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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The public two-year college, from its very inception, has been a unique educational genre in America. The institution has assumed the responsibility for providing to all people sufficient knowledge to lead self-actualizing lives in a democratic society. Acting on the premise that a college's responsibility could best be fulfilled by integration with the community, the institution became increasingly aware of occurrences in all segments of the society. Furthermore, the college sought to help shape the character of its community.

The goal remained constant throughout the development of the American community college system. Yet, fulfillment has not been realized. By day, classrooms were filled mainly with young people bent on pre-baccalaureate or career studies. The lights burned late serving adults. Until the last twenty-five years, however, the ideal of serving all segments of the community remained unfulfilled. Even to this day, not all community colleges are what the name implies.

Two-year colleges were first established in American as junior colleges—colleges designed to offer two
years of instruction acceptable to universities. According to Thornton, Professor of Education, San Jose State College, this university-parallel education remained the primary emphasis of junior colleges from the development of the junior college idea in 1850 until 1920. Thereafter, career-oriented programs assumed increasing importance, until by 1945 they had replaced transfer education on the forefront of junior college development.\(^1\) The addition of occupational curricula broadened the scope of the college but did not fulfill its chosen mission. The birth of the community services concept around 1945 initiated a third stage of development which brought the institution within reach of its goal.

The community services concept grew out of a recognition that there was a clientele yet to be served if the college were to be truly a "community" institution. The idea received its first nationwide acceptance as an integral part of the community college in 1956. Reynolds,\(^3\) community college leadership program


\(^2\)Thornton, Jr., loc. cit., pp. 51-53.

director, University of Texas, in his essay for that year's National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook stated that the institution "looked beyond its classrooms and campus and found educational needs in the community of which it is an integral part. The attempt to satisfy these needs has led to the development of community services."

The study being reported here sought to assess the degree to which community services has diffused from educational theory into actual community college programs. It is concerned with community services in its broadest connotation including career development, personal counseling, social outreach, community analysis, advisory and liaison functions. The study seeks not only to identify the current status of programs, but to account for that status. The need for the study and procedures are detailed below.

Need

Since the late fifties, comment on the idea of community services has increasingly reoccurred in literature about the community college. In many cases, authors laud specific practices in particular institutions and then attempt, rather vaguely, to generalize about community colleges as a whole. Yet, no general

---

empirical study seeking to determine the extent of diffusion of the community services concept from theory into practice exists.

The theoretical development of the concept has received considerable emphasis, especially in recent years. One of the most recent theorists is Johnson,^5 Director, community college leadership program, UCLA. Reporting on his nation-wide survey of change in the community college, he reiterates Thornton's stages of development and adds a value judgment: "It is the considered judgment of this author that the most important junior college development of the past 25 years has been the emergence of the concept of the public junior college as a community college." Later, he becomes more specific about the transition:

> The development of the junior college as a community college is dependent in large degree upon the extent to which its programs serve community needs and utilize community resources as an aid to program development and operation.6

In essence, he supports the position taken by Reynolds

---


6loc. cit., p. 318.
and assesses the emergence of community services as central to community college development.

Johnson is supported by other authors who focus more specifically on the future of community services. Myran,\(^7\) Associate Professor, Kellogg Community Services leadership program, MSU, agrees with him that "community services have emerged as an identifiable component of the community college . . . in the decade of the 1960's." He explains the development of the concept by suggesting that the major problems found in our society—"technology, race, poverty, and urbanization"—have mandated the college to broaden its mission to help develop human resources in the community. He sees the expanded mission reflected in the college on two levels. "Service to the community is increasingly an orientation of the community college as a whole, and the division of community services within the college is growing rapidly in terms of staff and scope of service."\(^8\) Johnson and Myran present cogent reasons for making community services the new focal point of institutional development.

Studies suggest that the trend will continue. The decade of the 1970's has been identified as the one in


\(^8\)ibid.
which community colleges will move toward the initiation and expansion of community services programs. Myran says "it now appears that community services is erupting as the major thrust in program development for the 1970's." Yet, the extent to which the transition is more than merely semantic remains uncertain. Recently, several authors have asked whether the theoretical ideal can be empirically validated. While not challenging the worth of community services as a goal, they question the extent of its diffusion. Cohen, Assistant Professor, Community College Teacher Education, UCLA, analyzes the development of community services which Reynolds presents as an accomplished fact. Community services, Cohen says, stemmed from an idea that everyone connected with the community college would search out educational gaps and seek to fill them. They would survey the community's desires, build responsible programs and generally upgrade the districts in which they were located. Cohen believes that the extent to which this personal involvement has happened is open to question: "Do [community services programs] actually serve the segments of society which are most in need of being served?" He suggests that the current

9ibid.

focus on means rather than on ends and the disregard for built-in evaluation procedures make this question difficult to answer. He goes on to state that, in a sense, it is difficult to demonstrate the worth of most community services except as public relations endeavors. Cohen concludes with a succinct summary of the position taken by those who view community services as an ideal yet to be realized:

If the colleges continue merely to provide space for hobby courses, the community's performing groups, and miscellaneous workshops, institutes and conferences--listed as "community services" mainly because they are allowed to be held on the campus--then the worth of community-service programs is in doubt.\textsuperscript{11}

Purpose

Much of what has been written concerning community services must be viewed as subjective opinion. Few, if any, of these studies to date have been undertaken to determine how thoroughly community services has permeated existing community colleges. Those who have studied community services begin with the premise that only those institutions with active, functional programs will be examined.\textsuperscript{12} While the data gathered

\textsuperscript{11}Cohen, loc. cit., p. 139.

\textsuperscript{12}Myran, op. cit., p. 4. Max R. Raines, \textit{A Community Services Inventory for Community Colleges} (East Lansing, Michigan: Kellogg Community Services Leadership Program, Michigan State University, 1969).
by these studies were valuable in establishing norms for community services programs, it is equally necessary to determine to what degree the community services concept has diffused from the general literature and been put into practice by community colleges. In effect, how nearly has the community college realized its ideal of becoming a community catalyst?

A premise of this study is that it would be useful for one to be able to identify and assess the status of those variables which affect the implementation of a comprehensive community services program. The norms established by the existing selective studies would be useful in identifying those variables which need to be assessed.

This study, then, will investigate the scope of community services programming in a given population—Michigan Public Community Colleges—and identify the degree to which selected variables affect the implementation of a comprehensive community services program.

Theory

Several writers have attempted to develop heuristic instruments which would provide guidelines for implementing or expanding community services programs. If such instruments are well-designed, they should be useful in measuring the scope of programming* in Michigan Public Community Colleges. The three most promising instruments are those offered by Distasio, Raines, and Harlacher. It is necessary to evaluate each of these instruments to determine whether any of them are sufficiently reliable for the purposes of this study, and if so, which is the most useful.

The instrument proposed by Distasio reflects the general theme which underlies the community services concept:

A junior college becomes a community college . . . only when it reaches the point where it can work with the community in jointly developing and adapting programs to the specific needs of human beings and the business and service agencies in the geography area surrounding it.13

The author goes on to suggest that the most effective way for the college to achieve a working relationship with its community is through the establishment of a

*Throughout the study this concept will be used to designate the extent and dimensions of the program planning being examined.

13Distasio, loc. cit., p. 2.
community services department which is a separate and
distinct component of the college—serving as a
"catalyst" or as "the conscience" of the institution.

Distasio's proposed format, a Center for Community
Development, is based on five principal objectives:

(1) to determine the extent to which existing
credit and non-credit programs in continuing
education and other community oriented projects
are effective. (2) to extend the benefits of
existing programs to more people. (3) to create
a "laboratory" setting wherein experimental
programs may be carefully monitored to provide
objective data before recommending institutional
change. (4) to improve our systems of employer--
college feedback, of citizen--college feedback
so that the creation of new jobs and new
educational programs may be responsive to the
real needs of both the community and employer.
(5) to develop an organization structure and
administrative procedure for the implementation
of the concept of an experimental unit within
an institution.

The center is described as a physically removed entity
which would house all community services programs.
While there, they would be constantly under development.
Programs would remain only until they became operational;
successful ones would become part of the regular college
while those which did not work would not be recommended
for wide-spread adoption.\footnote{Distasio, loc. cit., p. 4.}

While these objectives and the model based upon
them have a theoretical validity, they are vulnerable
when empirical assessment is sought. Only one application

\footnote{Distasio, loc. cit., p. 4.}
of the model is reported with no evidence available that a pilot experiment was conducted to test for functionality. The objectives were simply devised. No attempt to elicit an evaluation of them by practitioners before their implementation is reported. Therefore, while the model is attractive, as a criterion measure for community services scope of programming it is limited in applicability.

A second instrument for assessing community services scope of programming, developed by Raines, Director, Community Services Leadership program, MSU, is a taxonomy of community services functions. Its strong point is flexibility. The instrument provides for the addition, deletion or change of taxons as the concept of community services evolves. It has a tri-partite organizational structure:

I. **Self-Development Functions**—Those functions and activities of the college primarily focused upon the needs, aspirations, and potentialities of individuals or informal groups of individuals to help them achieve a greater degree of personal self-realization and fulfillment. II. **Community Development Functions**—Those functions and activities of the college primarily focused upon cooperative efforts with community organizations, agencies and institutions to improve the physical, social, economic, and political environment of the community (e.g., housing, transportation, air pollution, human relations, public safety, etc.). III. **Program Development Functions**—Those functions and activities of the community services staff designed to procure and allocate resources, coordinate activities, establish objectives and evaluate outcomes.15

---
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Each of the major dimensions is divided into six sub-headings.

In general, this model is less attractive for assessing scope than the preceding one. The taxonomy was developed by a research task force at Michigan State University. No pilot evaluation to establish validity was reported. The instrument was adapted to a Community Services Inventory questionnaire in 1969. No report of the findings of the questionnaire has been released. Subjectively, the eighteen sub-categories seem ambiguous and overlapping. The instrument, therefore, would at best yield ambiguous results were an attempt made to use it as a criterion measure for community services scope of programming.

The final instrument to be discussed is a Check List for Effective Programs of Community Services prepared by Harlacher, President, Brookdale Community College, New Jersey. It is based upon the Critical Incident Technique which emphasizes the discovery of those behavioral requirements which are critical in the sense that "significant numbers of knowledgeable individuals have observed them to be crucial factors in the achievement of the objectives of a job or activity."16

The Check List is composed of forty critical incidents grouped under three major headings: I. Securing community-college support. II. Determining the nature and scope of programming. III. Organizing and administering program.\textsuperscript{17}

The Check List was developed via an empirical survey; it was validated by a broad administration to practitioners in the field, and was subsequently re-administered as part of another project at a later date. In each case revisions of the instrument were made in accordance with practitioner feedback.\textsuperscript{18} In the opinion of this writer, of the available criterion measures, Harlacher's Check List has the highest degree of empirical validity and seems well suited to the measurement of scope of programming.

For the purposes of this study, Harlacher's Check List was adapted to questionnaire form, a pilot test was conducted, indicated revisions made, and the general administration undertaken.


General Statement

For the purposes of this study no specific definition of community services will be presented now. Instead, the forty critical incidents will be used as components for the concept. Any definition would create a perceptual screen distorting the validity of the practitioner's response to the questionnaire. As part of the conclusion of the study a definition, as drawn from practitioners' responses, is formulated.

Overview of the Study

In Chapter II selected pertinent community services literature is reviewed. It includes (1) the Harlacher studies, (2) studies on presidential attitude as it relates to program development and (3) studies of institutional variables which influence program development. Implications of these studies are discussed.

In Chapter III, the research design is outlined. The sample, the experimental procedure, the instrumentation, the data collection procedures, and the statistical model are discussed.

In Chapter IV, the analysis and interpretation of the results of the study are developed.

In Chapter V, the conclusions and recommendations of the study are presented.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature is essentially tripartite. First, the Harlacher studies are examined to determine the developmental scheme of the Check List. Second, studies on personal variables are reviewed to assess their role in program development. Finally, other studies which deal with institutional variables as they affect program development are examined. In each case, implications of the studies are discussed.

The Harlacher Studies

When Harlacher began exploring the newly emergent concept of community services, little had been done to establish guidelines for a community services program. He saw a need for a thematic scheme for future action. The ideal underlying the community school concept seemed to be functional, and the pioneer work of Seay and Crawford was a logical place to begin. The crucial emphases which they list "(1) service to the whole community, not merely to the children attending the schools, and (2) 'discovery, development, and use of the resources of the community as part of the educational
facilities of the school"¹ closely resemble the overall philosophy of the community college. Transposed, these emphases provide the theme for Harlacher's study: "... the community college is concerned with community development and self-improvement—not just with the schooling of college young people and adults."²

With this theme in mind, Harlacher set out to identify the critical requirements of community services programs. Using the Critical Incident Technique developed by Flanagan at the University of Pittsburgh,³ he emphasized the discovery of those behavioral requirements which are critical in that "significant numbers of knowledgeable individuals have observed them to be crucial factors in the achievement of the objectives of a job or activity."⁴ To translate the theme into


testable objectives a pilot study was needed.

Three parametric objectives were identified through a survey of related literature and correspondence with twenty-five presidents of California public junior colleges which claimed community service as a major function. These objectives were then adapted to check list form. Eighty-eight public and eleven private junior colleges in thirty-one states were selected to participate in the survey on the basis of their claim to community service as a major function.5

A total of 1,362 reported critical behaviors were classified under the three parametric objective categories. When duplicates were eliminated, it was found that 492 different critical behaviors contributed to the effectiveness of critical incidents in each of the categories. Obviously, a list of 492 critical behaviors classified according to the critical incidents would have limited value in the establishment of effective programs of community services. The critical behaviors as classified, however, did not represent 492 different procedures; a high degree of mutuality existed among them. Through a further step in the analytical reduction used to classify the critical behaviors, it was found

---

5 Harlacher, Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices, p. 87.
that there were ninety-one separate procedures which could be identified as critical requirements. They were organized into a Check List for Effective Programs of Community Services.6

The resultant Check List represented the first parametric criterion measure for community services programs with an empirical base. At the time of its completion, it had a high degree of reliability and validity for measuring the scope of community services programming. Two years after its completion, the instrument was again tested.

In 1967, the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), recognizing community services as a major function of the community college, authorized a nationwide study. Its purposes were:

1. To identify and report the nature and scope of community services programs currently being provided by U.S. community colleges; 2. To identify and describe exemplary community services programs and/or activities in community colleges in the United States; 3. To identify and report problems, issues, and trends in community colleges programs of community services; 4. To identify and recommend the appropriate role of the AAJC in the development and/or expansion of community college programs of community services.7

Harlacher was selected to conduct the study, primarily

---

6 Harlacher, loc. cit., 1967, pp. 63-76.
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because of his previous experience with a nation-wide survey on the subject.

The survey, funded by the Sloan Foundation, included sixty-five institutions "representing the small and the large, the rich and the poor, the urban and the rural community colleges" in nineteen states. As Harlacher remarked "In conducting this study . . . I . . . drew upon the findings of my 1965 nationwide study . . ." Using the Check List, he gathered the data necessary to fulfill the purposes of the AAJC project. Again, the major similarity among the colleges studies was their declared adherence to community services as a major function.

The Harlacher Check List has been tested and re-tested. Each time it has been empirically valid in describing ideal community services programs. The Harlacher Check List was chosen as the basic criterion measure of the dependent variable in this study since it is the only empirically based and empirically validated instrument available.

While information about the scope of existing programming in a given population is desirable, its value can be enhanced by accompanying information indicating what variables influence the diffusion of

8ibid.
community services from theory into practice. As indicated in Chapter I, the study being reported here seeks not only to identify the current status of community services in Michigan Public Community Colleges, but to account for that status—to discover not only what has happened but how it has happened. It is, therefore, necessary to identify those variables which appear most likely to influence program development in the community college.

Personal Variables

If the personal commitment of any individual in the community college structure to a given program can be regarded as tantamount to institutional commitment, then the attitude of that individual toward the community services concept should reveal the degree to which the concept has been adopted by his institution. One does not need to look far to find a candidate. Cohen and Roueche are unequivocal:

The junior college presidency is a most important position within the institution. It certainly exerts more influence on policy than does the university presidency. . . . The situation may change as a result of faculties' growing power, but, up to now, the community college president has had the major say in educational policy of his campus.9
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Their assessment is reinforced by Gleazer, Executive Secretary, AAJC, when he states that:

The President must lead in the interpretation of the character of the comprehensive community institution. . . . He must see to it that the board, administration, faculty, students, and community have a working understanding of what the role of the college is.

He goes on to stress that "This is not to say that the president's view is the only acceptable one or that it ought to be dominant, but it is the president's business to encourage the process by which a college's 'self-concept' can emerge."10 Certainly, if Gleazer is right, then the attitude of the president toward community services theoretically should, in part, determine its place in the college self-concept. Is there any empirical support for such a position?

In 1966, Ramstad undertook a survey of 233 public junior colleges to determine which environmental and individual variables most influenced experimentation. He found that: "the personal attitude of the chief administrative officer toward experimental programs was the most significant single factor in the process of adoption . . . of such programs."11 Empirically,
the comments of Cohen and Roueche and Gleazer are substantiated. Roueche in another source, explicates the president's role:

It appears that the president is the key to change in the junior college. Because he is more influential than any other person, it is almost axiomatic that "if the president wants something to happen, it will." The president is the educational leader of the junior college and the relative success of any program can often be traced directly to the president's interest in it. The fact that the president, more than anyone else, is the "change agent" in the junior college is well documented. Ultimately, he is responsible for all aspects of his institution.12

The foregoing authors interpret the role of the president as innovator or change agent within the community college milieu. Previously, it was established that community services was the "new wave" of development within the same milieu. The importance of presidential attitude as a variable influencing the development of community services programs receives further support from Myran. In his nationwide survey of thirteen "model" community college community services programs conducted under a W.K. Kellogg Foundation grant, he discovered that:

No other factor is more strongly recognized as a developmental factor than the commitment and support of the president or chief executive.

The interviews brought out the fact that, while the president has an entry to certain groups and individuals in the community not available to the community services dean, he is also the target of criticism when there is adverse reaction to new programs; thus, he must be committed to community services and be willing to take risks at times in supporting new programming.¹³

The statement is simple, direct and empirically derived. It echoes the earlier, more negatively phrased, comments of Houle, of the university of Chicago, that one "grave obstacle" stands in the way fulfilling the community services obligation; "the attitude of presidents . . . that the program of community services is merely an extension of so-called regular activities and therefore can safely be thought about as being secondary."¹⁴

Opinion and empirical data both point to presidential attitude as crucial in determining not only whether a community services program becomes a reality in an institution, but also the general scope of such a program. Consequently, this study would be remiss were it to ignore presidential attitude as a variable affecting the development of community services.


Yet, other environmental variables may limit a president's influence. The next section will assess five of them which emerge from a survey of pertinent literature as being influential.

Institutional Variables

In examining institutional variables which may contribute to the differences in community services programs from college to college, five stand out. First among them is financial resources. Myran states:

The development of community services in the community college is greatly influenced by its position in the institutional financial "pecking order." Where community services programming occupies a low-priority position in terms of allocation of funds, it is likely that little of significance can be expected. . . .

His position is supported by one of the conclusions of Harlacher's 1967 study. "From the overwhelming majority of reports gathered during this survey, finding money to finance the program remains the chief concern in the area of physical resources." In short, the amount of money available to the program will determine its developmental capacity. Information on this variable is clearly essential to the present study.

A pair of variables relating, albeit tangently, to

15Myran, op. cit., p. 52.
the diffusion of community services are institutional size (number of students) and chronological age. The Directory of the AAJC uses them as the sole differentiating statistics upon which to base their projections for future community college development.\(^{17}\) Regarding institutional size, Ramstad reports that "although a higher percentage of adoption [of innovative programs] was indicated in the colleges with enrollments of more than 900 full-time students, other colleges were giving careful consideration to experimental programs."\(^{18}\) This report suggests that findings are somewhat ambiguous and that this variable is therefore worthy of further study. Institutional age deserves consideration largely because of its relationship to the developmental trends within the community college. If newly established institutions replicate the pattern of transfer, technical, then community services development traced by Thornton, then their community services program scope will be more limited than that of older institutions. Enough speculation surrounds this variable to warrant investigation.

Another germane variable is the socio-economic


\(^{18}\)Ramstad, op. cit., p. 31.
status of the institution. Two recent studies reflect an environmental dimension of this variable. Hamrick states:

Increasingly, community colleges have developed community services programs with a professional staff prepared to carry forward programs which are significant and which have their own identity. This is less true, however, in small, non-urban institutions where community services activities are many times limited to evening classes for adults. In spite of past shortcomings, the non-urban community college has begun to understand social action; it has begun to assume greater social responsibility in its community.19

From the urban setting, Goodrich reports:

It is true that urban community colleges have evidenced a visible concern for citizens in their communities by implementing programs of direct intervention to improve the quality of life for all. We can reasonably assume that the results of this study indicate a nationwide trend which is beginning to take hold, and would, hopefully, eventually cover a major portion of the United States.20

Despite their differences, both studies suggest that urban or rural environment as a dimension of socioeconomic status does influence community services program development. The varied environments of the institutions in the population to be studied coupled with other social

---


20 Andrew L. Goodrich, Community Services for the "New Student" at Inner City Community Colleges (East Lansing, Mich.: Kellogg Community Services Leadership Program, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 20.
and economic differences mandate that the variable be dealt with.

Finally, a fifth variable is increasingly accounting for differences among institutions. That variable arises with the emergence of the multi-campus college. In a study prepared under the auspices of ERIC and AAJC, Kintzer, Jenson, and Hanson highlight the dimensions of the issue as they relate to community services:

Once a junior college district decides to establish a second campus the problems of multicampus organization begin. The basic questions relate to the identification and understanding of the crucial issues that are generic to . . . multicampus organization. . . . What kinds of programs? For what clientele? What kinds of instructional methodology or teaching process is appropriate to which program? Who makes the decisions?²¹

The authors' supposition raises some logical questions concerning community services which analysis of this variable will clarify. If the impact of multi-campus organization is as great as the monograph indicates then it should account to a considerable extent for differences in developmental level between single and multi-campus institutions.

Summary

The author reviewed the major heuristic instruments developed to provide guidelines for the implementation or expansion of community services programs. Of them, the Harlacher Check List seems best suited to empirically assess the scope of community services programming in Michigan Public Community Colleges. The nature of its development, its validation via re-administration, and its foundation upon critical requirements contribute to its overall reliability and empirical soundness. It is the best over-all criterion measure with which to assess the dependent variable in this study: the scope of community services programming.

Theoretically, virtually any variable will influence, to some degree, program development. A careful perusal of the literature, however, reveals six that seem to account for most of the variance among institutions. One is personal and five are environmental or institutional. Presidential attitude toward community services is advanced as a prime factor in program development. The five institutional variables are financial resources, institutional size, age of the college, socio-economic status of the college district, and the number of campuses.

The present study surveyed the scope of community services programming in Michigan Public Community
Colleges and the attitude of each president toward community services. It gathered data on the five institutional variables from state and national sources. The six independent variables were correlated with the dependent to ascertain the degree of influence each had upon program development.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The experimental design of a study is the strategy or model used to test the research hypotheses, to control extraneous variance, and to minimize error variance. The design provides for the identification of a relevant population, the extraction of a sample, the development of an instrument, a pilot administration, reliability and validity estimates, data collection procedures, and the statistical models used for analysis. These design elements are described in chapter three.

In brief, the study being reported is a field survey. A criterion measure was adapted from a previously developed checklist to assess the scope of community college community services programs. Another measure was adapted to survey presidential attitude toward community services. Both measures also gathered data on the demographic differences among the colleges. Using state and national data, the variables of college age, size, number of campuses, and socio-economic status were assigned numbers and hierarchically ranked. The scope measure was factor analyzed and a number of correlation ratios were computed to determine the
relationships between pair-wise combinations of the scope factors and presidential attitude, percent of budget allocated to community services programs, college age (number of years in existence), college size (enrollment), number of campuses and college socioeconomic status. Also frequencies and percentages of the responses to demographic questions were computed as a basis for making practically significant judgments about trends in the diffusion of community services from textbook theory into functioning programs.

Population and Sample

The public community colleges of America are the institutions which, verbally at least, make a commitment to community services. Therefore, they are the logical locus for a survey of the diffusion of community services. To establish limits manageable within the context of the project, the field survey was administered to the twenty-nine public community colleges in Michigan. Such a grouping had two qualities to recommend it. First, the researcher had ready access to the necessary subjects within the colleges. Every president and community services director, or their designated subaltern, responded to the survey. Second, the twenty-nine institutions represented all of their genre. In effect, the survey dealt with a complete population.
It was unnecessary to make inferential comparisons of the demographic data gathered. The percentages reported present an accurate picture of community services diffusion in the State of Michigan.¹

On the other hand, Michigan public community colleges represent a cross section of the national community college population. The elements which provide variance among the national community college population are the same as those which differentiate among the Michigan institutions. It is, therefore, correct to make inferential statements about community services diffusion when interpreting the relationships between scope of programming and the independent variables based on state and national sources. The sample fulfills the required conditions to permit the application of parametric models and these models are suitable for inferential interpretation.²

Instrumentation

The forty-item questionnaire used to obtain data for the scope of community services diffusion for the


study was a modification of Harlacher's *Check List*. The items used in the instrument were those statements which reflect actual activity on the part of the program director. Each item is followed by a continuous measure Likert scale. The respondent was requested to rate the degree to which each of the forty statements was a part of his community services program by circling the appropriate number.

The other aspect of the measure was a request for demographic data. Each respondent was asked whether services was a major administrative division at his college, the percentage of his time given over to community services responsibilities, the size of his staff, whether the community services program was financially self-supporting during the preceding fiscal year, and to whom in the administrative structure of the college did he report.

The independent variable of presidential attitude toward community services was also assessed by a forty-item questionnaire. The measure was another adaptation of Harlacher's *Check List*. Each respondent was requested to rate the degree of importance of each

---


4 See Appendix A.
of the forty statements to the community services concept as he perceived it, by circling the appropriate number in a five stage continuous measure Likert scale.

The second dimension of the Presidential Attitude questionnaire was a request for attitudinal responses toward the organization of a community services program. The participants answered "yes" or "no" to the following propositions: (1) the community services division should be responsible for the evening credit program offered by the community college; (2) community services should be the responsibility of the entire college, not just that of the community services division; (3) the community services administrator should report directly to the president of the college; and (4) the community services division should be a financially self-supporting entity.

The third dimension of the Presidential Attitude questionnaire was a request for an opinion on the direction of community services development in Michigan during the next five years. The respondents were given five choices ranging from "drastically over-extended, will decline slowly, will remain at their present level, and will expand gradually," to "is just starting and will expand drastically."5

---

5See Appendix B.
The presidential attitude measure also provided data on the second independent variable. Each respondent was requested to provide an approximation of the percent of overall institutional budget allocated to the community services program during the past fiscal year. Five categories of responses were possible: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-20%, 21-50%, and over 50 percent.

The categories of institutional size (number of students), age, and number of campuses are those which provide variance among the nation's community colleges. These independent variables were operationalized by referring to the Directory, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970, which is the authorized data book of the community college national organization.6

Institutional socio-economic status was operationalized by extracting an institutional ranking list from a report prepared by the Southeastern Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), research bureau for the Michigan Department of Education. The ranking was based on the following factors: assessed district valuation, millage levied, dollars spent per student, family dwelling values, median educational levels, family

size, and population density. 7

Pilot Administration

Based on Harlacher's test-re-test application of his Check List, it was assumed that the individual items comprising the questionnaires possessed item-reliability. 8 To assure that the questionnaires were measuring what they were set up to measure a pilot administration to establish content validity was undertaken. 9 Individuals occupying positions similar to those found in the population were chosen because of their familiarity with the position and the concept under analysis. To avoid contaminating the population, the individuals were chosen from outside Michigan. Two former presidents and two community services deans participated in the administration. They were asked to complete the measures according to the directions mentioned above. Also, they were requested to provide information on their reaction to the measures. Their comments served as insights into the degree to which the questionnaires adequately covered the content of community services programs and


8 Downie and Heath, op. cit., pp. 242-43.

the objectives of this study.

Following the pilot administration, the evaluations garnered were used to revise both criterion measures. Changes were made predominately in the questions dealing with the demographic dimensions of both program and attitude. Essentially, the concern was to assure that the language chosen communicated the author's intent. Assessment by the individuals involved in the actual administration suggests that the changes emanating from the feedback on the pilot administration did clarify the criterion measures.

Reliability Estimate

Harlacher, in using his Check List to assess the effectiveness of selected community services programs, established the reliability of the instrument via the test-re-test method. In adapting the Check List to questionnaire form no change was made in item wording or intent. Therefore, it is assumed that the criterion measure possesses item reliability. Because the survey reported here included an entire population, it was impossible to conduct another test-re-test reliability administration without contaminating the population. The pilot administration when compared with the actual

one would seem to provide a measure of subjective, non-statistical reliability. When the responses of the pilot participants are compared with those of the actual ones a high degree of similarity exists. The instruments were consistent from administration to administration.  

Validity Estimate

To assure that the criterion measures were valid—that is, that they were measuring the extent of community services programs—the pilot administration was undertaken. The respondents, as expert practitioners of community services, were asked whether the substance of the measures were representative of the content of the universe of the property being measured. All participants reacted to the measures as accurate and precise pictures of the community services universe. Therefore, the measures are considered to possess content validity.

Data Collection Procedures

The scope of programming questionnaire was distributed via mail to the twenty-nine community services

\[11\text{Kerlinger, op. cit., pp. 442-43.}\]

\[12\text{Downie and Heath, op. cit., p. 249.}\]
program directors in the Michigan Public Community Colleges. The respondents were requested to complete the instrument and return it in an envelope which had been provided. The instructions for completing the questionnaire were included. The presidential attitude questionnaire was distributed in the same manner.

Approximately ten days following the initial mailing, telephone contact was made with those individuals who had not yet responded. In eight cases a remailing was necessary. Approximately one month from the date of the initial mailing a trip to one institution was required to assure that the questionnaires were completed. There were fifty-eight completed questionnaires, representing one hundred percent of the institutions contacted.

Data Analysis

The study under discussion here is dualistic. On the one hand, the study seeks to make practically significant judgments about community services diffusion in Michigan Public Community Colleges. The study includes the total population. Van Dalen and Meyer point out that after collecting information from every member of a population, an investigator may draw generalizations from his data about that population. There is no need to state hypotheses which infer a relationship between
the data and some other hypothetical population, for, in effect, the data presented describe the "real world." Therefore, the study begins with four research questions focused on the Michigan population. They are:

1. What is the structure of the community services programs in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges?

2. What is the attitude of the president or his designated subaltern in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges toward the community services concept?

3. What is the nature of the community services program in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges?

4. What is the attitude of community college presidents or their designated subalterns in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges toward the developmental direction of the community services concept during the next five years?

The second dimension of this study is inferential. Michigan community colleges represent a cross section of the national community college population. Also, the study is designed so that it fulfills the conditions

---

necessary for the application of inferential models. The following six hypotheses are inferential in that they propose a relationship which will be tested by the application of statistical models. The hypotheses are:

1. There is a relationship between the attitude of the community college presidents or their designated subalterns and the scope of community services programming.

2. There is a relationship between the age of the community college and the scope of community services programming.

3. There is a relationship between the size of the institution and the scope of community services programming.

4. There is a relationship between the socio-economic status of the college district and the scope of the community services programming.

5. There is a relationship between the number of campuses a community college has and the scope of community services programming.

6. There is a relationship between the percent of institutional budget allocated to the community services program and the scope of programming.

To test these research questions and hypotheses the following research procedures were applied. The responses on each questionnaire were coded and punched on Hollerith-IBM cards for analysis. Frequencies and
percentages were computed for all demographic questions which relate to the population under analysis. The means were computed for the twenty-nine scope measures. Means were then computed for each of the independent variables, including that of presidential attitude.

Prior to any correlational evaluation of the dependent variable/independent variables relationship, a factor analysis of the dependent measure was performed. The purpose behind applying this treatment was to determine the elements which underlay the statements on the program scope measure. A factor is a construct, a hypothetical entity that emerges as the key to responses to items on a criterion measure. Once the factors emerged and were labeled it was possible to minimize within group (error) variance by extracting the major factors and computing correlational relationships between them, as dimensions of the dependent variable, and the independent variables.\(^\text{14}\)

Three factors emerged underlying the program scope measure—program maintenance (administration), program planning, and program integration (coordination). The initial factor includes the activities which occur in providing service to the program's constituency. The second, planning, represents all items which have

\(^{14}\text{Kerlinger, op. cit., pp. 650-70.}\)
to do with "thinking ahead"—arranging the preconditions necessary for the activities to occur. The last, integration (coordination), includes those items which are descriptive of "inter-facing" the college program with those of other community serving agencies.

Following the factor analysis, a series of correlation coefficients was computed to assess the degree of relationship existing between the factors underlying the dependent variable measure and the independent variables. The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was used to determine the degree of relationship between the factors underlying scope of programming and the independent variable of presidential attitude. The model was chosen because the two variables were continuous measures or nominal scales. In the case of the remaining five independent variables another model was needed. The correlation ratio was chosen because it permitted the comparison of nominal (dependent variable) and ordinal (independent variables) scales.

To further "account for" the influence of the independent variables over the dependent, the coefficient


of determination \((r^2)\) was computed. The squared coefficient of correlation is called the coefficient of determination. In the case of two correlated variables, it indicates the percentage of variance in the dependent variable associated with or "determined by" the variance in the independent one.\(^{17}\) It is a useful technique for establishing the strength of association between the variables.

**Summary**

The participants in this study, the twenty-nine Michigan Public Community College Presidents and Community Service Directors, comprise a population when viewed from a state perspective and a sample when viewed nationally. Two questionnaires were prepared; one assessed the scope of community college community services programming, the other measured community college presidential attitude toward the community services concept. Both measures gathered data on the demographic differences among institutions.

Reliability and validity estimates were established through a pilot administration of the measures.

Four research questions and six hypotheses and the statistical and non-statistical models used to respond

\(^{17}\)Kerlinger, op. cit., p. 112.
to each were discussed.

Analysis of the results is reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

The data obtained from the procedures described in Chapter III were analyzed by computing frequencies and percentages for those research questions dealing with the total population and by correlation models for the inferential hypotheses. The results are presented in three steps. First, the scope of community services programming in Michigan Public Community Colleges is examined and described. Second, the relationships between the factors of program scope and the independent variables listed in Chapter III are selectively discussed and interpreted. Finally, the findings of the study are summarized.

The reporting of results in this chapter departs somewhat from tradition. Usually, researchers have analyzed their data statistically and reported the level of significance at which the null hypothesis was rejected. More recently, a trend has developed in which the study is conducted, data analyzed, and the results reported irrespective of significance levels. This recent trend places more emphasis on the practical application of research findings than
upon traditional reporting methods.\textsuperscript{1} Given the dualistic nature of the study under discussion here, the latter method yields the most return. Van Dalen and Meyer point out, for example, that when dealing with the findings obtained from a total population it is unnecessary to make inferential analyses because the findings do represent the "real world."\textsuperscript{2} The research questions in this study which deal with program scope and descriptive of a total population. Therefore, statistical treatment of the data is unnecessary. The hypotheses which treat the Michigan institutions as representative of the national community college population, on the other hand, fulfill the conditions necessary for the application of inferential models. Therefore, statistical treatment was applied to those data. Findings are reported without reference to significance levels. Practically significant judgments about trends in the diffusion of the community services concept will appear in Chapter V.


Tables 4.1 through 4.4 record the frequencies and percentages of responses to questions about the structure of community services programs in Michigan public community colleges, presidential attitude toward the community services concept, nature of community services programs, and directions of future development of community services in Michigan public community colleges. Forty-five of these questions were answered by the twenty-nine community services directors or their designated subalterns; they appear in Tables 4.1 and 4.3. Of the five questions answered by the twenty-nine presidents or their designated subaltern, one—the question on percent of overall institutional budget allocated to the Community Services Division during the last fiscal year—appears in Table 4.1. The other four questions appear in Tables 4.2 and 4.4.\(^3\) Percentages of response are calculated to the second decimal place. In each case frequencies of response precede percentages.

Research Question 1

The data found in Table 4.1 were used to answer research question one. Question: What is the structure

\(^{3}\)Appendices A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is Community Services a Major Administrative Division at your* College?</td>
<td>13 institutions</td>
<td>16 institutions</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What percentage of your time is given over to Community Services Responsibilities?</td>
<td>12-41.38%</td>
<td>1-3.45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What was the percent of Overall Institutional Budget Allocated to the Community Services Division during the last fiscal year?</td>
<td>17-58.62%</td>
<td>9-31.03%</td>
<td>6-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. During the last fiscal year was your Community Services Division financially self-supporting?</td>
<td>15-51.72%</td>
<td>14-48.28%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To whom in the Administrative Structure of your college do you report?</td>
<td>19-65.52%</td>
<td>4-13.79%</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many people, including clerical personnel, comprise the Community Services staff at your College?</td>
<td>19-65.52%</td>
<td>4-13.79%</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this table "your" refers to Community Services Director or his designated subaltern.
of the community services programs in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges? Six responses pertain to this question.

According to the theories of Myran, Johnson, and Harlacher it is important that community services be independent, i.e., college divisions possessing organizational status equal to the other divisions of the college. In Michigan institutions practice does not reflect theory. More institutions (55.17%) do not have community services divisions than do (44.83%). Also, fewer than half of the institutions (48.28%) report having an individual solely responsible for community services. In fact 41.38 percent of the institutions assign an individual only 20 percent time responsibility for the program. Another dimension of the program parity is budget. An aspect of the college with such theoretical importance should command substantial funds. Again, theory far exceeds practice. Fifty-eight and sixty-two hundredths percent of the institutions (17) report that community services received 5 percent or less of the institutional budget. Nearly 4

---

90 percent (89.65%) of the programs in Michigan received 10 percent or less of the college budget. It is interesting to note, however, that over half of the programs (51.72%) were financially self-supporting.

Another dimension of program structure is placement in the college administrative hierarchy. The theoretical importance of the president's role has been established in Chapters I and II. The ability to report directly to the chief administrative officer contributes to achieving program parity. Nearly two-thirds (65.52%) of the institutions report that program directors have a line relationship directly to the president. It would appear, therefore, that community services is moving toward program parity. It is being accorded access to the center of decision making even in cases where it is not an independent division.

Another aspect of program structure which affects parity is staffing. Given the all-inclusive nature of the community services concept it is nearly impossible for one individual to master all its intricacies. Harlacher suggests that "an adequate . . . staff means sufficient personnel with enough time allotted to organize and expedite services . . . included in

the program.⁶ It is difficult to believe that Michigan measures up to this generalization. Nineteen institutions, 65.52 percent of the population, report that 1-3 people, including clerical personnel, comprise their community services staff. It would seem logical to infer from this response that the degree of specialization which characterizes the programs described in the specialized studies discussed above has not yet diffused to the total population. Also, such limited staffing casts doubt upon the degree of parity which exists.

In summation Table 4.1 reveals divergent trends in the program structure in Michigan. While community services does possess access to the locus of decision making, it has some distance to go before it can be viewed, structurally, as a major dimension of the community college. Lack of identity, of institutional financial support, and of personnel are obvious retarding factors. Although community services programs do exist in all the colleges, they need further refinement and expansion.

Research Question 2

The data reported in Table 4.2 were used to answer research question two: What is the attitude of the

⁶Harlacher, op. cit., p. 61.
TABLE 4.2

PRESIDENTIAL ATTITUDE
TOWARD COMMUNITY SERVICES

1. The Community Services Division should be a financially self-supporting entity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-(27.59%)</td>
<td>21-(72.41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Community Services Administrator should report directly to the President of the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-(68.97%)</td>
<td>9-(31.03%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Community Services Division should be responsible for the evening credit program offered by the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-(41.38%)</td>
<td>17-(58.62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Community Services should be the responsibility of the entire college, not just that of the Community Services Division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-(86.21%)</td>
<td>4-(13.79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President or his designated subaltern in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges toward the community services concept? Four responses pertain to the question.

It is instructive to observe the responses of the presidents in the context of the data reported on Table 4.1. The initial question on Table 4.2 asks whether community services should be a financially self-supporting entity. Seventy-two and forty-one hundredths of the respondents (21 institutions) felt that it should
not be. Yet 19 of those institutions (65.52%) received 10 percent or less of the institutional budget; and twelve of the nineteen received 5 percent or less.

Myran's point seems well taken: "aggressive seeking of funding is required since many community services programs . . . are largely non-remunerative." Community services administrators must be made aware that fund-raising will be an important part of their job until the presidential attitude that community services should not be self-supporting is reflected in budgetary allocations.

Greater consistency exists between theory and practice when it comes to program placement within the administrative hierarchy. Sixty-eight and ninety-seven percent of the respondents, 20 institutions, believe that the community services director should report directly to the president. In practice, 14 of those institutions, 48.28 percent of the total, are actually organized that way. Presidential attitude reflects a concern for "input" from the community services directors into the decision making process. Such input would appear to be a key element in program development.

Community services has begun to emerge as a distinct concept in the Michigan community colleges.

7Myran, op. cit., p. 37.
Nearly 60 percent of them (17-58.62%) do not feel that the evening credit program of the college should be the responsibility of the community services program. Such an approach is consonant with Myran's philosophy that community services encompasses "a wide range of educational services which are directed toward specific personal or community needs rather than toward the attainment of degrees or certificates." Furthermore, the assessment of the community college as a catalyst for community development seems borne out in the presidents' response, nearly 90 percent strong, (86.21%), that community services should be the responsibility of the entire college, not just that of the community services division. So long as this attitude is not made an excuse for neglect of the community services division itself, presidential attitude toward community services may be seen as quite positive. The presidents seem to perceive community services as an integral part of the college and have some concept of how it should function.

Research Question 3

The data found in Table 4.3 were used to answer research question three: What is the nature of the

8loc. cit., p. 10.
TABLE 4.3
NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS
IN MICHIGAN'S PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Program Planning</th>
<th>High (35-28)</th>
<th>Medium (27-21)</th>
<th>Low (20-0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (20.69%)</td>
<td>15 (51.72%)</td>
<td>8 (27.59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Program Integration (Coordination)</th>
<th>High (25-20)</th>
<th>Medium (19-15)</th>
<th>Low (14-0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (27.59%)</td>
<td>15 (51.72%)</td>
<td>6 (20.69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Program Maintenance (Administration) Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Community Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (30-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (44.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (23-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (27.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (17-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (27.59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Publicity                                  |
| High (20-16)                                  |
| 13 (44.83%)                                   |
| Medium (15-12)                                |
| 9 (31.03%)                                    |
| Low (11-0)                                    |
| 7 (24.14%)                                    |

| C. Faculty-Student Involvement                |
| High (30-24)                                  |
| 5 (17.24%)                                    |
| Medium (23-18)                                |
| 16 (55.17%)                                   |
| Low (17-0)                                    |
| 8 (27.59%)                                    |

| D. Research/Evaluation                        |
| High (35-28)                                  |
| 4 (13.79%)                                    |
| Medium (27-21)                                |
| 13 (44.83%)                                   |
| Low (20-0)                                    |
| 12 (41.38%)                                   |

| E. Development                                |
| High (25-20)                                  |
| 3 (10.35%)                                    |
| Medium (19-15)                                |
| 17 (58.62%)                                   |
| Low (14-0)                                    |
| 9 (31.03%)                                    |

community services programs in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges? The data were drawn from the community services directors responses to the forty
questions on the scope measure.

Categories one and two, program planning and program integration (coordination), represent program factors which emerged from the factor analysis reported in Chapter III above. Category three, program maintenance (administration), was content analyzed for the purposes of this table. The five elements represent the dimensions of the third factor. Category one includes questions 1-2-7-21-23-27-28. Category two includes questions 5-14-16-19-26. Element A under factor three includes questions 3-4-6-15-31-32. Element B includes questions 8 through 11. Element C includes questions 12-13-17-18-20-22. Element D includes questions 24-25-29-30-34-36-39. Finally, element E includes questions 33-35-37-38-40.9

The trends evident in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 are borne out in Table 4.3. Community services is passing through a developmental stage. Planning and Integration have been described as factors which emerge after a program has established an identity.10 In the Michigan case, over half of the institutions (15 or 51.72%) have begun work in these areas to at least some degree. In the instance of planning, fewer institutions (6)

9See Appendix A.

10Harlacher, op. cit., pp. 53-55.
are substantially involved with this area than are uninvolved (8). That ratio is reversed for integration (coordination). Planning and integration, as barometers of program development, are well under way in Michigan.

The findings under program maintenance (administration) reinforce the importance of establishing an identity for the community services program. Seeking community support and publicizing the capability and offerings of the program are crucial for the identification needed for viability. The reported data reveal that Michigan Community Colleges are most highly developed in these two areas. Thirteen institutions (44.83%) report a great degree of community support. Eleven of these same institutions also report substantial involvement with publicity. Overall, 72.42% of the institutions have at least some community support dimension as part of their programs; and 75.86% of them have publicity dimensions to at least some degree. Michigan programs would seem to be well grounded in community support and publicity.

Myran's suggestion that "... evaluation of community services at present appears to be fairly unsophisticated ..."12 is borne out in the Michigan programs.

11 See Appendix C.

12 Myran, op. cit., p. 39.
population. Most institutions are not evaluating the offerings of their programs or conducting research with and for their districts. Only four colleges report a great deal of involvement with evaluation while twelve report little or none. Also, only three institutions report intensive development in the areas of establishing written program policy, off-campus centers or independent funding. In both Research/Evaluation and Development, sizeable minorities (12-41.38% in the former case, and 9-31.03% in the latter) are virtually not involved. Perhaps it is safe to assume that these areas are dependent upon the program having achieved some degree of development. That research/evaluation programs are under way to some degree in 13 institutions (44.83%) and development programs are under way in 17 (58.62%) would seem to support that assumption.

Finally, it is Harlacher's assessment that "the importance of having . . . faculty support for the community services programs can hardly be over-emphasized."\(^{13}\) Obviously, Michigan programs need development in this area. Only 5 (17.24%) institutions report high student and faculty involvement while 8 (27.59%) report little or none. Over half of the Michigan colleges (55.17%) are moving toward the

\(^{13}\)Harlacher, op. cit., p. 46.
theoretical ideal.

In essence, the nature of community services programs is consonant with reported program structure and presidential attitude. Theory is rather in advance of practice, yet programs are developing.

Research Question 4

The data found in Table 4.4 were used to answer research question four: What is the attitude of community college presidents or their designated subalterns in Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges toward the developmental direction of the community services concept during the next five years?

Presidents were asked to mark the alternative which they consider most realistically reflects the future of Community Services as a part of the total community college program in Michigan. They were given the option of choosing one of five alternatives. Only one felt that community services is drastically over extended and will decline rapidly during the next five years. No one felt that community services has peaked and will decline slowly. A single individual reported that community services would remain at its present stage of development. Less than 7 percent (6.90%) of the respondents, therefore, can be interpreted as feeling that community services has
TABLE 4.4
DIRECTION OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES IN MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

| Community Services is drastically over extended and will decline rapidly during the next five years. | 1-(3.45%) |
| Community Services has peaked and will decline slowly during the next five years. | 0-(0%) |
| Community Services will remain at its present level of development during the next five years. | 1-(3.45%) |
| Community Services will expand gradually during the next five years. | 14-(48.28%) |
| Community Services is just starting and will expand drastically during the next five years. | 13-(44.83%) |

passed beyond its developmental stage. Nearly 50 percent (48.28%) responded that community services would expand gradually during the next five years. Another 44.83 percent predicted that community services will expand drastically during the next five years. A significant majority of the presidents (27 of them, or 93.11%) agree that community services is still in its developmental stage. The disparities between current practice (as reported in Table 4.1) and presidential attitude (as reported in Table 4.2) are made to seem less severe, at least in part, by the high percentage of cases in which presidents view community services programs as still developing. Furthermore, their responses support the position taken
by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education which described community services as "the newest, but inevitable, function of community colleges. . . ."14

In summation, the parametric aspect of this study suggests that community services as a major function in Michigan public community colleges is still in its developmental stage. In the crucial areas of division status, budget, and staffing the programs have yet to achieve parity with other functions of the college. Attitudinally, a degree of cognitive dissonance exists. Presidents' theoretical conceptions of community services are more advanced than the programs are in practice. That presidents recognize the disparity between theory and practice seems apparent in their responses to the question about the future of community services. The nature of programs reveals a theory-practice disparity in planning, integration, research/evaluation, development and faculty-student involvement. Presidential responses provide some hope for amelioration; virtually unanimous statements that the program will, at least, continue to develop gradually and, at best, will expand

drastically suggest that Michigan presidents are committed to reducing the gap between theory and practice.

The inferential aspect of the study established hypotheses concerning the correlation between scope of programming and six independent variables which the literature suggested are responsible for the diffusion of community services from theory into practice. To minimize within group (error) variance a factor analysis was performed on the dependent measure. Three dimensions of the dependent variable, scope of programming, emerged: (1) program maintenance, (2) program planning, and (3) program integration. Correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination were computed for each dimension with each of the six independent variables. Also, a composite figure, scope of programming, was correlated with the independent variables. In all, twenty-four sets of correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination were computed. The following discussion will selectively analyze them as they relate to the stated hypotheses. Those which are not mentioned specifically may be perused in the appendix accompanying this study.\(^{15}\)

\(^{15}\) See Appendix D.
Hypothesis 1

The data found in Table 4.5 were used to test hypothesis one. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the attitude of the community college president or his designated subaltern and the scope of community services programming.

TABLE 4.5

| CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM SCOPE AND PRESIDENTIAL ATTITUDE |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                                | $r$    | $r^2$        |
| Presidential Attitude and Scope of Programming | .165   | .027         |
| Presidential Attitude and Program Maintenance  | .156   | .024         |
| Presidential Attitude and Program Planning     | .196   | .039         |
| Presidential Attitude and Program Integration  | .114   | .013         |

The Pearson product-moment coefficients listed under $r$ in Table 4.5 reveal very little relationship between presidential attitude and scope of programming. How the president feels about the concept does not seem to have influenced the scope of programming thus far. The coefficients of determination listed under $r^2$ in Table 4.5 support this conclusion. These findings are
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consonant with those reported in Tables 4.1 and 4.4. The developmental stage through which community services is passing seems to entail a degree of cognitive dissonance on the part of presidents, in which their feelings about the concept differ substantially from the actual activity. A factor analysis of the presidential attitude measure revealed no clearly identifiable elements in common underlying presidential response. The absence of any clear correlation between scope of programming and presidential attitude, coupled with the absence of any common factors underlying presidential response reveal twenty-nine presidents whose concepts of community services have little in common except agreement that community services is a responsibility of the entire college and that community services is in a developmental state. The case made in Chapter II for the influence of presidential attitude on college programs suggests that although community services does not presently reflect presidential attitude, it is highly likely that it will do so increasingly as it develops. If so, unless the presidential attitudes are themselves in an embryonic stage, it seems probable that community services programs will eventually assume widely varied profiles reflecting the widely varied concepts of the college presidents.
Hypothesis 2

The data found in Table 4.6 were used to test hypothesis two. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the age of the community college and the scope of community services programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r ratio</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Age and Program Planning</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Age and Program Integration</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation ratios listed under r ratio in Table 4.6 show that the scope dimensions of planning and integration have an emergent relationship with the age of the institution. The coefficients of determination listed under r² reveal that nearly 20 percent of the variance is being accounted for on each of these dimensions by institutional age. These findings would seem to support the idea that community services is passing through a developmental stage. As institutions age the focus on community services would appear to increase. The elements of "thinking
ahead" and "inter-facing" with other community-serving agencies seem to come with institutional maturity. While age is not highly influential, there is a strong enough trend to merit attention. The other dimensions of scope when correlated with age produce nothing meriting discussion here. They may be perused in Appendix D.

Hypothesis 3

Data found in Table 4.7 were used to test hypothesis three. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the size of the institution and the scope of community services programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution and Program Integration</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Socio-Economic Status and Scope of Programming</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campuses and Program Planning</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.00018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of hypothesis three only one dimension emerged worthy of analysis when correlated with
institutional size. The correlation ratio listed under r ratio for size and program integration again suggests an emergent relationship. The coefficient of determination listed under $r^2$ reveals that over one quarter of the variance on integration is accounted for by size. It would seem prudent to infer, with Myran, that as institutions increase in size they include greater segments of the community and the need for "linkages with community groups" becomes increasingly felt.\(^{16}\) The other correlation coefficients reveal nothing of significance and may be examined in Appendix D.

Hypothesis 4

Data found in Table 4.7 were used to test hypothesis four. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the socio-economic status of the college district and the scope of its community services programming.

The data concerning hypothesis 4 are interesting for the lack of relationship which emerged. No discernible inter-relationship exists between socio-economic status and scope of programming. Such a finding might be accounted for in part by the nature of the college environments. In areas of high socio-economic status other community serving agencies may

\(^{16}\text{Myran, op. cit., pp. 44-45.}\)
be reducing the impact of the community services division. In areas of low socio-economic status the traditional lack of internalization of the value of higher education may limit program influence. In essence, socio-economic status did not emerge as the influential factor it is often theorized to be. The other correlation coefficients can be located in Appendix D.

Hypothesis 5

Data found in Table 4.7 were used to test hypothesis five. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the number of campuses a community college has and the scope of its community services programming.

The findings concerning hypothesis five suggest that there is virtually no relationship between scope and number of campuses. The lowest r ratio obtained in this study was between number of campuses and the dimension of program planning. This finding is interesting when compared with the theories of Kintzer et al. Their concern seems to be primarily for program planning. They conclude their study by listing the three most important "unities" which multi-campus institutions must have if they are to serve their constituencies. One of them is unity in "... planning to prevent unnecessary duplication."

correlation ratio listed under r ratio in Table 4.7 suggests, this theory does not seem to extend to community services programs. To obtain a coefficient of determination it was necessary to extend the computation two extra decimal places (see $r^2$, Table 4.7). In summation, there would seem to be little support for the theory that the number of campuses a community college has influences its program planning in the area of community services. The other coefficients may be perused in Appendix D.

Hypothesis 6

The data found in Table 4.8 were used to test hypothesis six. Hypothesis: There is a relationship between the percent of institutional budget allocated to the community services division and the scope of community services programming.

TABLE 4.8
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES SCOPE OF PROGRAMMING AND PERCENT OF BUDGET ALLOCATED TO COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r ratio</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Budget and</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Budget and</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The findings concerning hypothesis six are consonant with those reported in Table 4.1. The correlation ratio listed under r ratio in Table 4.8 for the composit figure reveals a very low correlation. In Table 4.1 few colleges received appreciable institutional funding yet over 50 percent of them were financially self-supporting. In essence, the scope of programming would seem to be more the result of a director's fund raising ability than of institutional support.

In the case of program planning, however, a trend seems to be emerging. The correlation ratio suggests that where budget is allocated it does influence planning. The coefficient of determination reveals that over one-fifth of the variance is accounted for by budget allocation. Perhaps, when the director is freed from the need to search for funds he is able to devote time to "thinking ahead." The other coefficients relative to this hypothesis may be found in Appendix D.

In summary, the inferential dimension of this study revealed interesting and emergent relationships although none were statistically significant. It is possible to interpret these findings as supportive of the position that community services is in a developmental stage. The consistency between the demographic and correlational findings makes this
interpretation quite attractive. Although none of the hypotheses were supported, a combination of responses drawn from the research questions and emergent inferential relationships contributed to the following findings.

Summary of Findings

The results from the analyses of the data collected during the research are summarized below:

1. In Michigan, more public community colleges do not have community services divisions than do.

2. Less than half of the Michigan public community colleges have an individual with full-time responsibility for community services.

3. Only slightly more than 10 percent of Michigan institutions allocate 10 percent or more of the college budget to community services.

4. Over half of the Michigan community services programs were financially self-supporting during the last fiscal year.

5. Nearly two-thirds of the Michigan community services program directors report directly to the president of the college.

6. Nearly two-thirds of the Michigan community college community services programs have a staff of three persons or less.
7. Nearly three-quarters of the Michigan community college presidents feel that community services need not be a self-supporting entity.

8. Nearly 70 percent of the presidents believe that the community services program director should report directly to the president.

9. Nearly 60 percent of the presidents do not feel that the evening credit program of the college should be the responsibility of the community services division.

10. Nearly 90 percent of the presidents feel that community services should be the responsibility of the entire college, not just that of the community services division.

11. Over 70 percent of the Michigan community college community services programs are involved to at least some degree in program planning.

12. Over three-quarters of the Michigan community college community services programs are involved in program integration (coordination) to at least some degree.

13. Nearly half of the Michigan community college community services programs are involved in seeking community support and publicity activities to a high degree.

14. Over 70 percent of Michigan community college community services programs report an emergent
involvement of faculty and students with the program.

15. Research/Evaluation and Development functions are the least emergent divisions of Michigan community college community services program.

16. Over 90 percent of the presidents believe that community services is in a developmental stage and will continue to grow during the next five years.

17. There is virtually no inferential relationship between presidential attitude toward community services and community services scope of programming.

18. There is an emergent inferential relationship between institutional age and community services program planning and integration.

19. There is an emergent inferential relationship between institutional size and community services program integration.

20. There is virtually no inferential relationship between institutional district socio-economic status and community services scope of programming.

21. There is virtually no inferential relationship between the number of campuses a college has and community services scope of programming.

22. There is virtually no inferential relationship between the composite scope of programming and the percent of budget allocated to the community services division.
23. There is an emergent inferential relationship between the percent of budget allocated to the community services division and community services program planning.
The purpose of this study was to assess the degree to which community services has diffused from educational theory into actual community college programs. The study sought not only to identify the current status of programs, but to account for that status. The twenty-nine public community colleges in Michigan served as the population for data gathering. The community college community services directors or their designated subalterns were surveyed concerning the structure and scope of community services programming at their respective institutions. The community college presidents or their designated subalterns were surveyed concerning their attitudes toward the structure, content, and future direction of community services programming at their respective institutions. Adaptations of Harlacher's Check List for Effective Programs of Community Services were used to elicit the data.

In this study, answers were sought to the following questions: (1) What is the structure of the community services programs in Michigan's public community colleges? (2) What is the attitude of the Presidents
or their designated subalterns in Michigan's public community colleges toward the community services concept? (3) What is the nature of community services programming in Michigan's public community colleges? (4) What is the attitude of community college presidents or their designated subalterns in Michigan's public community colleges regarding the developmental direction of community services during the next five years? (5) What is the relationship between the scope of community services programming in Michigan's public community colleges and the environmental variables of presidential attitude, institutional age, institutional size (number of students), socio-economic status of the college district, number of campuses, and percent of institutional budget allocated to the community services program?

The results indicated that community services was in a developmental stage in Michigan public community colleges. The parametric aspect of the study revealed that community support and publicity elements were present to a high degree. Long range planning, integration (coordination), research/evaluation, and development, while present, were much less extensive than community support and publicity. Findings drawn from the examination of presidential attitude reinforce the concept of a developmental stage. Presidents'
theoretical conceptions of community services were more advanced than the programs were in practice. Presidential responses, however, did provide hope for amelioration. The presidents were virtually unanimous in their opinions that community services will at least continue to develop gradually and may expand significantly during the next five years. Furthermore, they were similarly unanimous in assigning community services responsibility to the entire institution, not just to the community services division.

The results of the statistical aspect of the study were consonant with those of parametric aspect. No statistically significant relationship appeared between the scope of community services programming and the environmental variables. Yet, four emergent relationships were discernible. Institutional age was beginning to emerge as an influence on both planning and integration (coordination). Also, size and integration as well as budget and planning were approaching an inferential relationship. These results suggested that as institutions mature community services tends to broaden and diversify.

In summation, community services in Michigan public community colleges is passing through a developmental stage in its diffusion from educational
theory into actual community college programs. There is evidence to suggest that the development will continue. Furthermore, the data suggest that as programs mature inferential relationships emerge between scope of programming and environmental variables. In essence, community services is on its way to becoming the fifth major function of the community college.

Implications: Practicing Administrators

Individuals concerned with defining community services have been at a disadvantage. Studies conducted to date have been either purely theoretical or so narrowly stratified that any definition based on their findings cannot claim general validity. Therefore, the extant definitions of community services are essentially theoretical. The study described here, based on an entire population, permits the development of an empirical definition. The origin of the definition makes it useful to the community services director who is seeking a comparative perspective on his program.

Community services, according to the data reported here, is the outreach dimension of the community college. It involves the organization and integration of community as well as college resources. The director actively seeks community support and involvement in programming. Specific groups in the community are apprised, via a
comprehensive publicity program directed at specific interests, of the capabilities of the program and the community. Presently, emphasis is heaviest upon support and involvement. While research/evaluation and development activities are present, they are of secondary importance. The contention that community services has evolved beyond "educational public relations" does not appear borne out in the Michigan public community college setting. The preceding generalization should not be viewed as unequivocally negative. The mechanisms do exist and are being implemented to broaden and diversify the concept. In essence, the community services director charged with initiating a program would do well to recognize the need for establishing an identity based on community involvement and publicity.

A significant inference which can be drawn from this study is the emergence of a pattern of community services development. As mentioned above, community involvement and publicity are the most heavily developed aspects of community services programming. Integration (coordination) and planning are the second stage with research/evaluation and development the third stage. The impact of such a pattern must be assessed by each director. To what extent is he "marketing" pre-conceived programs? It would appear
important to evaluate the need for greater implementation of research/evaluation of the "relevance" of programming. The foregoing statement should not be construed as advocating total capitulation of programming to research or public opinion. Rather, there seems to be a lack of balance. If community services is to become a major function of the community college then there is a need for inter-facing all components of the community services concept. By recognizing that empirical research reveals a pattern of development, the community services director can decide whether the pattern fits the particular configurations and needs of his setting.

Another implication of the discernible pattern is its divergence from educational theory. It would be prudent to decide now whether any benefit would accrue from aligning practice with theory. If so, now would appear to be a critical juncture. The empirical data suggest that the divergence exists yet this divergence is not so great that realignment is impossible. Practitioners should weigh the merits of the alternate courses of action then proceed with all deliberate speed. The luxury of procrastination may soon remove the option.

A final inference deserves mention because of its relationship to the current economic scene. Although
the community college presidents are nearly unanimous in their opinion that community services programs need not be self-supporting, the lack of budgetary allocations has, in fact, placed them in that position. The emergent inferential relationship between percent of budget allocated and planning reinforced the importance of fund raising as a high priority activity. Given the prolonged recession now engulfing the nation and the increasing unavailability of outside funding, the community services director must begin contingency planning now if program broadening and diversification are to continue. New sources of funds must be sought or a new relationship to the institutional budget established. Unless one of these alternatives is implemented, community services' development as the fifth major function of the community college will be retarded.

Implications: Future Research

Any field survey quickly becomes dated. That generalization is particularly true of the survey reported here. Community colleges are the fastest growing segment of higher education in America. And community services is the most rapidly evolving dimension of the community college. Yet, the worth of the study is not determined by how long it remains
relevant. One barometer of worth is the kind of research a study generates. The results of this study suggest four areas of future research.

This study revealed a developmental trend in community services. The opinions of the presidents gave direction to the trend. It would be quite interesting to replicate the study in five years to determine whether the trend has continued. Furthermore, it would be valuable to examine the same environmental variables to discover if the emergent relationships have become inferential and if any other relationships have become discernible. Such a replication should validate the generalizations made here and provide insight into the degree to which the community college has fulfilled one of its stated purposes.

An important insight gained from this study is the amount of disagreement over the placement of the community services director in the administrative hierarchy of the college. There is a noticeable minority of presidents who do not perceive a need for a director to report directly to them. It would be valuable to be able to empirically assess the effect of placement. By measuring scope of programming and correlating it with placement in the hierarchy, it would be possible to generalize about the impact of "direct access to the locus of decision making"
on the scope of programming. Given the relatively limited nature of present empirical studies on dimensions of community services, such a study would aid the president in getting the most out of his professional staff.

Recently, a trend seems to be emerging in the tenure of community college presidents. The turn-over rate seems to be very high. Although no exact figures are available, at least one-third of the Michigan presidents have changed in the past two years. At best, it is difficult for any chief-executive to be responsive to the many sub-publics who make demands upon him. The community college community services program can have a role in improving the college/community relationship. To the degree that it develops community support, it "makes friends for the college." It would be useful to test this hypothesis by correlating scope of community services programming and the tenure of presidents. If an inferential relationship emerged it would be useful information for the president to have in seeking to fulfill the expectations which comprise the job. Even if no relationship emerged, a President's uncertainty in hierarchically ranking the demands confronting him might be materially reduced.

Finally, the inferential relationship hypothesized in this study revealed very little when tested. One
reason would appear to be the developmental status of community services in Michigan public community colleges. Some programs, however, are thoroughly developed. It would be most interesting to extract as a sample those institutions in the Michigan population which have a thoroughly developed community services program and correlate them with the environmental variables used in this study. The result would be a more intensive test of the hypothesized inferential relationships. Whatever the results, it would be easier to assess the validity of those theoretical studies which posit these environmental variables as instrumental in the development of community services. In summation, a number of worthwhile potential studies are suggested by this study.

Conclusion

As Shakespeare said "... What's in a name?"
The institution which provided the locus for this study is called the community college. Much of the literature on education today assigns the student a primary role in determining institutional thrust. Relevance has become a watch-word. Yet, the concept of "community" is composed of much more than that which is normally subsumed under the term student. As Seay and Crawford point out, a school that seeks to be
truly community centered must provide service to the whole community, not just the students attending the institution and must view as part of the educational facilities of the school the resources of the community and seek to develop and use them. If there is any existential validity in this study, it lies in learning more about the community dimension of America's unique contribution to higher education. The better we know the implications of community services, the greater will be our ability to realize the ideal established by Seay and Crawford. Social scientists agree that we live in a hostile, alienated society. The community services concept holds the potential to ameliorate some of the problems we face. Knowledge of the concept will permit us to realize its potential.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE: COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTORS
I. Name__________________________________________________________

II. Your Title_____________________________________________________

III. Institution____________________________________________________

IV. Is Community Services a major administrative division at your college?

   yes  no

V. What percentage of your time is given over to Community Services responsibilities?

   20%  40%  60%  80%  100%

VI. How many people, including clerical personnel, comprise the Community Services staff at your college?

   1-3  4-6  7-9  10-12  13-?

VII. During the last fiscal year was your Community Services division financially self supporting?

   yes  no

VIII. To whom in the administrative structure of your college do you report? ______________________

   (Title)

IX. Community Services Inventory:

   Please rate the degree to which each of the forty statements is a part of your Community Services program by using the following code and circling the appropriate number.

   5) To a Very Great Degree
   4) To a Great Degree
   3) To Some Degree
   2) To a Small Degree
   1) To No Degree
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1. Use of personnel from appropriate community groups in planning and promotion of the Community Services Program.  

2. Engage community advisory committees in planning the Community Services Program.  

3. Secure active participation and support of community leaders for the Community Services program.  

4. Organize a community advisory council as a means of identifying community needs and interests.  

5. Arrange for Community cultural groups to affiliate with the college.  

6. Maintain regular information service to keep citizens of the district community informed on college matters.  

7. Direct publicity and publications toward specific audiences in the community.  

8. Use extensive direct mail publicity for community services activities.  

9. Arrange for direct coverage of college events by the area press.  

10. Prepare brochures regarding community services activities and services and distribute them throughout the community.  

11. Issue personal invitations to community leaders to attend community services events.  

12. Encourage active participation of faculty, students and prospective participants in program development.
13. Organize a student-faculty planning committee.  
14. Coordinate community services program with other community and regional groups.  
15. Maintain close liaison with the public school personnel of the district community.  
16. Encourage community-wide coordination of cultural and recreational activities.  
17. Encourage college personnel to participate in community activities.  
18. Make college personnel available to the district community as consultants.  
19. Provide leadership in organizing needed community groups and solving community problems.  
20. Planning and presenting in-service training to the college faculty and staff to orient them to the community services function.  
21. Establish and maintain a five-year program plan.  
22. Encourage staff experimentation and innovation in developing the community services program.  
23. Community groups using college facilities and resources for their functions.  
24. Obtain written and oral evaluation of services and activities from participants.  
25. Conduct appropriate research studies, including surveys and polls.
26. Tailor program and individual services to meet the needs and interests of specific groups in the district community. 5 4 3 2 1

27. Develop a diversified and balanced program (Community use of facilities, community education services, community development, and cultural-recreational activities). 5 4 3 2 1

28. Develop objectives and a philosophy for the community services program and individual services. 5 4 3 2 1

29. Make a community survey to determine the specific needs and interests of the district community. 5 4 3 2 1

30. Base each decision to provide a given service or activity on an analysis of community needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1

31. Hold conferences and informal discussions with community people for purposes of determining community needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1

32. Encourage the community-at-large to express its desires and needs for specific services. 5 4 3 2 1

33. Establish written policies, regulations, and procedures for all aspects of the Community Services program. 5 4 3 2 1

34. Review policies, regulations, and procedures periodically to insure their continued effectiveness. 5 4 3 2 1

35. Offer services and activities at off-campus locations. 5 4 3 2 1

36. Use qualified consultants in developing the community services program when the need arises. 5 4 3 2 1
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37. Secure and maintain the understanding and support of the college governing board for community services as a major college function.  

38. Secure independent financial support for the community services program.  

39. Provide counseling, advisement, and testing services for the residents of the district community.  

40. Establish and maintain the evening credit program offered by the community college.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE: PRESIDENTS
QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Name__________________________________________________________

II. Institution____________________________________________________

III. Percent of overall institutional budget allocated to the Community Services Division during the last fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-5%</th>
<th>6-10%</th>
<th>11-20%</th>
<th>21-50%</th>
<th>Over 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IV. Community Services Inventory:

Please rate the degree of importance to the Community Services Concept of the forty statements by using the following code and circling the appropriate number.

5) Of Very Great Importance
4) Of Great Importance
3) Of Some Importance
2) Of Little Importance
1) Of No Importance

The Community Services Division of the Community College Should:

1. involve personnel of appropriate community groups in the planning and promotion of community services activities. 5 4 3 2 1

2. have a citizens advisory council. 5 4 3 2 1

3. have community services activities co-sponsored by community groups. 5 4 3 2 1

4. have community cultural groups affiliated with it. 5 4 3 2 1

5. establish a regular information service to keep the citizens of the district community informed on college matters. 5 4 3 2 1

6. use extensive direct mail publicity for its activities. 5 4 3 2 1

7. arrange for direct coverage of college events by the area press. 5 4 3 2 1
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8. prepare brochures regarding its activities and services then distribute them throughout the community.

9. issue personal invitation to community leaders to attend college events.

10. direct publicity and publications toward specific audiences in the community.

11. encourage active participation of faculty and students in the development and direction of its program.

12. coordinate its program with other community and regional groups.

13. maintain close liaison with the public school personnel of the college district.

14. encourage community-wide coordination of cultural and recreational activities.

15. encourage college personnel to participate in community activities.

16. make college personnel available to the community as consultants.

17. provide leadership in organizing needed community groups and solving community problems.

18. plan and present in-service training to the college faculty and staff to orient them to the community services function.

19. establish and maintain a five-year program plan.

20. encourage staff experimentation and innovation in developing its program.
21. invite community groups to use college facilities and resources for their affairs. 5 4 3 2 1

22. obtain written and oral evaluation of services and activities from participants. 5 4 3 2 1

23. conduct community research studies, including surveys and polls. 5 4 3 2 1

24. tailor programs and individual services to meet needs and interests of specific groups in the district community. 5 4 3 2 1

25. develop objectives and a philosophy for its program and individual services. 5 4 3 2 1

26. provide a program of non-credit short courses, workshops, and forums for the residents of the district community. 5 4 3 2 1

27. survey the district community to determine its specific needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1

28. base the decision to provide a service or activity on the analysis of community needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1

29. hold conferences and informal discussions with community residents to determine community needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1

30. encourage the community-at-large to express its desires and needs for specific services. 5 4 3 2 1

31. be established as a major administrative area within the college structure. 5 4 3 2 1

32. have a full-time administrator. 5 4 3 2 1

33. have a staff adequate to conduct its program. 5 4 3 2 1
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>establish written policies, regulations, and procedures for all aspects of its program.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>review policies, regulations, and procedures periodically to insure their continued effectiveness.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>offer services and activities at off-campus locations.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>use qualified consultants in developing the program when the need arises.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>secure the understanding and support of the College Governing Board for community services as a major college function.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>secure independent financial support for its program.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>provide counseling, advisement, and testing services for the residents of the district community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mark yes or no.

1. The Community Services division should be responsible for the evening credit program offered by the community college.  
   yes  no

2. Community Services should be the responsibility of the entire college, not just that of the Community Services division.  
   yes  no

3. The Community Services administrator should report directly to the president of the college.  
   yes  no

4. The Community Services division should be financially self-supporting entity.  
   yes  no
Please mark the alternative which you consider most realistically reflects the future of Community Services as a part of the total Community College program in Michigan.

1. Community Services are drastically over extended and will decline rapidly during the next five years.

2. Community Services have peaked and will decline slowly during the next five years.

3. Community Services will remain at their present level of development during the next five years.

4. Community Services will expand gradually during the next five years.

5. Community Services is just starting and will expand drastically during the next five years.
## Community Services Practices: Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Community Support (High = 30-24)</th>
<th>Publicity (High = 20-16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

COMPENDIUM: STATISTICAL RESULTS
## Compendium: Statistical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A.</td>
<td>Presidential attitude vs.</td>
<td>Program scope</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.</td>
<td>Presidential attitude vs.</td>
<td>Program maintenance</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C.</td>
<td>Presidential attitude vs.</td>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D.</td>
<td>Presidential attitude vs.</td>
<td>Program integration</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.</td>
<td>Age vs. Program scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.</td>
<td>Age vs. Program maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.</td>
<td>Age vs. Program planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.</td>
<td>Age vs. Program integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.</td>
<td>Size of Institution vs.</td>
<td>Program scope</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B.</td>
<td>Size of Institution vs.</td>
<td>Program maintenance</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C.</td>
<td>Size of Institution vs.</td>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D.</td>
<td>Size of Institution vs.</td>
<td>Program integration</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A.</td>
<td>Socio-economic vs. Program scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B.</td>
<td>Socio-economic vs. Program maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C.</td>
<td>Socio-economic vs. Program planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D.</td>
<td>Socio-economic vs. Program integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A.</td>
<td>Number of campuses vs.</td>
<td>Program scope</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B.</td>
<td>Number of campuses vs.</td>
<td>Program maintenance</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C. Number of campuses vs. Program planning</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.00018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D. Number of campuses vs. Program integration</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A. Percent of budget vs. Program scope</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B. Percent of budget vs. Program maintenance</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C. Percent of budget vs. Program planning</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D. Percent of budget vs. Program integration</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>