially--to vote for an increase in taxes if the schools need more money (p. 18)."

These two statements indirectly are related to the constant flow of written and verbal support for the impact on attitudinal change that the community education concept has on public school education.

Sampling the opinions of the public on the issues of public education is not just a recent trend in educational research. This technique which forms the basis of the present study had previously been used in many studies pertaining to education. Almost without exception, the 'opinion studies' were considered to be useful measurements of attitudes of the particular group involved. For
example, the National Education Association in 1958 issued a publication called Public Opinion Polls on American Education, and which summarized the findings from seven cities, five state and national polls taken between 1950 and 1958 (McMahon and Strauss, 1967).

Prior to these studies, evidence in support of opinion studies was found to be emerging in the middle and late forties. Hedlund (1948) declared that

... the public opinion poll is an ideal method for achieving public understanding of education, for it is a two-way medium of communication. Not only is the administration learning what his community thinks about education, but his community is learning what the important issues in education are and in what direction progress lies (p. 29).

Four years later, the San Diego, California public schools initiated a community-wide study about which Superintendent Crawford (1952) declared

... that the San Diego public school system is one of the first--actually the first so far as we know--to authorize a comprehensive public opinion survey without being under the pressure of public opinion engendered by some kind of a crisis situation (p. 35).

The poll, which was released under the title of "What San Diegans Think of the Public Schools" provided three basic implications. The first was that the public approved of their public schools and stood ready to support them even if higher taxes were necessary; second, that constant review of the curriculum was necessary to make sure that it was relevant to the needs of the times and thirdly, that a better communication system needed to be developed to keep the community aware of educational trends and curriculum needs (Crawford, 1952).
A study by Hutton (1956) entitled "What The People of Charlottesville, Virginia Think of Their Schools" continued to give testimony to the polling of community members concerning their attitudes towards public school education. A study by McCaskill (1960) entitled "The Public Favors Federal Support" reported on a nation-wide opinion poll concerning eight national problems in education. In 1963, the National Committee for Support of Public Schools analyzed responses of 89 business and industrial leaders to an informal survey of their attitudes about important issues facing public schools today (NCSPS, April 1964).

Cooperative Research Project No. 1828 (January 31, 1964) entitled Community Organization and Support of the Schools sampled all registered voters in the Birmingham, Michigan school district. Three questionnaires were administered. The findings revealed that child enrollment in the public school was associated with school support, and that support tended to arise from the more active group-participating citizens.
CHAPTER III
THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

Operational Definitions

The operational definitions of terms pertinent to this study were:

Community education This concept was defined as a process, usually based in a school, which creates an awareness of and mobilizes community resources for the ongoing education of the members of a community.

In this study the distinction was made between (a) those programs and educational activities under the direction of a district-wide community education coordinator and supervised by a building-level community school director at the elementary or secondary school level, and (b) those programs and educational activities under the direction of a district-wide community education coordinator and supervised only by part-time building directors or supervisors.

Opinion leaders The general definition of opinion leaders adopted by this study was that of Marcus and Bauer (1968) who considered them to be those holders of leadership positions in the community whose views and opinions influenced the thinking of the local population.

Operationally, opinion leaders were considered to be those citizens who occupied the offices of (a) political leader, (b) business leader, (c) banker, (d) communication leader, (e) industrial leader, (f) religious leader, (g) educational leader. Such positions also were associated with identified opinion leaders by Agger (1964), Aloha (1969), Katz (1965) and Presthus (1964).
**Attitudes**  Attitudes were defined as those feelings concerning matters or issues which caused an individual or group to assume a particular position in relation to them. This definition was in general agreement with that of Droba (1933) who defined an attitude as "... a mental disposition of a human individual to act for or against a definite object. This disposition is composed predominantly of feeling elements (p. 47)."

More specifically, the operational definition of attitudes towards the use of school facilities was considered to be those scores of the opinion leaders on the School Facility Use Inventory (SFUI) included as Appendix A.

Again, general attitudes towards public school education was defined as those scores of the identified opinion leaders on the Education Attitudinal Survey (EAS). This instrument is included as Appendix B.

**Public school education**  This concept was defined as the K-12 educational program conducted by the local board of education and supported by local and state taxes. The specific operational definition used in this study considered public school education to be the K-12 educational program operated in Michigan school districts under the control of a local superintendent of schools.

**School facilities**  School facilities included those buildings, grounds, plant and equipment used for education purposes. Operationally, school facilities were those buildings, grounds, plant and equipment used for public school educational purposes in the State of Michigan.
District coordinator of community education  The district coordinator of community education was operationally defined as that person having system-wide responsibility for the operation and administration of the school district's community education program.

Building level community school directors  These were operationally defined as the persons responsible for the community education program for a particular attendance area within a school district.

Part-time building supervisor  The operational definition of the part-time building supervisor was the person employed on an hourly basis to supervise community education programs under the direction of the district coordinator of community education.
Null Hypotheses

Based upon the theoretical hypotheses formulated in Chapter II, and incorporating the terms defined on p. 36, this study tested the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no differences in the mean attitude to the-use-of-school-facilities scores of opinion leaders in (a) districts having community education two years or more and having both a district coordinator of community education and building-level community school directors, (b) districts having community education two years or more and having only a district-wide coordinator of community education and part-time building supervisors, and (c) districts with no community education.

Districts such as those described in (a) above will hereafter be referred to as Group A districts, those described in (b) above will be referred to as Group B districts, and those districts described in (c) will be referred to as Group C districts.

This study made the distinction between Group A and Group B districts for two reasons. In the first place, these were the two major types of administrative organizations used in those school districts which had adopted community education. Secondly, the distinction was made to obtain measures of any attitudinal differences apparent in the identified opinion leaders of districts in which these different forms of community education organization was in use.

Additional to the general hypothesis described above, two other more specific hypotheses were tested. These were:
1(a). There will be no difference in the mean attitudes to the use of school facility scores of the three groups of opinion leaders for SFUS items clustered into five categories containing related questions; and

1(b). There will be no difference in the mean attitudes to the use of school facility scores of the three groups of opinion leaders for each individual item on the SFUS instrument.

2. There will be no differences in the contingency table distribution of attitude responses of opinion leaders to the Educational Attitudinal Survey in (a) districts having community education two years or more and having both a district coordinator of community education and building-level community school directors, (b) districts having community education two years or more having only a district-wide coordinator of community education and part-time building supervisors, and (c) districts with no community education. Each of the eight items numbered 31 to 38 on the Educational Attitudinal Survey (EAS) were considered separately and separate contingency tables were computed for each.

Statistical Treatment

**Hypothesis 1.** The null hypothesis of no differences between the means of school facility use attitude scores of opinion leaders in district Groups A, B and C (Ho: \( \mu_{ola} = \mu_{olb} = \mu_{olc} \)) was tested against the alternative hypothesis (Hi: \( \mu_{ola} \neq \mu_{olb} \neq \mu_{olc} \)). Data were presented in the form of group means of the attitude scores for the opinion leaders in the three district groups. Responses on the School Facility Uses Survey (SFUS) instrument were allocated numerical scores from 1 to 5 according to the positiveness of the responses. For the
purpose of this study, these data were considered to be interval data. These data were analyzed by the use of one factor analysis of variance. Statistical procedures followed were those outlined by Glass and Stanley (p. 295).

Hypothesis 2. The null hypothesis of no difference in the contingency table distribution of the attitudes of the opinion leaders from Group A, Group B and Group C school districts was tested by the chi-square test of independency of contingency table classifications detailed by Glass and Stanley (1970, p. 329). Data were presented in the form of 3 X 3 contingency tables for each of the eight attitude items included on the EAS instrument. Responses were allocated to contingency table cells according to degrees of positiveness indicated by the respondents. Three classifications were used: high positive, medium positive and low positive.

All data processing and analysis of this study was computed using computer programs on file in the Texas A&M University Computer Center. Parametric statistical tests were conducted using the Analysis of Behavioral Sciences Data (AOBSD) Package. Descriptive statistics and non-parametric statistical testing were conducted with the assistance of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) Package developed by the Institute of Statistics at the North Carolina State University. Data processing support services such as coding, key punching and verification of initial data supplied by respondents in this study was computed with the assistance of several staff members and research fellows of the Texas A&M University Community Education Center.
Populations and Samples

There will be three populations concerned in the investigation. Two populations will consist of those opinion leaders in Michigan school districts having community education programs earlier referred to as Group B and Group C and which met the following criteria of (a) having the same superintendent for two or more years; (b) having a K-12 population within the range of 2,500 to 10,000 students; (c) qualifies under the Michigan Department of Education, Adult and Continuing Education Services for approval for reimbursement for salaries of community school directors or coordinators for the 1973-74 school year. The third population consisted of opinion leaders in Group C districts which met criteria for (a) and (b).

These populations were determined by reference to official Michigan Department of Education reports and statistics (Michigan Department of Education, 1971-72; 1973-74).

The classification of school districts determined from these sources were further checked by staff members from Community Education Development Centers at Western Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University and Alma College.

The purpose of this check was to ascertain the accuracy of these classifications (Appendix C). Staff members were asked to make an independent classification of the school districts according to the criteria listed above and also those used in the classification of districts as Groups A, B and C.

Following this procedure there were 101 school districts in Group A, 12 in Group B and 31 in Group C (See Appendix D). A simple
random sample of 10 districts was drawn from each population using the table of random numbers (Glass and Stanley (p. 511)).

For the selected districts in each identified group, the attitudes of seven opinion leaders were surveyed. Thus, in each of the three districts-groups, the attitudes of 70 opinion leaders were surveyed in this study.
Description of the Tests Used

Two instruments were used to collect the data for this study. These were (a) the School Facility Use Inventory, and (b) the Educational Attitudinal Survey (EAS).

The School Facility Use Inventory (SFUI) consisted of thirty community education items that were developed by Cunningham (1973) and which validity values ranged from 0.336 to 0.775. The validity of each item in predicting total score ranged from 0.315 to 0.691. Cunningham concluded that "... all of the values for both the total predictiveness of an item and the predictiveness of an item within the scale of which it is part were highly significant at above the 0.01 level of confidence (p. 63)."

This instrument required respondents to opt for one of five Likert Scale-type choices in response to questions concerning the use of school buildings and facilities. Of the thirty items, eleven were framed so that the most positive response was that under the heading of "Strongly Disagree." In computing group mean scores, these responses were allocated the score appropriate for the most positive response.

The latter instrument was developed from the four-year national study by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., (IDEA). This organization, sponsored through the C. F. Kettering Foundation had commissioned Gallup International, Incorporated, to conduct a national survey. This survey, which started in 1969, was known as How The Nation Views the Public School and its primary
objective was to "... ascertain local public knowledge of and attitudes towards public schools (Gallup, 1969)." Gish (1972), in a study to determine the feasibility of adapting the Gallup-Kettering Model for surveying public opinion of public schools for surveys in local school districts, found that "... it proved to be a workable technique which could be used by any and all school districts (p. 29)."

Such research support for the Gallup-Kettering survey instrument indicated that it could be adapted for the present study. Items 31 to 38 included on the EAS instrument were adapted directly from the Gallup-Kettering survey. The responses to these eight items were used to complete the contingency table classification relating to the positiveness of attitudes towards public school education of community opinion leaders.

Two additional items relating more directly to community education also were included as items 39 to 40. Responses to these two items were not used in the data relating to Hypothesis 2 but were included as appendices to this study. It was considered that such data would be useful in a post-hoc analysis of the influences of community education on leaders in the community studies. The results of these items, however, are included in the general discussion of this study in Chapter V.

The EAS instrument required opinion leaders to make one of three possible responses to actual or hypothetical situations concerning public school education. For the purpose of this study, these responses were considered to indicate "high," "average" or "low" degrees of positiveness to particular aspects of public school education.
Design of Study

The first part of the study consisted of a pilot study to determine categories of opinion leaders to be used to gather data information relating to the two major hypotheses of the study. Fifty-seven graduate students from three areas of the State of Texas were assigned to interview five people in their respective communities. The five people were asked to list six people in their community who were considered to be opinion leaders on issues of public concern.

In their survey of local communities the research students interviewed representative samples of the community. These samples took into consideration the variables of sex, race, socioeconomic class, community size and age group (Appendix E).

Upon return of the one hundred eight-four forms, a tabulation of identified community leaders by area was recorded (Appendix F). The seven occupational categories checked most frequently were used in this study. These categories were banking, business leader, political leader, communication leader, industrial leader, religious leader and educational leader. These categories of opinion leaders were in general agreement with those listed by Agger (1964), Aloha (1969), Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) and Presthus (1964).

The next step taken was to identify the thirty school districts that were to be used in the study. A list was secured from the Michigan State Department that listed the current 1973-74 school districts to be funded for operating a community education program. By matching the names of the districts funded to the population.
limits set in the study, a list of seventy-seven school districts qualified.

The districts were broken down into two groups. Districts which had a full-time coordinator and building-level community school director were referred to as Group A. Those districts with only a full-time director with no building-level full-time community school director were classified as Group B districts. There were twenty districts to qualify for Group A and fifty-seven districts for Group B. Using the same sources, 101 districts having no community education were identified and were referred to as Group C districts.

To further check the accuracy of these classifications of school districts as having community education programs, the list of the seventy-seven districts in Groups A and B were sent to the three Regional Centers for Community Education Development in the State of Michigan. The directors of these centers were asked to provide an independent classification of these districts according to the perceived status of their community education programs.

After the second screening, forty-three districts remained in Groups A and B, twelve in Group A and thirty-one in Group B.

From each group, a simple random sample of ten school districts was drawn using a table of random numbers. Ten districts also were selected from the 101 that had no community education programs and which met the district size criterion.

Using the seven categories of opinion leaders identified in the pilot study for each of these thirty randomly chosen districts resulted in 210 possible opinion leaders in these communities. Names and
addresses of persons occupying these positions in each school district were obtained from the local school superintendent, the secretary of the local chamber of commerce and the community education coordinator. Where discrepancy occurred in the names supplied by these three people, the opinion leader surveyed was the one mentioned most frequently. Where there was no agreement between the three returns, an arbitrary decision was made to survey the opinion leader named by the chamber of commerce secretary. It was judged likely that this person may have less educational bias than the superintendent or the community education coordinator.
Controls for Sources of Error

Kerlinger (1964) identified two major defects of mail questionnaires. These were "... possible lack of responses and the inability to check the responses given (p. 397)."

For this study, two principal potential sources of error variance were considered likely to affect the interpretation of data. The first of these was that related to a low response rate of opinion leaders surveyed. To attempt to maximize the number of respondents, four steps were taken. A cover letter on official university stationery was included with the survey instruments; the instruments were so designed to demand a minimum of response time; a return stamped-addressed envelope was included; and a reminder letter was mailed to non-respondents after a period of three weeks following the initial mailing.

The second possible source of error concerned the characteristics of the opinion leaders who did and those who did not finally respond. Kerlinger (1964) had advised that in cases where the returns were less than 80%, efforts should be made to "... learn something of the characteristics of the non-respondents (p. 397)." In view of the warning, comparisons were made between respondents and non-respondents on the criteria of occupational category, sex and age.

These comparisons are shown below as Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Table 1 indicates that the response rate for this study was 75.5%. This figure, higher than what is generally reported for mail questionnaire studies, was attributed primarily to the fact that the study was dealing with community opinion leaders. These persons, usually of
above average education and social status, are consequently persons more likely to be interested in and respond to a questionnaire such as the one used in this study. Secondly, the follow-up technique used also contributed to the high response rate.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To provide more specific data concerning the respondent and non-respondent groups, an analysis was done using three variables for which data were available—occupational category, sex and classification of school districts according to the existence or non-existence of community education programs.

Table 2 indicated that males constituted 90.54% of the respondent group; in the non-respondent, 93.75%. It was considered that the respective sexual rates in the respondent and non-respondent groups were very similar.
Table 2
Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further comparison was made using the variable of occupation. An analysis of respondents and non-respondents was made for each of the seven occupational categories associated with opinion leaders in this study.

Table 3 indicated that the overall study response rate of approximately 76% also was reflected in the response rates for the seven categories. For the "banker" category, the response rate was 70%, for the "business leader" category, it was 77%, for the "political leader" category, it was 70%, for the "communication leader" category, it was 70%, for the "industrial leader" category, it was 77%, for the "religion leader" category, it was 80% and there was an 83% response rate from "education" opinion leaders.
Table 3
Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents by Occupational Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>n = 30</th>
<th>Banker No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The third variable considered in the analysis of respondent and non-respondent groups concerned the school districts having or not having programs in community education. The data in Table 4 again indicated that the response rate for each of the three types of school districts being studied was very similar to the over 76% response rate. Identical response rates of 77% were obtained from Group A and Group B districts; the response rate for Group C was 73%.

Table 4

Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents by School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A - District with Community Education Coordinator plus Director</th>
<th>n = 70</th>
<th>Group A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B - District with Community Education Coordinator only</th>
<th>n = 70</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group C - District with No Community Education</th>
<th>n = 70</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kerlinger (1964, p. 397) had suggested that a response rate of 80% represented an excellent return for studies using the mail questionnaire technique. This study's response rate closely approached this level and the analysis of respondents and non-respondent groups suggested that the size and the characteristics of the non-respondent groups was such that the potential source of error variance associated with the non-return of 51 or 210 questionnaires would be slight.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

In this study a .05 level of significance was used for the purpose of rejection of null hypotheses. In other words, the null hypothesis was not rejected unless \( p < .05 \). The results and the tables which follow are presented in the same sequence in which the theoretical hypotheses were discussed in Chapter II.

Attitudes Towards Use of School Facilities

The first hypothesis of this study concerned the attitudes towards the use of school facilities by groups of opinion leaders from school districts with and without community education programs.

Responses to the thirty-item SFUS instrument were analyzed (1) item by item, (2) by items grouped into five general categories—Community Education, Use of School Facilities, Curriculum Development, Age-Group Involvement and Communication and Community Resources, and (3) by total responses to the entire instrument.

A five point scale was used for each item-response; the most positive extreme was five and the most negative was one. Table 5 presents the item-by-item analysis of mean responses for each of the three groups of opinion leaders. For each item, an F-Ratio was computed and the associated level of probability was also presented.
Table 5

Mean Responses by Three Groups of Opinion Leaders to the Thirty Item School Facility Use Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Level of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Group C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.648</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>4.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>4.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>4.630</td>
<td>4.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>4.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.463</td>
<td>4.519</td>
<td>4.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>3.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>3.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>3.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>4.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.648</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.815</td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td>3.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td>3.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>2.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>4.204</td>
<td>4.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.444</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>4.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>4.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>2.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>3.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>3.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>3.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>3.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.556</td>
<td>4.537</td>
<td>4.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>3.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.407</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.241</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>4.463</td>
<td>4.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>4.130</td>
<td>4.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>4.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
Statistically significant differences were found between the responses of the three groups of opinion leaders for items 1 \((p = 0.019)\), 22 \((p = 0.037)\), 24 \((p = 0.008)\) and 28 \((p = 0.022)\).

The null hypothesis concerning the mean attitude scores for individual SFUS items for the three groups of opinion leaders was not rejected with the exception of these four items.

A post-hoc analysis of these four items using Tukey's \(t\)-test method (Table 6) indicated that for item 1, differences were observed between the responses of opinion leaders from Groups A and B, and between Groups A and C. For items 22 and 24, the differences were found to be between Groups A and C, and B and C. For item 28, differences were observed between Groups B and C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>Leve of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>2.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>2.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 1 concerned the school's provision of "... a broad opportunity for recreational and social activities," item 22 posited that the "... impact on the solution of social problems should come from the
academic program." Item 24 stated that the "... community should make full use of school facilities and equipment," and item 28 referred to the need for the school curriculum to be designed "... to meet the needs and interests of children, youth and adults." The implications of these inter-group differences are discussed in Chapter V.

A further analysis of responses to the survey was done by clustering the thirty items of the questionnaire into five categories. Cluster 1 (Community Education) contained seven questions, cluster 3 (Educational Involvement by Different Age Groups) contained five items, cluster 4 (Communication and Community Resources) contained four items and cluster 5 (Curriculum Development) contained seven items.

A list of the five cluster categories by questions are listed below and can be read in Appendix A.

Cluster 1 (Community Education) - Questions 1, 8, 9, 11, 19, 23, 26.

Cluster 2 (Use of School Facilities) - Questions 2, 5, 7, 14, 18, 24, 29.

Cluster 3 (Educational Involvement by Age Groups) - Questions 12, 15, 16, 25, 30.

Cluster 4 (Communication and Community Resources) - Questions 3, 4, 10, 27.

Cluster 5 (Curriculum Development) - Questions 6, 13, 16, 20, 21, 22, 28.

Table 7 presented mean response scores for all items in each cluster for each of the three groups of opinion leaders.
### Table 7

**Mean Response Scores for Clustered Items for Opinion Leaders**

*By School District-Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clustered Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Level of Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Group C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.185</td>
<td>27.667</td>
<td>27.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.370</td>
<td>26.852</td>
<td>26.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.204</td>
<td>20.722</td>
<td>20.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.241</td>
<td>17.074</td>
<td>15.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.333</td>
<td>30.315</td>
<td>29.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

F-Ratios were computed for the mean group scores in each cluster. A significant F-Ratio of 7.489 (p = .001) was found for cluster 4, containing items relating communication and the use of community resources.

A post-hoc analysis of the mean scores of the three groups for this cluster was done using the Tukey's $t$-test method. The groups which differed in their responses to cluster 4 items were A and C, and B and C (Table 8).
Table 8
Post-Hoc Analysis of Data by Groups Using Tukey's t-test Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Cluster</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Level of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>3.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis concerning the clustered attitude scores of the three groups of opinion leaders was not rejected for clusters 1, 2, 3 and 5 but was rejected in the case of cluster 4.

This result indicated that so far as the use of community resources and the development of a communication system between the school and community were concerned, the opinion leaders in Groups A and B differed significantly from Group C. Both of these areas are key variables in the development of a community education program. The data infers that those districts without community education did not feel these areas were important for their respective school districts and therefore do not approve of their involvement within the public schools.

Finally, the mean of each group of opinion leader's responses to the thirty items on the total instrument was then computed and analyzed (Table 9).
Table 9
Mean Response Scores for Total SFUS Instrument for Three Groups of Opinion Leaders by School District-Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124.704</td>
<td>123.000</td>
<td>120.490</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting F-Ratio of 1.33 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence and the general null hypothesis concerning use of school facilities was not rejected.
Attitudes Towards Public School Education

The second hypothesis of the study concerned the effect of community education on the attitudes of opinion leaders towards public school education. Surveys were mailed out to 210 opinion leaders in thirty Michigan school districts. A total of 159 respondents were tabulated in the final analysis of data. Eight questions specifically related to the second hypothesis were tested and are reported in table form on the following pages. A chi-square analysis was used on each question. The results will be discussed by each question.

The first question concerned opinion leader's perceptions of the "... quality of the public schools" in their community (Appendix B, Item 31). The contingency table presented on Table 10 shows the distribution of the responses to this question.

Table 10

Comparison of Perception of 159 Opinion Leaders on the Quality of the Public Schools in Their Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications in Table 10 were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. A chi-square value of
3.878 was obtained. The critical chi-square value with four degrees of freedom (df) was \( .95 \chi^2 = 9.488 \). Therefore, the null hypotheses of independence could not be rejected at the .05 level.

The similarity in the contingency table classifications for each type of school district suggested that the perceptions of opinion leaders concerning the quality of the public schools did not differ markedly between districts having and not having community education. If, as research has suggested, the attitudes of community opinion leaders reflect general public attitudes, then the belief frequently referred to in community education literature, that the presence of a community education program would result in improved perceptions of the quality of the public schools, cannot be confirmed by the results of this study.

The second question concerned opinion leader's satisfaction with the amount of influence that citizens have in "... the running of the public schools" in their community. The contingency table classification, by district type, of the responses to the question are shown in Table 11.
Table 11
Comparison of Perception of 159 Opinion Leaders on Whether They Felt Citizens Had Enough to Say About Running of the Public Schools in Their Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.A.S. Responses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square test for independence of contingency table classifications resulted in a chi-square value of 5.107. The chi-square value (4df) required for rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level was 9.488. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

However, the data in Table 11 suggest that in those districts having community education programs, there is a tendency for opinion leaders to be less satisfied with the amount of "say" had by citizens in the running of the public schools. Group A districts, 12.9% of respondents indicated that they felt citizens did not have enough "say" in school affairs. In Group B districts, 14.8% of respondents felt this way, but in Group C districts--those having no community education programs--only 5.8% of respondents felt this way.

The third question concerned the extent to which opinion leaders felt that "... the needs of the average citizen are taken into account in the running of the schools." The data in Table 12 is derived from responses to this question.
Table 12

Comparison of Perceptions of 159 Opinion Leaders on Whether They Felt the Needs of the Average Citizen are Taken into Account in the Running of Their Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>31 57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>31 57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>26 51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>88 55.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications shown in Table 12 were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. A chi-square value of 3.433 was obtained and therefore the null hypothesis of independence could not be rejected at the .05 level.

The fourth question for which data were obtained concerned the frequency of attendance of the opinion leaders at a local board of education meeting. Data derived from this question is presented in Table 13.
Table 13

Comparison of 159 Opinion Leaders on How Often They Had Attended a Meeting of Their Local Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications shown in Table 13 were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. A chi-square value of 1.414 was obtained and as the value for rejection of the null hypothesis of independence was 9.488, the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level.

The data indicated no statistically significant difference between the three groups. It appeared that all groups had some regular contact with the board of education, but no one group stood out as indicating any overwhelming involvement with the local district. However, the data indicated that the opinion leaders in these thirty Michigan communities had attempted to make themselves aware of problems dealing with education and were likely to be aware of the educational programs in the various districts represented in this study.

However, reference to the percentage of attendance records of opinion leaders in Group A districts which had community education for more than two years indicated that 96.3% of these people had, at least,
attended board of education meetings "occasionally" during the past year. This compared to a 80.4% attendance by opinion leaders in districts having no community education.

The next question concerned the extent of the attendance of opinion leaders from the three types of school districts at "... lectures, meetings or social events in public school buildings during the last year." This question sought to provide data to test the hypothesis that such attendance would increase in school districts in which a community education program was operating. The data relating to this question are shown as Table 14.

Table 14
Extent of Attendance by Opinion Leaders at Programs in Local Public School Buildings by School District-Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications shown in Table 14 were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. The resulting chi-square value of 10.151 was greater than that required for rejection of the null hypotheses ($p < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected.

These results suggested that there was a difference in the attendance patterns of opinion leaders in the districts with and without
community education. Indeed, in Group B districts—those having a district-wide coordinator of community education—98.1% of respondents indicated some recent attendance at a school based function. This compared to a rate of 84.2% in districts having no community education.

The data also showed that, overall, community opinion leaders appeared to attend school board activities to a considerably greater extent than would be expected of the public in general.

The next two questions related to opinion leaders willingness to become directly involved in executive positions in local PTA and board of education affairs.

The first of these questions read: "If selected, would you serve as a president or member of a local PTA Association?" Responses to this question are shown in Table 15.

**Table 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications shown in Table 15 were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. The resulting
chi-square value was 1.027 and therefore the null hypotheses of independence could not be rejected at the .05 level.

The other question which related to the board of education read: "If approached, would you agree to be nominated for the district Board of education?" Responses to his question are shown in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contingency table classifications shown in Table 16 again were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. The obtained chi-square value was 0.594. This was considerably smaller than the chi-square value of 9.448 required for rejection of the null hypothesis.

The data in Tables 15 and 16 further suggested that opinion leaders did not consider direct involvement in such educational activities as PTA and the board of education to be an important part of their community involvement.

Definite "yes" responses to Item 36 on the EAS were given by only 29.7% of opinion leaders in Group A districts, by 20.8% in Group
B districts and by 27.4% in Group C districts. Respective "yes" responses to Item 37 were 37.4%, 35.1% and 35.2%.

Positive "no" responses to Item 36 were given by 27.7%, 37.2% and 29.4% of opinion leaders in the three kinds of districts. For Item 37, definite refusals were recorded by 18.5%, 24.2% and 23.5% of the respective groups of opinion leaders.

The final question for which data were presented in contingency table form concerned support for an increase in education taxation. The hypothetical question required opinion leaders to indicate a response to the following: "Suppose a local board of education said they needed much more money. As you feel at this time, would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?" Table 17 presents data relating to this question.

Table 17
Comparison of Responses by 159 Opinion Leaders of Whether They Would Vote to Raise Taxes for Local School Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No. %</td>
<td>Possibly No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>29 53.7</td>
<td>21 38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>29 53.7</td>
<td>19 35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>26 51.0</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 159</td>
<td>84 52.8</td>
<td>61 38.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These contingency table classifications were tested for independence by use of the chi-square test. The obtained chi-square value was...
0.799. As a result, the null hypotheses could not be rejected at the .05 level.

These results, while indicating that the three groups under study did not differ markedly in their responses to this question, did point to the fact that opinion leaders generally have a more positive attitude to educational tax increases than other samples studied by the Gallup organization (Table 18).

Table 18

Comparison of Persons Favorable to Educational Tax Increases (Per Cent): Opinion Leaders and Gallup National Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Favorable to Tax Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Leader Study</td>
<td>Community Opinion Leaders</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup 1970 Study</td>
<td>National Total</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Children in School</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public School Parents</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup 1971 Study</td>
<td>National Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Children in School</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public School Parents</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup 1972 Study</td>
<td>National Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Children in School</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public School Parents</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 54% of opinion leaders surveyed indicated that they would be favorable to tax increases. This compared to the national response of 37% in 1970, 40% in 1971 and 36% in 1972.

Again, only 7.4% of opinion leaders said they would definitely not support tax increases for education; the representative national figures for 1970, 1971 and 1972 were 56%, 52% and 56%.
Summary

Statistical analyses of the study data, then, suggested the following conclusions.

1. Based upon the total responses to the thirty item SFUS instrument, it was found that the opinion leaders from the three groups of school districts had similar attitudes towards the use of school facilities.

2. Based upon analyses of individual items in the SFUS instrument, the attitudes of the opinion leaders from the three groups of school districts were found to differ on Items 1, 22, 24 and 28 (Table 6).

3. Based upon an analyses of items clustered according to five category headings, differences were found to exist, in that group of items concerned with community resources and communication between the opinion leaders in Groups A and C and B and C. That is, the opinion leaders from the school districts having no community education were found to be less positive in their attitudes towards the use of community resources than were opinion leaders from both types of school districts in which community education programs were in operation.

4. Based upon responses to the EAS instrument, it was found that the educational attitudes of the three groups of opinion leaders were similar with the exception of the frequency of their attendance at school-based activities. For this attendance variable, opinion leaders from Group C school districts were found to have lower level of involvement than opinion leaders from the other kinds of school districts.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will (1) summarize the purposes and design of the study, (2) restate the hypotheses investigated and the results indicated by the data, (3) discuss some possible explanations and reasons for these results, and (4) propose some implications for community education that might be considered as a result of the study.

The Purposes and Design of the Study

The study was designed to investigate two aspects of the effect of community education on the attitudes of selected opinion leaders towards public school education and the extended use of school facilities. Additionally, it provided evidence concerning the two types of community education administrative organizations and compared them for attitudinal effectiveness at the community level.

Hypotheses of the Study

The study tested the following theoretical hypotheses:

1. There will be differences in the mean attitudes to the use-of-school-facilities scores of opinion leaders in (a) districts with no community education, (b) districts having community education two years or more and having both a district coordinator of community education and building-level community school directors, and (c) districts having community education two years or more and having only a district-wide coordinator of community education and part-time building supervisors.

The mean attitude scores of the opinion leaders from each of the three groups were analyzed.
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1.1 By considering total scores on the thirty-item SFUS instrument. Data resulting from this analysis (Table 9) were analyzed by use of a one factor analysis of variance. The observed differences between the groups of opinion leaders were not sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis.

1.2 By considering scores on each of the thirty items. Data resulting from this item-by-item analysis were tested by use of a one factor analysis of variance; observed differences in the mean scores of the groups of opinion leaders were not sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis in the case of twenty-six items. However, in the case of four items (Nos. 1, 22, 24 and 28), differences between the mean attitude scores of the groups of opinion leaders were found to be statistically significant (p < .05) and, as such, offered limited support for the theoretical hypothesis.

1.3 By considering scores for items clustered according to content areas. Five clusters were identified. Of these, observed differences in the mean attitude scores were found to be not sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis in four cases (Table 7). However, for Cluster 4 (that concerned with the use of community resources) the differences in the mean group scores were such that the theoretical hypothesis was supported. The attitudes of opinion leaders from each of the groups having community education programs were found to be more positive than those of the opinion leaders from the non-community education districts.

In general, the limited support was found for the first theoretical hypothesis.
2. There will be differences in the contingency table distribution of attitude responses of opinion leaders to the Educational Attitudinal Survey in (a) districts with no community education, (b) districts having community education two years or more and having a district coordinator of community education and building-level community school directors, and (c) districts having community education two years or more and having only a district-wide coordinator of community education and part-time supervisors.

This theoretical hypothesis was tested by individual analysis of eight contingency table classifications. These contingency tables corresponded to the eight specific items which constituted the EAS instrument.

The areas and the results of the data analysis for each of the contingency tables are listed below. The data in each case was analyzed by use of a chi-square test for independence of contingency table classifications.

2.1 Quality of public schools. The distribution of attitude responses of the three groups of opinion leaders did not support the theoretical hypothesis.

2.2 Public involvement in school operations. The observed differences in the distribution of the attitude responses to this item were not sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis.

2.3 Schools and citizen needs. Again, the theoretical hypothesis was not supported.

2.4 Attendance at board of education meetings. Although the data pointed to a tendency for opinion leaders in districts having community education to be more frequent in attending board of education meetings, the chi-square analysis of the contingency table classifications did not support the theoretical hypothesis.
2.5 **Attendance at school-based functions.** In the case of this contingency table, the chi-square value of 10.15 resulted in a rejection of the null hypothesis and in support of the position taken in the theoretical hypothesis. Opinion leaders from school districts having community education programs were more frequently involved in a school-based functions—meetings, classes, programs and social events.

2.6 **Executive involvement with PTA affairs.** The results indicated that opinion leaders as a leadership group do not regard membership in PTA-type organizations as part of their community involvement in school affairs as indicated by all three groups. Therefore, the theoretical hypothesis was not supported.

2.7 **Service as a board of education member.** A general pattern of reluctance towards each of these questions was observed on the part of opinion leaders from each of the three groups. Contingency table classifications of the responses showed very similar patterns of response distribution. The theoretical hypothesis was not supported.

2.8 **Taxation increases for educational purposes.** Although the responses of opinion leaders to this indicated that these persons were generally more favorable to such taxation increases than were the general public (Table 17), the responses of the three groups of opinion leaders did not differ markedly and the results of the data analysis did not support this theoretical hypothesis.
Discussion of Findings

Attitudes to the use of school facilities

The results of this study suggested that the presence or absence of community education in school districts did not appear to be a major influence on the attitudes of opinion leaders towards the use of school facilities.

While opinion leaders generally had very positive attitudes towards the expanded use of school facilities, there were only limited differences found between the attitudes of the groups of opinion leaders involved in this study.

The specific areas in which attitudinal differences were observed, however, were ones that are central to the community education philosophy. The first of these concerned the belief that the school should provide a broad opportunity for recreational and social activities. The acceptance of this position is one of the initial steps taken by a school district in incorporating the community education concept into its educational program. The expansion of the parameters of education from those of a formal K-12 program to those associated with a definition which considers education to be an enabling experience, is a central belief of the community education concept.

As such, it was not surprising to find more positive attitudes on the part of local leaders from districts which had a program of community education in operation for more than two years.

The second area in which different attitudes were observed between the groups of opinion leaders concerned the statement "... the impact
on the solution of social problems should come from the academic program only."
This is very closely related to the first area in that it also places a responsibility for the solution of social problems on the local educational institutions. The belief that schools should concern themselves predominantly with formal academic training is replaced, in the framework of community education, with a belief that school-based programs, activities and initiative can be a powerful force in general social betterment. This, in the community education philosophy, is just as critical for preschoolers, out of school youth, adults and senior citizens as it is for the persons between the ages of five and sixteen.

Again, the fact that the attitude of the opinion leaders differed on this question is not surprising. Most community education programs have assumed a major responsibility in the area of social problems. In places such as Atlanta, Georgia, the community education program has been responsible for the physical location of thirteen social agencies in the John F. Kennedy school. Instead of being in difficult-to-reach, difficult-to-identify locations in downtown governmental office complex (as is often the case in many cities), the representatives of these social agencies are in the communities they serve and are in close physical and personal contact with the people and their problems. The problems associated with old age have become a vital concern of many community educators. Community education offices in many communities have become referral sources for problems associated with health, income and governmental requirements. Many direct services to senior citizens (such as house repair and manual tasks) have been
coordinated or initiated by local community educators; personal enrichment of social discussion and information programs are other examples of this kind of involvement.

The other two items on which differences were marked also concerned similar statements which stressed the expanded role of the school, its facilities, and programs in the education of a district's citizens.

Perhaps the most significant finding relating to the first hypothesis concerned the cluster of items which referred to the use of community resources. The data presented in Table 8 points to the fact that while opinion leaders from the two groups having community education programs expressed similar attitudes, each group differed from the group of opinion leaders from school districts having no community education.

This finding was in line with the significant differences referred to above. The expanded and coordinated use of community resources is another central concern of community educators and another central component of the community education concept.

One of the major characteristics of a well-developed community education program is the involvement of how well the existing community organizations, service clubs and social service agencies in the total education program. Long before the concept and philosophy of community education came into existence, primary services to local community members were being accomplished through organizations and agencies. The city recreation department along with the YMCA, Boys Clubs and 4-H, to name a few, were doing a good job in many communities of
providing recreational activities. Service clubs such as the Jaycees, Optimists and Lions were picking up some additional special seasonal activities in the local communities. Social services were being provided by a large number of health and welfare agencies common to most communities across the country.

The one ingredient that social service agencies and community organizations are lacking is some type of systematic coordination and cooperation to eliminate the tremendous overlap and duplication of services which is so common today. The community education philosophy provides this ingredient by utilizing the public school facilities as a delivery system to coordinate and prevent overlapping of services; this saves money and better meets the needs of a community. Looking objectively at the public schools as a delivery system for services, one would be hard pressed to find another agency or organization that has such a good communication system with the grassroot levels of the community. When a school system enters into the cooperative philosophy of sharing resources, a new life is generated in the community and a powerful vehicle for change and service comes into existence.

Community opinion leaders from those districts having a community education project indicated their realization of the public schools as a delivery system for services. Opinion leaders, occupying such offices as banker, industrial leader, minister of religion and local educational leader were considered likely to be in close contact with the spectrum of resources available within a community.
Consequently, the opinion leader's awareness of the potential improvement in the use, coordination and reduction of overlap in these resources was considered to be an almost inevitable consequence of the introduction of community education.

**General attitudes towards public school education**

In seven of the eight areas included in the EAS instrument, non-significant differences were found between the three groups of opinion leaders. The one situation in which community education appeared to have influenced the behavior of the opinion leaders was that of attendance at school-based programs and activities. Opinion leaders from those districts with community education reported a greater amount of in-school involvement. Another interesting result was reported in Table 11. Despite the fact that the chi-square value obtained from an analysis of the test data did not reach the critical value needed for statistical significance, an obvious trend was apparent in the data. There was a much stronger feeling evident in the responses of opinion leaders from districts with community education programs that citizens did not have enough say in the running of the schools. Definite "No" answers were submitted by 12.9% and 14.8% of opinion leaders in Group A and B districts. In Group C districts—no community education program—the comparable figure was 5.8%.

Community education places strong emphasis upon such things as citizen advisory councils and citizen input into the provisions of educational programs. This emphasis may have been responsible for the trend pointed to here.
While only limited support for the second theoretical hypothesis was shown by the test data, the results pointed to several characteristics of opinion leaders that may have implications for community education. These included:

1. The substantial support given by opinion leaders to public school education. For example, over 90% of each group of opinion leaders indicated that they would support, or possibly support a tax increase for local schools (Table 16). This hypothetical tax increase question has been considered by the Gallup organization to be one of the central indications of public support for education.

2. The fact that opinion leaders attempted to keep themselves informed on local educational matters by at least occasional attendance at meetings of boards of education. Over 96% of opinion leaders from Group A districts indicated frequent or occasional attendance at such meetings (Table 13). For Group B and C, the respective percentages were 85% and 80%. These attendance records were considered to be considerably higher than that of the public in general. In the light of such evidence, it would not be rash to suggest that the opinion leaders identified in this study are relatively well informed on local educational matters.

But, as Straayer (1973) has pointed out, opinion leaders such as these may be simply one kind of community opinion leader. His contention, discussed in Chapter III is that, in a given community, there are various combinations of persons who, in a particular area, or on a particular matter, are seen to be the opinion leaders.
Consequently, not all opinion leaders may be well informed on education or interested in educational matters. However, the study suggested that those holding the offices identified earlier, are likely to exhibit considerable interest in education.

While the opinion leaders were actively interested in educational affairs, they did not exhibit great interest in becoming directly involved in executive positions in such organizations as local PTAs or boards of education.

Several reasons may account for the opinion leaders reluctance to serve in PTA-type organizations. Many opinion leaders were considered likely to already hold leadership positions in several other local bodies. The possibility of holding several leadership positions is especially likely in the relatively smaller communities concerned in this study. Again, it is possible that these persons felt that their local visibility and power is such that their influence can be brought to bear in areas such as education without being directly represented on such bodies as a PTA.
Implications of the Study

The results of this study had several important implications for education in general and for community education in particular.

Implication 1

This study made it clear that the local community opinion leader is an important figure in local educational matters. Generally, he is likely to be a supporter of education, he is likely to be informed on educational matters and he is likely to have had direct involvement with school-based programs and activities.

The local banker is a prime example of an opinion leader's involvement in school affairs. The educational budget, in most communities, is generally one of the larger money expenditures by a local community. Many times the local banks are involved for loan purposes due to delays in tax collection or state and federal monies arriving later than anticipated. Short term loans to meet school payrolls are monthly occasions in many school districts. In addition, the banker's insight on investment of bonds for local school support provides another area of active involvement by bankers.

Therefore, the identification of and the establishment of channels of communication with opinion leaders, such as bankers, should be a major concern of local educators. If the kind of influence wielded by opinion leaders that has been pointed to in related literature also applies to educational matters, the establishment of rapport with these leaders is important.
Implication 2

The responses made by opinion leaders to the question concerning boards of education and PTAs may also have implications for the community educator's stress upon community councils. To this time, the advisory or community council has been considered to be an almost indispensable component of the establishment of a community education program.

The responses of the opinion leaders in this study indicated some reluctance to become directly involved in organizations of this kind, and it may be that the input of this group of persons may be better obtained in a less-structured or differently-structured situation than that provided by the community council. Present community councils are not unlike PTAs in their format and representativeness; it seems likely that key opinion leaders may also tend to react to these councils as they do to PTAs.

Accordingly, the community educator may find it necessary to provide an alternative mode of input to tap the views and reactions of opinion leaders such as those referred to in this study.

Implication 3

The key role played in local educational affairs by opinion leaders pointed to the need for some revision in the training given to community educators.

In the present academic and field training required for community educators, there is little, if any, stress placed upon the identification
or characteristics of local opinion leaders. In view of the findings of this study, it seems that considerably more emphasis should be given to an understanding of the social role played by opinion leaders and the potential functions that they might serve in the development of the community education concept in a local school district.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

School Facility Use Survey Instrument
SCHOOL FACILITY USE SURVEY

Part I

1. The school should provide a broad opportunity for recreational and social activities.
SA A NO D SD

2. The school building should be used only 6 to 7 hours a day.
SA A NO D SD

3. A communication network should extend from the school throughout the community.
SA A NO D SD

4. Use of the community resources should be limited to the academic program only. (Community resources example: Social Service Agency or Service Clubs).
SA A NO D SD

5. The school should be closed to community groups needing a meeting place.
SA A NO D SD

6. Health learning and service should be provided only as a part of the academically required program.
SA A NO D SD

7. Schools should be operated on a year-round basis.
SA A NO D SD

8. The community should control the school.
SA A NO D SD

9. Enrichment experience should be limited to what can be worked into the required class day.
SA A NO D SD

10. Communication, by the school, with the community as a whole is not necessary.
SA A NO D SD

11. The school day should be extended to provide time for enrichment experience.
SA A NO D SD

12. People without children should be actively involved in the school program, both day and evening.
SA A NO D SD

13. Learning experience should be academically centered only.
SA A NO D SD

14. The length of a school day should be extended to 12 or more hours.
SA A NO D SD

15. Participation of parents and lay people in the learning experience of the child should be limited to PTA-type activities only.
SA A NO D SD
16. People without children in school should not be involved with school affairs.  

17. The curriculum should be for children and youth only.  

18. The school week should be six days long, including evening hours.  

19. An enlarged qualified staff should be provided for an extended school program.  

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

21. Many direct efforts at integration of people of all ages and socioeconomic circumstances should be made through a variety of programs and activities.  

22. The impact on the solution of social problems should come from the academic program only.  

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

24. The community should make full use of school facilities and equipment.  

25. The student body should include children, youth and adults.  

26. To fulfill the needs of people, the learning experience should be extended beyond the years of formal schooling.  

27. Community resources should be used on a broad basis in the extended school day.  

28. The school curriculum should be designed to meet the needs and interests of children, youth and adults.  

29. The outlet for creative expression should be broadened into the extended school day, week and year.  

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

Educational Attitudinal Survey
EDUCATIONAL ATTITUdINAL SURVEY

Part II

Check the box opposite the most appropriate response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( ) Very Good</th>
<th>( ) Good/Fair</th>
<th>( ) Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. In general, what do you think of the quality of the public schools in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Do the citizens have enough to say about the running of the public schools in your community?</td>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) To Some Extent</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Do you consider that the needs of the average citizen are taken into account in the running of the schools?</td>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) To Some Extent</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. How often have you attended a meeting of your board of education?</td>
<td>( ) Frequently</td>
<td>( ) Occasionally</td>
<td>( ) Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. How often have you attended lectures, meetings, or social events in your public school buildings during the last year?</td>
<td>( ) Frequently</td>
<td>( ) Occasionally</td>
<td>( ) Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. If selected, would you serve as a president or member of a local PTA Association?</td>
<td>( ) Definitely Yes</td>
<td>( ) Possibly</td>
<td>( ) Definitely No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. If approached, would you agree to be nominated for the district board of education?</td>
<td>( ) Definitely Yes</td>
<td>( ) Possibly</td>
<td>( ) Definitely No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Suppose the local board of education said they needed much more money. As you feel at the time, would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?</td>
<td>( ) Definitely Yes</td>
<td>( ) Possibly</td>
<td>( ) Definitely No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. How would you describe your understanding of the community education concept?</td>
<td>( ) Quite Clear</td>
<td>( ) Generally Clear</td>
<td>( ) Very Vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Does your community have such a concept in operation in the local public schools?</td>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) Don't Know</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, thank you for your time and effort. We would appreciate it if you would also complete the very general information below:

Personal Data: I am in the age group:       21-30       31-40       40 and over

Sex:       Male       Female

( ) Please send me the results of this survey.
Center for Community Education

Initial List of Community Education School Districts Qualifying for Study

(GROUP A) Has two or more coordinators or Community School Directors

- Adrian City School District
- Alpena City School District
- Bedford Public School District
- Beecher School District
- Bloomfield Hills School District
- Escanaba Area Public Schools
- Fennville City School District
- Flushing Community Schools
- Hazel Park City School District
- Highland Park City Schools
- Huron Valley Schools
- Kearsley Community Schools
- Niles Community School District
- West Bloomfield Twp. School District
- Wyoming Public Schools
- Rockford Public Schools
- Godwin Heights Public Schools
- Lakewood Public Schools
- Breitung Township School District
- Hillsdale Community Schools

(GROUP B) Has at least one coordinator or Community School Director

- Berkley City School District
- Bridgeport Community School District
- Carman School District
- Center Line Public Schools
- Clawson City School District
- Clintondale Community Schools
- Grand Blanc Community Schools
- Grand Haven City School District
- Holland City School District
- L'Anse Creuse Public Schools
- Marquette City School District
- Mona Shores School District
- Monroe City Public Schools
- Oak Park City School District
- Rochester Community School District
- Romulus Community Schools
- Saginaw Twp. Community Schools
- South Lake Schools
- Ypsilanti City School District
- Coldwater Community Schools
- East Lansing School District
- Grandville Public Schools
- Ionia Public Schools
- Mt. Pleasant City School District
- Alma Public Schools
- Cadillac Area Public Schools
- Fruitport Community Schools
- Holt Public Schools
- Reeths Puffer Schools
- Willow Run Public Schools
- Brighton Area Schools
- Cheesman Union Schools
- Eaton Rapids Public Schools
- Fenton Area Public Schools
- Greenville Public Schools
- Owosso Area Community Schools
- Kewanna Hills Public Schools
- Ludington Area School District
- Orchard View Schools
- Sturgis City School District
- Allegan Public Schools
- Harper Creek Community Schools
- Marshall Public Schools
- Menominee Area Public School
- Northville Public Schools
- Grosse Pointe Public Schools
- Petoskey School District
- South Lyon Community Schools
- Bradford Public School District
- Buchanan Public School District
- Caro Community Schools
- Fremont Public School District
- Huron School District
- Lakeville Community School District
- Rudyard Area Schools
- Spring Lake Public School District
- Zeeland Public School District
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Final List of Community Education School Districts Qualifying for Study

**GROUP A**

Has two or more coordinators or Community School Directors

- Adrian City School District
- Alpena City School District
- Bedford Public School District
- Beecher School District
- Bloomfield Hills School District
- Escanaba Area Public Schools
- Ferndale City School District
- Flushing Community Schools
- Hazel Park City School District
- Highland Park City Schools
- Huron Valley Schools
- Kearney Community Schools
- Niles Community School District
- West Bloomfield Twp. School District
- Rockford Public Schools
- Godwin Heights Public Schools
- Lackwood Public Schools
- Breitung Township School District
- Hillsdale Community Schools

**GROUP B**

Has at least one coordinator or Community School Director

- Berkley City School District
- Bridgeport Community School District
- Cass City School District
- Center Line Public Schools
- Clinton Community Schools
- Grand Blanc Community Schools
- Grand Haven City School District
- Holland City School District
- L'Anse Creuse Public Schools
- Marquette City School District
- Mona Shores School District
- Monroe City Public Schools
- Oak Park City School District
- Rochester Community School District
- Romulus Community Schools
- Saginaw Twp. Community Schools
- South Lake Schools
- Ypsilanti City School District
- Coldwater Community Schools
- East Lansing School District
- Grandville Public Schools
- Ionia Public Schools
- Mt. Pleasant City School District
- Alma Public Schools
- Cadillac Area Public Schools
- Fruitport Community Schools
- Holt Public Schools
- Battle Creek Public Schools
- Willow Run Public Schools
- Brighton Area Schools
- Cheesaning Union Schools
- Eaton Rapids Public Schools
- Pentwater Area Public Schools
- Greenville Public Schools
- Grinnell Community Schools
- Kenowa Hills Public Schools
- Ludington Area School District
- Orchard View Schools
- Sturgis City School District
- Allegan Public Schools
- Harper Creek Community Schools
- Marshall Public Schools
- Menominee Area Public School
- Northville Public Schools
- Ogemaw Public Schools
- Petoskey School District
- South Lyon Community Schools
- Brandywine Public School District
- Buchanan Public School District
- Caro Community Schools
- Fremont Public School District
- Huron School District
- Lakeville Community School District
- Rudyard Area Schools
- Spring Lake Public School District
- Zeeland Public School District
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List six persons in your community whom you consider to have the greatest influence on local public opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX F

COMMUNITY OPINION LEADERS - RESULTS

Note: Only top ten occupations categories are listed for this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texas A&amp;M University College Station</th>
<th>Texas A&amp;M University Alice Extension</th>
<th>Texas A&amp;M University San Angelo Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>County Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drilling Cont.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Regional Center for Community Education Development at Texas A&M University is in the process of conducting a study of how community leaders view the work of local public schools in the area of Community Education development. Your name and school district was secured through the State Department of Michigan as having a viable Community Education program. In addition, we have also contacted Eastern and Western Michigan University Centers for verification along with Alma College Center.

We are asking your assistance, as an identified leader in Community Education in your district, to assist our Center in identifying men and women in your community who you deem as most influential in your community and who presently represent the following positions: banker, business leader, industrial leader, political leader, communication leader, religious leader and educational leader. These seven identified community leaders will greatly assist us in our study.

We are enclosing a brief form to facilitate your response and a return self-addressed envelope.

Having worked five years in Community Education in the public school system of Ohio, I know how very busy you are. We thank you for your time on this request and I assure you that it will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stephen L. Stark, Associate Director
Center for Community Education

SS/sh

enclosure
The Regional Center for Community Education Development at Texas A&M University is presently conducting a study of how community leaders view the extended use of public school facilities which is a primary component of the community school philosophy developed in Flint, Michigan. Since Michigan has been the pioneer in the area, we have selected thirty communities in your state, including yours, for study.

Will you, as the educational leader of your community, assist us by giving the names and addresses of the men or women in your community that are most influential and who presently represent the following position: banker, business leader, industrial leader, political leader, communication leader and religious leader.

I am enclosing a brief form to facilitate your responses and a return self-addressed envelope. We recognize how busy a season this is and sincerely appreciate your assistance. Upon request, we shall be happy to inform you of our findings.

Thank you again,

Stephen L. Stack, Associate Director
Center for Community Education

SS/eh

closure
The Regional Center for Community Education Development at Texas A&M University is presently conducting a study of how community leaders view the extended use of school facilities in the after-school hours. Since Michigan has been the pioneer in this area via the community school concept developed in Flint, Michigan, we have selected thirty school districts, including yours, for study.

Will you, as an active business representative of your community, assist us by giving the names and addresses of the men or women in your community that are most influential and who presently represent the following position: banker, business leader, industrial leader, political leader, communication leader, religious leader and educational leader.

I am enclosing a brief form to facilitate your responses and a return self-addressed envelope. We recognize how busy a season this is and sincerely appreciate your assistance. Upon request, we shall be happy to inform you of our findings.

Thank you again,

Stephen L. Stark, Associate Director
Center for Community Education

SS/sh

enclosure
Dear Community Leader:

Approximately three months ago, your community was selected, along with twenty-nine others in Michigan, to participate in a study being conducted by the Texas A&M University Center. This study deals with the public attitudes toward extended use of school facilities for after-school and evening programs.

In order to receive a cross section of opinions on this issue, we have selected seven 'opinion leaders' from each of the thirty Michigan communities involved in this study. You were identified as one of the seven from your community.

Michigan has long been identified as a leader in their after-school and evening use of public school facilities. The State of Texas is just beginning in this area and it is our responsibility to assist in this new dimension in education within our State. We are also interested in how this program may effect your attitudes in general toward total public school education programs.

Your valued cooperation in promptly filling out the enclosed form and returning it at once will be greatly appreciated. Your replies on the issues raised will be most valuable in formulating a balanced view of all the thirty communities in Michigan.

We have kept the questionnaire short in hopes of not requiring over fifteen minutes to be filled out and returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. If you would like to have a copy of the results of this survey, please check the space after question 40 on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your generosity in time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Robert I. Berridge
Director, Regional Center for Community Education
Texas A&M University

Stephen L. Stark
Associate Director
March 28, 1974

Dear Community Leader:

About three weeks ago we sent you a questionnaire on the Attitudes Towards Extended Use of School Facilities, with materials which explained its origin and purpose. We realize that perhaps it came to you at a busy time, and therefore we are sending another copy at perhaps a calmer period. If you have already returned the form, please disregard this follow-up.

To date, we have received over 140 returns from fellow opinion leaders in Michigan. Full returns from opinion leaders in all walks of life will yield the most complete analysis and insure that all viewpoints are represented.

Although we will send the results of the total study to those who request it, all individual questionnaires will be strictly confidential.

We shall be most grateful if you will take ten minutes to fill out the enclosed form and return it as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Robert L. Be ridge
Director, Regional Center For Community Education
Texas A&M University

Stephen L. Stark
Associate Director
APPENDIX L

Final Selection of Districts Participating in Study

(Group A)
Has two or more coordinators or community school directors

Adrian City School District
Bedford Public School District
Flushing Community Schools
Hazel Park City School District
Huron Valley Schools
Kearsley Community Schools
Rockford Public Schools
Godwin Heights Public Schools
Lakewood Public Schools
Alpena City School District

(Group B)
Has at least one coordinator or community school director

Bridgeport Community School District
Fenton Area Public Schools
Coldwater Community Schools
Buchanan Public School District
Alma Public Schools
Grandville Public Schools
Greenville Public Schools
Petoskey School District
Rochester Community School District
Allegan Public Schools

(Group C)
No identified community education program

Allen Park School District
Owasso School District
Grand Ledge School District
Belding School District
Traverse School District
St. Johns School District
St. Joseph School District
Milan School District
Sparta School District
Hillsdale School District
## APPENDIX M

**Comparison of 159 Opinion Leaders on Their Overall Understanding of Community Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Generally Clear</td>
<td>Vague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX N

**Comparison of Responses by 159 Opinion Leaders as to Whether Their Community is Currently Operating a Community Education Program In Their Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Community Education Development</th>
<th>E.A.S. Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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