INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-26,188

PUUSTINEN, Leonard Russell, 1945-
SELECTED COMMUNITY EDUCATION VARIABLES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE PERCEPTION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The University of Michigan, Ed.D., 1977
Education, community and social

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

SELECTED COMMUNITY EDUCATION VARIABLES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE PERCEPTION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Leonard Russell Puustinen

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1977

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Curtis Van Voorhees, Chairman
Professor Frederick Bertolaet
Professor Howard Brabson
Lecturer Marilyn J. King

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation to the members of my doctoral committee and especially my chairman, Dr. Curtis VanVoorhess, whose awesome patience, peacefulness, reassurance, and guidance has contributed greatly to my personal and professional growth and trust.

To the professional acquaintances and friends whose encouragement was of immense benefit; Joe Maloney and family, Marilyn King, Pete Cwik, Priscilla Lisicich, Bill Venable, and many others.

Special thanks to Judy Eisele and her seven senior citizens whose energy and willingness was invaluable in collecting data for the study.

To my son, Greg, and my daughter, Penny, for the constancy of their love and understanding. My best wishes for their "education" and future.

Finally to the two people who have had a great influence on me as a person, my parents, Esther and Weikko. Their belief in me, supportiveness, love, and personal example have contributed a great deal to any personal and professional success I have achieved. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

Purpose
The Problem
Hypothesis Questions
Methodology
Instrumentation
Procedure
Statistical Treatment
Definitions
Limitations
Summary

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16

CHAPTER III: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 48

Introduction
Procedure and Methodology
Data Collection
Community Background
Statistical Treatment and Analysis
Additional Findings
Summary

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS 100

Summary
Findings
Implications
Recommendations

APPENDIX 111

BIBLIOGRAPHY 139

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Number and Percent of Total of Persons Interviewed, by Strata	51
3.2	Number and Percent of Interviews, by Sex . .	52
3.3	Number and Percent by Marital Status	52
3.4	Number and Percent of Respondents With and Without Children	53
3.5	Number and Percent by Age Level	53
3.6	Chi-Square Analysis of the Relationship Between Length of Residency in Community and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	55
3.7	Chi-Square Analysis Between Race and Sex and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	58
3.8	Chi-Square Analysis Between Age and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	61
3.9	Chi-Square Analysis Between Marital Status and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	64
3.10	Chi-Square Analysis Between Respondents With and Without Children and How They Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools. .	67
3.11	Chi-Square Analysis Between Present Occupation and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools . . .	70

Table		Page
3.12	Chi-Square Analysis Between Occupational Level and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	73
3.13	Chi-Square Analysis Between Present Occupation and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	76
3.14	Chi-Square Analysis Between Occupational Level of Spouse and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools . .	79
3.15	Chi-Square Analysis Between Educational Level and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	82
3.16	Chi-Square Analysis Between Family Income and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	85
3.17	Chi-Square Analysis Between Initial Information Source About Community Education and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	88
3.18	Chi-Square Analysis Between the Description of Community Education and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	91
3.19	Chi-Square Analysis Between Community Education Program Involvement and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools	94
3.20	Chi-Square Analysis of Employment Level of Non-School Employed Respondents and their Involvement in Community Education Programs	96
3.21	Chi-Square Analysis of Family Income for Non-School Employed Respondents and Program Involvement	97

Table | Page

3.22 Chi-Square Analysis of Program Categorization for Non-School Employed Respondents and Program Involvement 98

CHAPTER I

Purpose

The purpose of this study will be to determine what relationships exist between certain Community Education variables for various strata of respondents in the community and their perception of the effectiveness of the public schools.

The Problem

Local education systems throughout the country are besieged by pressures from within and without to become more responsive to the wants, needs, and perceptions of the communities they serve. Other pressures impinge upon educational institutions; the impact of collective negotiations,[1] the burden of having to obtain more financial backing to stay in operation,[2] the tremendous resources that are required to cope with these pressures, but in most cases not available, and the reality that these pressures

---

[1]Tom Wagamon, 1974. The University of Michigan, unpublished dissertation, p. 36.

[2]Ibid., p. 36.

are increasing at an accelerating rate.[3]

The Community Education concept is one method schools and communities have been using to deal with these pressures. The major objective of Community Education is:

> . . . to mobilize the human and institutional resources of a community in such a fashion that people of all classes and creeds are given necessary encouragement and opportunity to a better life, and local institutions become genuinely responsive to human needs and wants.[4]

The possibility of greater involvement of citizens in the educational decision-making process and programs, coupled with increased pressure from the Federal Government has resulted in a flurry of activity by school officials to organize community advisory councils and programs.

Greater involvement of citizens is a sign that change has begun to occur. Stevens describes three categories of educational change that can occur:

1. Structure-Educational efficiency and effectiveness. ("Quality")
2. Product-Educational Equity. ("Equality")
3. Process-Educational Control. ("Power")[5]

---

[3]Matthew B. Miles, "Education Innovations: The Nature of the Problem," Innovation in Education. ed. Matthew B. Miles, New York: Columbia University, 1964.

[4]Peter L. Clancy, The Flint Community School Concept (Brochure distributed by the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, 1969), p. 2.

[5]Leonard B. Stevens. "The Paradox of School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1976, p.

Community Education is capable of being the agent for implementing these types of changes.

During the past few years the process of change and innovation in educational institutions has been receiving the increased attention that is needed.

> . . . the failure of educational systems to meet the demands of a changing technology and a changing population results from an inability to readily adjust institutions and public policy.[6]

A good many observers suggest that we are in the advanced stages of a revolution in education. To support their case, these people point to the accelerated rate of change or contemplation of change in educational practices that has occurred over the past eight or nine years.[7]

Other literature points out that some institutions resist change. Lewin describes the traditional role of the school as a stabilizer in our society and a preserver of the American Value System.[8] He further implies that educational administrative structures are geared to maintain the

---

[6]Marilyn Gittell (ed.), Educating an Urban Population (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1957), p. 7.

[7]Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovation (Eugene, Oregon: Center For the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 2-3.

[8]Kurt Lewin, "Quasi-Stationary Social Equilibria and the Problem of Permanent Change." The Planning of Change, First Edition, Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, editors (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1961).

system and therefore resist change and avoid conflict. As Drucker[9] points out, the managers of educational systems are among those most challenged to implement change-producing innovations.

While the demand for changes and the implementation of change-producing innovations are plentiful, practical strategies for diffusing and implementing innovations throughout societal institutions rarely accompany such demands for change. Some school officials feel frustrated because of the lack of literature on school change. They insist change would occur even more rapidly if a practical strategy for implementation of change were available.[10] Unfortunately, a general theory of the diffusion of innovations does not appear to exist. Rogers suggests that a partial explanation for the absence of a diffusion theory is a result of . . .

> a lack of agreement upon social concepts involved in adoption behavior, and the absence of a synthesis of these concepts into a general theory that might be tested by empirical research.[11]

---

[9]Peter F. Drucker, The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

[10]Louis M. McGuire, Observations and Analysis of Literature on Change, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia.

[11]Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1972), p. 300.

Furthermore, the relative advantage an educational innovation provides over a traditional method may take years to assess, and may be only a slight improvement over the traditional practice. In addition, many educational innovations are often inadequately field tested because of limitations on personnel, equipment or funds.[12]

Among the many problems that have confronted public education, none is more controversial than the question of community participation in the decision-making process of public education. Considerable interest was and is directed toward this issue both by professional educators and concerned lay members of society.

As the demand for total control of the schools by some communities has subsided, the struggle continues in search for viable patterns of citizen involvement in the educational decision-making process. Some educators feel education change is facilitated by support from the community. Rogers and Svenning have pointed out that the adoption of innovations is facilitated by involving in the adoption-rejection decision those who actually use the innovations.[13]

---

[12]Floyd Wade Scholes, Identifying Initial Community Education Adopter Sources (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1975).

[13]Everett M. Rogers and Lynne Svenning, Managing Change. Operation PEP, San Mateo County Board of Education, California, 1969, pp. 75-94.

If the community is to be involved in the educational changes process, increased communication and participation between the institution and the citizen would seem to be important. Harold Hand has stressed that schools can be effective only to the degree to which they continually monitor the attitudes confronting them.[14] Rogers and Svenning have said:

> the flow of information between the administration and the public is neither steady nor heavy. Communication takes place most often when interested members of the community seek out the school principal or superintendent.[15]

It is doubtful that we can educate and inform a whole population this way.

Some school systems are apparently unable to adjust to the changing needs of the students and their parents. The school community shows a growing awareness of this inability. Clearly, the question of participation is moving closer to a mandate for many institutions. According to James B. Conont:

> the nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore, to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreck havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable.[16]

---

[14]Harold C. Hand, What People Think About Their Schools (New York: World Book Company, 1945), p. 2.

[15]Op. cit., p. 50.

The idea that the citizens of a community should participate in the schools is not new. John Dewey, in his book, Moral Principles in Education, said:

> . . . education is primarily a public business, and only secondarily a specialized vocation. The layman, then will always have the right to some utterance on the operation of the public schools.[17]

Truman M. Pierce has suggested that change and innovation can only be achieved as a result of strong community participation.[18] The American Association of School Administrators has said:

> the will of the community as a whole, must be translated by the school board into policies and implemented by the professional staff in operational programs.[19]

A wealth of sociological and psychological studies substantiates the belief that the participation of an individual in the process of establishing goals which are of concern to him will generally increase individual commitment toward these goals. The role of reinforcement, reward, or gratification is universally recognized by students of human

---

[16]James B. Conant, "Community and School Are Inseparable," in The School and Community Reader (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963), p. 53.

[17]John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1909), p. v.

[18]Truman N. Pierce, "Educational Change and the Role of Media and Educational Innovation," W. C. Meierhenry, ed., Neb." University of Nebraska, 1964.

[19]Imperatives in Education (Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1966), p. 106.

nature as crucial in the acquisition and performance of skills and knowledge. However, it has been stated that:

> . . . an event regarded by some persons as a reward may be differently perceived and reacted to by others. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceived that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behavior or attributes versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside himself and may occur independently of his own actions. The effect of the reinforcement following some behavior on the part of a human subject, in other words, is not a simple stamping-in process, but depends upon whether or not the person perceives a causal relationship between his own behavior and the reward.[20]

This conceptualization indicates that the degree to which a person will participate is dependent on the degree to which he expects a causal link to exist between his own behavior and the outcome of a situation.

In an attempt to involve citizens in the schools and thus perhaps improve the attitude of community members toward the institution, many community schools are mandating the establishment of community advisory councils and programs. The assumption underlying this action is that citizen involvement in the activities of setting goals and involvement in programs will establish a relationship between involvement and a more positive perception of the schools.

---

[20]Julian B. Rotter, Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement (Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, Whole No. 69), p. 1.

Hypothesis Questions

1. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on length of residency?

2. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on race and sex?

3. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on age?

4. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on marital status?

5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on whether or not respondents have children?

6. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupation?

7. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level?

8. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on present occupation of spouse?

9. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level of spouse?

10. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on educational level?

11. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on family income?

12. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on initial information source about Community Education?

13. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on their description of Community Education?

14. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on Community Education program involvement?

Methodology

Sample

The population sampled included Board of Education Members, the School Superintendent, School Principals, and a random sampling of lay citizenry.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was developed by a team of students and staff in the Office of Community Education Research at The University of Michigan. The questions were pre-tested in six communities. See Appendix for a copy of the instrument.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered through face-to-face and phone interviews by a trained Research Team from the community. The distribution and sampling for each group were:

1. Board of Education--All board members were personally interviewed whenever possible. Otherwise, the interview took place by phone.

2. Superintendent--Personal interview.

3. Community Citizens--The intent was to obtain a sample representative of a cross-section of the community. Both personal and phone interviews were used. Locations for personal interviews included shopping centers, factories, churches (from each denomination), Employment Offices, restaurants or bars, and homes. The methods for selection of home interviews included the following:
(1) Face-to-face interviews in public places in the community,
(2) Random selection of names and addresses from phone books.

Attempts were made to obtain an approximately equal number of males and females.

4. Principals--All available principals in the public schools were interviewed.

Statistical Treatment

The results of the study were statistically analyzed using the Michigan Interactive Data Analysis System (MIDAS) at The University of Michigan.

The chi-square, a nonparametric test was utilized to test the hypotheses. The level of significance for the chi-square tests will be placed at the .05 level.

Definitions

Perception.--An awareness of the environment gained through direct or intuitive cognition.

Community School.--Refers to the vehicle most commonly designated for the implementation of the Community Education Process.

Community Education.--Specifies the process by which residents of a community are involved in democratically determining their needs and desires, planning activities and programs designed to meet expressed needs and desires, and utilizing the school as a catalytic agent to develop reciprocally constructive school-community relationships.

Community betterment, problem solving, and change are the ultimate concerns of Community Education.

Involvement.--At least two fundamental levels exist when Community Education is implemented. First, program involvement, which includes the K-12 programs, use of facilities, activities for school age children and youth, and activities for adults. Secondly, process, which includes delivery and coordination of community services, and community involvement through local advisory councils.

Limitations

1. Only one district was sampled, it was not intended that the findings of this study should imply fact for districts that are not of a similar type.

2. This study was conducted in the summer and will be limited by the unavailability of certain personnel and citizenry due to vacations.

Summary

Many schools are under pressure to change. Internal and external pressures in the form of collective negotiations, failing millage elections, and increased pressures for more responsiveness to community needs and perceptions, have caused some educational institutions to begin to involve citizens in educational programs and the decision-

making process.

Greater involvement of the local citizenry is a sign that change has begun to occur. Community Education is an agent and philosophy schools have been using to implement change.

Educational change has been besieged by many problems. A lack of literature on practical implementation strategies is one of the problems confronted by educators. Another problem is that many educational institutions are resistive to change because of the long-standing role of tradition stabilizer and preserver of the American Value System.

Other problems confronting educational change is the time-consuming and inadequate evaluation and testing of traditional and non-traditional educational practices. In addition, the controversy over community participation in the decision-making process of public education continues on. Several authors believe change is facilitated by involvement of the people who will be using the innovation in the decision to adopt or reject an innovation.

It is believed that participation in setting goals which will affect an individual will generally increase an individual's commitment to achieving these goals. With the establishment of advisory councils and programs, the individual will be involved and may acquire a more positive

attitude toward public schools because of increased understanding of educational goals and involvement in the educational process.

The remainder of the study is presented to the following format:

Chapter II Selected Review of the Literature

Chapter III Report of the Data

Chapter IV Summary, Findings, Recommendations and Implications

In Chapter II, a portion of the available literature concerning types and methods of educational change will be examined. In the Report of the Data, the sampling procedure, sample design, method of data collection and statistical treatment and analysis of the research data are defined and examined. A summary of the research data, conclusions founded upon the results of the research and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER II

> America is entering an Age of Education. Education will become the dominant coordinating force for society, occupying the same position that science and religion have in the past.[1]

The financial crunch in the form of local, state, and federal pressures, collective negotiation, and the impact of the community power structure[2] has in some instances brought about increased involvement of lay citizenry in local school programs and councils.

This increased involvement has generally led schools to change in the direction of being more responsive to the wants, needs, and perceptions of the communities they serve. This involvement for both school officials and local citizenry has served at least two purposes. On the one hand, involvement serves as an end in itself. In other words, it can by its nature be a fulfilling activity for the individual. Self-generating activities such as leisure-time classes and

---

[1]Mario D. Fantini. "From School System to Educational System," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, p. 10

[2]Michigan Department of Education, Research Implications for Educational Diffusion, Major Papers Presented at the National Conference on Diffusion of Educational Ideas. East Lansing, Michigan, 1968.

special community events would fall in this category.[3]

Involvement also serves a means to an end. This type of involvement takes the form of establishing cooperative procedures and communication channels with governmental agencies, volunteer and civic organizations, and business and industry. The establishment of citizens advisory councils to create a climate for change and innovation is a most desirable form of involvement.

The literature indicates that educational change is not coming about as rapidly and spontaneously as it might. Shane has stated that because of the urgency of our global problems the present rate of educational change is not fast enough and should become far more widespread if we are to survive and flourish as a species.[4]

Other authors believe that school purposes, forms, and functions are, unfortunately, not substantially different in 1976 from what they were in 1970.[5] In other words, it would appear that very little, if any, change is occurring in our public schools. Evidence seems to indicate that it is, in

---

[3]Jack D. Minzey and Clyde E. LeTarte. From Program to Process. Midland, Mich. Pendell Publishing Co., 1973), p. 28.

[4]Harold G. Shane. "Looking to the Future Reassessment of Educational Issues of the 1970's," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1973, p. 329.

[5]Leonard B. Stevens. "The Paradox of School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, February 1976, p. 37.

fact, quite common for innovations to be abandoned wholly or in part a year or two after being introduced by an outside agency such as the Federal Government, thus indicating a resistance to change of this nature.[6]

One author has indicated that the abundance of innovations is well documented, but implementation has not been successful.[7]

At first glance, it would appear that schools are changing, however, there are potentially several levels of innovation, ranging from "superficial" change to fundamental redesign of the educational system. A closer look reveals that most educational change is probably superficial.

Fundamental redesign of the schools seems unlikely:

> . . . there is no hard evidence that the nation's school system is in the midst of fundamental redesign. There is, in fact, more evidence that the system is almost impervious to redesign, typically withstanding the best efforts of the most skillful reformers.[8]

Therefore,

---

[6]Roland J. Pellegrin. "Problems and Assumptions in the Implementation of Innovations," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 1. 1975, p. 92.

[7]Regis Q. McKnight and Hal W. Seaton. "Innovations in Education--Fact or Fiction," Reading Improvement, No. 12, 1975, p. 242.

[8]Joseph B. Giacquinta. "Status Risk-Taking: A Central Issue in the Initiation and Implementation of Public School Innovations," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 1. 1975, p. 371.

> the goal of bringing about fundamental and lasting change in the public schools remains out of reach.[9]

One school official has even gone so far as to state: "In the main, those of us who are school practioners dare not, and to be completely candid, we care not to serve as democratic change agents."[10] The reasoning behind this statement is that since education hasn't been involved in significant societal changes in the past, this is not a reasonable expectation for schools of the future.[11]

Because of this apparent lack of concern by some school officials to respond to the wants, needs, and perceptions of people not represented in the community power structure, the schools are viewed as relatively ineffective in meeting the expectations of these citizens to the point that a number of citizens have petitioned the courts to obtain their children's right to a quality education.[12] Coupled with this school officials are being confronted in the courts with the civil liberties of students.[13]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 102.

[10] Bernard S. Miller. "A Brief Trip to the Schools of the Eighties," The North Central Association Quarterly, Spring 1975, p. 357.

[11] Ibid., p. 358-364.

[12] Fantini, op. cit., p. 11.

[13] John P. DeCecco and Arlene K. Richard. "Due Process for Students: The Court Moves in," Psychology Today, November 1975, p. 56.

Because of pressure on some educational institutions by citizens, it appears that change may be desired, and if the pressures for change are effective, what aspects of the institution is it reasonable to expect can or cannot be changed? At least three areas of the educational sphere appears to have the potential to be changed. These three categories as originally suggested by Joseph Litterer are structure, product, and process.[14]

One province that appears amenable to reform is school structure, consisting of dollars, teachers, administrators, buildigs, and buildings, and vocational, academic and adult programs. Restated in question form, how effective are the schools at educating with the resources available?

A search of the current literature on structural change reveals a limited number of suggested reforms. One suggestion is that schools should grant increasing opportunities for children and youth to become acquainted with career options in the early grades and to explore these options through "hands-on" experiences.[15]

Another author indicates that because youths are isolated from the world of work, they are unable to find and

---

[14]Joseph Litterer. Organizations, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969).

[15]Roy Weaver. "The Futurists Gather in Washington," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, p. 49.

hold gainful employment thus indicating that schools are ineffective at helping youths survive in a work situation, creating a need to combine the worlds of education and labor.[16]

An area of structural reform suggested by Fantini is what the president of the American Federation of Teachers has called "Educare," a publicly funded educational plan that would provide all Americans with free access to life-long learning.[17] He has further stated:

> . . . reform does not mean scrapping our free system of public schools, as some critics have proposed, but rather of transforming it.
>
> . . . The transition from school to educational system will ultimately require linkages with a network of learning resources in the community.
>
> . . . This sharing of educational objectives and competencies will relieve the school of the need to spread itself thin. Instead, the school will become an integral part of an educational system, dealing with the basics, as it has done historically, but also assuming other critical roles: orchestrator and coordinator of the new educational system.[18]

U.S. News and World Report hints at another structural change:

---

[16]Lyndon G. Furst. "The Educational Fifth Column: An Expanded Role for Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, p. 9

[17]Fantini, op. cit., p. 12.

[18]Ibid., p. 10-12.

> . . . the number of learners age 35 or older enrolled in some form of adult education has increased 30% during the past two years.[19]

Shane has summarized what the potential of this statistic could mean: Postsecondary education doubtless will continue to attract larger numbers of mature learners.

> To meet the needs of this mature group, new structures and new content will surface. The structure promises to involve less red tape governing admissions, fewer arbitrary prerequisites for courses, greater self-determination, and more motivated self-direction. Colleges of arts and sciences are likely to become more service oriented in their contacts with older learners, while rediscovering the importance of excellence in undergraduate pre-professional programs for physicians, architechts, educators, lawyers, and the like.[20]

Another structural change suggested in the literature deals with the problem of compulsory attendance.

> This basic problem could be remedied by replacing compulsory school attendance laws with a system that would allow the student to choose from many options. Certainly the basic skills of reading, languages, and arithmetic seem necessary to members of our society. For most children these skills can be acquired most efficiently in the formal structure of a school. Thus, as a safeguard, compulsory attendance might be needed for children from ages 8 to 14, or whenever a child has acquired proficiency in the three basic areas.[21]

Stevens also has suggested typical structural reforms:

--Higher school spending.
--Additional administration, managerial systems, e.g., PPBS, MBO, MIS, computerized data; etc.

---

[19]U.S. News and World Report, March 17, 1975, p. 8.

[20]Harold G. Shane. "The Future as a Force in Educational Change," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, p. 15.

[21]Furst, op. cit.

--Additional teachers; teacher licensing reforms; CBTE; more/better inservice training; teacher centers; etc.
--New and/or renovated schools.
--School district consolidation; regionalization.
--Bigger comprehensive high schools.
--New curricula, e.g., new math, etc.; closed-circuit TV; programed instruction; teaching machines; etc.
--Team teaching; departmentalized teaching; differentiated staffing; use of aids and paraprofessionals; etc.[22]

In spite of the fact that these changes have taken place or will take place, the evidence seems to indicate that no fundamental institutional change is taking place as a result of structural change. In addition, the structural changes have not significantly altered public perception of the receptiveness and effectiveness of the institution.

> . . . In short, it appears that in schools there is a great deal of talk about innovation and behavioral commotion during initiation efforts, but that far less firm and desired motion toward new organizational forms really takes place.[23]

A second area of the educational institution that seems to be sensitive to change is product. These are services and policies that schools use in treating students. The thrust of this reform is educational equity, or equal quality education. This area seems to generate a great deal more debate and literary comment than structural change.

One area of product change that appears in the literature is the emergence of a different attitude toward learning.

---

[22]Stevens, op. cit., p. 272.

[23]Giacquinta, op. cit., p. 104

One suggestion is that schools have the obligation of presenting an optional array of approaches to learning.[24] Also, education is being viewed by the general public as a continuous, lifelong, enjoyable, and very rewarding process.[25] The premise being: "Education is a lifelong process and the school is simply a preparation for a life of learning."[26]

Another major product change needed according to the literature is to use community resources. Up to this point, community resources and public education have generally not been complementary. Community education, community colleges, and high school co-op programs are about the only activities that begin to tap community resources. One of the demands of citizens is to make education relevant to the needs of the individual. One author has said:

> . . . During the early teen years when the transition from childhood to adulthood has just begun, a youth desperately needs the stimulation of being with more mature persons. Instead, the "adolescent island" realized by Ralph Tyler has been created.[27]
>
> . . . To meet this challenge, the school will need to devise ways of working jointly with other community organizations to develop effective learning opportunities for character development, for positive induction of youth into adulthood, and for the responsibilities

---

[24]Weaver, op. cit.

[25]Furst, op. cit., p. 11.

[26]Ibid., p. 9.

[27]Ibid.

> of citizenship. Some schools have already been successful in working with other community agencies to increase educational opportunities for adolescents.[28]

A specific plan to achieve this type of reform has been formulated for California's 1,528 intermediate and secondary schools.

> The first step in the RISE reform program is the development of a plan for reform by each participating school. Involving all members of the school community--students; parents; teachers; administrators; and representatives of labor, industry, business, and the professions--the planning must include a challenge to existing assumptions and a total reassessment of the school's goals and organizational patterns. This self-examination will seek to identify gaps between the current school program and a program that fits into the goals of RISE. Once these gaps have been identified, the school's plan can be developed to fill them and to redirect the school's program so that personalized learning can be achieved.
>
> In a nutshell, the school plan represents a framework of ongoing processes. It is not a static document written only to be filed away.[29]

In the context of this added emphasis on more realistic education, the most important thing that must happen in every school is that each learner achieve minimum competencies in basic areas to become self-sufficient in our complex society.[30]

The problem of values is an equally critical product

---

[28]Ralph W. Tyler. "Reconstructing the Total Educational Environment," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1975, p. 12.

[29]George W. Neill. "The Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education in California," Phi Delta Kappan, February 1976, p. 393.

[30]Ibid., p. 393.

area. One author observes that the pursuit of change in American schools takes place in the context of a pluralistic society:

> A plural democracy ultimately grounds its values in the differences among individual members. The clash of values which is so clearly present in resistance to change is the clash of legitimately differing interests.[31]

Other value problems are "the sharp conflict between the Third Force and Skinnerian psychological movements in education.[32] This rift centers around the dichotomy of humanistic or nurturing education versus "feelingless" conditioning. Related to this split is the inclusion or exclusion of "compassion" in educational settings.

> Such an emphasis would demand that educators reorganize decision-making relationships in schools to include children and youth on a parity basis, require more personalized and humanistic teaching, and assure a range of self-iniated, self-paced in- and out-of-school activities.[33]

In a discussion of values education, Fantini discusses the differences between "schooling" and "education." He says:

> The primary aim of the former is basic literacy, general knowledge of the disciplines, and vocational training.

---

[31]Dale Mann. "Making Change Happen," Teachers College Record, Volume 77, No. 3, 1976, p. 322.

[32]Harold G. Shane and Roy A. Weaver. "Educational Developments Anticipating the 21st Century and the Future of Clinical Supervision," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 2, 1976, p. 92.

[33]Weaver, op. cit.

> The major emphasis of the latter is personal psychosocial growth, talent development, competence in performing the major societal roles--communicator, political participant, consumer, parent, etc.--all in accordance with the noblest humanistic values of a free and open society. The curriculum of "education" would include such pressing issues as peace, war, death, cooperation, survival, health, law, communications, compassion, trust, dignity, human potential, and social justice.
>
> Educated persons of good will will be striving, as world citizens, to maintain the international policies of interdependence, harmony, and ecological balance.[34]

Shane becomes even more specific by listing changes that he and other futurists believe must take place in order to preserve our well-being. He believes change will occur in three stages:

> 1) the Preintervention Period, 1976-1981; 2) the Alternative Approach Interval, 1981-1991; and 3) the Crucial Uncertainty Threshold, 1991-1996. A 20-year period was chosen because futurists generally agree that humankind will have done irreversible damage to the biosphere unless plans are well underway to change present wasteful practices within 10 years, and unless new and more Spartan life-styles have been generally adopted by 1996.[35]
>
> With effort and wisdom, by 1996 the human race will be experiencing life on a recuperating planet.

Product change is concerned not only with cognitive and physical changes but also with the affective. In some instances, academic learning and teaching is so structured that it excludes the relevance of emotion.[36] In other words education should be concerned with education of the total

---

[34]Fantini, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[35]Shane, op. cit., p. 14.

[36]Weaver, op. cit.

individual to help the individual "become."[37] Stevens has suggested the following product reforms:

> --Remediation; compensatory education; Head Start; etc.
> --"Gifted" programs; advanced placement; etc.
> --Bilingual education; ESL programs
> --Alternative schools; minischools' special schools; community-as-resource schools; independent study; work-study; etc.
> --Dropout prevention; out-of-school youth projects; equivalency diplomas
> --Integrated schools
> --Nonracist, nonsexist school policies; elimination of "institutional racism"; elimination of tracking; students' rights codes; etc.
> --State-aid equilization systems; plans to mandate equal school spending.[38]

Many, if not most, of the preceding product changes have been implemented in some form or another in many schools and after a decade of attempts at innovative reform, evidence of real change does not appear to have materialized.[39] As noted earlier however, fundamental institutional change and redesign has not occurred. What are the reasons that change has not occurred?

One obvious reason could be lack of money. However, federal aid figures show that:

> Promoting innovations accounts for approximately 10 percent of the federal aid to public schools which currently exceeds $3.5 billion annually. The U.S. Office

---

[37]E. O. Melby, Horace Mann Lecture, 1955, The Education of Free Men (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955), p. 54.

[38]Stevens, op. cit., p. 373.

[39]McKnight and Seaton, op. cit.

> Education spends most of these funds through a number of avenues, one of which includes so-called "change agent programs."[40]
>
> Federal change agent funds did not appear to induce school districts to experiment or to take risks with significant innovations. Instead, districts took advantage of the availability of these funds to support temporary add-ons or to finance practices for which prior LEA commitments to solve a local problem existed.[41]

Perhaps fundamental change has not occurred because of lack of knowledge about diffusion of innovation. One source says: "the gap in our knowledge about implementing change in the schools is formidable.[42]

Another source says:

> Educators are seriously handicapped by the lack of managerial technologies that might provide assistance in the innovation process. The literature on educational innovation has provided little in the way of practical help for those who plan and implement change. At the same time, the knowledge base is weak with regard to innovation in other types of institutional or organizational settings. Presumably the problems of implementing changes in schools are similar, at least in some respects, to those existing in other kinds of organizations. The extent to which education's problems are distinctive is, however, unclear.[43]
>
> . . . Nor has our understanding of the essential factors that block or facilitate the alteration of schools become crystallized in the form of a strongly predictive theory of success.

---

[40]Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. "Implementation of Educational Innovation," The Educational Forum, March 1976, p. 345.

[41]Ibid., p. 365.

[42]Mann, op. cit., p. 313.

[43]Pellegrin, op. cit.

> The deliberate process of change has remained poorly defined and has not been brought satisfactorily under conscious control in spite of the development and

However other sources indicate that "Change in outcomes has occurred, but the measurement and analyses are inappropriate or insensitive."[45] Information about promising practices does not seem to stimulate school districts to look outside of their districts for innovations.

> . . . local planners tended to rely on technologies that were known and supported locally. When demand for change existed, it arose within the district in response to local needs, not generally as a result of an awareness of purportedly successful innovations that took place elsewhere.[46]

Another situation which may impede the diffusion of innovation is what has been called the "siege mentality." "Teachers as well as administrators have allowed an adversary relationship to evolve."[47]

In their concentration on "key factors," educational reformers and researchers have often overlooked the most important systemic features that must be taken into account

---

[44]Giacquinta, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

[45]Berman and McLaughlin, op. cit., p. 349.

[46]Ibid., p. 365.

[47]Paul Zatz. "Reform in Education," NASSP Bulletin, February 1976, p. 95.

in the study of any human social organization: human communication.[48]

Associated with communication problems in impeding change is the problem of power. One source has called the problem "the struggle of little egos."

> . . . change-agents were generally unwilling to agree that their goals for students were morally or ethically inferior to anyone else's or that their pedagogy was worse than someone else's. . . Where two parties persist in their disagreement, yet one is somehow to do what he or she would not do otherwise, we have a situation of power. Power is not a common way to look at the change-agent experience, yet it may help to explain some otherwise puzzling outcomes.[49]

Fear may be another reason change has not occurred. Two forms of this fear are the fear of changing the status quo and loss of money.

> . . . Schools are organized and school people are appointed by boards of education to be followers, not leaders; to be defenders of the status quo, not agitators for reform. We obey the power structure in our communities, and the power structure wants no waves, no controversy, and no unnecessary budget hikes. Schools should serve as echo chambers of a community, say the overwhelming majority of those who control the purse strings. And we fashion our schools accordingly.[50]

Another variety of fear is the fear of risk-taking. One author believes:

---

[48]Tom Deats. "Educational Futures What Do We Need to Know," Educational Theory, Volume 26, No. 1, 1976, p. 81.

[49]Mann, op. cit., p. 315.

[50]Miller, op. cit., pp. 357-358.

> Often, and with reason, organizational members will put aside fears they have about innovations because they are convinced that the expert knows best and has the interest of the organization and its members at heart. Others are not so generous. They distrust change agents be they from the outside or within the organization. The efforts of change agents under these conditions are apt to be unsuccessful.[51]

E. Hoffer believes:

> In the case of drastic change the uneasiness is, of course, deeper and more lasting. . . "We have to adjust ourselves, and every radical adjustment is a crisis in self-esteem; we undergo a test, we have to prove ourselves. It needs inordinate self-confidence to face drastic change without inner trembling."[52]

To successfully deal with an innovation, one would have to accept the viewpoint that the objective risks and real losses or gains when innovation are introduced probably are not as great as the estimations.

> . . . the reduction of uncertainty and <u>unwarranted</u> risk perceptions would help the process of change, if one accepts the status-risk perspective. But, reduction of uncertainty and imagined risks would require that management be clear itself about the innovation and its ramifications, conditions that seldom seem to be met adequately. New desired actions need to be reinforced.[53]

A historical perspective can explain part of education's resistance to change:

> Historically, change in American education has been a slow, deliberate, and evolutionary process. It has

---

[51]Giacquinta, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 113.

[52]E. Hoffer. <u>The Ordeal of Change</u> (New York, Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 1-2.

[53]Giacquinta, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 112.

> been stated that it takes between 75 and 100 years for an educational theory to be implemented or translated into practice.[54]

In the final analysis, change agents may have unrealistic expectations for structure and product changes. Realistically, it appears that structure and product changes can only be expected to "refine" the present system making significant fundamental institutional change an unobtainable goal. Paradoxically though perhaps product and structure change need to occur before fundamental change takes place. On the other hand perhaps fundamental change must occur before significant product and structure changes can take place. What type or kind of change must take place to significantly alter the basic institutional character? One begins to glimpse the reality of the situation by looking at the statement:

> the peculiar disadvantage of change agents in education lies in applying methods which are largely educational to situations which are fundamentally political.[55]

Having examined product and structural change, the third type of change suggested by Litterer is a "process" change. Process is concerned with who makes the decision about the ultimate control of the educational institution. In political terms, the issue is power. If a fundamental

---

[54]McKnight and Seaton, op. cit., p. 244.

[55]Mann, op. cit., p. 314.

change of the educational system is desired, the issue of power must be dealt with. The following hierarchy of control of power has been suggested with the first suggestion having the least community power to the last suggestion having the most community power:

> Performance contracting; elimination of tenure for administrators; accountability systems
> Parent/citizen participation in collective bargaining
>
> Participatory roles for parents and other citizens in educational decision making
>
> Vouchers; entitlements for high school-age-youth; "public schools of choice"
> Community-controlled schools[56]

Other methods of community involvement in the literature suggest that:

> Critical for the success of a total school planning process in achieving reform is the participation of the entire school community. This is why all participating schools will be required to establish a school/community council that is representative of the school's community.
>
> The council will participate in the development of school plans and the total reassessment of each of the school's components. "In other words," Fortune explained, "it will be actively involved in what's happening in its school and will share responsibility and accountability for what occurs."[57]

Other literature suggests that local procedures should be developed to include advice from students, school staff, and community representative in the process of selecting new school personnel.[58]

---

[56]Stevens, op. cit., p. 375.

[57]Neill, op. cit., p. 393. [58]Miller, op. cit., p. 362.

One source has suggested that citizen participation in the schools start with the following suggested reforms:

> --Each participating school must spend the first year developing a school site reform plan.
> --A school/community council must be established at each school.
> --A school/community resources committee must be formed at each school to deal specifically with crime and violence.
> --The district and the state must provide additional state resources to participating schools to provide an incentive for reform.[59]

Alvin Toffler at a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Anticipatory Democracy reflected growing interest in individual grassroots participation in decision making. Toffler urges development of more effective ways to involve people in educational planning.[60]

Shane has listed six problems that may arise in anticipating the work of education in the 21st century:

(1) continuing pressure and growing influence brought to bear on educational institutions by militant professional teacher unions and associations;

(2) parental and community demands for accountability;

(3) the question of whether or not to make greater use of electronic, psychological, or biochemical approaches to behavior modification;

(4) growing pressures for including more community representation in educational policy formation;

---

[59]Neill, op. cit.

[60]Weaver, op. cit., p. 50.

(5) emerging legislation and litigation related to such matters as student rights and which permeate all aspects of the educational process;

(6) rising interest in and support for lifelong, open entry-and-exit year-round educational settings;[61]

As the clamor for total community control by some communities has subsided, a search for viable patterns of citizen involvement has begun. Some alternative methods local school districts have been using to deal with this demand for involvement of citizens in the schools is to implement Community Education advisory councils and programs.

Generally, at least two structural changes appear to occur when Community Education is implemented, one being increased interaction with other agencies interested in citizen involvement, the other being the addition of community programs.

In most communities, there are agencies that have been established to deal with various community and individual needs, such as the school, the church, the "Y," the parks department, medical clinics, mental health agencies, social service agencies, federal state and local service agencies, and potentially many more. It has been suggested that Community Education attempt to bring about a better relationship between these agencies[62] and act as a coordinator to

---

[61]Shane and Weaver, op. cit.

[62]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 28.

prevent duplication of services.[63] Minzey has also suggested that the school be the center of this coordinating and mediating function.[64] In addition,

> the community school should be a human resource center through which all the above agencies might funnel their resources to the grass root or operational level.[65]

More research to determine the desirability of using the school as opposed to other community agencies for the implementation of Community Education would be helpful.

Community Education also attempts to develop a number of community programs[66] and while the program aspect of Community Education is not the ultimate goal, it is often the best method by which to proceed,[67] although at this point no research has been done to support or negate this claim.

School buildings are an important part of the Community Education concept. Up to this point, the school building has been emphasized as a neighborhood center, playing a key role in providing facilities and serving as a unifying

---

[63]Maurice F. Seay and Associates. Community Education: A Developing Concept. (Midland, Mich., Pendell Publishing Co., 1974), p. 13.

[64]V. M. Kerensky and E. O. Melby. Education II: The Social Imperative. (Midland, Mich. Pendell Publishing Co., 1971), p. 70.

[65]Ibid., p. 170.

[66]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 24.

[67]Ibid., p. 57.

force in identifying community.[68]

More specifically, it has been advocated that a community room should be established if at all possible as it represents an important bridge between the school and the community.[69] Structurally speaking then, Community Education is the encompassing concept and the school has been the system which provided for the carrying out of this concept. Today, in addition to using the schools, experimentation is taking place using other organizations to implement Community Education such as city government and citizen's organizations.

As one of the vehicles for implementation of the Community Education concept school structural changes to benefit the product are suggested by Kerensky and Melby:

> --Include all age groups
> --Open schools on weekends
> --Open school year-round
> --Open schools from early morning until late evening, and in some communities leave them open around the clock.[70]

Some attitional advantages to the individual of implementing Community Education through the schools would be that the community school can become an excellent vehicle

---

[68] Ibid., p. 5.

[69] Curtis Van Voorhees and Howard Hickey. The Role of the School in Community Education. (Midland, Mich., Pendell Publishing Co., 1969), p. 107.

[70] Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 168.

for enrichment of the K-12 program--primarily because of the lengthened time that the school is open and available. Community resources as well as staff personnel can be utilized to enrich the regular program in almost any way imaginable.[71]

> The community school also opens a number of possibilities to the senior citizens of a community. Our social structure has only recently begun to recognize that this group has special needs and desires.[72]

In the community school, preschool--or early childhood training and learning--has an increased opportunity for initiation and development,[73] and because of a commitment to be responsive to the needs of all the community members, any group or individual would have input and a part in the decision as to what programs would be offered. One author has even suggested that

> enrichment opportunities, recreation programs, cultural activities, avocational offerings, and political and civic programs are partial ways of resolving certain community problems.[74]

Other advantages for the individual as he becomes involved suggested by the literature include an increased sense of individual well-being. "The purpose of community education is to provide its citizens a sense of well-being.

---

[71]VanVoorhees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 108.

[72]Ibid., p. 109. [73]Ibid., p. 109.

[74]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 4.

What has been lost through urbanization can be regained through the educational programs."[75]

Another author has suggested:

> . . . it is only a slight stretch of the imagination to realize that practically all problems of a community--recreation, old age, unemployment, community politics, etc., play a part in the well-being of the educational life of the student and the community.[76]

> . . . the community effort recognizes the worth of human potential and the development of the self-image for each individual. The result is a new appreciation and a collective interest in human betterment and actualization.[77]

Finally, in relation to product, Community Education is concerned with improving the well-being of the individual as he relates to the community and within himself. The first step is to identify the needs and problems of the community members and secondly to implement the programs which will "meet or alleviate those identified needs."[78]

The implementation of Community Education will affect the learner in another way. The relationship between teacher and pupil will have new and added dimensions. One author has suggested that changes in teacher preparation may be needed.

> A new education must begin with a new type of preparation. We cannot expect teachers and administrators to be concerned with the affective considerations of the

---

[75]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 178.

[76]VanVoorhees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 32.

[77]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 115.

[78]VanVoornees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 66.

> educational process if only the cognitive concerns are emphasized and practiced in the preparation of their programs.[79]

Another author states:

> The involvement of the staff in the entire community education process will be essential in the development of staff attitudes necessary for a successful program. Staff members who are possessive about their facilities and equipment, are threatened by outside contact, or are jealous of their control of the educational process will be detriments to the development of the program. Teachers must be informed, involved and perhaps even indoctrinated in the concept so that they will become ardent supports.[80]

> Promoting a new philosophy--The community educator must understand from the outset, that in-service success in Community Education will be more difficult to achieve than in most other areas of education. Community Education presents a concept substantially different from that held by most educators and community members. To succeed in an in-service effort in Community Education, old belief systems and operational patterns must be broken down before new ones can be developed. It is always difficult to change existing patterns of behavior. Community Education requires this change before success can be achieved.[81]

Many feel Community Education's greatest potential lies in the area of process. At this level, such concepts as democracy, freedom, participation, advisory councils, control and change appear. Few words or concepts begin to approach the emotional level, timeliness and urgency associated with these words.

---

[79]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 140.

[80]VanVoorhees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 37.

[81]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 189.

As a vehicle for process change, Community Education makes some basic assumptions. One is that communities are capable of positive change, another is that social problems have solutions.[82]

One author feels that Community Education must be established on the premise that people must be involved in community decisions that affect them.[83] On the other side of the coin, involvement includes educators. Thus community education is not only a means of educating children and parents but is also a means of educating school personnel, teachers, principals and superintendents.[84] Educators need to learn how to relate to many different types of people, to utilize community personnel in establishing the relationships which administrators sometimes find difficult to achieve.[85] If implemented in the school, Community Education becomes the link between the community and its educational program. The more free-flowing that lines of communication between these two entities are, the stronger this link becomes.[86]

---

[82]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 32.

[83]VanVoorhees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 273.

[84]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 154.

[85]Ibid., p. 154.

[86]VanVoorhees and Hickey, op. cit., p. 115.

A question then arises, specifically how does Community Education gain input from the community other than through programs? The answer is, through the use of local advisory councils.

> Advisory councils put the community into community education. They provide a grass-roots level of participation in the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of all the people of a community.[87]

Basic to the complete success of Community Education is the use of advisory councils. The central idea is freedom, freedom for participation in ordering the affairs of one's community and one's government.[88]

Community Education then attempts to develop a process by which the community can become self-actualized.[89] Self-actualization being freedom to develop fully the potential for democratic community autonomy.

The literature on how much community control should exist as a result of implementing Community Education varies. One author believes lay citizens should totally control the operation of the school and the education of their children, and are responsible for all decisions from trivia to major policy determinations, and that responsibility and decision-

---

[87]Seay, op. cit., p. 121.

[88]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 185.

[89]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 29.

making authority should rest with the constituent citizenry.[90] Another author believes complete community control would mean a "narrow, provincial, even racist education for some communities and that such a development would be a threat to true democratic education."[91] Still another believes: "Community education and the free schools movement both stand somewhere between the 'School is All' and the 'De-Schooled Society' poles."[92]

Dewey has explained that philosophy begins when man feels a need to replace a condition which exists.[93] In some communities, desired change has not or can not take place because of lack of a method for bringing about this change. In conjunction with philosophy, Community Education can be an active method for replacing unwanted conditions.

Minzey has stated that one of the strongest forces for making change is community power, and that community members are willing to commit their energies to bring about community change.[94]

A major problem in bringing about change in a community

---

[90] Ibid., p. 7.

[91] Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 163.

[92] Seay, op. cit., p. 81.

[93] John Dewey. Reconstruction in Philosophy. (Boston, Mass., Beacon Press, 1929).

[94] Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 33.

is finding leadership that can enlist the support necessary for change.[95] It also appears that if change is to take place within a system, it must be done through the people already employed within the system as change agents from outside the system have a great deal more difficulty facilitating change.[96]

Finally, it is important to note that the implementation of Community Education and/or change in a community is an evolutionary step-by-step process. Eric Hoffer has suggested that no one really likes change. When new ideas are presented to the public, the behavior exhibited often does not coincide with the openness with which the idea or change was presented. One explanation is that the new idea or change may demand an overt behavior change and a decision concerning the adoption or rejection of the new idea. The change may also demand an attitude change on the part of the receiver.[97] The institution introducing the change has an obligation to keep communication channels open to facilitate as smooth of a change as possible. Rogers has suggested the following pattern of change can be expected when an innovation is introduced:

---

[95]Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 78.

[96]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 179.

[97]Floyd Wade Scholes. Identifying Initial Community Education Adopter Sources (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan., 1975), p. 34.

> individuals may be classified into five adopter categories: (1) innovators--the first 2.5% of the population to adopt an innovation, (2) early adopters--the next 13.5% of the population to adopt an innovation, (3) early majority--the next 34% of the population to adopt an innovation, (4) late majority--the succeeding 34% adopting, (5) laggards--the last 16% of the population to adopt an innovation.[98]

Community Education is evolutionary in that it grows and[99] matures in a community.[100]

Totten has summarized the potential powers of Community Education:

> --Power to bring about curriculum change
> --Power to influence the construction of school plants
> --Power to raise the values held for education
> --Power to bring about understanding among men
> A. through leadership
> B. through human relations
> --Power to strengthen the work of volunteer agencies
> --Power to improve economic conditions
> --Power to reduce waste
> --Power to raise the cultural base of the community[101]

At the three levels of structure, product and process, Community Education has the potential of contributing to change. As people can become more involved in education and understand its problems, the outcome may be that people will be more supportive of education.

---

[98]Everett M. Rogers. Diffusion of Innovations. (Midland, Mich., Pendell Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 156-160.

[99]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 33.

[100]Ibid.

[101]W. Fred Totten. The Power of Community Education. (Midland, Mich., Pendell Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 156-160.

Finally, Community Education has made claims for change, but they have never made the necessary, and in some cases even minimal, effort to demonstrate their effectiveness in terms of whether they have accomplished what they claimed they would accomplish.[102]

Summary

As the pressure for change has occurred in some educational institutions, the responses to this pressure have included structural, product, and process changes. Structural changes involve new managerial and/or teaching systems, and and plant changes. Product changes include concentrating on the quality of the education for the student. Process changes are concerned with establishing a continuum of who has control of the public schools ranging from no community control to complete community control.

Community education has been offered as a viable alternative for bringing about more substantial and lasting change in the form of process. The nature and extent of this potential inducing change is an area for further study and research.

---

[102]Minzey and LeTarte, op. cit., p. 247.

CHAPTER III

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze data collected in the study. All statistical results were computed on the Michigan Interactive Data Analysis System (MIDAS), using The University of Michigan Terminal System.

The instrument administered to the respondents was developed by the Office of Community Education Research at The University of Michigan (see Appendix A).

Procedure and Methodology

Sampling Procedure

The population sampled included school board members, the School Superintendent, and high school, junior high, and elementary principals. In addition to school personnel, the sample contained lay citizens.

The questionnaire was administered using face-to-face and telephone interviews. The following procedure was utilized:

1. Board of Education--some board members were interviewed by phone and others face-to-face.
2. Superintendent--face-to-face interview.

3. Citizens in the community--the intent was to obtain a sample representative of a cross-section of the community. Both personal and phone interviews were used. Methods for selection of interviews included the following:
   (1) Random selection of names and addresses from phone books,
   (2) Face-to-face interviews in public places in the community.
4. Principals--principals were interviewed by phone and personal interviews.

Data Collection

The Superintendent and Community Education Director were contacted initially regarding permission to administer the survey instrument. An explanation of the purpose of the study, specific survey procedures to be used, and the approximate dates the survey would be administered were also discussed. Approximately two weeks later permission was given to administer the questionnaire.

The senior citizen coordinator was then contacted concerning obtaining volunteers to aid in administering the questionnaire. Seven senior citizens volunteered. A one-day training session was arranged for the volunteers.

The first four hours of training contained a basic

introduction to research covering confidentiality, neutrality of interviewer and purpose of questionnaire. Initial familiarization with the instrument and answer sheet, assignment of strata to be interviewed, and a question and answer session were also included.

The second four hours was spent having the volunteers practice administering the questionnaire to each other under supervision, followed by a question and answer session.

The survey was then administered by the trained volunteers. All instruments and answer sheets were returned at an agreed-upon date.

Community Background

The community selected is a rapidly growing rural area the size of two standard townships (72 square miles), with a population of 22,000 approximately 5 miles from Flint, Michigan.

This community, originally a rural farming area, is expanding rapidly. This growth is sponsored by the completion of 2 major expressways that run near the town, the completion of several large housing projects, and the present development of a large shopping center complex. In addition, expanded water and sewage facilities are also an indication that the community is growing. According to a 1975 research report published by the public schools, agriculturally

oriented income groups are on the decline.

Statistical Treatment and Analysis

The results of the study are reported in two parts. The first identifies the number and percent of responses for various demographic variables; these are listed in Tables 3.1 through 3.5. The second part examines the 17 major hypotheses tested and related findings.

For the purposes of this study, the chi-squre, a non-parametric test was utilized to test the hypotheses. The level of significance for the chi-square tests was placed at the .05 level.

Demographics

The number and percent of responses for the strata interviewed, sex, marital status, the number and percent of respondents with and without children, and age are reported in the following tables.

TABLE 3.1.--Number and Percent of Total of Persons Interviewed, by Strata

Strata	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
School Board	5	7.7
Superintendent	1	1.5
Elementary Principals	2	3.1
Junior High Principals	4	6.2
High School Principals	1	1.5
Local Residents	52	80.0
Total	65	100.0

Of the total persons interviewed, 13 (20%) were school employed. The remaining 52 (80%) were local residents.

TABLE 3.2.--Number and Percent of Interviews, by Sex

Sex	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
White Male	30	46.2
White Female	35	53.8
Total	65	100.0

Because of the small racial minority representation in the community, only white males and white females were encountered in the sample.

TABLE 3.3.--Number and Percent by Marital Status

Marital Status	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
Married	50	76.9
Single	7	10.8
Divorced	1	1.5
Separated	2	3.1
Widowed	4	6.2
Other	1	1.5
Total	65	100.0

Almost one-fourth of the community members interviewed placed themselves in categories other than married.

TABLE 3.4.--Number and Percent of Respondents With and Without Children

Children	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
Yes	55	84.6
No	10	15.4
Total	65	100.0

Slightly more than one-sixth of the respondents interviewed did not have children while the remaining five-sixths had one or more children.

TABLE 3.5.--Number and Percent by Age Level

Age Level	Number of Responses	Percent of Total
16-25	10	17.10
26-35	11	18.80
36-45	19	32.50
46-55	9	15.40
56-65	4	6.80
66-75	5	8.50
Total	65	100.00

Slightly more than 35% of the people sampled were 35 years of age or younger. Almost 50% were between the ages of 36 and 55. The remaining 15% were 56 years of age or older.

Findings

Fourteen hypotheses were tested using the Chi-Square technique. The MIDAS program at The University of Michigan was employed for all analyses. For the purpose of statistical treatment, all hypotheses are stated in the null form in the following discussion.

Of the fifty-nine persons who indicated the length of residency in the community, almost two-thirds of the respondents had lived in the community twenty years or less.

Most of the responses appear to be grouped in the "average" and "above average" categories. No one who had lived in the community twenty-one years or longer rated the effectiveness of the public schools "below average."

Hypothesis I (HO.1)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on length of residency.

The chi-square value obtained was 9.2893, producing a level of significance of .2681 (Table 3.6). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis

TABLE 3.6.--Chi-Square Analysis of the Relationship Between Length of Residency in Community and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Length of Residency		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
0-10 Years	Non-School	15	0	2	6	4
	School	2	0	0	1	1
	Total	17	0	2	7	5
11-20 Years	Non-School	17	0	5	4	4
	School	3	0	0	1	1
	Total	20	0	5	5	5
21-30 Years	Non-School	9	0	0	3	3
	School	4	0	0	0	2
	Total	13	0	0	3	5
31-65 Years	Non-School	9	0	0	3	2
	School	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	9	0	0	3	2

TABLE 3.6--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
303						
415	2.8750	7.8030	9.2893	.3814	.3895	.2681
325						
404						

could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups; school-employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated for each case (Table 3.6). The values were 2.8750 for school employed respondents and 7.8030 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .3814 and .3895 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the sixty-five persons who responded, thirty were white males and thirty-five were white females. The community has a very small representation of minority groups. None were contacted in this study.

Both genders had a substantial number of responses in the "average" category, and a small number of responses in categories "below average." Responses from white males clustered in the "above average" category, while the majority of white females responded in the "very effective" category.

Hypothesis II (HO.2)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on race and sex.

The chi-square value was 5.2351, producing a level of significance of .1561 (Table 3.7). This was not significant

TABLE 3.7.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Race and Sex and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Race and Sex		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
White Male	Non-School		0	2	9	8
	School		0	0	2	3
	Total	30	0	2	11	11
White	Non-School		0	5	12	5
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	35	0	5	12	6

TABLE 3.7--Continued

	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
Very Effective	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
4 2 6 11 1 12	.80357	5.2909	5.2351	.5442	.1624	.1561

at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.7). The values were .80357 for school employed respondents and 5.2909 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .5442 and .1624 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the 58 persons who indicated their age, about two-thirds of the respondents were in the 16 to 45 age groups. None of the respondents in the 46-75 age group rated the effectiveness of the public schools average.

Hypothesis III (HO.3)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on age.

The chi-square value was 19.602, producing a level of significance of .1877 (Table 3.8). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic

TABLE 3.8.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Age and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Age		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
16-25	Non-School		0	1	2	5
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	10	0	1	2	5
26-35	Non-School		0	2	2	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	9	0	2	2	2
36-45	Non-School		0	4	6	0
	School		0	0	1	0
	Total	18	0	4	7	0
46-55	Non-School		0	0	3	2
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	9	0	0	3	3
56-65	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	3	0	0	1	1
66-75	Non-School		0	0	1	3
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	5	0	0	1	4

TABLE 3.8--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
2 0 2						
2 1 3						
6 1 7	7.000	19.031	19.602	.3849	.0640	.1877
3 0 3						
0 1 1						
0 0 0						

was calculated in both cases (Table 3.8). The values were 7.0000 for school employed respondents and 19.031 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .3849 and .0640 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the sixty persons who indicated their marital status, three-fourths were married. None of the widowed respondents rated the effectiveness of the public schools below average. The cell with the highest number of responses for the married respondents was the very effective column with 17 responses.

Hypothesis IV (HO.4)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on marital status.

The chi-square value was 15.863, producing a level of significance of .3366 (Table 3.9). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school-employed and non-school-employed, and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.9). The values could not be computed for school-employed respondents and was 16.392 for non-school employed respondents. The attained

TABLE 3.9.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Marital Status and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Marital Status		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Divorced	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Single	Non-School		0	1	2	3
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	7	0	1	2	3
Married	Non-School		0	5	10	7
	School		0	0	2	4
	Total	45	0	5	12	11
Separated	Non-School		0	1	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	1	1	0
Widowed	Non-School		0	0	1	3
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	4	0	0	1	3
Other	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0

TABLE 3.9--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
0						
0						
0						
1						
0						
1						
14						
3						
17	Could Not Be Computed	16.392	15.863	Could Not Be Computed	.3030	.3366
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						

attained level of significance was .3030 for non-school employed respondents which was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the sixty persons who indicated the number of children in their families, fifty had one or more children while 10 respondents had none. Among respondents who had children the cell with the highest number of responses was in the "very effective" column when rating the effectiveness of the public schools.

Hypothesis V (HO.5)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on whether or not respondents have children.

The chi-square value was 3.6168, producing a level of significance of .2857 (Table 3.10). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school-employed and non-school-employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.10). The value for school employed respondents could not be calculated and the value for non-school employed respondents was 4.6584. The attained level of significance for non-school respondents was .2013 which was not significant at the .05 level. The

TABLE 3.10.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Respondents With and Without Children and How They Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Children		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
No	Non-School		0	1	3	5
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	10	0	1	3	5
Yes	Non-School		0	6	13	8
	School		0	0	2	4
	Total	50	0	6	15	12

TABLE 3.10--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value School	Chi-Square Value Non-School	Chi-Square Value Total	Level of Significance School	Level of Significance Non-School	Level of Significance Total
1 0 1 14 3 17	Could Not Be Computed	4.6584	3.6168	Could Not Be Computed	.2013	.2857

null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the sixty persons who revealed their occupations, one-fourth were housewives. Respondents in education and industry accounted for more than one-third of the respondents, and retirees and persons employed in sales and business accounted for almost one-fourth of the responses. Almost one-eighth of the respondents were unemployed. Housewives and those employed in education seemed to have the highest number of their responses in the "very effective" column when rating the effectiveness of public schools.

Hypothesis VI (H0.6)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupation.

The chi-square value was 33.016, producing a level of significance of .3829 (Table 3.11). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school-employed and non-school-employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.11). The values were 2.2500 for school employed respondents and 34.771 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .5577 and .1876 respectively, neither of which are

TABLE 3.11.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Present Occupation and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Present Occupation		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Housewife	Non-School		0	3	4	2
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	15	0	3	4	3
Industry	Non-School		0	1	3	4
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	9	0	1	3	4
Sales/ Business	Non-School		0	0	1	3
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	7	0	0	1	4
Farming	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	1	0	0
Services	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	1	0	0
Health	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Education	Non-School		0	1	0	1
	School		0	0	2	2
	Total	12	0	1	2	2
Unemployed	Non-School		0	0	3	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	6	0	0	3	2
Retired	Non-School		0	0	3	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	7	0	0	3	1
Other	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0

TABLE 3.11--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
4 1 5 1 0 1 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0	2.2500	34.771	33.016	.5577	.1876	.3829
0 0 0 5 1 6 1 0 1 3 0 3 0 0 0						

significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the forty-six who described their employment level, one-half of the respondents were semi-skilled and professional employees. None of the respondents who were professionally employed rated the effectiveness of the public school below average.

Hypothesis VII (HO.7)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level.

The chi-square value was 25.426, producing a level of significance of .4673 (Table 3.12). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school-employed and non-school-employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.12). The values were 3.2000 for school employed respondents and 27.205 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .4069 and .3056 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the 45 persons who indicated their spouses'

TABLE 3.12.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Occupational Level and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Occupational Level		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
None	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	0	1	0
Unskilled	Non-School		0	0	2	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	0	2	0
Semiskilled	Non-School		0	2	5	4
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	13	0	2	5	4
Skilled	Non-School		0	1	0	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	5	0	1	0	2
Management	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	5	0	0	1	2
Professional	Non-School		0	0	0	1
	School		0	0	2	2
	Total	10	0	0	2	3
Self-Employed	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	1	0	0
Desiring Work	Non-School		0	0	2	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	5	0	0	2	2
Unemployed Not Desiring Work	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	0	1	1

TABLE 3.12--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
0						
1						
1						
0						
0						
0						
2						
0						
2						
2						
0						
2						
1						
1	3.2000	27.205	25.426	.4069	.3056	.4673
2						
4						
1						
5						
0						
0						
0						
1						
0						
1						
1						
0						
1						

occupation, spouses who were either housewives or in industry. None of the respondents who had spouses in education services rated the effectiveness of the public schools below average. All of the respondents who had retired spouses rated the effectiveness of the public schools in the very effective category.

Hypothesis VIII (H0.8)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on present occupation of spouse.

The chi-square value was 28.555, producing a level of significance of .0861 (Table 3.13). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.13). The values were 12.750 for school employed respondents and 27.246 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .0943 and .0857 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the 38 persons who described the level of their spouses' occupation, more than half had spouses who were

TABLE 3.13.--Chi Square Analysis Between Present Occupation and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Present Occupation of Spouse		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Housewife	Non-School		0	2	1	2
	School		0	0	0	2
	Total	9	0	2	1	4
Industry	Non-School		0	2	6	3
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	16	0	2	6	4
Sales/ Business	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	1	0	0
Government	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	3	0	0	0	1
Farming	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	1	0	0
Services	Non-School		0	0	2	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	0	2	0
Education	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	2	0
	Total	6	0	0	3	1
Retired	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	4	0	0	0	0

TABLE 3.13--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
0 2 2 4 0 4 1 1 2 2 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 0 2 4 0 4	12.750	27.246	28.555	.0943	.0857	.0861

in semi-skilled, skilled, or management occupations. More than one-fourth had spouses who were in seim-professional, professional, or self-employed occupations. None of the respondents who had spouses employed in semi-professional, or professional positions, or who were unemployed rated the effectiveness of the public schools below average.

Hypothesis IX (H0.9)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level of spouse.

The chi-square value was 23.368, producing a level of significance of .6185 (Table 3.14). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.14). The values were 12.000 for school employed respondents and 25.137 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .1057 and .7445 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the 60 persons who indicated their educational level, almost two-thirds had a high school diploma or

TABLE 3.14.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Occupational Level of Spouse and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Occupational Level of Spouse		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
None	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Unskilled	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Semiskilled	Non-School		0	1	1	1
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	6	0	1	1	2
Skilled	Non-School		0	1	2	1
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	9	0	1	2	2
Management	Non-School		0	1	4	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	8	0	1	4	0
Semi Professional	Non-School		0	0	0	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	0	1
Professional	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	2	0
	Total	7	0	0	3	1
Self-Employed	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	1	0	0
Unemployed	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	0	0	0
Other	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	0	0

TABLE 3.14--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value School	Chi-Square Value Non-School	Chi-Square Value Total	Level of Significance School	Level of Significance Non-School	Level of Significance Total
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
2						
0						
2						
4						
0						
4						
3						
0						
3						
	12.000	25.137	23.368	.1057	.7445	.6185
0						
0						
0						
3						
0						
3						
0						
1						
1						
1						
1						
2						
1						
0						
1						

less. All the respondents with a baccalaureate degree or higher rated the effectiveness of the public schools average or higher.

Hypothesis X (H0.10)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on educational level.

The chi-square value was 23.573, producing a level of significance of .4081 (Table 3.15). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.15). The values were 9.7500 for school employed respondents and 24.384 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .2528 and .4408 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the fifty-nine persons who disclosed their income level, more than two-thirds of the respondents rated their income in the middle and upper middle categories.

TABLE 3.15.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Educational Level and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Educational Level		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
8th Grade or Less	Non-School		0	0	0	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	0	1
Some High School	Non-School		0	2	2	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	8	0	2	2	2
High School Regular	Non-School		0	2	12	5
	School		0	0	1	0
	Total	28	0	2	13	5
High School G.E.D.	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	0	0
Community College or Technical School	Non-School		0	1	1	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	6	0	1	1	2
Some College	Non-School		0	2	0	1
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	4	0	2	0	2
Baccalaureate Degree	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	4	0	0	1	1
Graduate Work	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	2	0	0	0	1
Masters or Specialists Degree	Non-School		0	0	0	1
	School		0	0	1	2
	Total	6	0	0	1	3

TABLE 3.15--Continued

	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
Very Effective	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
0 0 0						
1 1 2						
7 1 8						
1 0 1						
2 0 2	9.7500	24.384	23.573	.2528	.4408	.4081
0 0 0						
1 1 2						
1 0 1						
2 0 2						

Hypothesis XI (HO.11)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on family income.

The chi-square value was 4.9933, producing a level of significance of .9270 (Table 3.16). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.16). The values were 1.1429 for school employed respondents and 4.9860 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .4654 and .9187 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the fifty-six persons who revealed their source of information about Community Education, eleven people heard about Community Education from the Community School Director, twelve from printed announcements, seven from a school administrator, and six from a teacher.

All those who heard about Community Education from the Community School Director and a school administrator rated the effectiveness of the public school average and above with almost half of the people who heard about Community

TABLE 3.16.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Family Income and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Family Income		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Very Low	Non-School		0	0	2	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	0	2	1
Low	Non-School		0	1	1	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	5	0	1	1	2
Lower Middle	Non-School		0	1	3	1
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	8	0	1	3	2
Middle	Non-School		0	2	6	5
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	21	0	2	6	5
Upper Middle	Non-School		0	2	4	4
	School		0	0	1	4
	Total	22	0	2	5	8
High	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total		0	0	0	0

TABLE 3.16--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value School	Chi-Square Value Non-School	Chi-Square Value Total	Level of Significance School	Level of Significance Non-School	Level of Significance Total
0 0 0 1 0 1 2 0 2 8 0 8 4 3 7 0 0 0	1.1429	4.9860	4.9933	.4654	.9187	.9270

Education from the Community School Director rating the effectiveness of the public schools in the highest category available.

Hypothesis XII (HO.12)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on initial information source about Community Education.

The chi-square value was 34.547, producing a level of significance of .2444 (Table 3.17). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.17). The values were 3.5000 for school employed respondents and 36.281 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .3814 and .1023 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the forty-six persons who offered a description of Community Education, thirty-seven described Community Education as a program. Of the respondents who described Community Education as other than a program none rated the effectiveness

TABLE 3.17.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Initial Information Source About Community Education and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Initial Information Source About Community Education		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Child	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Relative	Non-School		0	1	0	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	1	0	2
Friend	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	0	1	1
Teacher	Non-School		0	1	2	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	6	0	1	2	2
Community School Director	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	1	3
	Total	11	0	0	2	3
School Administrator	Non-School		0	0	4	2
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	7	0	0	4	2
Newspaper	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	0	1	1
Printed Announcement	Non-School		0	3	3	3
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	12	0	3	3	3
School Function	Non-School		0	1	0	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	5	0	1	0	0
Mott Foundation	Non-School		0	1	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	1	1	0
Movie/Slides	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0
Other	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	1	1
	Total	3	0	0	1	1

TABLE 3.17--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
0						
1						
1						
4						
2						
6						
1						
0						
1						
	3.5000	36.281	34.547	.3814	.1023	.2444
0						
0						
0						
3						
0						
3						
4						
0						
4						
1						
0						
1						
0						
0						
0						
1						
0						
1						

of the public schools below average.

Hypothesis XIII (HO.13)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on their description of Community Education.

The chi-square value was 7.7295, producing a level of significance of .6178 (Table 3.18). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.18). The values were 6.8750 for school employed respondents and 8.7858 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .3247 and .6088 respectively, neither of which are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Of the 60 persons who indicated involvement in the schools, 25 had not been involved in a Community Education program and 35 had been involved. The mean rating of the effectiveness of the public schools by non-school respondents was 2.9167 for those not involved in Community Education and 2.5185 for those involved in programs.

TABLE 3.18.--Chi-Square Analysis Between the Description of Community Education and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Description of Community Education		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Program	Non-School		0	7	9	8
	School		0	0	1	3
	Total	37	0	7	10	11
Process	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	1	0
	Total	3	0	0	2	0
Resources	Non-School		0	0	1	1
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	3	0	0	1	1
Services	Non-School		0	0	0	0
	School		0	0	0	1
	Total	2	0	0	0	1
Change	Non-School		0	0	1	0
	School		0	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	0	1	0

TABLE 3.18--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
729 101 011	6.8750	8.7858	7.7295	.3247	.6088	.6187
101 000						

Hypothesis XIV (HO.14)

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on Community Education program involvement.

The chi-square value was 6.4432, producing a level of significance of .0215 (Table 3.19). This was not significant at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The total respondents were divided into two groups: school employed and non-school employed and the X^2 statistic was calculated in both cases (Table 3.19). The values were 3.9375 for school employed respondents and 11.265 for non-school employed respondents. The attained level of significance was .1732 and .0065 respectively. The null hypothesis could not be rejected for school employed respondents.

The level of significance for non-school employed respondents is below the .05 level therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Additional Findings

Additional chi-square analyses were done to determine if any significance relationships existed between program involvement and other variables of the study. Three comparisons with significance greater than .05 were found.

The first comparison with significance greater than .05 is reported in the following table.

TABLE 3.19.--Chi-Square Analysis Between Community Education Program Involvement and How Respondents Rated the Effectiveness of the Public Schools

Community Education Program Involvement		N	Effectiveness of Public Schools: Not Effective	Below Average	Average	Above Average
No	Non-School		0	1	6	11
	School		0	0	1	0
	Total	25	0	1	7	11
Yes	Non-School		0	6	10	2
	School		0	0	1	4
	Total	35	0	6	11	6

TABLE 3.19--Continued

Very Effective	Chi-Square Value			Level of Significance		
	School	Non-School	Total	School	Non-School	Total
6 0 6 9 3 12	3.9375	11.265	6.4432	.1732	.0065	.0815

TABLE 3.20.--Chi-Square Analysis of Employment Level of Non-School Employed Respondents and their Involvement in Community Education Programs

Employment Level	Total Number of People	Program Involvement		Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance
		No	Yes		
Unskilled	2	1	1		
Semiskilled	13	5	8		
Skilled	5	1	4		
Management	3	2	1		
Professional	5	1	4		
Self-employed	1	0	1		
Desiring Work	5	5	0		
Unemployed--Not Desiring Work	3	3	0	14.561	.0168

Thirty-seven non-school employed persons responded to the questions about employment level and involvement in Community Education Programs. The level of significance for non-school employed respondents (Table 3.35) was .0168 ($X^2 = 14.561$). None of the unemployed respondents were involved in Community Education Programs indicating a trend toward limited involvement among unemployed individuals.

The second comparison with significance greater than .05 is reported in the following table.

TABLE 3.21.--Chi-Square Analysis of Family Income for Non-School Employed Respondents and Program Involvement

Family Income	Total Number of People	Program Involvement		Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance
		No	Yes		
Very Low	3	3	0		
Low	5	4	1		
Lower Middle	7	1	6		
Middle	21	9	12		
Upper Middle	14	7	7	8.7340	.0342

Fifty non-school employed persons responded to the questions about family income and program involvement. The level of significance for non-school employed respondents (Table 3.21) was .0342 ($X^2 = 8.7340$). Since most of the low and very low income respondents were not involved in Community Education Programs, it appears that lower income individuals had limited involvement in Community Education Programs.

The third comparison with significance greater than .05 is reported in the following table.

TABLE 3.22.--Chi-Square Analysis of Program Categorization for Non-School Employed Respondents and Program Involvement

Program Categorization	Total Number of People	Program Involvement		Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance
		No	Yes		
Evening Classes	2	2	0		
Educational Classes	2	1	1		
Leisure Classes	3	0	3		
Enrichment Classes	1	0	1		
K-12 Classes	1	0	1		
Sr. Citizen Classes	1	1	0		
Adult Classes	8	6	2		
Family Classes	17	5	12	12.422	.0308

Thirty-five non-school employed persons responded to the questions about a definition of Community Education and program involvement. The level of significance for non-school employed respondents (Table 3.37) is .0308 ($X^2 = 12.422$). It appears that respondents who classified Community Education programs as leisure classes and family classes were more involved than people who classified Community Education programs as adult classes.

Summary

On the basis of the data reported in this study the null hypothesis was rejected regarding only one hypothesis.

A significant relationship does appear to exist between how non-school employed respondents rated the effectiveness of the public schools and involvement in Community Education programs.

Additional findings seem to indicate that unemployed individuals do not tend to get involved in Community Education programs, low income respondents tend not to get involved in Community Education programs, and respondents who classify Community Education programs as family and leisure classes tend to get more involved in Community Education programs than people who classify Community Education programs as adult classes.

CHAPTER IV

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between Community Education variables for various strata of respondents in the Community and their perception of the effectiveness of the public schools.

Problem

Many school districts, whether they are increasing or decreasing in enrollment are experiencing community pressure. Pressure for change is being expressed in increased collective negotiations, and failing millage elections. These pressures have, in some instances, brought about increased contact between the community and the schools.

The problem has been to determine what effect this increased involvement has on local residents and the educational institution.

Methodology

The sample consisted of 65 respondents in a single community; 52 local residents and 13 school employed personnel

including Board of Education Members, the Superintendent, and Principals.

An instrument was designed that identified the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools as it relates to demographic and various other Community Education variables.

The instrument was administered in a face-to-face and telephone setting. Analyses consisted of using the Chi-Square test. In addition, the value for each cell was reported.

Findings

Fourteen hypotheses were tested with findings as follows:

Hypothesis I

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on length of residency.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and length of residency appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis II

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools

based on race and sex.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and race and sex appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis III

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on age.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and age appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis IV

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on marital status.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and marital status appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis V

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on whether or not respondents have children.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the

public schools and whether or not respondents have children appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis VI

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupation.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and occupation appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis VII

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and occupational level appear to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis VIII

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on present occupation of spouse.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and present occupation of spouse appeared to

be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis IX

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on occupational level of spouse.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and occupational level of spouse appeared to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis X

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on educational level.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and the educational level appeared to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis XI

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on family income.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and family income appeared to be independent

of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis XII

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on initial information source about Community Education.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and initial information source about Community Education appeared to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis XIII

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on their description of Community Education.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and their description of Community Education appeared to be independent of each other and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis XIV

There will be no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools based on Community Education program involvement.

Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and Community Education program involvement

appeared to be independent for school employed respondents. However, the level of significance for non-school employed respondents is below the .05 level, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

Implications

The significance of this study centers in the finding that those people involved in Community Education programs tended to rate the effectiveness of public schools lower than those who were not involved in Community Education programs. In other words, those who appear to be more involved and have more contact with school programs saw the schools as less effective than those who apparently have less contact with the school.

Several reasons are probably responsible for the existence of this situation. One reason could relate to the study itself. Results could have been biased, however no situation readily lends itself to influence a conclusion of this nature.

Potential reasons for this lowered ratio of the effectiveness of public schools could exist outside the study. The community studied is representative of a phenomenon that is commonplace in America today. Because of desegregation, high taxes, high crime rates, and other influences, people are migrating from large cities to outlying rural districts.

The community studied is just such an outlying rural district. The data show that a majority of the residents have lived in the community less than 20 years, and almost half of this majority has been in the community 10 years or less. The data also show that almost two-thirds of the residents sampled are between the ages of 16 and 45 years of age. This age group rated the public schools least effective in comparison to the other age groups, as did those who had been in the community 20 years or less.

This migration into rural districts from larger cities has brought people who probably have expectations of a rural school that would be equal in quality to the city schools. If this expectation is not met people might rate the effectiveness of public schools lower in the rural district because of the unmet expectation.

Another possible reason for this finding is the schools' relationship to the community power structure. School districts can be responsive to the power structure. People in community power structures might tend to be long-time residents of the community. In this study people 45 years of age and older and people who had resided in the community longer than 20 years rated the public schools more effective than those in the lower categories. If the long-time residents constitute the power structure, and the school is responsive to this power structure, this may explain why the majority

of the community rates the public schools less effective than the minority, assuming they are outside the power structure.

Another reason this finding may exist is that familiarity may indeed breed contempt. If people do become disenchanted with the effectiveness of schools after increased contact, perhaps open and honest communication about reasonable expectations for the public schools needs to be established with the local citizenry. This reeducation could be accomplished through the Community Education vehicle.

In the past, a great deal of emphasis has been placed on touting the effectiveness of Community Education per se. Now that Community Education has been effectively established in many districts in the United States, perhaps a synthesis of public education and Community Education is ready to take place. Instead of Community Education per se, or public school per se, a fusion is needed of community, public schools, via the Community Education concept to introduce synergistic communication instead of isolated communication.

In conclusion, if as the findings of this study suggest, schools are seen as less effective when there is only program involvement, schools may need to become more receptive to community involvement at the process level if they wish to maintain a reputation as a viable alternative for implementing education.

Recommendations

1. Establish a program or method that would deal with citizens questions and perceptions about the public school after increased contact with the public schools.
2. More studies to investigate communities who have increased local citizens perception of the effectiveness of the public schools and those communities who have not and examine the variables that are significantly related to this difference.
3. Studies that would investigate the developmental aspects of a Community Education program from inception to present-day operation and measure the perception of the effectiveness for several parallel studies.
4. A replication of this study in an identical community, an urban community, an inner-city community, and a strictly rural community.
5. A study of several Community Education directors to determine the effect of training, philosophy, educational background, cultural background, and other relevant characteristics that might affect community members perceptions of the effectiveness of the public schools.
6. A replication of this study in different parts of the country.
7. An extension of the additional findings of this study to develop a comprehensive profile of the attitudes,

beliefs, perceptions, and expectations of the person who gets involved in Community Education.

8. Further study to determine how the effectiveness rating of the public schools is influenced not only by program involvement but also process involvement.

APPENDIX

Introduction

HELLO, I AM(your name)AND I AM PART OF A NATIONAL RESEARCH TEAM FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN. WE ARE GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT (name of community) DO YOU LIVE IN THE(name of school district)SCHOOL DISTRICT?

INSTRUCTIONS:

[NO] Response = WE ARE ONLY SEEKING RESPONSES FROM PEOPLE IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT, SO I WILL NOT TAKE ANY MORE OF YOUR TIME. THANK YOU FOR TALKING WITH ME.

[YES] Response = Continue as below.

WE NEED YOUR HELP IN GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR COMMUNITY. THE QUESTIONS I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WILL TAKE ABOUT 10 MINUTES AND, ALTHOUGH NOT SENSITIVE QUESTIONS, ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO HELP US OUT?

[NO] Response = THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. PERHAPS ANOTHER TIME.

[YES] Response = Go directly to the questionnaire.

RECORD: NO RECORDING REQUIRED.

1. QUESTION: HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS COMMUNITY?

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose is to determine the approximate number of years the respondent has lived in the general area of the community or school district. Any questions directed to you should be responded to in such a way as to clarify that you simply want to know how many years they have lived "around the area" of name of community.

RECORD: Enter the actual number of years to the nearest whole number for question #1.

1. QUESTION: HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS COMMUNITY?

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose is to determine the approximate number of years the respondent has lived in the general area of the community or school district. Any questions directed to you should be responded to in such a way as to clarify that you simply want to know how many years they have lived "around the area" of name of community.

RECORD: Enter the actual number of years to the nearest whole number for question #1.

2. QUESTION: SEX AND RACE

RECORD: Enter the number which best describes the race and sex of the respondent.

1 = MALE-WHITE and all others not mentioned below.	6 = FEMALE-WHITE and all others not mentioned below.
2 = MALE-BLACK	7 = FEMALE-BLACK
3 = MALE-ORIENTAL	8 = FEMALE-ORIENTAL
4 = MALE-SPANISH SURNAMED	9 = FEMALE-SPANISH SURNAMED
5 = MALE-AMERICAN INDIAN	10 = FEMALE-AMERICAN INDIAN

COMMENT:

If the interview is completed by phone, simply ask the interviewee (AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW), their race. Sex will probably be determinable without asking questions but ask, if necessary. If the respondent refuses to provide the information, leave question #2 blank.

3. QUESTION: IN WHAT YEAR WERE YOU BORN?

INSTRUCTIONS:

If the respondent refuses to answer, then leave the question quickly and go on to the next question without hesitation.

RECORD: Enter the last two digits of the year of birth (e. g., if born in 1928, record 28) for Question #3.

If the respondent refuses to answer, estimate the respondent's age and enter for Question #3 but circle it (e. g., if you think the respondent is about 60, enter (60).

If the interview is completed by phone and the respondent will not indicate year of birth, make no entry for Question #3.

4. QUESTION: WHICH NUMBER, 1 THROUGH 6, BEST DESCRIBES YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

INSTRUCTIONS:

Show the respondent the chart below as you ask them the question.

MARITAL STATUS
1. Married
2. Single
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed
6. Other

RECORD: Enter the appropriate number (1-6) for Question #4.

5. QUESTION: DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN?

INSTRUCTIONS:

YES Response = HOW MANY ARE:

a. ___ PRE-SCHOOL AGE (0-5 approximately).

b. ___ SCHOOL AGE AND ATTENDING SCHOOL (5-18 approximately).

c. ___ OUT OF SCHOOL BUT LIVING AT HOME (over 5 but not attending school, drop-outs, or a high school graduate still living at home).

RECORD:

NO = Check NO for Question #5

YES = Check YES for Question #5 and enter the number of children (0-9) for each category above (i. e.,(a) pre-school, (b) school age, (c) out of school but living at home).

6A. QUESTION: ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED?

YES Response = WHAT DO YOU DO?

NO Response = WHAT DO YOU DO?
Try to ascertain what the respondent does - use common sense. (e.g., are you a student, a housewife, out of work?)

EMPLOYMENT CODING

AREA	LEVEL
01. HOUSEWIFE	01. NO LEVEL REQUIRED
02. STUDENT	02. UNSKILLED (very low level skills required)
03. INDUSTRY	03. SEMI-SKILLED
04. SALES/BUSINESS	04. SKILLED
05. GOVERNMENT	05. MANAGEMENT
06. FARMING	06. SEMI-PROFESSIONAL
07. SERVICES (other than government or health)	07. PROFESSIONAL (Certification and degree required)
08. HEALTH (medicine)	08. SELF-EMPLOYED
09. EDUCATION	09. DESIRING WORK
10. LEGAL	10. NOT DESIRING WORK
11. UNEMPLOYED	11. OTHER
12. RETIRED	
13. OTHER (determine)	

RECORD: Enter four (4) numbers for every respondent, the first two numbers reflect the area, the second two the level. Enter all four numbers for Question #6A (e.g., enter 02 for area and 10 for level for a student not desiring to work).

INSTRUCTIONS:

If the respondent indicated that they were married, ask:

6B. QUESTION: IS YOUR SPOUSE EMPLOYED?

[YES] = WHAT DOES (HE) (SHE) DO?

[NO] = WHAT DOES (HE) (SHE) DO?
Try to ascertain what the respondent's spouse does (e. g., is (he) (she) a student, housewife, out-of-work).

EMPLOYMENT CODING	
AREA	LEVEL
01. HOUSEWIFE	01. NO LEVEL REQUIRED
02. STUDENT	02. UNSKILLED (very low level skills required)
03. INDUSTRY	03. SEMI-SKILLED
04. SALES/BUSINESS	04. SKILLED
05. GOVERNMENT	05. MANAGEMENT
06. FARMING	06. SEMI-PROFESSIONAL
07. SERVICES (other than government or health)	07. PROFESSIONAL (certification and degree required)
08. HEALTH (medicine)	08. SELF-EMPLOYED
09. EDUCATION	09. DESIRING WORK
10. LEGAL	10. NOT DESIRING WORK
11. UNEMPLOYED	11. OTHER
12. RETIRED	
13. OTHER(DETERMINE)	

RECORD: Enter four (4) numbers for every respondent. The first two numbers reflect the area, the second two the level. Enter all four numbers for Question #6B (e. g., enter 02 for area and 10 for level for a student not desiring to work).

7A. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCA-
YOU HAVE COMPLETED:

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose is not only to determine the highest level of formal education but, if the respondent completed high school, which type diploma they received. If the respondent indicates that they completed high school or any formal education above high school, ask: QUESTION 7B

7B. QUESTION: DID YOU COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE TYPICAL WAY, OR THROUGH ADULT HIGH SCHOOL, OR GED? (General Education Development Test)

RECORD: Enter the appropriate two (2) numbers for question 7A according to the following table. Also, record in 7B the appropriate two (2) digit number indicating the type of high school diploma the person received (i.e., 21, 22, or 23).

LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION COMPLETED
01 8th GRADE OR LESS
11 SOME HIGH SCHOOL
21 HIGH SCHOOL - REGULAR
22 HIGH SCHOOL - ADULT HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION
23 HIGH SCHOOL - G. E. D.
31 COMMUNITY OR TECHNICAL SCHOOL OR COLLEGE
41 SOME COLLEGE
51 BACHELOR'S DEGREE
61 GRADUATE WORK
71 MASTER'S DEGREE OR SPECIALIST'S DEGREE
81 DOCTORATE
91 OTHER

8. QUESTION: WHICH NUMBER IN THE CHART BELOW BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FAMILY INCOME?

INSTRUCTIONS:

Show the respondent the chart below. If there is hesitation or if questions, respond accordingly. The purpose is to get a general estimate of the family income level. If a question is asked about the population to which they are being compared, indicate that they should compare themselves to others in their community.

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME LEVEL
1 = VERY LOW
2 = LOW
3 = LOWER MIDDLE
4 = MIDDLE
5 = UPPER MIDDLE
6 = HIGH
7 = VERY HIGH

RECORD: Record the number (1-7) of the response to Question #8. If the respondent refuses to answer, record an 8 for Question #8.

9. QUESTION: IF I ASK YOU TO DESCRIBE ME, YOU MIGHT SAY (use 3 or 4 descriptors to define yourself). WHAT FIVE WORDS BEST DESCRIBE YOUR COMMUNITY?

INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of this question is to obtain a list of objectives, both positive and negative, which people use to describe their community. If sentences or long descriptions are given, try to reduce the comment to single words - check to see if those words accurately reflect what the respondent said before recording them.

RECORD: Enter the 3-5 words offered for Question #9.

10. QUESTION: HAVE YOU HEARD OF THE TERM COMMUNITY EDUCATION?

INSTRUCTIONS:

NO	Record as below and go to Question #11.
YES	ASK: WHAT DOES THE TERM COMMUNITY EDUCATION MEAN TO YOU?

RECORD:

1. Check YES or NO response to Question #10.
2. If the respondent answered YES, place a check (✓) in the Community Education column (CE) beside all descriptors used by the respondent to define Community Education (on the back of the answer sheet).

SUGGESTION:

Record the actual response in the space provided and check the appropriate words immediately after the interview.

11. QUESTION: HAVE YOU HEARD OF THE TERM COMMUNITY SCHOOLS?

INSTRUCTIONS:

NO	Circle (N)) for Question #11 and then go to Question #12, if the respondent answered YES to Question #10. If the respondent answered NO to both Question #10 and Question #11, go directly to Question #14.
YES	ASK: WHAT DOES THE TERM COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MEAN TO YOU?

RECORD:

1. Check YES or NO response to Question #11.
2. If the respondent answered YES, Place a check (✓) in the Community School (CS) column beside all descriptors used by the respondent to define Community Schools (on the back of the answer sheet).

SUGGESTION:

Record the actual response in the space provided and check the appropriate words immediately after the interview.

12. QUESTION: WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION ABOUT (COMMUNITY EDUCATION) (COMMUNITY SCHOOLS)?

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this question is to determine where people heard about Community Education and/or Community Schools. If the respondent related to only one of the terms, then use only that term in asking the question. If the respondent related to both, use both.

RECORD: Place a (✔) beside all sources that the respondent identifies under Question #12. If the respondent identifies areas not listed, list them (explain) under "OTHER" for Question #12.

13. QUESTION: USING THIS CHART (point to chart), HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF (COMMUNITY EDUCATION) AND/OR (COMMUNITY SCHOOLS) IN THIS COMMUNITY?

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this question is to obtain a rating of Community Education by the respondent. If the respondent asks "compared to what?" Answer - COMPARED TO WHAT YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE.

C H A R T

---

1. = NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE

2. = JUST SLIGHTLY EFFECTIVE

3. = OF BELOW AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS

4. = OF ABOUT AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS

5. = OF ABOVE AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS

6. = VERY EFFECTIVE

7. = EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE

RECORD: Enter the number (1-7) identified by the respondent for Question #13.

8 = No Response

14. QUESTION: USING THE SAME SCALE (point to chart below), HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS - KINDERGARTEN THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL, INCLUSIVE?

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this question is to obtain a rating of the K-12 system. If the respondent asks "Compared to What?" ANSWER: COMPARED TO WHAT YOU THINK THE SCHOOLS SHOULD BE.

C H A R T
1. = NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE
2. = JUST SLIGHTLY EFFECTIVE
3. = OF BELOW AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS
4. = OF ABOUT AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS
5. = OF ABOVE AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS
6. = VERY EFFECTIVE
7. = EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE

RECORD: Enter the number (1-7) identified by the respondent for Question #14.

8 = No Response.

If the respondent indicates that the Public Schools and the Community Schools are the SAME THING, enter the same number (1-7) as you entered for Question #13 and PLACE A CHECK in the box (☑ SAME THING) after Question #14.

15. QUESTION: USING A SCALE FROM (1-7), (1) MEANING "NOT AT ALL," (4) MEANING ABOUT AVERAGE, AND (7) MEANING A GREAT DEAL, PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: (show chart below.)

C H A R T
1 = Not At All
2 = Very Little
3 = Less Than Average
4 = About Average
5 = More Than Average
6 = Very Much
7 = Totally

A. TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD ONE ORGANIZATION IN YOUR COMMUNITY TAKE THE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OFFERING COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

B. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES ONE ORGANIZATION IN YOUR COMMUNITY CURRENTLY TAKE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OFFERING COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

C. HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU THAT AN ORGANIZATION IN YOUR COMMUNITY TAKE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OFFERING COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

D. TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD ALL LOCAL CITIZENS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE DIRECTLY INVOLVED (IN ADDITION TO VOTING IN ELECTIONS) IN THE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS (EDUCATIONALLY, SOCIALLY, POLITICALLY, AND CULTURALLY), IN THEIR COMMUNITY?

E. TO WHAT EXTENT DO ALL LOCAL CITIZENS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY (REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEY TAKE ADVANTAGE OF IT) TO BE DIRECTLY INVOLVED (IN ADDITION TO VOTING IN ELECTIONS) IN THE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS (EDUCATIONALLY, SOCIALLY, POLITICALLY, CULTURALLY), IN THIS COMMUNITY?

F. HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU THAT ALL LOCAL CITIZENS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE DIRECTLY INVOLVED (IN ADDITION TO VOTING IN ELECTIONS) IN THE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS (EDUCATIONALLY, SOCIALLY, POLITICALLY, CULTURALLY),IN THIS COMMUNITY?

G. TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE USED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEYOND THE AVERAGE SCHOOL DAY?

H. TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD PUBLIC FACILITIES, OTHER THAN THE SCHOOLS (FOR EXAMPLE, PARKS), BE UTILIZED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES?

I. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS USED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEYOND THE AVERAGE SCHOOL DAY?

J. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE PUBLIC FACILITIES, OTHER THAN THE SCHOOLS (FOR EXAMPLE, PARKS), BEING UTILIZED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES?

K. HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU THAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE USED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEYOND THE AVERAGE SCHOOL DAY?

L. HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU THAT PUBLIC FACILITIES, OTHER THAN THE SCHOOLS (FOR EXAMPLE, PARKS), BE UTILIZED FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES?

C H A R T
1 = Not At All
2 = Very Little
3 = Less Than Average
4 = About Average
5 = More than Average
6 = Very Much
7 = Totally

16 A. QUESTION: CONSIDERING YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND YOUR COMMUNITY, WHAT ARE THE FIVE (5) PROBLEMS OF GREATEST CONCERN TO YOU? If clarification is requested, say: THOSE PROBLEMS THAT ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU.

INSTRUCTIONS:

To the best of your ability, obtain five problems or problem areas. They may fall into any or all of the areas (self, family, neighborhood and community). Do not force responses. Give ample time and then move to 16B even though you may have fewer than five problem areas.

RECORD: Write out each response as it is given to you - if you can summarize without losing the basic intent, do so. List answers for Question #16A.

WARNING! DO NOT GET INVOLVED IN PERSONAL PROBLEMS - SOMETIMES THE RESPONDENTS MAY WANT TO TALK ABOUT THEIR TROUBLES - MOVE ON, GENTLY BUT PURPOSEFULLY.

16B. QUESTION: WHAT ORGANIZATION, AGENCY, OR INSTITUTION DO YOU THINK SHOULD TAKE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEM OF:
(Briefly indicate one at a time, each of the five (5) problems identified by the respondent.)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Try to get the name of an organization for each of the five (5) problem areas identified. If the respondent offers no organization name, go on to the next problem. Ask all five. Try to identify the organization they believe should take major responsibility.

RECORD: Write the name or an easily identified abbreviation for each question - five (5) in all, after B, Question #16 for all responses identified in Question #16A.

16 C. QUESTION: WHAT ORGANIZATION IS CURRENTLY TAKING MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEM OF: (Identify all five (5) - one at a time.)

AS THEY ANSWER EACH ONE, ASK:

16 D . QUESTION: HOW WELL IS THE PROBLEM OF: (Identify all five (5) - one at a time) CURRENTLY BEING DEALT WITH?

USE THIS SCALE. (Show scale below.)

S C A L E
1 = NOT AT ALL
2 = VERY SLIGHTLY
3 = BELOW AVERAGE
4 = ABOUT AVERAGE
5 = ABOVE AVERAGE
6 = VERY WELL
7 = EXTREMELY WELL

RECORD: (PART I) Record the name or abbreviation of the organization mentioned for each question under Question #16C.

RECORD: (PART II) Enter the number identified (1-7), for each of five (5) parts of Question #16 after D. If no response is forthcoming, enter an eight (8).

17. QUESTION: HAVE YOU EVER TAKEN PART IN A COMMUNITY SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THIS COMMUNITY?

RECORD:

[NO] = Circle NO for Question #17.

[YES] = Circle YES for Question #17 and ASK:

QUESTION: (A) WHAT PROGRAMS HAVE YOU TAKEN PART IN? DID YOU TAKE PART (B) AS AN INSTRUCTOR? (C) AS A PARTICIPANT?

RECORD: Abbreviated names for each program and check (✓) the appropriate column (Instructor or Participant) for Question #17, Columns A, B, C and D. Enter the program name in Column A and place appropriate checks in Columns B and C. If the respondent took part but was neither instructor nor participant (student), place a check (✓) in Column (D) - Other.

18. QUESTION: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF A COMMUNITY EDUCATION OR COMMUNITY SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCIL IN THIS COMMUNITY?

RECORD:

YES	Check YES for Question #18, and ask: WERE YOU ELECTED OR APPOINTED? Check the appropriate response.
NO	Check NO for Question #18.

COMMENT:

We are only interested in membership on a Community Education or Community School Advisory Council in the community being studied. Membership in PTA or similar organizations DOES NOT COUNT.

19. QUESTION: HOW ACTIVE ARE YOU IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES? USE THIS SCALE (SHOW THEM THE SCALE BELOW.)

1	=	NOT AT ALL
2	=	VERY LITTLE
3	=	BELOW AVERAGE
4	=	AVERAGE
5	=	ABOVE AVERAGE
6	=	ABOVE AVERAGE
7	=	A GREAT DEAL

RECORD: Record the number 1-7, indicating the respondent's answer (8 = no response) for Question #19.

COMMENT:

Job related activities may be counted.

20 A. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE BEST THING THAT HAS HAPPENED IN PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE PAST 10 YEARS?

RECORD: Respondent's answer should be entered for Question #20A.

20 B. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE WORST THING THAT HAS HAPPENED IN PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE PAST 10 YEARS?

RECORD: Respondent's answer should be entered for Question #20B.

21. QUESTION: WHAT SINGLE FACTOR HAS MOST INFLUENCED YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE PAST 10 YEARS?

RECORD: Respondent's answer should be entered for Question #21.

SAY: THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME. YOU HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Dwight W. "A Baker's Dozen: Educational Alternatives." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

American Association of School Administrators. "Imperatives in Education." Washington, D.C. (1966).

American School Board Journal. "Getting Behind Those I.Q. Differences." (March, 1974).

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. "Implementation of Educational Innovation." The Educational Forum (March, 1976).

Carlson, Richard O. Adoption of Educational Innovation. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

Clancy, Peter L. "The Flint Community School Concept." Brochure Distributed by the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan (1969).

Deats, Tom. "Educational Futures: What Do We Need to Know." Educational Theory, Volume 26, No. 1 (1976).

DeCecco, John P., and Richard, Arlene K. "Due Process for Students: The Court Moves In." Psychology Today (November, 1975).

Dewey, John. Moral Principles in Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1909.

_____. Reconstruction in Philosophy. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1929.

Drucker, Peter F. The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines To Our Changing Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Fantini, Mario D. "From School System to Educational System." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

Furst, Lyndon G. "The Educational Fifth Column: An Expanded Role for Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

Giacquinta, Joseph B. "Status Risk-Taking: A Central Issue in the Initiation and Implementation of Public School Innovations." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 1 (1975).

Gittell, Marilyn. Educating an Urban Population. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1957.

Hand, Harold C. What People Think About Their Schools. New York: World Book Company, 1945.

Hoffer, E. The Ordeal of Change. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Kerensky, V.M., and Melby, E.O. Education II: The Social Imperative. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Lewin, Kurt. Quasi-Stationary Social Equilibria and the Problem of Permanent Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Litterer, Joseph. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969.

Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen." Teachers College Record, Volume 77, No. 3 (1976).

McKnight, Regis Q., and Seaton, Hal W. "Innovations in Education--Fact or Fiction." Reading Improvement, No. 12 (1975).

Melby, E.O. The Education of Free Men. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955.

_____. National Community School Education Association Keynote Address. Miami, Fla.: Carillon Hotel, December, 1967.

Michigan Department of Education. "Research Implications for Educational Diffusion, Major Papers Presented at the National Conference on Diffusion of Educational Ideas. East Lansing, Michigan (1968).

Miles, Matthew B. "Education Innovations: The Nature of the Problem." Innovation in Education, 1964.

Miller, Bernard S. "A Brief Trip to the Schools of the Eighties." The North Central Association Quarterly (Spring, 1975).

Minzey, Jack D., and LeTarte, Clyde E. From Program to Process. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1973.

Neill, George W. "The Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education in California." Phi Delta Kappan (February 1976).

Pellegrin, Roland J. "Problems and Assumptions in the Implementation of Innovations." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 1 (1975).

Pierce, Truman N. Media and Educational Innovation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1964.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962.

Rogers, Everett M., and Svenning, Lynne. Managing Change. Operation PEP, San Mateo County Board of Education, California, 1969.

Rotter, Julian B. "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement." Psychological Monographs, Volume 69 (1968).

Scholes, Floyd Wade. Identifying Initial Community Education Adopter Sources. University of Michigan: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 1975.

Seay, Maurice F., and Associates. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974.

Shane, Harold G. "Looking to the Future Reassessment of Educational Issues of the 1970's." Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1973).

_____. "The Future as a Force in Educational Change." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

Shane, Harold G., and Weaver, Roy A. "Educational Developments Anticipating the 21st Century and the Future of Clinical Supervision." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 9, No. 2 (1976).

Sheposh, John, Abrams, Alvin J., Licht, Mark H. "Assessment by Technical Personnel of the Role of the Change Advocate." Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 60, No. 4 (1975).

Stevens, Leonard B. "The Paradox of School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan (February, 1976).

Totten, Fred W. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1970.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Reconstructing the Total Educational Environment." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

U.S. News and World Report (March 17, 1975).

VanVoorhees, Curtis, "Community Education Needs Research for Survival." Phi Delta Kappan (November 1972).

VanVoorhees, Curtis, and Hickey, Howard. The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1969.

Wagamon, Tom. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Michigan, 1974.

Weaver, Roy. "The Futurists Gather in Washington." Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1975).

Zatz, Paul. "Reform in Education." NASSP Bulletin (February, 1976).