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CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the characteristics of selected school districts with successful community education programs and those with less successful community education programs.

Need and Significance of Study

Development of community education has accelerated dramatically during the past decade. Fewer than five school districts had adopted community education by the early 1960's. Today, according to records maintained by the National Community Education Association, approximately seven hundred districts have community education programs (1972 Membership Directory of NCEA).

Much of the expansion can be attributed to the efforts and financial support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. The Foundation has established a network of Community Education Centers throughout the United States. Among the primary functions of these Centers is the development of community schools and community education programs throughout the United States (1972 Annual Report, The Mott Foundation).

The Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education (MACCE) located at the University of Virginia, has been actively
developing such programs in its service area since its inception in 1971. Because of the vastness of the region (Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina, Maryland and the District of Columbia) and the demands placed by rapid growth of community education, the Center's staff has had little time to evaluate the performance or quality of the community education programs in the school districts served by MACCE.

Certain characteristics have traditionally been associated with successful community education programs:

1. Interest in establishing a community education program on the part of the superintendent of schools (Berridge, 1973, p. 19).

2. Commitment of the school district's administration to provide training opportunities for staff (Totten, 1970, p. 21).


If these characteristics are indeed associated with successful community education programs, it seems reasonable to assume that the assignment of resources to school districts by MACCE based upon these characteristics will result in a greater return upon the investment. Identification of those variables which have made community education more successful in some districts than in others is a pressing need for MACCE.
If certain variables can be identified as leading to the development of more successful programs, a more reliable assessment of a school district's potential can be made and implications for future development can be drawn. For example, community education development can be encouraged when most of the identified success variables are present in a particular district. Conversely, the absence of variables related to success may indicate a need to delay the inception of community education programs pending further development in such areas as a positive attitude toward community education by the superintendent of schools, a commitment to provide training opportunities for staff, interest in community education by a cross section of community leadership, and a willingness to remove bureaucratic barriers to innovation often found in large school districts.

Uses of the results of this study for community education development are not limited to MACCE. Potentially, the results of the study could be used by other centers across the nation as criteria for future development and expansion in their regions.

Community Education: An Overview

The concept of community education is not new or revolutionary. Many school systems have operated various components for decades; and many authors have advocated community education development, although some have referred
to it by other labels.

For purposes of this study, Minzey and LeTarte's (1972) definition of community education was utilized:

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

Implicit in this definition is the utilization of school facilities. Beginning with the colonial period, schools have been used for a variety of community purposes, activities, and programs after traditional school hours. Glueck (1927) reported on such expanded usage in the northeastern United States.

According to Cubberly (1934), school facilities were first used for adult evening school in Providence, Rhode Island in 1810 (p. 587). In 1865, the Chicago Board of Education initiated public funds for the support of evening adult education programs (Mann, 1956, p. 11).

As early as the 1900's, schools were used for recreational purposes. In Newark, New Jersey, the Playground and Recreation Association was formed by 1906 to advocate utilization of school facilities for recreational purposes (Nashlund, 1953, p. 151). New York City in the early 1900's became one of the first metropolitan areas to open schools for adult evening recreation programs. Nashland (1953, p. 151) also documented
that some 55 cities were using schools for evening recreation programs by 1930.

Although community education first emerged as a concept advocating greater utilization of school facilities, the concept began to broaden at the turn of the 20th century. The need for closer ties between the school and community and the need to make school curricula more relevant to the social environment were pointed out by Dewey (1916). He 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 skills, and is saturated with its emotional spirit (p. 26).

The 1939 American Association of School Administrators Report also expressed the belief that the school should be integrated into the community and work with social agencies in the continuous building and improving of group life (Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1953, p. 20).

The scope of community education was enlarged to include the role of the school in improving the quality of community life. The Penn School located on St. Helena Island, South
Carolina was among the first schools to become an active part of the community. St. Helena was inhabited by Negroes who were isolated from contact with the mainland because of the geographical position of the island. Begun in 1862 by the Royal Missionary Society of Philadelphia, the school's emphasis was on the usual academic type of education. But, in 1904, the school was reorganized, and community development together with industrial and agricultural training was accepted as the school's main mission. At harvest time, the school was closed, and the teachers worked in the fields with the people and demonstrated agricultural techniques. The island became the school (Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1953, pp. 49-50).

The depression of the 1930's increased the trend for schools to become involved in attempting to solve personal and community problems. Schools became the center of the community 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 (Berridge, 1969, p. 15).

Elsie Clapp (1939), author of the Community Schools in Action, was actively involved in developing community schools in Jefferson City, Kentucky and Arthursdale, West Virginia.
Her writing helped to further broaden the concept of community education and her definition of a community school is still used. She stated:

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

She continued:

A community school foregoes its separateness. It is influential because it belongs to its people. They share its ideas and ideals, and its work. It takes from them and gives to them. There are no bounds, as far as I can see, to what it could accomplish in the social reconstruction if it had enough wisdom and insight, and devotion and energy. It demands all these, for changes in living and learning are not produced by imparting information about different conditions or by gathering statistical data about what exists, but by creating by people, and for people (p. viii).

Everett (1938) summarized the characteristics of the broadened concept of community education when he compared the philosophies of the traditional school and the community school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All life is educative</th>
<th>vs. Education is gained only in formal institutions of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education requires participation</td>
<td>vs. Education is adequately gained through studying about life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Adults and children have fundamental common purposes in both work and play vs. Adults are primarily concerned with work and children with play

Public school systems should be primarily concerned with improvements of the social order vs. School systems should be primarily concerned with passing on 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 subjects

Public education should be founded upon democratic process and ideals vs. The belief should be that most children and most adults are incapable of intelligently either running their own lives or participating in common group efforts

Progress in education and community living best comes through the development of common concerns among individuals and social groups vs. Progress best comes through the development of clear-cut social classes and vested interest groups which struggle for survival and dominance

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

Teacher-preparatory institutions should prepare youth and adults to carry on a community type of public education vs. Such institutions should prepare youth and adults to perpetuate academic traditions and practices (pp. 435-457).

Thus, from the colonial era to the late 1930's, there was a gradual broadening of the concept of community education. It evolved from a philosophy of promoting a greater
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utilization of school facilities to one of mandating a closer working relationship between school, home, and community.

Perhaps the most significant demonstration of the broad potential of community education occurred in Flint, Michigan, in the 1930's (Manley, Reed, and Burns, 1961). Frank Manley, Director of Physical Education for the Flint Public Schools was deeply concerned about the problem of juvenile delinquency. He felt that wholesome recreational programs could help to counteract the problem. Since schools contained recreation facilities, they could be opened afternoons, evenings, weekends, and during summer vacations for these purposes. In 1935, he interested Charles Stewart Mott, philanthropist and automotive pioneer in this idea.

Excited by the possibilities of opening school facilities for community betterment, Mott donated $6,000 to the Flint Board of Education. This donation was the Mott Foundation's initial entry into community education. The following year, the Foundation granted $15,000, and additional schools were opened. As participation and involvement of the community increased, so did the financial commitment from the Mott Foundation. In addition to opening schools, it provided funds for the development of a Children's Health Center, summer camps for school age children, breakfast programs in elementary schools and rehabilitation programs for prison inmates.
A significant test of the community's support for community education came on June 6, 1950 when Flint voters approved a $7,000,000 school building bond issue, part of which would be used to build a community school. The tremendous importance of the vote was the fact that up to that time every millage request had been defeated by the voters.

Basic to the Flint model was the development of a new professional position, "community school director." A community school director was located in each community school. Each director was responsible for developing and administering a community school program designed for his community. By 1952, every school in Flint had become a community school and had the full time services of a community school director.

The success of the Flint experience became known in other areas, particularly within the state of Michigan. Through the efforts and support of the Mott Foundation, other communities and localities became interested and initiated community schools. Significantly, the "Flint Model" did not develop outside the state of Michigan until 1961 (Manley, Reed and Burns, 1961). Miami, New Haven and Atlanta were the first to initiate the "Flint Model" of community education outside of Michigan.

Role of Regional Centers for Community Education Development

The Mott Foundation began to commit itself to the development of community education outside of Flint,
Michigan, in the late 1950's. Grants were made to other cities and communities such as Miami, and the District of Columbia. But, as Doug Procunier, Director of Training and Dissemination related to the writer, the Foundation soon discovered the difficulty of screening applicants for grants and supervising grants in funded communities. Because the Foundation's resources were limited, it chose instead to fund universities as centers to encourage and aid in the expansion of community education development.

The Foundation felt that if community education was to develop significantly, colleges and universities must be involved. These institutions could not only help develop "pilot community schools," but more importantly develop graduate programs in community education as well as training programs for individuals in key leadership roles needed to successfully implement community education. The Mott Foundation 1972 Annual Report showed the Foundation funding fifteen regional centers for community education development.

The regional centers, such as MACCE, have three broad functions which are not separate or unrelated. Rather, they overlap and often complement one another. These functions are dissemination of information, development of community education programs and training of personnel. Because community education must be known to be understood, accepted, and developed, each center is provided considerable financial resources to make presentations throughout its assigned
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region to superintendents and their administrative staffs, school boards, teachers, governmental, civic and industrial groups and other community groups. In addition, the centers develop promotional materials on community education for wide distribution throughout the region and write articles for journals and newspapers detailing the community education philosophy and its potential.

The ultimate goal of the regional centers is to make every school in the country a community school. Thus, center personnel expend considerable time and effort consulting with and providing information and assistance to communities seeking to adopt community education.

After community education is adopted and community school directors hired, the centers provide training opportunities for individuals in leadership positions. Pre-service workshops are designed to acquaint a cross-representation of community leadership including school board members, school administrators, business and civic leaders and community school advisory councils with community education. Separate workshops are frequently held for community school directors who require intensive training in the human, conceptual and technical skills required to be an effective leader.

In-service workshops and seminars are held regularly for professional community educators. They are designed to aid in updating skills and competencies and to provide
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opportunities for meaningful peer interaction.

Graduate degree programs are instituted to meet the increasing need for trained professionals. Many of the regional centers have developed master's and doctoral degree programs in community education. Typically, these programs have been offered as a graduate option or emphasis in existing graduate degree programs (Regional Center Statistical Reports, 1973).

Successful Community Education Programs

Defining successful implementation is a difficult task. Authors and leaders in the field rarely agree completely as to what constitutes successful community education development. The reason for the difficulty is explained partially by the fact that each community is unique and each community education program is designed to meet a specific school-community need.

Differing perspectives also add to the difficulty in reaching a consensus of what constitutes success. A practitioner views success in terms of the satisfactory completion of steps in the developmental process. In his handbook for developing a community education program, Berridge (1973) listed the steps a system must take to successfully develop community education and stressed the crucial role the centers play in implementing these steps:

1) Securing a commitment from the Superintendent and Board of Education to the concept of Community
Education as a process;

2) Appointing a steering committee to assist in planning of the process;

3) Designing and adopting a logo or symbol;

4) Employing a full-time coordinator;

5) Developing and finalizing a working budget;

6) Fully informing the community of the process and its potential through news media, films and special purpose meetings;

7) Informing and seeking assistance from all identifiable groups, organizations, agencies and institutions, through a group meeting; holding a follow-up meeting to ascertain their commitments and to form a Coordination Board;

8) Informing and involving business and industry personnel;

9) Outlining more exacting plans at a community-wide informational meeting;

10) Developing and implementing a community-wide door-to-door survey to discover wants and needs of the community and to assess individual resources and resources persons in the community;

11) Establishing a city-wide council as well as neighborhood councils for each school site;

12) Interpreting wants and needs into a program format (a task of the Coordination Board);

13) Initiating programs (pp. 18-19).

A funding agent's perspective of success often differs from that of a practitioner's. To help the Regional Centers select those school systems with the greatest potential, the Mott Foundation established minimum criteria that must be met in order to receive financial assistance (Centers Directors Manual, 1974). These criteria are:
1) A trained professional community educator must have completed: course work, workshops, visitations, in-service seminars, internship, special projects, and work experience; and
   
a. At least one-half time person, released from other duties (when part-time, there should be a provision to move toward full time).
   
b. He should be considered an integral part of the school district staff.
   
c. He should have specialized training approved by the Center serving the school district.
   
d. He must regularly attend available in-service training sessions.
   
e. Salary should be commensurate with local school district salary schedule, considering training, experience, and responsibility.
   
f. Selection should be by a group representing the school and broader community.
   
g. A means of annual performance assessment should include stated goals and objectives with some reasonable means of assessing progress towards them.
   
2) Each community school program shall have identifiable structure for assuring representative community participation in the operation of the community education program, i.e., community council, neighborhood council, extended PTA, advisory council, etc.

3) Board of education must pass upon a formal resolution supporting the concept of community education. This should be done after the board has provided evidence of an understanding of the basic principles of community education.

4) Evidence of matching financial support of community education, other than Regional Center, shall be shown.

5) Established measurable goals and objectives for the system's community education program shall be presented. (See "g" above).
6) Board of education policies shall encourage use of school buildings and facilities for broad community purposes.

7) Maximize use of existing human resources.

8) Board policies should encourage cooperative procedures with other agencies, such as government, business, and industry (pp. 10,11).

An evaluator's perspective of success is in terms of achievement of goals and objectives. The "Suggested Goals and Objectives for Community Education" as developed by Decker (1972) and MACCE's Policy Board represents a synthesis of objectives listed by authors in the community education field and is used to aid MACCE in evaluating community education programs operating in its region. (See Appendix A).

Although the perspectives included in Appendix A are of help in defining what is a successful community education program, regional center staffs must develop additional criteria. The criteria for success proposed by writers in the field, the Mott Foundation and MACCE, are based upon four variables, namely: attitude of school superintendents toward community involvement, training received by the community education directors, consultations with MACCE and size of school district.

Therefore, this study is based upon the position that these variables are related to successful community education development. They are listed as follows in the form of the theoretical hypotheses of this study.
$H_1$ The most successful community education programs are most likely to be found within school districts having superintendents with positive attitudes toward community involvement.

$H_2$ School districts who consult with MACCE more frequently will be more successful in developing community education.

$H_3$ School districts having trained Community Education Directors will have more successful community education programs than those districts having untrained directors.

$H_4$ School districts with smaller K-12 student enrollments will be more successful in implementing community education programs than districts having larger K-12 enrollments.
CHAPTER II
RATIONALE FOR THEORETICAL HYPOTHESES

This study dealt with certain variables considered necessary to the adoption of a community education program which is considered successful by the director and past director of MACCE. The variables were:

1) The superintendent's role in bringing about change and introducing innovative programs.

The superintendent is usually the primary agent for initiating changes and innovations in school systems. He is the agent who develops and recommends to the school board policies and procedures that facilitate the development of innovative programs such as community education. Carlson (1965) indicated that the prestige and status of the office of superintendent can often itself promote educational innovations.

2) Size of the school district.

Change has been shown to be difficult to attain in large bureaucratic organizations. Argyris (1957) indicated that there is a need in every school system for some centralization, some standardization of procedures. The amount, however, should be just enough to permit effective use of resources and personnel. It is assumed that smaller school districts have less centralization, fewer layers of
bureaucratic structure, thus making innovation easier.

3) Training of the community education directors.

Kelly (1974) claimed that community education center directors believe that the presence of trained community school directors is a key factor in the successful development of community education. Training, interdisciplinary in nature and including the principles of change, seems to provide the director with the specific knowledge and skills necessary to implement community education.

4) Consultations with representatives of the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education

Woods (1967) indicated that in starting an innovation or adopting a change, a change agent within a school system utilizes knowledge and information from sources usually outside the school system. One of the major responsibilities of MACCE staff is providing assistance and consulting with school administrators and staff as well as community leaders to promote innovation and change, thus setting the stage for the inception of a community education program.

The variables discussed above formed the basis for the following theoretical hypotheses.

H1 The most successful community education programs are most likely to be found within school districts having superintendents with positive attitudes toward community involvement.
Three basic assumptions underlay this hypothesis. It was assumed that the superintendent is the key administrative officer in the local educational systems. Miles claimed, "There is some doubt whether local boards do in fact exert policy control. The superintendent may well be the source of influence on all but gross matters (p. 3)." McCloskey (1967) maintained:

...the superintendent should be a symbol of educational leadership. He should be Mr. Local Education, and as such, he can and should exercise considerable direct and indirect influence on public opinion. The amounts of local interest in education and the quality of local school systems is influenced greatly by the success with which he does so. When he exercises effective leadership, the symbol he embodies gains public respect and in turn increases his leadership capacity (p. 269).

In another direct assessment of the central role played by the superintendent, Carlson (1965) stressed that when a school system as a whole accepts or rejects innovations, the superintendent is at the focal point in the decision making process (p. 11).

As well as being the principal focus of power in a local educational system, the superintendent is assumed by most writers to be the prime force in initiating change in a school district. This role as an innovator and change-agent is often specified in the job descriptions and lists of responsibilities for local superintendents of schools. For example, Havinghurst and Neugarten (1969) indicated the importance of the superintendent in initiating change when they listed the following as the responsibilities.
of a superintendent:

a) to understand the society in which the school operates its social systems and subsystems and to strive to work out agreement with the other systems on allocation of funds.

b) to plan for development of the school system encouraging innovation and evaluation.

c) to analyze the tensions in the community that affect the schools and to work to reduce these tensions by assisting diverse groups to communicate with one another and to achieve a peaceful *modus vivendi* (p. 287).

Even in those situations where the superintendent may not be the actual initiator of the idea for change, his role in the movement from idea to implementation is a critical one. Experience has shown that without his support and approval, local educational change at all levels is difficult to achieve. Brickell (1961) stated, "The administrator may not be and frequently is not the original source of interest in a new program, but unless he gives it his attention and actually supports it, it will not come into being (p. 24)." Other writers concerned with this function of the superintendent included Berridge (1973) and Carlson (1965).

The third assumption specifically concerned the superintendent's function in change directly related to community education. The implementation of community education in a school district involves substantial change in educational thinking, practice, and programming. Such a change in basic thinking about education cannot occur without the support of
local superintendents. Kelly (1974) reported that one of the ten variables found to be significant and critical in the successful development of community education in a school district was the understanding and support of community education by the school administration including the superintendent. Berridge (1973) emphasized:

The initial step in developing community education is to receive a formal commitment by the Board of Education and strong support from the superintendent. Without this commitment and without the backing of the superintendent, community education will not develop as a community project (p. 19).

In addition to the need for the superintendent to be an innovative force in bringing about the change, the literature strongly suggested that the superintendent's attitude concerning community involvement is a critical factor in the successful implementation of community education. Minzey and LeTarte (1972) asserted that:

Educators must share the decision making process in educational programming and involve lay citizens in the process of formulating policies and procedures. Community involvement must be a joint undertaking and approached on the assumption that both lay citizens and professional educators have a unique and valuable contribution to make and each, because of their uniqueness, cannot develop an adequate program without the other (p. 9).

In most situations, such community involvement takes three basic forms: the greater usage of school facilities by the community, the development and utilization of community councils and the identification and coordination of existing community resources to meet community needs.
Referring to the use of school facilities, Whitt (1971) argued that "Community Education will require a much extended use of school facilities. In fact, this is the key to a successful program. The school that stays open until late at night is the one that will have the greatest impact on the education within the community... (p. 58)". Similar statements have been made by the American Association of School Administrators (1973), and by Berridge (1973). The AASA position was that school facilities should be used as many hours a day and as many weeks a year as possible (p. 29). Berridge (1973) also noted that the Board should pass a formal resolution favoring the concept which contains statements of the Board's agreement to liberalize use of facilities by the citizens of the community and of the Board's desire to coordinate efforts with other groups and organizations in the community (p. 19).

The superintendent's attitude towards expanded use of school facilities is a vital one. He not only gives direction to School Board deliberations on such matters, but he has the administrative and statutory power to require building principals to extend the hours during which their buildings and facilities may be used. In short, the superintendent is the key decision maker in such a context.

The second aspect of community involvement concerns the development of what are generally referred to as community councils. These councils are comprised of representatives
from local groups or strata of the community structure and their existence and usefulness depends to a considerable extent upon the superintendent. As was the case with the expansion of the use of the school facilities, the establishment of these community councils also is dependent upon the stance taken by and the attitudes of the superintendent of schools. A positive attitude on his part is considered to be a major force in determining the success of community councils in a district having community education.

In communities where community education is introduced, these community councils are seen to be indispensable components of the process. To Minzey and LeTarte (1972), they were a basic ingredient in the success of community education. They claimed: "...councils can be of invaluable assistance in establishing educational purposes, providing an awareness of community problems and concerns, and assisting in establishing the basis for programs that might help to solve some of these problems (p.9)."

Kerensky and Melby (1971) stressed that each community school should have a citizen's advisory council which strives to inform the school of the community needs, desires and expectations and assists the professional educators by informing members of the community of problems and goals sensed or expressed by educators (p. 175).

The third aspect of the community involvement question concerned the greater utilization of community resources.
Such resources include recognized existing resources such as community agencies and facilities, as well as the less obvious human resources such as classroom volunteers. The community education concept emphasizes the coordination and utilization of such resources to enhance and enrich the traditional K-12 program, making it more relevant and meaningful.

In permitting or encouraging educational opportunities outside the confines of the classroom, the superintendent is, again, a powerful encouraging or inhibiting force. School policies concerning the presence or use of non-school personnel, the incorporation of local resources as learning experiences, and even the provision of services such as school buses for trips and enrichment experiences are very much shaped and determined by the superintendent.

Thus, the power and influence of the superintendent is both great and widespread. The first hypothesis sought to specifically document the role played by the superintendent in community education development. The Community Involvement Attitudinal Survey instrument attempted to measure the degree of positiveness of a superintendent's attitudes toward community involvement in school districts having community programs considered to be "more successful" and "less successful."

H₂ School Districts who consult with MACCE more frequently will be more successful in developing community education.
One of the principal functions of the regional centers for community education such as MACCE, is to provide information on community education and to act as a catalyst in its development. In its Five Year Plan (1972) the Mott Foundation detailed the functions and responsibilities of regional centers for community education development. The center staff was recognized as having considerable expertise in facilitating community education development. One of the staff's primary responsibilities is to provide consultative service to school systems, community groups and others interested in community education. Consultive services include in-service and pre-service workshops for staff and community groups, seminars, lectures, and visitations to successful community education projects. By providing funds for consultive services, the Mott Foundation clearly documented its position regarding the importance of these services.

Because implementing community education requires changes in a school system, the community school coordinator and others acting to initiate community education can be viewed as change agents. There was extensive support in the literature to suggest that an outside stimulus can be an important variable in helping a change agent bring about organizational and philosophical change. Watson (1967) claimed that in many instances the most rational strategy for change combines the efforts of external and internal
change agents working together (p. 89). Referring to the need for external support during a period of change or innovation, Lippitt (1967) contended that a socialization agency should provide support during the period of trying out a new practice and consolidating it and should have an institutionalized continuing in-service training program (p. 45).

In a more specific reference to the role of outside supportive agents, Lippitt (1967) concluded that probably a training team which balances outside objectivity and expertness with inside diagnostic knowledge and effective commitment is the most creative (p. 45).

In the area of community education, there has been considerable emphasis placed upon the need for and effects of consultation by regional centers. Weaver and Seay (1974) asserted that regardless of the quality of his pre-service, the nature of the community educator's work requires that he update and expand his training periodically (p. 140), and that:

Resource help from such centers of research and leadership as universities, state education agencies and professional organizations will be required if in-service efforts are to result in substantive improvements among the participants. The Regional University Centers are active in providing programs of in-service training planned specifically for community education leaders (p. 141).

Rogers (1969) cited several research studies to support his contention that the frequency of consultations or
exposures to new programs is an important determinant of successful implementation. Referring to studies by Coughenour (1960), Emery and Oaser (1958), Hoffer (1942) and Lackey and Larson (1961), Rogers argued the basic proposition that the adoption of a new idea "...varies directly with exposure to the new idea. The results of past studies indicate this relationship between exposure and adoption is generally very high (p. 104)."

A similar position was taken by Totten (1970). He emphasized the relationship between the successful development of community education and the extent of the in-service opportunities that are made available to lay groups, agencies and community groups. Totten claimed that,"Professional educators with training and preparation in community education should provide a variety of learning experiences to enhance leadership among other staff members and lay people (p. 21)."

More recent support for the theoretical position taken in the second hypothesis came from Minzey and LeTarte (1972) and from Kelly (1974). These authors placed great stress on the critical importance of in-service education. They contended that "To state that in-service education is of major importance to community educators is an understatement...it is simply impossible to develop good Community Education without good in-service (pp. 179-180)."
Kelly (1974) also stressed this component. In a study which identified factors considered critical to community education development, he concluded that participation in regional center-sponsored community education training and in-service programs was another important and necessary variable in successful development.

In summary, the evidence to substantiate the relationship between consultation and in-service training and successful organization change was strong. There was almost unanimous agreement among the studies reviewed that there is a need for ongoing and frequent service of this kind. Testing of the second hypothesis $H_2$ provided specific information on the relationship between community education change agents and the services provided by MACCE.

$H_3$ School districts having trained community education directors will have more successful community education programs than those districts having untrained directors.

The question of the nature and scope of the training for community school directors has been frequently debated. In the initial developmental stages of community education, there was a feeling that community education directors did not need formal training in the understanding, implementation and dissemination of the concept. However, in recent years, the evidence and writing in this area has strongly suggested the need for specific training and for specific
skills on the part of the director. Weaver (1972) is one writer who stressed the need for an appropriate balance among the personal skills of the director. Weaver claimed that:

In order to perform his role, the community educator, the person...must have technical and conceptual skill and a high degree of human skill. That is to say, he must have some technical skill facility with tools and techniques unique to community education (pp. 2-3).

Watson (1967) also discussed the training aspect of a person involved in any innovative enterprise. Without referring specifically to community education, Watson presented a position very similar to that of Weaver (1973). He claimed that three categories of skills were needed; problem solving skills, interpersonal skills of relating, and inner personal learning (p. 100).

In a recent publication, Weaver and Seay (1974) insisted that leaders were required for the implementation and dissemination of the community education concept. These leaders, they claimed, ...must be people who are personally and professionally qualified to give leadership to community education (p. 119).

Berridge (1973) considered the best kind of person to be directing community education programs. After analyzing the advantages of local compared to outside personnel, he concluded that:

...with all factors being equal, probably the local man does have the initial advantages, but over all, the expertise of the individual will make the difference.
The training of the individual should be priority in making the final employment decision (p. 22).

The question of the director's training was also raised by Minzey and LeTarte (1972). Conceding that it was not always possible to find a fully-trained person at the outset of a community education program, they stressed that should a person with the appropriate personal characteristics be employed, he should then ... be provided appropriate training. Such training, they argued, should minimally consist of ... an intensive exposure to the community education concept and an internship with an experienced community school director (p. 54). One consequence of this training was seen by these authors to be that of enhancing...the individual responsible for community education, and subsequently enhance community education (p. 176).

Specific suggestions concerning the training and preparation of community education directors have been provided by Becker (1972) and Watson (1967). Becker stated that at least two elements should be included in the training of community school directors. They were:

A. pre-service experience should be provided in leadership, management and communication skills.

B. regular in-service information and activities should be available to and participated in by all community school directors (pp. 85-86).

This basic training format is similar to that suggested by the Mott Foundation Center Directors Manual (1973). These two criteria were included as part of this study's operational
definition of a "trained" community school director.

Thus the relationship between trained community education directors and successful community education development is strong. The third hypothesis sought to document this relationship.

\[ H_4 \quad \text{School districts with smaller K-12 student enrollments will be more successful in implementing community education programs than districts having larger K-12 enrollments.} \]

Change and innovation have been found to be more difficult to achieve in large bureaucratic organizations. Kerensky and Melby (1971) indicated that large urban school systems are bureaucratically top-heavy with many organizational layers. They contended:

> The result is that, at the present moment, the traditional patterns of administration constitute a definite limit upon all innovative practices including community education. Unless these practices can be changed, the process of achieving effective community education will be slowed (pp. 144-145).

Applicable to large school systems is Wood's (1967) warning that bureaucratic organization can be a barrier to innovation. He asserted: ... the bureaucratic organization and the innovative person are not the least bit compatible (p. 36).

In smaller school systems there are fewer levels of administrative structure allowing closer communication between administrators, teachers and the community. The
importance of communication in adopting changes and innovations is pointed out by Whitt and Burden (1974). They asserted:

Change must be planned and all those within the system must learn not only to participate in change but also manage change. This cannot happen unless the administrator responsible for setting the organizational climate understands the nature of the change but more importantly, understands the degree to which it is necessary for all members at all levels to take part in fact-finding deliberations, and setting goals that are realistic to the group (pp. 24-25).

Besides having fewer personnel, smaller school systems provide more opportunities for interpersonal communication. Interpersonal communications can be effective in changing attitudes and opinions hostile to the desired change. Rogers and Svenning (1969) contended that attitudinal changes brought about by interpersonal communication channels are more lasting than those produced by mass media channels (p. 3).

Many large urban school systems, such as St. Louis, Missouri Public Schools, have been attempting to decentralize their systems. In doing so, they are attempting to approximate conditions already existing in most smaller systems. The importance of decentralization to innovation was asserted by Havelock (1969). He stated: Decentralization offers increased capacity for knowledge flow and utilization among the members of the decentralized unit (p. 4).

Woods (1967) substantiated Havelock's position when he said: The effective administrator provides a climate for
innovation that is nonhierarchical in structure and flexible in organization (pp. 37-38).

If large school systems contain barriers to change and innovation, it seemed reasonable to assume that smaller school systems were more likely to provide a climate for successful innovation or successful community education development. Statistics maintained by the National Community Education Association tend to support this contention. A survey of the 1972 membership directory of NCEA indicated that a majority of the community education programs have developed in districts with smaller K-12 enrollments (15,000 or less).

Decker (1971) was one community education author who considered the variable of size of school district student population as a central variable in the successful development of community education programs. He reported:

...data on perceptions of the regional university community education center directors...seem to indicate that there are differences in the case of implementation and adoption of community education in different types of districts and with different sizes or student populations (pp. 118-119).

In Decker's study, school districts with between 5,000 and 10,000 students had the highest level of support for community education. The urban districts with student populations in excess of 40,000 had the lowest level of commitment (p. 114).

Thus the fourth hypothesis $H_4$ assumed the theoretical
position that there is positive correlation between the size of a school district and its relative success in establishing a program of community education.
CHAPTER III
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study has been to determine the relationship, if any, between certain variables and successful community education development. The variables considered in this study were: attitude of school superintendents toward community involvement, training received by the community education directors, the amount of consultation with MACCE and student population of selected school districts. Chapter III will provide information regarding the operational definitions, statistical treatment, population, sample and data collection for the study.

Operational Definitions

The following terms were considered to be those central to this study. The operational definitions offered here are those adopted for this study:

a) The region served by MACCE consisted of school districts operating community education programs in the states of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia. In the region considered by the study, there are twenty districts...
with community education programs in operation.

b) **Community education** was considered to be "those programs and educational actions under the direction of a building level community school director employed in that capacity on at least a one-half time basis."

c) **Successful programs** were considered to be those with community education programs operating in a school district, within the defined region, ranked by the present and former directors of MACCE as being in the upper ten of the twenty districts having community education.

d) **Less successful programs** were defined as the community education programs operating in a school district, within the defined region, ranked by the present and former directors of MACCE as being in the lower ten districts having community education programs.

e) **Characteristics:** this study considered the following variables to be the characteristics of the school districts with community education:

1. **attitudes of the district superintendent toward community involvement in schools.**
2. **size of the school district in terms of K-12 enrollment.**
3. **training received by the community school directors in community education.**
4. **extent of on-site consultations with the MACCE staff.**
The operational definitions of these characteristics were:

1. **attitudes of the district superintendent**...the score of individual superintendents on the Community Involvement Attitudinal Survey.

2. **size of school district as**...the number of students enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade as certified by the *Education Directory, 1973-74 School Systems*.

3. **training received by the community school directors as**...the number of days in attendance at a Flint Training Workshop, or at a Mid-Atlantic Training Seminar or in extended work at the National Center for Community Education.

4. **consultations with MACCE staff as**...the number of man hours spent by MACCE staff in the school district.

f) **Trained community school director** was considered to be that person in charge of a local program of community education who has met the minimum training standards specified by the Mott Foundation in its *Manual for Regional Center Directors* (1973). The standards specified in this publication were:

1. He must regularly attend available in-service training session.

2. He should have specialized training approved by the Center serving the school district.
Although no specifications concerning the word 'regularly' are given in the publication referred to, for this study 'regularly' was considered to mean attendance at a minimum of two in-service sessions during each twelve months of service as a community school director. Specialized training was considered to be:

1) Attendance at a two week Flint training workshop or
2) Attendance at a workshop, established by Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education for new community school directors.

g) An untrained community school director was considered to be that person in charge of a local program of community education who had not met the minimum training requirements specified above.

h) Trained school district was considered to be that district where at least 75% of the community school directors were classified as being trained.

i) Untrained school district was considered to be that district where 75% of the community school directors were not classified as being trained.

j) Superintendent's attitudes were operationally defined as those scores of superintendents of local school districts in the region served by the MACCE on the Community Involvement Attitudinal Survey.

k) On-site advisory service was defined as the number of man-hours of advisory contact made by the members of...
the MACCE staff with representatives of local school districts having community education programs. For example, if two members of the MACCE staff consulted with local school district personnel for three hours, this was considered to be six man-hours of advisory contact.

Null Hypotheses

Based upon the theoretical hypothesis outlined in Chapter I and including the operational definitions listed earlier, this study tested the following null hypotheses:

1) There will be no difference in the mean attitude scores toward community involvement in education of superintendents of school districts (i) having community education programs designated as "more successful", (ii) having community education programs designated as "less successful," and (iii) having no community education programs in operation.

2) There will be a zero correlation between the rank ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting a community education program, and of the amount of on-site advisory service provided by the MACCE.

3) There will be no significant differences among the success rankings of those districts having trained community education directors and those having untrained
There will be a zero correlation between the rank-ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting community education programs, and of the rank ordering of districts in terms of the size of their student populations.

Statistical Treatment

The following four hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

**Hypothesis 1** - The null hypothesis of no difference between the means of attitude scores on the CIAS of superintendents in the successful/less successful community education districts and those districts having no community education ($H_0: \mu_{\text{success}} = \mu_{\text{nce}}$) was tested against the alternative hypothesis ($H_1: \mu_{\text{success}} \neq \mu_{\text{nce}}$).

Seventy superintendents were expected to complete the CIAS. They represented the seventy school districts selected for this study and were categorized into three groups: non-community education districts, more successful community education districts, and less successful community education districts. Mean attitude scores were then derived for the three groups. A one way analysis of variance was employed to determine differences between the three groups were significant, independent $t$-tests

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
utilized to ascertain differences between groups.

Group means relating to this first hypothesis were presented and analyzed in three forms:

1) The means of superintendents' attitude scores for the total survey instrument;
2) The means of superintendents' attitude scores for CIAS items clustered into the five general categories of:
   a. Community use of school facilities
   b. Advisory council roles
   c. Role of community in school affairs
   d. Role of school in community
   e. Organization of school boards
3) The means of superintendents' attitude scores for each individual CIAS item.

**Hypothesis 2** - The null hypothesis of a zero positive correlation between the rank ordering of community education programs in terms of their success or relative lack of success, and of the rank ordering of districts in terms of the amount of consultative/advisory time spent with them by MACCE staff members, was tested by use of the Spearman's $r$ correlation coefficient. Statistical procedures followed were those detailed by Glass and Stanley (1970).

**Hypothesis 3** - The null hypothesis of no significant differences among success rankings of those districts having trained community education directors and those having untrained
directors was tested by use of a chi-square test for independence of classifications as detailed by Glass and Stanley (1970, pp. 329-332).

Data were presented in the form of a 2 x 2 contingency table classification with the variables of successful/less successful programs and trained director/untrained directors as the cell labels.

Hypothesis 4 - The null hypothesis of a zero positive correlation between the rank ordering of school community education programs in terms of their K-12 student populations, was tested by use of the Spearman’s $\rho$ correlation coefficient.

Data were presented in the form of rank orders of district community education programs in terms of perceived success, and in terms of size of student K-12 populations ranked from smallest to largest.

Description of the Test Used

The Community Involvement Attitude Survey (CIAS) was a twenty-seven item test instrument, which required respondents to react to each statement on a five-point scale about the involvement of the community in education. Responses to the CIAS were ascribed numerically the values 'Strongly Agree'= 5, 'Agree'=4, 'Neutral'=3, 'Disagree'=2, 'Strongly Disagree'= 1. The range of possible total points extended from 135 to 27 with a score of 135 being the most positive and 27 the
most negative. Of the twenty-seven items, six were framed so that the most positive response was that under the heading of "Strongly Disagree". In computing mean scores, these responses were allocated the score appropriate for the most positive response.

The survey instrument measured attitudes of superintendents toward expanded utilization of school facilities, advisory councils' roles, the role of community in school affairs, the role of school in community affairs and organization of school boards.

The instrument was reviewed, prior to being field tested by members of the writer's Doctoral Committee. A number of changes were suggested by individual members and incorporated into the instrument. The CIAS was then field tested prior to use. The objective of the pilot study was to obtain an indication of language or interpretation problems. Those involved in the pilot study were six superintendents of school districts which were within the MACCE service region, but did not have community education programs.

The letter which accompanied the pilot study of the test instrument is shown as Appendix B. Following the analysis of responses to the pilot study, several modification in terminology and structure of the test instrument were made. The final version of the CIAS is included as Appendix C.

The final version of the CIAS was mailed to the selected school superintendents on May 5, 1974. A second, follow-up
letter was mailed to non-respondents on June 12, 1974. The final response for non-community education superintendents was 41 out of 50 or 80.2%. The response for superintendents of less successful community education districts was 10 out of 10 or 100%. And the response for superintendents of more successful community education districts was 10 out of 10 or 100%.

Kerlinger (1964) had suggested that a return rate of near 80% was considered a very satisfactory return rate for a mail questionnaire. The high return rate in this study can likely be attributed to the following factors:

1) The fact that the twenty community education districts work closely with MACCE and are supportive of its goals and objectives.

2) The fact that the survey instrument was brief, easily understood and could be completed in approximately ten minutes.

3) The fact that stationery bearing the letterhead and logo of MACCE was used for the introductory letter and follow-up request letter. (Appendices D,E,F)

4) The fact that as mentioned above, a follow-up letter was used for non respondents.

Populations and Samples

The populations and samples used in the present study were:
1) in connection with Hypothesis 1, all twenty school districts having community education programs in the region served by MACCE were used in this study. In addition, a sample of fifty districts not having community education programs was randomly selected from the four hundred eighty-eight school districts listed in the Education Directory, 1973-74 School Systems for the six state region and which were not known to have programs of community education. The table of random numbers included in Glass and Stanley (1970) was utilized.

2) in connection with Hypotheses 2 and 4 all twenty school districts having community education programs in the region served by MACCE were used.

3) in connection with Hypothesis 3, the population studied consisted of the community school directors who were employed in full-time community education work in the twenty school districts referred to above. The identification of the school districts and of the community school directors who worked in them was done by reference to the annual statistical survey and progress report compiled by the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education for submission to the Mott Foundation (July, 1973).

Design of the Study

The first part of the study consisted of the develop-
ment, field-testing and refinement of the survey instrument. The twenty-seven attitude statements which comprised the instrument were developed by adapting statements about community education and community involvement which had appeared in the related literature.

Following the field-testing and modification of the CIAS instrument, it was mailed to the superintendents of the twenty districts in the MACCE region in which community education programs were in operation. These districts had previously been placed in rank-order in terms of their relative success in their community education programs by the two faculty members who had the closest knowledge of their operation and quality -- Dr. Robert Frossard, Director of the MACCE from 1971 to 1973, and Dr. Larry Decker, current Director of the Center.

These persons were asked to come to a consensus ranking of the twenty school districts in terms of their perceptions of the relative success of the programs. Drs. Frossard and Decker were given eleven criteria for use in their rankings of the districts. These were:

1) adult education enrollments
2) youth enrichment enrollments
3) public library utilization
4) community school council and frequency of meetings
5) number of social service agencies providing services
6) adult basic education enrollment
7) flexibility of school policies, rules and regulations, especially in the area of utilization of school facilities
8) teacher attitudes toward community involvement
9) administrator attitudes toward community involvement in schools
10) attitudes of a cross-section of community leadership toward the public school system
11) amount of use of school facilities

According to Minzey and LeTarte (1972), there are two major components of community education – program and process. The program component deals with the activities, programs and courses being offered to meet community needs. Ideally, programs, services, and activities will be scheduled to meet community needs at each age level, pre-schoolers through senior citizens. The other component, process, deals with the technique utilized to organize and activate a community to begin solving its own problems. The criteria outlined above were intended to cover both components of community education and to serve as a guide for the two consultants ranking the school districts.

Initially, the consultants ranked the school districts individually using the criteria mentioned above. Their individual rankings are shown as Appendices G and H. Those districts which fell in the upper half of the ranking were
considered to be the "more successful" community education districts and those in the lower half, the "less successful". At a later date, the two consultants met jointly to develop a consensus ranking on districts. Their rankings are shown as Appendix I.

Data relating to Hypothesis 2 — that concerned with the correlation between success of program and the amount of on-site consultative service from the MACCE — were derived from the Center's Community Education service log kept as a record of visits to and time spent with local school district personnel. These records were converted to a 'man-hours' schedule and the twenty districts having community education programs were ranked according to the amount of on-site consultative service received.

Data relating to Hypothesis 3 — that dealing with the training of the community education directors operating the community education programs in the school districts — were derived from the annual statistical reports from the districts to the MACCE. These reports included information concerning the qualifications and training background of the directors.

The data relating to Hypothesis 4 which were concerned with the relationship between school district size and success in implementing a community education program were derived from the consensus ranking of the two 'experts' and from Public School Systems, 1973-74 Education Directory.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Three separate analyses are reported in this chapter. One examines differences of superintendents' attitudes toward community education, utilizing one way analysis of variance and independent t-tests. Another examines the relationship between more successful-less successful programs and system student population and man-hours of consultation, utilizing Spearman's rank correlation. The third analysis compares differences in more successful-less successful programs and trained and untrained community education personnel, utilizing a chi-square for independence of classifications. The results and tables which follow are presented in the same sequence in which the theoretical hypotheses were presented in Chapter I.

Null Hypothesis 1

Null hypothesis 1 was previously stated as follows:

There will be no significant difference in the mean attitude scores toward community involvement in education of superintendents of school districts having community education programs designated as "more successful", having community education programs designated as "less successful" and having no community education programs in operation.

Responses to the twenty-seven item CIAS instrument were analyzed by: (1) total responses to the entire instrument, (2) responses with respect to the five cluster areas --
Community Use of School Facilities, Advisory Council Roles, Role of School in Community Affairs, Organization of School Boards, and Role of Community in School Affairs, and (3) responses with respect to each survey item.

**Total Attitudinal Score**

Table 1 presents the data with respect to total attitude scores. Mean attitude scores of superintendents were computed for superintendents categorized into the three groups: non-community education districts, less successful community education districts and more successful community education districts.

**Table 1**

*Analysis of Variance of Mean Attitudinal Scores for Total Survey Response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Non CE)</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Less Successful)</td>
<td>10310</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>5.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (More Successful)</td>
<td>108.20</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .01
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As can be seen from Table 1, the analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 5.83 which was significant at the .01 level. Therefore, null hypothesis 1, with respect to total attitude scores was rejected. Further analysis was employed to identify differences between groups. Table 2 presents the data from Tukey's t-test which tested for significance between groups.

TABLE 2

Post Hoc Analysis of Mean Attitudinal Scores for Total Survey Response Using Tukey's T-Test Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Response</td>
<td>-7.10</td>
<td>-12.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .01

As revealed in Table 2, the t-score for differences between groups was significant between groups 1 & 3. Non significant differences were found between groups 1 and 2 and between 2 and 3. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts as compared with those attitudes of superintendents in more successful community education districts. There were no
significant differences between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and less successful community education districts and between more successful and less successful community education districts. Although there was a significant difference only between groups 1 and 3, attitudes scores were linear in nature. Most successful—most positive, less successful — second most positive and non-community education education — least positive. (See Table 1)

Cluster Area Attitudes

Mean attitude scores for superintendents in the three groups were computed for each cluster area. Cluster area 1—Use of School Facilities included item numbers 16, 24, and 26; Cluster area 2—Advisory Council roles — included item numbers 5, 7, 13, 15, 19, 25, and 27. Items 1, 2, 8 and 12 were included in Cluster Area 3, Role of School in Community. Items 17, 22, and 23 were included in Cluster Area 4 — School Board Organizations and Cluster Area 5 — Role of Community in School — included items 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 13, 20, and 21. Analysis of variance was employed to determine significance among the three groups for each cluster area. Table 3 presents that data.
TABLE 3
An Analysis of Variance of Mean Attitude Scores for the Five Cluster Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Area</th>
<th>Group 1 N=41</th>
<th>Group 2 N=10</th>
<th>Group 3 N=10</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>5.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>8.43***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05
** significant at .01
*** significant at .001

As can be seen from Table 3, significant F-ratios were yielded for cluster areas 1, 2 and 5. Therefore, null hypothesis 1, with respect to those cluster areas must be rejected. Null hypothesis 1 cannot be rejected for cluster areas 3 and 4. In order to determine significant differences in cluster areas between groups, further analysis was performed. Table 4 presents the data from the Tukey t-test which tested for significance between groups only when significant F-Ratios were found for differences among the three groups.
**TABLE 4**

Post Hoc Analysis of Mean Attitude Scores for Cluster Areas 1, 2 and 5 Using Tukey's T-Test Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>-5.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05  
** significant at .01  
*** significant at .001

As can be seen in Table 4, in cluster areas 1 and 5 there were significant differences between groups 1 and 2 and 1 and 3. The most positive attitudes were found for group 3; districts ranked as having more successful community education programs. Therefore, it can be interpreted that there is a significant difference between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and less-successful community education districts and significant difference in attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and more successful districts. There was no difference in attitudes of superintendents in more and less successful districts.
In cluster area 2, there were significant differences between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and more successful districts. No significant differences existed between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education and less successful districts or between less successful and more successful districts.

It also should be noted (see Table 3) that where significant differences were revealed, attitude scores were linear in nature in every case. Most positive attitudes - most successful, 2nd most positive - less successful, least positive - non-community education.

Item Attitude Score

Table 5 presents the data from the analysis of variance with respect to responses on each survey item. Mean attitude scores of superintendents were computed for superintendents in the three groups.
TABLE 5
An Analysis of Variance of Mean Attitude Scores for Each Survey Item (N=27) Among Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Non-Comm. Ed. (N=41)</th>
<th>Less Successful (N=10)</th>
<th>More Successful (N=10)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>4.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>4.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>4.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>4.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>5.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>3.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>4.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05
** significant at .01
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As can be seen in Table 5, significant F-Ratios were found for items 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26, and 27. Therefore, null hypothesis 1 with respect to those items must be rejected. Further analysis was undertaken to identify differences between groups. Table 6 presents the data from the Tukey t-test which tested for significance between groups.

### TABLE 6

Post Hoc Analysis of Mean Attitude Scores for Items With Significant F-Ratios Using Tukey's T-Test Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05
** significant at .01
*** significant at .001
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As can be seen in Table 6, there were significant differences for items 3 and 16 between attitudes of superintendents in groups 1 & 2 and no significant difference between groups 1 & 3 and groups 2 & 3. Superintendents in less successful districts possessed the most favorable attitudes with respect to those items. On items 4, 5 and 6, there were significant differences between groups 1 & 2 and between groups 1 & 3 and no significant difference between groups 2 & 3. For items 4 & 5, superintendents in more successful community education districts had the most positive attitudes. On item 6, superintendents in non-community education districts had significantly less positive attitudes than superintendents of more successful and less successful districts. For items 11, 21, and 24, there were significant differences between groups 1 & 3 and no significant difference between groups 1 & 2 and groups 2 & 3. Superintendents in the most successful districts possessed the most positive attitudes. For item 27, there were significant differences between groups 1 & 3 and between groups 2 and 3 and no significant difference between groups 1 & 2. Superintendents in the most successful districts again possessed the most positive attitudes. For items 18 and 26, although there were significant differences among the groups as evidenced in Table 6, there were no significant differences between any two pairs of groups. As can be seen in Table 5, attitudinal scores of superintendents
in more and less successful districts were more positive than in non-community education districts.

Null Hypothesis 2

Null hypothesis 2 was stated previously as follows:

There will be a zero correlation between the rank ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting a community education program, and of the amount of on-site advisory service provided by the MACCE.

In order to test null hypothesis 2, Spearman's rank correlation analysis was employed. The procedure for ranking systems according to success and consultation/advisory time was previously described in Chapter III. Table 7 presents the data from the Spearman rank correlation analysis (Table 7 may be found on page 61).

As can be seen from Table 7, the correlation coefficient of .83 was significant at the .001 level. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was rejected. There is a significant positive relationship between the success rankings of the twenty community education districts and the number of man-hours of consultation.

Null Hypothesis 3

Null hypothesis 3 was stated previously as follows:

There will be no significant differences among the success rankings of those districts having trained community education districts and those having untrained directors.
### TABLE 7

Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis for Relationship Between Rankings of Community Education Programs and Number of Man/Hours Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Success Rank</th>
<th>Man Hours Consultation Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r = .83 - \text{significant at .001} \]

* The rank orderings in terms of man hours of consultation rank does not equal the number of rankings in the Success Rank column because of ties.

In order to test hypothesis 3, the chi-square analysis was employed. As described in Chapter III, community education districts were identified as trained or untrained based upon the training of the community school directors and more or less successful programs. Table 8 presents the...
data from the chi-square analysis in the form of a $2 \times 2$ contingency table classification with the variables of more successful/less successful programs and trained/untrained community education districts as the cell labels.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Successful Programs</th>
<th>Less Successful Programs</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts Having Trained Community Education Directors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts Having Untrained Community Education Directors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 7.74 p .01

As evidenced in Table 8, the chi-square was significant at the .01 level. Therefore, null hypothesis 4 was rejected. Of the fourteen districts which were classified as trained districts, ten were identified as being more successful, while four were identified as being less successful programs. There were no districts identified as being trained districts which were also identified as being less successful programs. Six districts identified as untrained districts were also identified as being less successful programs.
Null Hypothesis 4

Null hypothesis 4 was stated previously as follows:

There will be a zero correlation between the rank-ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting community education programs, and of the rank ordering of districts in terms of the size of their student populations.

In order to test hypothesis 4, Spearman's rank correlation analysis was employed. The procedure for ranking systems according to success and student population was previously described in Chapter III. Table 9 presents the data from the Spearman rank correlation analysis. (Table 9 may be found on page 64.)

As can be seen from Table 9, the correlation coefficient of .32 was not significant. Therefore, null hypothesis 4 cannot be rejected. There is no significant relationship between the success rankings of the twenty community education districts and the size of the student population.

Conclusions and implications which have resulted from the data analysis are presented in Chapter V. Recommendations for further research will also be included.
Spearman Rank Correlation Analysis for Relationships Between Rankings of Community Education Programs and Size of Student Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Student Population Rank</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS

Chapter V (1) summarizes the purposes and design of the study, (2) restates the theoretical hypotheses tested and the results of the analysis of data, (3) discusses possible explanations for the results and (4) indicates some implications for community education development and research.

The Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the characteristics of selected school districts having successful community education programs with school districts considered to have less successful community education programs. The following four variables were investigated: attitudes of superintendents of schools toward community involvement, the presence of trained community education personnel, the number of man-hours of consultation with MACCE and the size of the school districts in terms of student population.

Hypotheses of the Study

The study tested the following theoretical hypotheses:

\[ H_1 \text{ There will be significant differences in the mean attitude scores on the CIAS of superintendents in (a) non-community education districts, (b) less successful community education districts and (c) more successful community education districts.} \]
The mean attitude scores of the superintendents' responses were analyzed by:

1.1 Consideration of total scores on the twenty-seven item CIAS instrument. Data (Table 1) were analyzed by a one factor analysis of variance. As was seen in Chapter IV, the theoretical hypothesis, with respect to total attitude scores, was accepted. A Tukey's $t$-test was utilized to test for significance between groups. Significant differences were found between the attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and attitudes of superintendents in more successful community education districts. Attitude scores were also linear in nature: most successful-most positive, less successful-less positive and non-community education - least positive.

1.2 Consideration of scores for items clustered according to content areas. Five clusters were utilized and observed differences were found to be sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis for cluster 1 (use of school facilities), cluster 2 (Advisory Council Roles) and cluster 5 (Role of Community in School). A Tukey's $t$-test was again utilized to test for significance between groups. For clusters 1 and 5, significant differences were found between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education and less successful community education districts and in attitudes of superintendents in non-community districts and more successful community education districts. For cluster
area 2, there were significant differences between attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and more successful districts.

1.3 Consideration of scores on each of the twenty-seven CIAS 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 superintendents were not sufficiently large to support the theoretical hypothesis in the case of sixteen items. However, in the case of eleven items (3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26, and 27) differences between the mean scores of the groups of opinion leaders were found to be statistically significant ($P > .05$).

In summary, considerable support was found for the first theoretical hypothesis.

$H_2$ There will be a positive correlation between the rank ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting a community education program, and of the amount of on-site advisory service provided by MACCE.

This theoretical hypothesis was tested by a Spearman's rank correlation analysis. The coefficient of .83 was significant at the .001 level, thus supporting the theoretical hypothesis. There was a significant positive relationship between the success rankings of the twenty community education districts and the number of man hours of consultation with MACCE.
There will be significant differences among the success rankings of those districts having trained community education directors and those having untrained directors.

This theoretical hypothesis was tested by a chi-square analysis for independence of contingency table classifications. The chi-square was significant at the .01 level, thus supporting the theoretical hypothesis. Districts identified as having trained community education directors were more successful in developing and implementing community education programs.

There will be a positive correlation between the rank ordering of school districts in terms of their success in implementing and conducting community education programs and of the rank ordering of districts in terms of the size of the student population.

This theoretical hypothesis was tested by a Spearman's rank correlation analysis. The coefficient of .32 was not significant, therefore, rejecting the theoretical hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the success rankings of the community education districts and the size of the student population.

Discussion of Findings

Attitudes of Superintendents Toward Community Involvement

The results of this study indicated that the attitude of the superintendent of schools toward community involvement was an important factor in successful community education development. In the analysis of the total instrument,
a significant difference was found between the attitudes of superintendents in non-community education districts and in more successful districts, with the latter being more positive towards community involvement.

This finding is consistent with the position taken by community education writers and leading community education practitioners. All have consistently advocated the need for early commitment and support on the part of the superintendent for successful community education development. In addition, they have indicated the commitment needs to be based upon an understanding and strong appreciation of the underlying philosophies and components of community education, such as community involvement.

An analysis of attitudes between groups in several of the cluster areas offered interesting insights into superintendents' attitudes toward certain aspects of community involvement. Regarding attitudes toward community use of school facilities and the role of the community in school affairs, significant differences were found between superintendents in non-community education districts and superintendents in less successful community education districts. Similar attitudinal differences were also found between superintendents in non-community education districts and superintendents in more successful community education districts. Community education authors stressed the importance to community education development of the superintendents'
willingness to allow the community greater access to school facilities. They felt such access is essential to program development and is an important phase in successful community education development. Analysis of the data showing a more positive attitude toward community use of schools by superintendents of community education districts supported the views expressed in the literature.

Likewise, the community education philosophy mandates a greater role for the community in school affairs. Items in cluster 5 measured a variety of attitudes in this area ranging from the role of the citizenry in hiring of staff to the roles and values of community volunteers. According to leading community education authors (Minzey and LeTarte, 1972) community members should and must play an extended role in school affairs if community education is to reach its full potential. Thus, the results indicating a more positive attitude toward community involvement by superintendents in districts operating community education reinforce the writings of leading authorities.

Somewhat surprising is the fact that significant differences were not found in attitudes between superintendents in less successful and more successful districts in the areas of community use of facilities and role of community in school affairs. However, the scores were linear in nature, suggesting that although statistically the differences were not significant, there is a difference in the degree of
favorableness. The above results seem to indicate that while the superintendent's support is a crucial factor in determining whether or not there will be a community education program, it is not a factor in determining the success of a program once it is in operation.

The literature pointed out that numerous superintendents view the traditional educational program as being separate from the community education program. Such opinions can be found among superintendents operating community education programs. Many of the items for cluster area 5 dealt with the role of the community in the traditional school program. The results showed that in responding to these items on the CIAS, the respondents did not view them as being related to successful community education development, thus accounting for the relatively negative attitudes of superintendents in both successful and less successful community education districts.

Cluster area 2 (Advisory Council Roles) indicated a significant difference in attitudes between superintendents of non-community education districts and superintendents of more successful community education districts. The superintendents in the more successful districts were more in favor of community advisory councils. This finding supports the community education authors cited in Chapter 2 who emphasized the important roles of community school advisory councils. Minzey (1972) noted the "process" component of
community education cannot be achieved without meaningful councils. Kerensky (1971) emphasized the need for active community involvement, thus mandating the development of community school advisory councils.

Analysis of data for cluster area 3 (Role of School in Community) and 4 (School Board Organization) resulted in the rejection of the theoretical hypothesis for these areas. Thus, these cluster areas cannot be viewed as determining factors for successful community education development. Such findings are surprising in light of the review of literature in Chapter 2. Authors such as Minzey (1972) had suggested the importance of these factors in successful community education development. However, several authors have compared the influence of superintendents and school boards in the development of educational innovations. They have concluded that, in most cases, the superintendent plays a far greater role than school board members in this area. For example, Miles (1967) claimed, "The superintendent may well be the source of influence on all but gross matters." Thus, conceivably too much emphasis has been placed on the role of school boards in the development of community education. Perhaps the superintendents in this study shared this point of view and reflected it in their responses regarding school board organization.

The item by item analysis did not indicate or reveal any significant findings that have not already been dis-
cussed above. The primary purpose for analyzing the item by item responses to the CIAS instrument was to determine those that did result in significant differences. Significant F-Ratios were found for items 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26, and 27. They are presented in Appendix J and are discussed later in this chapter.

Advisory Service Provided by MACCE

Analysis of the data indicated a significant positive relationship between the success rankings of the twenty community education districts and the number of man hours of consultation with MACCE. Thus, the amount of consultation was found to be a factor in determining successful community education development. This result supported the literature. Watson (1967) and Lippitt (1967) were two authors citing the importance of outside consultation for successful adoption of innovations. Both felt that outside change agents such as resource consultants play an invaluable role and enhance the chances for successful innovation. Similar views were expressed by such community education writers as Totten (1970) and Minzey (1972). Weaver (1974) specifically cited the importance of Regional Community Education Centers as outside consultants in the successful development of community education.

To the best knowledge of this writer, the present study was the first to support the positive relationship between successful community education development and the number
of man hours of consultation with a Regional Center for Community Education. The implications of this finding will be discussed later in this chapter.

Student Populations of School Districts

Although theoretical support for the fourth hypothesis could be found from authors in the area of change, very few community education writers commented on the relationship between size and successful community education development. Such a void was somewhat surprising in view of the fact that a majority of the community education programs have developed in districts with K-12 enrollments of 15,000 or less.

The first analysis of the data indicated that size of a school district in terms of student population is not a determining factor of successful community education development. The most successful community education district was the third largest school district in the study.

Although this finding is surprising, it is, nevertheless, understandable. Superintendents even in relatively large school districts are usually very much involved in the initiation and development of community education in their districts. They frequently remain involved after the program is initiated. First, they know it is a program that has appeal to the community and thus has the potential for improving the school's public image. And, secondly, Regional Community Education Centers attempt to continually
involve superintendents in in-service and regional meetings, thus, maintaining their interest and support of the program. Third, supportive superintendents can remove administrative roadblocks to effective community education development that might be present in larger school districts. Layers of bureaucratic organizations are often by-passed by making the community education personnel directly responsible to the superintendent or assistant superintendent, thus negating size as a determining factor of success.

Trained Community Education Directors

The data clearly indicated that trained community education directors are essential for successful community education development. Significantly, the ten school districts identified as being more successful in community education development all employed trained community education directors. And six of the districts with less successful programs employed untrained directors.

Every new field, such as community education, has its own concepts, philosophies and techniques. It logically follows that individuals, desiring to be successful in its implementation, would receive training in these areas. Strong support for this assumption was provided in Chapter II by leading authorities in community education. The findings in this area strongly substantiate the author's theoretical position.
Implications for Community Education Development

The results of this study have the following implications for future community education development.

Implication 1

The support of the superintendent is a critical factor in successful community education development. Center personnel must accurately assess the superintendent's attitudes toward community education and community involvement prior to initiating the program. If the superintendent's attitudes are found to be negative, it is doubtful that MACCE or any other Center should commit its financial and human resources to development of community education in that school district until the superintendent's support can be assured. Initially, efforts of the regional center staff may need to be concentrated on securing the support of the superintendent for the changes implied in the adoption of community education in the district.

Implication 2

Because the data showed that size apparently is not a determinant of successful community education development, MACCE and other community education centers should not be reluctant to work with larger school districts (15,000 and over student populations). The results of this study indicate that receiving a firm commitment from the district's
superintendent and maintaining his support is a prime determinant of success regardless of the size of the district.

Implication 3

This study demonstrated clearly the need for school districts to employ trained community education directors or to provide training programs and opportunities shortly after employment begins. Continued in-service programs also need to be instituted as a part of any long range training program.

Unfortunately numerous school districts throughout the country attempt to initiate community education with untrained community education directors. Hopefully, the results of this study can be utilized as additional support for those individuals attempting to convince superintendents of the errors of such a practice.

The findings also support the need for Regional Centers for Community Education development to continue to provide training programs throughout their regions and to consider training as a priority function. Because of the rapid growth in the number of school districts implementing community education, the development of graduate programs and advanced degree programs in community education would appear to be of critical importance in the years immediately ahead if the need for trained personnel is to be met.
Implication 4

Providing training opportunities for community education directors must be a top priority for MACCE. Workshops and seminars conducted at various sites throughout the region should be increased. The importance of offering training programs in strategic locations throughout the region cannot be overemphasized. A majority of the districts in this study identified as having untrained directors were geographically removed from existing training programs.

Implication 5

The number of man hours of consultation provided by MACCE was a determining factor in success of community education programs. Thus, consultation should continue to be an operational priority of the Center. Because each of the other regional community education centers perform identical roles to those of MACCE in providing consultation to districts in the area, it appears that a similar conclusion can be drawn for the operation of other regional centers.

In the near future, MACCE should increase consultative services to those school systems identified in this study as being less successful in their efforts to develop community education. At the same time, the more successful districts should continue to receive consultative services.
as there is a continual need for in-service training and consultative help in even the more successful school districts.

**Implication 6**

MACCE needs to analyze and evaluate the quality of the community education programs within its region. The evaluative procedures used in this study could be utilized to collect the desired data. Based upon the results of the study, MACCE operational priorities could be evaluated and, if needed, appropriately modified.

**Implications for Future Research**

**Implication 1**

The analysis of data indicated that the items listed in Appendix J effectively measured the superintendents' attitudes toward certain components of community involvement. Accordingly, items in Appendix J can be considered to be discriminatory in nature and could be utilized as the beginnings of a new instrument for measuring attitudes toward community involvement. The findings in this study seem to justify further research in this area and the development of a new community involvement instrument.
Implication 2

Consideration should be given to broadening the empirical base of this study by including the following new dimensions.

A longitudinal study measuring the effect of the variables under investigation in this study over a period of time would be useful. Perhaps, the results would be different at the end of a two year period. For example, man hours of consultation with MACCE might not continue to be a determining factor of success for a school district over a period of several years. A longitudinal study could easily be conducted at a regional community education center as such centers have a continuing relationship with school districts in the region.

Replication of the present study in several geographic sections of the country would also be useful. Regional attitudes, customs and traditions could conceivably alter the findings of this study. For example, certain geographic areas have traditionally resented the intrusion of outsiders into local affairs. Outside consultants such as staff members of a regional community education center might have difficulty working effectively in these areas.

Additional variables could also be included in further study. Many community educators believe the attitude of the community school principal is just as important to success-
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ful development as that of the superintendent of schools. Thus, the principals' attitude toward community involvement could well be the subject of further investigation.

Other variables that would have meaning are the attitudes of the teachers toward community education, the amount of money expended for the program in a school district, the attitudes of other agencies toward community education and the attitudes of formal and informal leadership in a local school community toward community education.

In conclusion, all of the above mentioned items could significantly broaden the empirical base of this study without changing its design or methodology.
APPENDIX A

Suggested Goals and Objectives
For Community Education
GOAL I - To develop and implement a sound Community Education program in Community School areas.

A-1. Develop a balanced program for neighborhood areas as suggested by people through surveys, observation and staff input, organizing specific programs in the following areas:

a. Education
   1. Enrichment classes
   2. Drug education
   3. Safety education
   4. Health education
   5. Pre-school and early childhood experiences
   6. Teen-age and young adult activities
   7. Physical education and fitness opportunities
   8. Family life education
   9. Senior citizens' opportunities
  10. Adult opportunities
  11. Cultural affairs and fine arts
  12. Vocational and business education

b. Recreation
   1. Provide recreation programs in cooperation with the City Park & Recreation Department and assist them in providing a broader based service.
2. Provide other recreational programs requested by individual neighborhood councils or by observations in order to meet needs that are different than the traditional activities; e.g., after-school child care programs, hobbycraft programs, chess, photography, ceramics, wood, intramurals, etc.

c. Cultural and Civic Affairs

1. Provide facilities and resources for civic action groups in individual Community School areas and provide more cultural inputs.

d. Social Services

1. Engage in cooperative efforts with other social service institutions for improving social services.

e. Neighborhood Concerns

1. Help develop communications between local neighborhoods and their city-county government and school district through such means as a regularly published newsletter to neighborhood residents and periodic town hall type meetings.

2. Develop a strong Community Education Advisory Council for relaying neighborhood concerns and for developing neighborhood leadership.
3. Assist residents in improving the quality of their neighborhoods and assist in community development.

A-2. Provide a balanced program for all ages and interests, specifically, pre-school youth and their parents, elementary age, junior and senior high age, adult and Senior Citizens.

A-3. Increase the school facility and building usage by opening them more hours and by acting as a catalyst to bring more neighborhood groups to use local resources.

A-4. Organize and strengthen the neighborhood Community Education Advisory Councils and ensure a cross section of people including youth, young adults, adults with children in school and out of school, Senior Citizens and representatives from various social service agencies in local school geographic locations.

A-5. Establish a plan of action for a district-wide Community Education Advisory Council or policy committee which meets on a regular basis.

A-6. Establish a fee and charge structure and procedure for classes and program areas.

A-7. Cooperatively involve business and industry, churches, city and county governments, community relations advisory committees, pre-school associations and
other related educational and social and youth-serving institutions in the Community Education program.

A-8. Carry out the Community Education program on a year-round basis, with the emphasis on better neighborhood identification and local problem solving.

A-9. Provide locations in Community Education schools, municipal or other public and private facilities, to meet on a daily basis to pursue leisure-time activities, adult education classes and social service benefits.

GOAL II To improve communications within the community and define Community Education to the people.

B-1. Conduct informational meetings for the administrative and teaching staffs, custodians and other educational personnel.

B-2. Communicate adequately with the school and cooperating organizations and agencies and personnel.
   a) Participate in administration staff meetings.
   b) Follow up any suggestions or recommendations by staff members and community personnel.

B-3. Conduct Community Education evaluation meetings with the individual principals and neighborhood advisory councils of the Community Schools.
B-4. Encourage and conduct visitations for PTA leaders and other interested residents from non-Community School areas to improve their understanding of Community School concepts and the future potential in their local school area.

B-5. Make presentations to service groups and organizations in local area and surrounding communities.

B-6. Increase the financial commitment from private foundations and local individuals by encouraging philanthropic giving to either the general Community Education program or special programs.

B-7. Develop and distribute a quarterly or regularly scheduled Community Education Program booklet or publication to be mailed to all residents of the School District.

B-8. Develop and distribute a bi-monthly newsletter to all local residents of each Community School Attendance area.

B-9. Develop appropriate communications materials:
   a) Special brochures on programs such as Adult High School, Adult Basic Education, Senior Citizens, General Educational Development, Child Care, School Volunteers and Community Resources or other special projects.
   b) Mailable informational packet for responding to inquiries.
c) Slide presentation and visual displays.

B-10. Develop a library and resource center of Community Education materials for staff and community use.

B-11. Involve the local newspaper, radio and television stations in publicity by providing news releases and features on a regular basis.

GOAL III To develop long range plans of operation and evaluation of Community Education.

C-1. Assist the Community Education Advisory Committee and neighborhood councils in assessing the impact of Community Education programs and work with other citizens in developing and expanding programs and processes of Community Education.

C-2. Prepare plans for Community Education in the School District, including projected financial requirements, number of Community Schools, staffing patterns, and guidelines on program development.

C-3. Submit a quarterly program evaluation report of the Community Education program to Advisory Committees, Councils, Board of Education and other significant groups.

C-4. Prepare an annual document outlining the accomplishments and participation in Community Education.

C-5. Establish operational guidelines and procedures for personnel practices, including a classification and salary plan and a regulation on building use.
C-6. Prepare the procedure Community Education staff performance standards and criteria for assessment.

C-7. Submit required program evaluation reports to fulfill requirements of grants-in-aid, such as the Older American Program, Adult Basic Education, General Educational Development, Adult High School, and Child Care Program.
APPENDIX B

Letter to Superintendents Included in Pilot Study
Dear:

I am currently working on my dissertation to fulfill the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education through Western Michigan University. The purpose of this letter is to request your help in pre-testing my survey instrument.

My study deals with variables that might have an impact on the development of community education in a school system. One variable is the attitude of the superintendent of schools toward community involvement.

The instrument is attempting to assess a superintendent's attitudes about various forms of community involvement: councils, community use of facilities, citizen roles in determining curriculum and selecting personnel, and openness of school board meetings.

A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed. Would you be willing to fill it out? It also would be extremely helpful if you would jot down any comments you might have about the questions asked. Were there any questions which you felt did not really measure the desired attitudes? If so, please indicate as such feedback will be extremely useful.

If I may, I would like to talk with you for several minutes on the telephone after you have returned the instrument.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Tremper
Associate Director
APPENDIX C

Community Involvement Attitudinal Survey Instrument
University of Virginia
Mid-Atlantic Center
Community Involvement Attitudinal Survey

Instructions: The following statements are designed to gather opinions regarding the role of the citizenry in public education. To each of the statements, indicate your perception of the role the public should play in your school system by checking in the appropriate blank as follows:

SA (Strongly Agree) A (Agree) N (Neutral) D (Disagree) SD (Strongly Agree)

Individuals or school systems will not be identified in the reporting of information from this survey.

1) Schools of the future should be more involved in delivering social services to the community.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

2) Teachers should be required to visit the homes of their students.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

3) Parents should be encouraged to visit the classrooms of their children.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

4) The community should not be involved in the development and determination of the curriculum.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

5) The involvement of community advisory councils need not be limited to the planning and development of those activities which take place after regular school hours.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

6) Attitudinal and issue oriented community surveys should be utilized in developing educational programs.

SA______ A______ N______ D______ SD______

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
7) The membership of community school advisory councils should be selected so as to insure representation of various segments of the community.

8) One of the weaknesses of school systems is the failure of school personnel to work effectively with other agencies and institutions in the community.

9) Volunteers are of limited value in public schools.

10) Special interest groups create difficulties for schools in any attempts at involving the community in school affairs.

11) Parents should be a part of the committees screening prospective principals and teachers.

12) Home and community environments may be more important determinants of academic achievement than school environment.

13) Superintendents need to develop system wide community advisory councils.

14) A danger of involving the community in the schools is that ultimately they will want to control them.

15) The use of community advisory councils is not essential for a successful school program.
16) Policies regarding "Use of School Facilities" should include provisions for maximizing the community use of school facilities.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

17) Local school boards should permit citizens to express their opinions at board meetings.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

18) Educational decision making should be as decentralized as is possible.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

19) Members of the community should be encouraged to serve as chairmen of community advisory councils.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

20) Community members in addition to parents should be more involved in school affairs.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

21) As lay citizens, parents should have very little to say about what is taught in the schools.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

22) Local school board members should be elected rather than appointed.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

23) All business of local school boards, excluding personnel and land purchase deliberations, should be discussed in public meetings.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____

24) School administrators should take the initiative to encourage individuals and groups to make use of school facilities after regular school hours.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____
25) Community advisory councils should be developed at each school.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____ 

26) School buildings should be available for community use during the school day when such use does not interfere with the basic educational program of the school.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____ 

27) The most effective educational policies are those that involve all segments of the community in their planning.

SA_____ A_____ N_____ D_____ SD_____ 

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Paul W. Tremper
Associate Director
Mid-Atlantic Center
School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
(804) 924-3625
APPENDIX D

Letter to Superintendents
Community Education Districts
May 5, 1974

Dear

We appreciate the support and assistance we have received in the past from you as a superintendent of a school system with community education within the Mid-Atlantic Region. Once again we need your help.

Paul Tremper, Associate Director of the Mid-Atlantic Center, is currently conducting a study of several factors associated with the implementation of community education within a school system.

Enclosed is the questionnaire designed to measure your feelings about certain aspects of community involvement. We have kept the questionnaire short to permit you to complete it in less than ten minutes. Your responses to the questions will be of great assistance to the Mid-Atlantic Center in the years ahead. Your cooperation in promptly filling out the enclosed form and returning it at once will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed. Systems and superintendents will not be identified in the reporting of the data.

A copy of the results of the study will be provided upon request.

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Decker
Director

Enclosure

/nm
APPENDIX E

Letter to Superintendents of Non-Community Education Districts
May 5, 1974

Dear

The University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education is in the process of conducting a study related to assessing Superintendents feelings about aspects of community involvement. We would like your help by completing a questionnaire which will take less than ten minutes. Your cooperation in promptly filling out the enclosed questionnaire and returning in the attached self-addressed, stamped envelope will be appreciated. System and Superintendent will not be identified in the reporting of the data.

The Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education serves as the regional Center for Community Education Development in the states of Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and the District of Columbia. For your information, also attached is a brochure describing the functions and services of the Center. If we can be of assistance, please contact us.

A copy of the results of the study will be provided to you upon request.

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Decker
Director

Enclosure

/nm
APPENDIX F

Follow-up Letter to Non-Responding Superintendents
Dear:

Attached is a copy of the questionnaire mailed to you on May 5, 1974. Although the response from school superintendents has been good, we need your response to make the study meaningful to the Mid-Atlantic Center.

The study concerns itself with the investigation of several factors associated with the implementation of community education within a school system. We feel it has great implications for community education development in your geographic area in the years ahead.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed with the questionnaire. We have kept the instrument short allowing you to finish it within ten minutes. Systems and superintendents will not be identified in the reporting of the data.

A copy of the results of the study will be provided upon request. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Decker
Director

Enclosures
APPENDIX G

Rankings of School Districts by Dr. Larry E. Decker
May 1, 1974

Mr. Paul Tremper
Associate Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
School of Education, University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Dear Paul:

Enclosed are my rankings of the twenty school districts operating community education within the Mid-Atlantic Region. I used the eleven criteria and supporting data that you provided.

I understand that individual districts are not to be identified. I have utilized the coding system that you provided.

1. nn 11. jx
2. av 12. uv
3. ny 13. sx
4. xo 14. ws
5. df 15. tq
6. tx 16. nc
7. cd 17. ov
8. nb 18. sb
9. lm 19. qa
10. ts 20. pn

Sincerely,

Larry E. Decker
Director

LED/lac
APPENDIX H

Rankings of School Districts by Dr. Robert Fossard
March 9, 1974
Mr. Paul Tremper, Associate Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
School of Education, University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Dear Paul:

As former Director of the Mid-Atlantic Center, you have asked that I rank, in terms of success, the twenty districts operating community education programs within your region. I have completed that process utilizing the eleven criteria you provided as well as the accompanying data. The districts falling in the upper half of the ranking I understand are to be considered "more successful" and those falling in the lower half, "less successful."

As agreed, the names of the districts are to remain anonymous. To that end I have utilized your coding system.

Looking forward to meeting with Dr. Decker in the near future to develop a consensus ranking.

1. ny 11. sx
2. nn 12. uv
3. av 13. jx
4. to 14. nc
5. cd 15. tq
6. df 16. ws
7. tx 17. ou
8. nb 18. qa
9. lm 19. sb
10. ts 20. pn

Sincerely,

Robert Frossard
Past Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
APPENDIX I

Consensus Ranking of School Districts
June 13, 1974

Mr. Paul Tremper  
Associate Director  
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education  
School of Education, University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dear Paul:

Bob Frossard and I have met and developed a consensus ranking of the twenty community education school districts. Our rankings are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>nn</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>jx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>xo</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>sx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>av</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>uv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>ws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ad</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>nc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>nb</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>tg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>tx</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>lm</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>qa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>pn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Larry E. Decker  
Director

Robert Frossard  
Former Director

* The author has inserted the letter coding to conform to the coding used in the tables that are presented in Chapter 4.
APPENDIX J

Items on CIAS Instrument That Resulted in Significant Differences
Items on CIAS Instrument That Resulted In Significant Differences

1. Parents should be encouraged to visit the classrooms of their children.

2. The community should not be involved in the development and determination of the curriculum.

3. The involvement of community advisory councils need not be limited to the planning and development of those activities which take place after regular school hours.

4. Attitudinal and issue oriented community surveys should be utilized in developing educational programs.

5. Parents should be a part of the committees screening prospective principals and teachers.

6. Policies regarding "Use of School Facilities" should include provisions for maximizing the community use of school facilities.

7. Educational decision making should be as decentralized as is possible.

8. As lay citizens, parents should have very little to say about what is taught in the schools.

9. School administrators should take the initiative to encourage individuals and groups to make use of school facilities after regular school hours.

10. School buildings should be available for community use during the school day when such use does not interfere with the basic educational program of the school.

11. The most effective educational policies are those that involve all segments of the community in their planning.
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