AN ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROCESS FOR CHANGING THE K-12 CURRICULUM

by

Bonnie Proctor White

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1979

Approved by

Louis V. Edwards
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Louis V. Eddinger

Committee Members

March 26, 1979
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 26 1979
Date of Final Oral Examination

WHITE, BONNIE PROCTOR. An Analysis of the Potential of the Community Education Process for Changing the K-12 Curriculum. (1979) Directed by: Dr. Lois V. Edinger. Pp. 116.

There is a need to resolve the difference between what schools are and what schools should be. To this end, there must be change within the K-12 curriculum which will enhance or otherwise improve the quality of living in schools. An initial step toward such change involves the identification of constraints within the curriculum. A further step is to seek ways to remove these constraints. The purpose of this study was to analyze the potential of community education for changing the K-12 curriculum. Community education was defined as a process for identifying and responding to community needs for continuous socialization, life-long learning, and problem solving.

The methodology of this study included an identification of six curricular constraints and recommendations for curricular change as found in the selected review of literature relating to curricular change. The investigator identified the curricular constraints to be that the curriculum is discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, and provincial. The selected review of literature showed consensus on the need for the following changes: (1) The need for a redefinition of the meaning of schools and education which includes recognition that learning should take place within the context of the world outside of schools and

learning should be personalized and liberating; (2) The need to involve all agencies in the educational process realizing that schools are not the only source of learning and recognizing the benefits possible through the utilization of all existing resources; (3) The need to provide for personal and community participation in determining educational needs and planning, implementing and evaluating curriculum.

Community education materials were used as descriptive data. These data included: a current status report on community education, a review of the historical development of community education, an examination of the values and assumptions of community education, an exploration of the dynamics of community education, and the implications for schools. From the data there were six integrated findings.

An analysis of community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum involved two steps. First, the integrated community education findings were matched against the curricular constraints. Second, the integrated community education findings were matched with the recommendations for change.

It was concluded that the community education process is antithetic to the curricular constraints and congruous with the recommendations for change. The community education process has potential for changing the K-12 curriculum and resolving the difference between what schools are and what schools should be.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to express her appreciation to her graduate committee: Dr. Lois V. Edinger, Dr. Dale L. Brubaker, Dr. James B. Macdonald, Dr. Robert O'Kane, and Dr. Allen Trelease. All of these committee members provided stimulation and support; they shared in both a professional and personal way.

A very special debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. Edinger who so ably directed this study. Dr. Edinger has been that rare combination of teacher and friend. She has taught me to persevere.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER I

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRADICTIONS IN CURRICULUM

Today, the school as an agent of society is severely criticized and actively challenged. The range of the criticism is extraordinary[1] and the voices which speak out are in the millions.[2] There is general dissatisfaction and particular censure. In essence, the furor relates to the concept of the function of schooling. Any attempt to study the problem must contend with what schools are and what schools should be.

The indictments are diverse. According to Chisholm, "Public education is failing millions of children who are from racial and language minority groups or who are simply poor."[3] Brown states, "Too many classrooms are dead and the result is a pervasive, stupid waste of our most important resource--our children."[4] University professors charge the

---

[1]Louis Rubin, ed., Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1976), p. 197.

[2]Richard I. Miller, Education in a Changing Society, Project on Instruction Reports (Washington: National Education Association, 1965), p. 1.

[3]Shirley Chisholm, "Rescue the Children," in Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools, ed. Louis Rubin (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1978), p. 83.

[4]George Isaac Brown, ed., The Live Class Room: Innovation through Confluent Education and Gestalt (New York: The Viking Press, 1975), p. 1.

curriculum with being dull and out of date and learning experiences unstimulating.[5]

In The Purposes of Education, Bailey[6] finds that students question why they study what they study while parents wonder what their taxes are purchasing for their children. Public officials are plagued with the problem of educational cost and equity. Scholars and teachers try to justify their existence. And, through all the uncertainty, the critics suggest educational ills.

Bailey notes that because there is no comprehensive rationale, people latch on to narrow goals, such as "the three Rs" or "job training"; or they may settle for traditional rhetoric, i.e., "the liberal arts" or "useful skills". Others choose banalities--"self-fulfillment" and "the whole man". Bailey's own assumptions and value preferences lead him to examine an educational system which can relate more effectively than in the past to the need to improve the quality of life.

It is suggested by Mario Fantini[7] that we are in an age of public accountability leading to a redefinition of

---

[5]Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 16.

[6]Stephen Bailey, The Purposes of Education (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976), pp. 1-8.

[7]Mario D. Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," Community Education Journal 6 (December 1978): 2.

American education. He believes that we are entering the period with a basic structure and organization geared to schooling and not education. Because schooling deals with limited objectives and education broadens those objectives, it is necessary to convert our system of schooling to a system of education. "The problem before us is one of identifying a conceptual framework that emanates from our present school system and yet provides a structure for transition to an educational system."[8]

The critics of the school, in reality, have aimed not only at what is wrong with schools and the individuals within them, but also what is wrong with society.[9] Macdonald and Zaret point out that the criticism has been aimed primarily at the school. They say:

> The bulk of criticism has focused upon what is wrong with the schools. The criticism has been of five kinds: (a) schools are inefficient; (b) schools are socially and technically inadequate; (c) schools are inhumane; (d) schools are culturally inauthentic, and (e) schools are authentic in maintaining the social-political-economic status quo of powerless groups in our society.[10]

Within the school setting the critical unit is the curriculum. It is the curriculum which most nearly reflects the purpose of schooling through its creation of a learning

---

[8]Ibid.

[9]James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, eds., Schools in Search of Meaning (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975), p. 13.

[10]Ibid., p. 13.

environment, the reality of its experiences, and the multitude and meaning of its activities. "The curriculum, in short, is at the heart of the educational enterprise. . . ."[11]

Criticism has spawned a history of reformers and reform movements. Curriculum and, in fact, all of schooling has been moved by this criticism. Subsequently, there is a diversity of processes and practices within American education. These coincide with the plurality of stated beliefs and values and/or the assumptions and perceptions about those beliefs. There are contradictions.

More significantly, there are contradictions between things deemed important in the schools and the quality of living in the schools.[12] Macdonald concludes that,

> If we accept the improvement of cultural conditions of everyday life as the fundamental goal of social change (that is the enhancement of the quality of existence), then the resolution of contradictions becomes a first order of business for schooling.[13]

Stated in other terms, there is frequently a contradiction between the intent of curriculum projects and what is actually occurring in the classrooms.[14]

---

[11]Louis Rubin, Curriculum Handbook: The Disciplines, Current Movements, and Instructional Methodology (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977), p. ix.

[12]James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, eds., Schools in Search of Meaning, p. 13.

[13]Ibid., p. 94.

[14]John I. Goodlad, "The Curriculum," The Changing American School in The Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1966), p. 53.

Imbedded in the contradictions are four basic curriculum questions. Herbert Kliebard proposes that the following four questions must be answered:

> (1) Why should we teach this rather than that?
> (2) Who should have access to what knowledge?
> (3) What rules should govern the teaching of what has been selected? and,
> (4) How should the various parts of the curriculum be interrelated in order to create a coherent whole?[15]

These questions help to build curriculum theory; theory can provide us with a lens through which we can view the problems we must face in curriculum development.[16] The challenge ahead in curriculum development also involves,

> Taking curriculum development out of the "accidental" category and introducing some form of genuine rational input into planning, but maintaining the participation and integrity of the persons and groups involved.[17]

Clearly there is a need to resolve contradictions.

Statement of the Problem

There is a need to resolve the difference between what schools are and what they should be. To this end, there must be change within the K-12 curriculum which will enhance or otherwise improve the quality of living in schools. An

---

[15]Herbert Kliebard, "Curriculum Theory: Give Me a 'for instance'," Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977): p. 262.

[16]Ibid., p. 268.

[17]James B. Macdonald, "Curriculum Development in Relation to Social and Intellectual Systems," The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect in The Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1971), p. 111.

initial step toward change involves the identification of constraints within the curriculum. A further step is to seek ways to remove these constraints. Various individuals might identify any number of constraints, looking from their particular perspectives. For the purpose of this study, the investigator has identified the constraints to be that the K-12 curriculum is discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, and provincial.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the potential of the community education process for changing the K-12 curriculum.

Definitions

As has been previously stated, this study is concerned with what schools are and what schools should be and curriculum has been identified as the critical unit. In defining the problems to be investigated it has been suggested that the K-12 curriculum should not be discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, or provincial. For the purpose of this study the words are defined as follows:

1. Discrete--disconnected. The schools of today organize teaching and learning into a series of disconnections, i.e., grades, subjects, courses, and levels. Within those distinctions there is a further breakdown of concepts, skills, and

appreciations. The emphasis is on program; the result is parts of a program.

2. Isolate--apart. The schools establish a teaching learning environment apart from other human and material resources. The environment is unto itself. There is little attempt to cooperate, coordinate, or collaborate with other agencies in society.
3. Irrelative--unrelated. The schools separate teachers and learners from who they are and what they might become. There is little value placed on native learning, personal perceptions, or self-determination of need and want.
4. Differential--discriminatory. The schools through a variety of selecting procedures, such as grouping, tracking, and pairing, determine what knowledge will be taught to whom.
5. Impersonal--dehumanized. The schools frequently treat persons, students and teachers, as though they are inhuman, that is, students and teachers are treated as objects. There is a tendency to replace collective and individual needs with labels, numbers, and objectified reports.
6. Provincial--particularized. The schools do not prepare students to live in the world. Global issues are seldom used as focal points for learning.

> Particular knowledge is processed and the result is that knowledge is restrictive rather than liberating.

In the purpose of this study it has been stated that there will be an analysis of the community education process. While community education is being hailed as a panacea for educational ills, it is a widely misunderstood concept. For some it is a totally new view of the potential of education, while for others it is the reinstatement of the neighborhood school with its all inclusive functions.[18]

For the remainder of this dissertation and in adherence with prior usage[19] the definition will be as follows:

> Community Education--A process for identifying and responding to community needs for continuous human socialization, life-long learning, and problem solving.

Community education utilizes all existing resources within a community to provide a framework for educational services. Community education combines the concept of community (living together) with education (development).

---

[18]Larry E. Decker, "Community Education: The Need for a Conceptual Framework," NASSP Bulletin 59 (November 1975): 6-7.

[19]The investigator is indebted to Mario Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," p. 3, for his reference to community education's derivation from the notion of human socialization.

Community Schools are not to be considered synonymous with community education. The definition of community school is as follows:

> Community School--A school which recognizes itself as one of the existing resources which responds to community needs for educational services. A community school is an agent of the community education process.

The descriptive data collected for analysis in this study are referred to as community education materials. The definition of community education materials is as follows:

> Community Education Materials--The literature of or pertaining to community education.

Methodology

In order to analyze community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum, community education materials will be used as descriptive data. The data will include: a current statistical report on the status of community education; a review of the historical development of community education; a delineation of the values and assumptions in community education; an examination of the dynamics of community education; an identification of the implications of community education for public schools, with specific emphasis on the themes, issues, and assumptions therein.

The data will be examined in two steps. First the data will be examined in their relation to the identified constraints present in the K-12 curriculum. The purpose of this examination is to determine whether community education is antithetical to the existing constraints. Second, the community education data will be examined in their relation to the findings from the selected review of literature concerning specific changes which are needed in the K-12 curriculum. The purpose of this examination is to determine whether the community education process is congruous with the specific changes which are advocated in the findings from the selected review of literature, and whether, then, community education has the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum and resolving contradictions between what schools are and what they should be.

Organization of the Dissertation

In the present chapter, the investigator has noted the need to resolve the difference between what schools are and what they should be. It has been posited that there must be change within the K-12 curriculum which enhances or otherwise improves the quality of living within schools. Further, it is stated that existing constraints in the K-12 curriculum must be identified and ways must be sought to remove these constraints. Finally, it has been assumed that the discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, and provincial

elements in the K-12 curriculum are constraints and as such should be removed. These constraints represent what schools should not be. The plan of this dissertation is to analyze community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum in light of the existing constraints and in relation to findings concerning desired change.

Chapter II will be given to a selected review of recent literature relating to the findings on curricular change. The materials chosen have been published during the past twenty years. The review is organized to include works which pertain to: the need for reform; an assessment of reform: real change or rhetoric; and recent significant findings on the state of curriculum.

Since there have been a significant number and wide range of materials written on the subject of the need for and nature of curricular reform, the rationale for selection of included materials is based upon: a presentation of works by writers well known to the profession; a diverse sample of views; and the larger studies relating to curricular change. In recognition of the fact that numerous authors, writing for the public and profession alike, present similar findings some arbitrary judgment has been made concerning how many citations of particular views will be included. The investigator has used authors frequently cited by professionals in the field of curriculum.

Chapter III will present community education materials as descriptive data. The first presentation, The Realities, will include a current status report and a review of the historical development of community education. The second presentation, The Foundation and Forces, will give the values and assumptions of community education and explain its operation. Finally, The Implications will address the future directions for community education.

Chapter IV will include an analysis of the data. Chapter V will summarize and point out implications of the data, and make recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

THE CONTROVERSIES OF CURRICULUM REFORM

In the previous chapter, an organizational outline was presented for the entire dissertation. The present chapter is designed to review selected literature relating to curricular change. It is necessary to examine literature on curriculum change in order to know and understand what schools are and what they should be. In addition to providing an understanding of the work that has been done, the findings and recommendations which emerge from the review will be used as a part of the analysis of the data.

There is a considerable body of literature which focuses on curricular change. For the purpose of this dissertation, the review of literature will be limited to materials which relate to the need for resolving the conflict between what schools are and what schools should be. Therefore, the literature examined will pertain to the need for reform, an assessment of reform, real change or rhetoric, and recent significant findings on the state of curriculum.

The literature included in the review has been published within the past twenty years. The organization of the review allows one to proceed from an identified need through efforts at meeting the need. The review concludes with an appraisal of the present state of curricular change. Subsequently, the

review of selected literature relating to change and attempts at change in curriculum will provide the understandings and insights necessary for the next step in the study--an analysis of the community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum.

Literature on the Need for Reform

Those who chronicle the history of reform in schooling are frequently critical and pessimistic. "Public education originated from impulses that were conservative, racist and bureaucratic."[1] Thus, the present appalling state of our schools is, according to Katz, directly attributable to the past. Further, the origins of American education and the dreary tale of innovations that did not reach their goals combine to make educational reform so difficult and so urgent.[2] Purpel and Belanger[3] also contend that school reform, which has been a recurrent theme in educational literature, is difficult to achieve today and has always been so.

Many writers on reform, in addition to describing the conditions which warrant reform, have tried to specify

---

[1]Michael B. Katz, ed., School Reform: Past and Present (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), p. 3.

[2]Ibid., pp. 1-3.

[3]David E. Purpel and Maurice Belanger, eds., Curriculum and the Cultural Revolution (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 479-496.

particular changes which will make reform a reality. J. M. Stephens[4] acknowledges the need for reform but asserts that improvements in education are contingent upon understanding the process of schooling as it exists, and the forces that brought schools into being and underlie the work they accomplish. Stephens hypothesizes that

> the teacher is the crucial factor in the process, that his actual interests determine the effective curriculum, and that his minute by minute classroom activities are not susceptible to precise control by others but stem instead from ancient, beneficent tendencies deeply ingrained within him.[5]

Designing Education for the Future: An Eight State Project is a significant undertaking which includes thirty noted authors in three volumes of work. The third volume is devoted to outlining plans for effecting changes and proposes strategies and procedures for implementing the changes. Glines,[6] in discussing the planning and effecting of changes in individual schools, prefaces his work with the idea expressed by Donaldson: "If schools are to be significantly better, they must be significantly different." He further states that the focus must be on the individual teacher and

---

[4]J. M. Stephens, The Process of Schooling: A Psychological Examination (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), pp. 3-5.

[5]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[6]Don E. Glines, "Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Individual Schools," in Designing Education for the Future: Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Education, eds. Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1967), pp. 163-164.

student with the intent to bring a better education for all. To realize this goal, he argues that changes must occur in four broad areas: teaching strategies, curricula, organizations, and facilities. These changes can be accomplished by "developing committed leadership; critically reviewing the literature; evolving a philosophy; creating a dissatisfaction with the inappropriate; overcoming the barriers; arranging for models; considering the budget; selecting an alternative; providing ongoing evaluation; and interpreting developments and planning future improvements."[7]

Murphy and Pilder[8] agree that schools need reforming. They present the idea that schools must counter prevailing social expectations, for the role of education can no longer be to socialize children for life in a network of formal organizations of which they can never be a part. They conclude that "school, as an organization, makes learning age-specific, teacher related, classroom bound, and based on a graded curriculum."[9] The effect is the negation of learning and the reinforcement of life in a bureaucratic society.

Specific implications for change in curriculum appear in The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's

---

[7]Ibid., p. 178.

[8]William J. Murphy and William F. Pilder, "Alternative Organizational Forms, Cultural Revolution and Education," in Planned Educational Change: Some Issues, Some Directions, Vol. 43, No. 3: Viewpoints: Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1972), pp. 62-65.

[9]Ibid., p. 63.

Schooling. Bell[10] advocates building the curriculum on collective experience, using conceptual inquiry as the focus, teaching about the real world, and confronting normative questions. He presents a unique concept of life-long learning in his suggestion that persons make choices from a bank of educational rights. Individual withdrawals, within limits, can be made at any stage of life; thus, the practice of continuing education is fostered.

Glaser[11] attacks the major inadequacies of the status quo and redesigns the curriculum through the creation of an adaptive environment for learning. Flexibility is his key. He proposes multiple points of entry into the curriculum, self-pacing, and continuous monitoring of progress for the purpose of adapting the environment to meet the needs of the students.

While maintaining the position that educational reform and specifically curriculum reform is still needed, Kliebard[12] looks at the changes that have occurred in education. He

---

[10]Daniel Bell, "Schools in a Communal Society," Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling, ed. Louis Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), pp. 45-48.

[11]Robert Glaser, "The School of the Future: Adaptive Environments for Learning," in The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling, pp. 131-133.

[12]Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling in 1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Vernon F. Haubrich, ed. (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971), pp. 74-89.

asserts that although the public has associated the first half of the twentieth century with Dewey and "Progressive Education," in reality the dominant educational theory which emerged and held power came from the practices of corporate management. The curriculum was the chief instrument of bureaucratization. The bureaucratic model sought efficiency, a division of labor, and job specialization. The bureaucratic machinery of the school used the child as the raw material from which to issue standardized products. A value was attached to everything, and even school subjects, such as Latin and mathematics, were appraised by principles of cost accounting.

Kliebard traces the predominant curriculum theory through its decline, but warns that the decline proved to be only temporary. Out of a second industrial revolution, electronic and technological, a modified curriculum theory came into existence. Today, Kliebard sees modern curriculum theory influenced by systems analysis which

> tends to regard the child simply as input inserted into one end of a great machine from which he eventually emerges at the other end as output replete with all the behaviors, the "competencies," and the skills for which he has been programmed.[13]

Significance to the Study

The literature reviewed in this section, "The Need for Reform," has bearing upon the nature of this investigation.

---

[13]Ibid., p. 93.

It is significant that reform is considered to be difficult to achieve. This supposition gives importance to the overall purpose of the study, the analysis of community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum. This study begins, then, from a knowledge that many reforms have been tried and many reforms have failed; therefore, it is imperative to establish that a proposed reform or change is more than a fad, a gimmick, or inoperable innovation. There must be a sound basis for change and a strong framework from which to attempt change.

The hypothesis given by Stephens concerning the role of individuals (teachers) in the process of change indicates that this study should examine the roles of participants. Glines also emphasizes the critical relationship of participants (teachers and students).

Other writers reviewed in this section point out that the present organization and activities of schools do not lend themselves to real learning; rather they negate real learning. Specific implications from this section include: the need to create a learning environment which values lifelong learning, the needs of the learner, the reality of the world, and rejects the bureaucratic programs and procedures which reduce learners to an impersonal, objectified level.

Real Change or Rhetoric

In the past twenty years, a wide range of materials has been produced on the subject of schooling and the need for change. In 1959, Conant,[14] in his defense of the comprehensive high school, recommended that the basic pattern and practices of American secondary education could, without radical reform, meet the needs of education in American society. A decade later, Charles Silberman[15] proclaimed that there was a crisis in the schools. He assessed the great number of changes that had taken place, and concluded that the reform movements had been quantitative but not qualitative.

Many other writers of the sixties and seventies have looked at schools to see whether change has been effected. Tanner[16] summarizes reform efforts in the fifties and sixties as specialized and piecemeal. He traces the national reform movement of this period and concludes that the focus was on revising subject matter to represent the disciplines of knowledge as outlined by scholars and scientists themselves. He considers Jerome Bruner the leader of the national reform

---

[14]James Bryant Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 96.

[15]Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 158-159.

[16]Daniel Tanner, Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), pp. 225-248.

movement because he provided the rationale for unification in his work, The Process of Education. The rationale for curriculum reform was based on several key premises:

1. The cognitive style of the immature learner compared with that of the mature scholar represents a difference in degree not in kind;

2. Because intellectual activity everywhere is the same, the intellective interests and pursuits of scholar-specialists can be made appropriate for young learners at any level;

3. Because the scholar-specialist on the forefront of knowledge is concerned with the principal structural elements of his discipline, the proper subject matter for the schoolboy can be determined through the structure of each discipline;

4. Because the mature scholar specialist is the one who is most competent to determine the structure of his discipline, he must play a central role in devising the subject matter at all levels of schooling;

5. Because the mature scholar-specialist is engaged in the process of inquiry-discovery in order to develop new knowledge, and because the cognitive style of the young is not qualitatively different from that of the mature scholar, the appropriate mode of learning for the school-boy is that of inquiry discovery.[17]

The actual changes of the fifties and sixties, according to Tanner, resulted in established priorities in mathematics and science. In 1970, there were sixty-nine curriculum improvement projects which had been inventoried by the National Science Foundation.[18] The Physical Science Study

---

[17]Ibid., p. 248.

[18]Course and Curriculum Improvement Projects, quoted in Daniel Tanner, Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospectives, p. 255.

Committee (PSSC), the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), the Chemical Education Material Study (CHEM Study), and the Chemical Bond Approach Project (CBA) all produced models which are widely used and recognized. In mathematics, the primary improvement projects came from the School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG) and the University of Illinois Committee on School Mathematics (UICSM). Both of these programs follow the theme of inquiry-discovery.[19]

"The priorities given to improvement in science and mathematics . . . led many educators to express concern over the dangers of curriculum imbalance in our schools."[20] Thus, there was a proliferation of social studies curriculum projects. In 1971, one hundred and eleven different social studies projects were identified,[21] and much like the science and mathematics programs they sought to follow an inquiry-discovery approach. Immediately behind the "new social studies" was the "new English." Some reformers in English tried to pattern the new curriculum development after the discipline-centered approaches. Others tried to make English relate to all other subjects, as well as to the problems of youth and society; still others advocated that curriculum development be concerned with competencies and skills in communication.[22]

---

[19]Tanner, Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospectives, pp. 256-280.

[20]Ibid., p. 289. [21]Ibid. [22]Ibid., pp. 299-301.

In summary, Tanner finds the national curriculum reforms of the 1950's and 1960's directed to the pursuit of academic excellence. From all the new programs, projects and shifts in the curriculum Tanner concludes that the real results of reform were curriculum fragmentation and the neglect of the "interrelationships of knowledge and the ecological nature of the school."[23]

In The Changing American School, fourteen contributing authors were asked to "describe and analyze a visible aspect of schooling that has emerged or undergone significant re-examination since World War II."[24] Further they were charged with assessing whether there had been real changes in school practice or only rhetoric.

Goodlad, the editor of the compilation, looked at change in the total curriculum as he wrote about what he called the nationwide curriculum reform movement of the 1950's and 1960's. He notes that:

> . . . the current movement set out to correct certain curricular deficiencies and imbalances and to a considerable degree has succeeded, it has provided some notable assets. But inasmuch as it was also a reaction to previous excesses and shortcomings, recent curriculum change has spawned some excesses and shortcomings of its own.[25]

---

[23]Ibid., p. 249.

[24]John I. Goodlad, ed., The Changing American School in The Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1966), p. 7.

[25]Ibid., p. 45.

Goodlad cites the assets of the movement as: involvement of scholars, the use of inquiry rather than rote, and packages of instructional materials rather than textbooks as the sole aid for instruction. His limitations of the reform movement include: the emphasis of the separate-disciplines at the expense of inter-disciplinary studies, the emphasis on concepts and abstractions at the expense of application, the lack of concern with developmental processes of learning, and the overuse of packaged instructional programs to the exclusion of teacher-student interaction.[26] His conclusions indicate that:

> The excesses and shortcomings in the present movement are now quite apparent and can be corrected short of a counter-reform through the combined efforts of scholars in the fields to be taught, teachers in the schools, psychologists, and educationists.[27]

In two of the analyses which are more specific in scope, the contributing authors report conflicting findings. For example, in an examination of the availability and use of technological resources Dale concluded that "there is a lag between what we know how to do and what we have done."[28] He suggests that technological resources should be being used to provide experiences which lead to the development of the independent learner. At the same time, Sprinthall

---

[26]Ibid., pp. 45-52. [27]Ibid., p. 58.

[28]Edgar Dale, "Instructional Resources," in The Changing American School, John I. Goodlad, ed., p. 94.

and Tiedeman see progress for the reality of self-directed choice and the ultimate liberation of students because of substantive changes within the guidance and counseling field.[29]

In a work written three years after the previously cited The Changing American School, Frost and Rowland[30] set out to look at curricula for the seventies; they put their proposals in perspective through a backward glance at the decade of the sixties, a time when:

> The poor were discovered; the obsolescence of the slum schools was exposed; early-childhood education was rediscovered; technology invaded the schools; federal support spurred innovation; the hippies and student militant groups forced public attention to focus on our stumbling schools; teachers, too decided to join the act and demanded the right to participate in the politics that permeate schools.[31]

Although curriculum research and curriculum development built a framework for achieving meaningful goals, Frost and Rowland still find that there is a need for new avenues for enlivening communication, behavioral change based on humanistic, social and intellectual objectives, a spirit of inquiry in programs, an intensification of the aesthetic experiences, a rejection of normative teaching, the concept of the school

---

[29]Norman A. Sprinthall and David V. Tiedeman, "Guidance and the Pupil," in The Changing American School, John I. Goodlad, ed., p. 31.

[30]Joe L. Frost and G. Thomas Rowland, Curricula for the Seventies: Early Childhood through Early Adolescence (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), pp. 431-438.

[31]Ibid., p. 431.

as part of society at large, and the view of the total community as an extension of the classroom.[32]

The National Education Association in its series, Schools for the 70's, compiled preliminary studies, auxiliary studies, and a comprehensive, single-volume report which address concerns for developing a meaningful curriculum. Pharis and others[33] recognize, that in the 60's, the area of curriculum emphasized the development of behavioral objectives. This trend, which reflected the belief that learning is a change in behavior, has had an important effect on education in this country. The question for the 70's is still, "what constitutes behavior?".

The 60's also produced the era of programmed instruction. The 70's and 80's will have to contend with ways to use these experiences most effectively. Thus, there are questions about whether programmed experiences should be formal or informal, primary, or balanced with other methodology; in other words, how extensively should programmed experiences be used?

One of the most widespread changes in the 60's was in the content area. "What to teach?" emerged from a perceived

---

[32]Ibid., pp. 431-438.

[33]William L. Pharis, Lloyd E. Robison, and John C. Walden, Decision Making and Schools for the 70's, Schools for the 70's Preliminary Series (Washington: National Education Association Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970), pp. 33-49.

lag between information gain and information retrieval. Linked with the change in content must also be a change in process. "Unless educators begin to struggle seriously with the theoretical relationships of process and content, even the dream of equal educational opportunity for all may cease."[34]

Foshay[35] looks at the school's need for a revitalized curriculum through an exploration of changes which have occurred and those which must occur. He indicates that although the primary function of education has been to serve the needs of society, it must, now, contribute to self-fulfillment and self-respect. Historically, when these needs have clashed, the schools have resolved in favor of social needs with dire consequences.

Foshay classifies the changes which have taken place in the world of education into four categories. The first change, he notes, is in the nature and thinking of students. Second, there has been a revolution in our conception of subject matter. Next, he cites the gross change in the nature of schooling as an institution. Last, he highlights the phenomenon of teacher militancy as it affects both the teacher selection process and the determination of their duties.

---

[34]Ibid., p. 49.

[35]Arthur W. Foshay, Curriculum for the 70's: An Agenda for Invention, Schools for the 70's Preliminary Series, pp. 11-23.

All these changes are insufficient or incomplete for Foshay contends that: the change in the students' character results in the view that there are two worlds, theirs and ours, and the schools aggravate the rift; the revolution in subject matter has not resulted in learning that is more relevant to society, or more integrative for the individual; the overly-organized, overly-segmented school has produced artificial divisions and less articulation; and the new militant role of teachers has resulted in a proliferation of committees for curriculum development, each with its own agenda.[36]

Changing the curriculum necessitates the changing of three curriculums. According to Foshay, "there are always three curriculums operating in a school."[37]

> Curriculum I is the formal academic offerings, plus those cocurricular activities that are planned.
>
> Curriculum II, sometimes called the latent curriculum, has to do with the nature and function of authority in life, the problems of participating in the decisions that make one's own life, and in general with social development.
>
> Curriculum III is a curriculum in self-awareness and in self-development.[38]

All three of these curriculums demand attention. Curriculum I has been the focus of most of the curriculum development. Curriculum II has been left dormant, while virtually nothing has been done with Curriculum III.[39]

---

[36] Ibid. [37] Ibid., p. 28.

[38] Ibid., pp. 28-31. [39] Ibid.

One of the larger studies of reform and its perceptible changes in the classroom was conducted in 1970, by John Goodlad and associates.[40] Using knowledge about the historical development of the schools, a set of values for observing educational practices, and ten expectations for schools, the researchers set out to find the degree to which actual school practices met their expectations.[41]

The findings, from a sample of one hundred and fifty-one classrooms in sixty-seven schools selected from major population centers, reveal that change stopped at the classroom door. A synthesis of the findings relating to the expectations set forth shows that there was no clear sense of direction at the school level or within individual classrooms. The practices in individual classrooms did not reflect educational practices or learning principles. Instructional practices were primarily group-oriented and made few provisions for individual differences; likewise, evaluation did not attend to pupil variability but was geared to a grade-norm standard. Instructional practices encouraged students to be reactors to materials, usually the textbook, which had

---

[40] John I. Goodlad et al., Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 1-19.

[41] A previous citation by Goodlad (page 22) reviews the reform movement of the 1950's and 60's and is a general finding. The citation above comes from a study done four years later and is specific in nature; the findings in this study are from the local school level.

little intrinsic appeal for them. Other materials were extremely limited and the use of human resources was generally restricted to a single teacher operating within a self-contained environment. There was a further limitation in that interaction between and among students was restricted. Finally, there were limitations in the curriculum; language arts dominated all subjects and although new math was recognized as part of the curriculum, the pedagogy was the same as it had been for the traditional math.[42]

From their research Goodlad and associates conclude that the educational system is resistent to change and there is no effective structure for facilitating change. They point out that "the system is geared to self-preservation, not to self-renewal."[43]

Significance to the Study

The review of literature presented relating to "Real Change or Rhetoric," contains findings of great importance to the purpose of this study. First, reform in curriculum cannot be oriented solely to academic subjects. Tanner concludes that such an emphasis in reform leads to curriculum imbalance, fragmentation, and lack of relationships. Learning becomes disconnected, irrelational, and impersonal.

Although Frost and Rowland note that curriculum research and development have built a framework and goals, they assert

---

[42]Ibid., pp. 77-94. [43]Ibid., p. 99.

there must be more concern with the aesthetics. Man's needs for celebration and play are seldom given their rightful importance. As schools subtly begin to place artificial divisions between work and play they create the beginning of a life-long problem. What is man to do with his leisure time? There is a crucial need for the school to be accepted as a part of the larger society and the larger society to be integrated with the school. Convergence of school and society will provide an arena for approaching the real problems and potentials of man.

Another critical factor emerging from the literature of The Schools for Seventies studies is the need for a learning environment and learning activities which build a relationship between the world in which students live and the world in which adults live. The barriers which have been raised result in a lack on inter-generational understanding and a failure to utilize our human resources to their potential. Schools concentrate on knowledge whereas the outside world operates on skills and relationships. Without an effective linkage between the schools and society neither knowledge, skills or relationships are developed to their fullest.

Goodlad's study shows that educational purposes must be clearly defined, completely understood, and carefully executed. There is too often a breakdown between the stated purposes of education and actual practices in the classroom. Goodlad and associates conclude that the needs of the learner

must be paramount in determining instructional techniques. Further, the study emphasizes that instructional materials must be enriched and human and physical resources must be expanded.

The State of Curriculum: Recent Significant Findings

Having examined selected literature on the need for reform, and some changes in curriculum, it is necessary, now, to look at the present state of curriculum. This literature falls into three categories: the negative view, the positive outlook, and the continuing challenge.

The Negative View

A number of writers see the present state of curriculum and the efforts at reform through a negative lens. Jencks[44] charges that there is no evidence that school reform can reduce the extent of cognitive inequality. His research further suggests that none of the programs or structural arrangements in common use has consistently different long term effects. He concludes that school reform is important for the lives of children in the classroom, but not for the establishment of equality once adulthood is reached.

Others see an inconsistency between the goals of the classroom and the realities outside the classroom. Henry

---

[44]Mary Jo Bane and Christopher Jencks, "The Schools and Equal Opportunity," in Christopher Jencks in Perspective, William J. Ellena, ed. (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973), pp. 4-10.

Steele Commager[45] states that "The schools cannot reconstruct society, and society has little interest in reconstructing itself along the lines that schools might find gratifying." The only means for achieving social reconstruction which will be effective is to enlist all educational agencies in an enterprise that can embrace all of society.[46]

In two separate works, Apple[47] and Crouse[48] indicate that schools succeed in doing that which they should not do. The consequences of schooling are ominous, for they:

> restrict more important civil liberties than they enhance;
>
> alienate the young from more desirable avenues of growth into adulthood;
>
> create excessive dependence on the schools as the only legitimate means for learning;
>
> contribute to the unequal distribution of power, prestige, and money by both confirming and reproducing an unequitable social system;
>
> have financial costs which are rapidly becoming unmanageable;
>
> contribute to a pattern of compulsive consumption in the pursuit of continuing and continual vertical progress through life; and

---

[45]Henry Steele Commager, "The School as Surrogate Conscience," Saturday Review (January 11, 1975): 57.

[46]Ibid., pp. 54-57.

[47]Michael W. Apple and Nancy R. King, "What Do Schools Teach?" Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977): 354.

[48]James H. Crouse and Paul T. McFarlane, "Monopoly, Myth and 'Convivial Access' to the Tools of Learning," Phi Delta Kappan 56 (May 1975): 591-595.

> contribute to racial and social class discrimination among those pursuing access to employment, power and prestige through their power of certification.[49]

Positive Outlooks

Contrary to the negative findings of sources already cited, Walberg and Rasher,[50] Roberts,[51] and Itzkoff[52] point out that schools and the curriculum are in, or approaching, a salutary state. Using data drawn for the Coleman Report, Walberg and Rasher[53] conclude that higher levels of educational expenditures and smaller pupil/teacher ratios are related to lower rates of mental test failure on the Selective Service Test, and that the higher the percentage of age-eligible children enrolled in public schools, the lower the rates of test failure in the state as a whole. These researchers view financial and physical resource investment as important factors in reducing failure rates. They are optimistic that schools and learning can be made better.

---

[49]Ibid., p. 592.

[50]Herbert J. Walberg and Sue Pinzur Rasher, "Public School Effectiveness and Equality: New Evidence and Its Implication," Phi Delta Kappan 56 (September 1974): 3-9.

[51]Arthur D. Roberts, ed., Educational Innovation: Alternatives in Curriculum and Instruction (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975).

[52]Seymour W. Itzkoff, A New Public Education, Educational Policy, Planning and Theory Series (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1776).

[53]Walberg and Rasher, "Public School Effectiveness and Equality," pp. 3-

The availability of an alternative to the traditional school is viewed by both Roberts[54] and Itzkoff[55] as a healthy sign. They both suggest that the voucher system is one existing viable alternative. According to Itzkoff, the voucher system allows parents and children a choice which should result in both investment in and support for a particular school. Further, the right of choice and voluntary participation is seen as "a way to liberate the American educational system from its institutional paralysis without revolutionizing the present structure."[56]

To further support the position that the educational system offers hope, the National Education Association reports that a panel of fifty national leaders examined the goals of The Seven Cardinal Principles and concluded that they were pertinent for today. The panel offered an agreed-upon statement of support for the original principles, thus verifying faith in the past, and they gave a list of suggestions for adding new meaning to the principles, thus proclaiming faith in the future.[57]

---

[54]Roberts, Educational Innovation, p. xii.

[55]Itzkoff, A New Public Education, p. 11.

[56]Ibid., p. 11

[57]Harold G. Shane, "America's Educational Futures: 1976-2001," Futurist 10 (October 1976): 252-257.

Continuing Challenges

The new meanings which up-date The Seven Cardinal Principles are in effect challenges to be met. The panelists assembled by the 1972 NEA Bicentennial Committee agreed on the need to develop new directions in education such as:

> A spirit of global community;
> Education as a life-long process;
> Flexibility in learning;
> Recognition of the wide-range of performance;
> Learning which is partly selective;
> Continuing education for the mature;
> Teaching and learning outside the school;
> Recognition that home-school relations need to be modified;
> Occupational education which will transcend vocational training;
> Problem prevention in early childhood;
> Instruction which inculcates the understanding of the threats to the environment;
> Promotion of human geography.[58]

Another challenge being given to educators concerns the inclusion of others in the curriculum planning process. Tyler urges "the enlisting of other major social institutions in the educational process."[59] Benjamin Bloom,[60] in pointing out that other countries use a cooperative method in planning their entire curriculum, suggests that American educators should take a look at what is happening in other educational agencies in this country and plan curriculum as one part of

---

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ralph W. Tyler, "Tomorrow's Education," American Education 11 (September 1975): 23.

[60]Benjamin S. Bloom, "New Views of the Learner: Implications for Instruction and Curriculum," Educational Leadership 35 (April 1978): 572-573.

a larger educational system. In citing the work of the national curriculum centers in various parts of the world, he states that:

> The curriculum centers have learned, after much frustration, that no major curriculum change can be effectively introduced in the schools until many groups in society have had some opportunity to understand the changes and express their views about these changes.[61]

Finally, Coleman reminds us that "society has a responsibility to create environments, containing schooling, but not limited to it."[62]

Three unique challenges for the future of curriculum are presented by Zais,[63] Huebner,[64] and Rubin.[65] Although these invitations are very different, each of them illustrates widely-held beliefs among educators and curriculum workers today. Zais indicates that although curriculum is influenced by a diversity of groups, i.e., suppliers of curriculum materials, the federal government, private foundations, university professors, professional organizations, and

---

[61]Ibid., p. 573.

[62]James Coleman, "The Transition from Youth to Adult," New York University Education Quarterly 3 (Spring 1974): 3.

[63]Robert S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1976), pp. 478-506.

[64]Dwayne Huebner, "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work," Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1976): 165.

[65]Louis Rubin, ed., Curriculum Handbook: The Disciplines, Current Movements, and Instructional Methodology (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977), pp. 371-374.

professional educators and their publications, it is the individual who must take the initiative in curriculum work and then translate it into a framework for group action. He proposes that citizens should become involved in a process that is usually thought to be the province of special or vested groups.[66] Huebner, on the other hand, suggests that involvement should be narrowed. He argues that the curriculum field of the past one hundred years is dead, and its death is attributable to the multitude of things it tried to do. His solution is to return to the roots of curriculum work--the identification of educational content and ways to make it available to students.[67] Rubin's[68] challenge is that given the present state of the economy, it can no longer be assumed that this country can afford the best of all educational systems. He cites that although there is considerable interest in the view that direct community experience and service can be beneficial to students, a number of factors including budgetary costs are uncertain. He concludes that

> The facts seem to suggest that a major quest in future curriculum design will center upon procedures for developing the same amount of learning at a reduced cost, or more learning for the same cost.[69]

---

[66] Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations, pp. 473-474; 506.

[67] Huebner, "The Moribund Curriculum Field," p. 165.

[68] Rubin, Curriculum Handbook, p. 374.

[69] Ibid.

Two prominent educators, John I. Goodlad and Ralph W. Tyler,[70] have prepared a set of four cassette tapes which uniquely present their data on the accomplishments of American education and the challenges before the public schools. In selected passages printed from these tapes they address a number of continuing challenges. Goodlad speaks to the need to place the individual school at the center of the work to be done.[71] He and Tyler agree that the non-graded school, for which Goodlad has been a leading contributor, provides a good structure for enabling students to pursue maximum educational opportunities.

One of the major themes in their discussion is the need for schools "to help students make sense out of the total array of experiences they are having. . . ."[72] They both point out the need to use the community and citizens as resources to the schools.[73] If these involvements take place, both authors suggest that "the schools will be less insulated

---

[70]M. Frances Klein, "Tyler and Goodlad Speak on American Education: A Critique," Educational Leadership 33 (May 1976): 565-570.

[71]This particular premise supports the previous study by Goodlad and associates in 1970 (p. 22). The major finding in that study related to the inability of change to get through the classroom door.

[72]Klein, "Tyler and Goodlad Speak on American Education," p. 567.

[73]The reference to the use of community and other outside resources supports a previous citation by Tyler (p. 35).

from the community and will become more responsive to resources outside the profession."[74]

Closely tied to Goodlad and Tyler's observations about the need for extending the school outward, is the suggestion that the school be open to students for continuing education. Both Tyler and Goodlad view continuing education as a frontier for the future.[75]

Significance to the Study

The literature in this section, "The State of Curriculum: Recent Significant Findings," has implications for the larger study being undertaken. Specifically it is pointed out that the schools are too frequently called upon as the only source of learning. There is evidence to suggest that curriculum planning, usually done within the school, should be undertaken as a part of a larger educational plan and system. It is also suggested that there should be considerable involvement of individuals and agencies as resources to the schools. Finally, it is shown that the high cost of schooling in an economically uncertain world may be a major factor in any future programs or proposed reforms.

---

[74]Klein, "Tyler and Goodlad Speak on American Education," p. 567.

[75]Ibid., p. 568.

Summary of the Review of the Literature

History is useful as a tool for gaining perspective. Historical perspective is liberating for it teaches us that where we are is a result of specific circumstances, and the knowledge of those circumstances holds hope for change and betterment.[76]

A significant number of writers agree that school and particularly curriculum have undergone many reforms. Out of the many reform efforts at least three models have had impact on the schools of today. They are the bureaucratic-technological model, the discipline-centered model, and the humanistic model.

While there is agreement that there has been a significant number of reform movements, there is disagreement as to the actual effect of the reforms. There are those who believe that a capacity for curriculum change has been demonstrated, and schools can meet the educational needs of American society without radical reform or revolution. Others believe that schools, regardless of the changes they undertake, cannot meet the educational needs of society today. In this group of critics, there are some who feel that schools have never been able to do that which they were given to do. However, most educational critics are hopeful that curriculum change and meaningful schools can emerge from a carefully

---

[76]Katz, School Reform: Past and Present, p. 3.

conceived set of principles, with appropriate strategies, and a wise use of resources. It has also been pointed out that there must be an effective structure developed to implement change.

The literature of curriculum development and revision is replete with differences in opinions and findings. The variance in the beliefs and findings of educational spokesmen is surely bound up in what Herrick describes as "the particular way one regards man, his nature and his education."[77] Further, any failures to effect the reform wished for in school practices and programs might lie in the ways in which innovation and adaptation are seen.[78]

In reviewing the literature of the critics of schooling, Philip Jackson determines that there have been fundamental shifts in the ways of thinking about school and society. He states that:

> First we have broadened our conception of the forms the ill effects of schooling might take. Second, we have in recent years altered our notions about the victims of the damage. Third, we are slowly beginning to discern a few of the more subtle qualities of school learning to which deleterious effects of various sorts might ultimately be traced.[79]

---

[77]Virgil E. Herrick, Strategies of Curriculum Development, comp. Dan W. Andersen, James B. Macdonald, and Frank B. May (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965), p. 53.

[78]William A. Reid and Decker F. Walker, eds., Case Studies in Curriculum: Great Britain and the United States (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), p. 2.

[79]Philip W. Jackson, "Beyond Good and Evil: Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling," Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977): 314.

The findings of the review of literature conducted by this investigator indicate consensus, as the following needs have been identified:

1. The need for a redefinition of the meaning of schools and education which includes recognition that learning is life-long, learning should take place within the context of the world outside of school, and learning should be personalized and liberating.
2. The need to involve all agencies in the educational process realizing that schools are not the only source of learning and recognizing the benefits possible through the utilization of all existing resources.
3. The need to provide for personal and community participation in determining educational needs and planning, implementing and evaluating curriculum.

To reform schools and the critical unit, the curriculum, requires knowledge of what schools are and what schools should be. In light of the long history of reforms which have never gone beyond the classroom door, and an existing educational system which is said to be geared to self-preservation rather than self-renewal,[80] it is appropriate to initiate curriculum change by asserting what curriculum should not be. The assumptions set forth in this study are

---

[80]Goodlad, Behind the Classroom Door, p. 99.

that curriculum should not be: discrete; isolate; irrelative; differential; impersonal; or provincial. The changes suggested by the findings from the selected review of literature can be observed to have significance for removing the six identified curricular constraints.

CHAPTER III

COMMUNITY EDUCATION MATERIALS AS DATA

In the purpose of the dissertation, it has been stated that community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum will be analyzed. A need for changing the K-12 curriculum has been established, and a set of specific curricular constraints has been identified. A review of previous attempts at change and recent significant findings in curriculum change are given in Chapter II; a summation of these findings is also given. The present chapter will provide community education materials as descriptive data.

The Significance of Community Education Materials as Data

Today, community education is being considered by many as a conceptual framework which can provide transition from a system of schooling to a system of education.[1] Community education is, according to Fantini, "the best model for effecting conversion of a school system to an educational system."[2] Decker further emphasizes that while

> . . . very little research has been done on community education, especially its consequences, the little evidence that is available seems to indicate that

---

[1]Mario D. Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," p. 3.

[2]Ibid.

> the consequences of its adoption is change in the role of the public school and in lay and professional views on the comprehensiveness of education.[3]

Community education materials as descriptive data will aid in answering the question, What is there in community education that can change the discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, or provincial nature of the K-12 curriculum?

Procedure for Data Collection

As has been previously pointed out in this study, community education has been defined in many ways, resulting in a confusion as to what community education is and is not. Olsen and Clark[4] conclude that there are several possible causes for the common misconceptions. They are the broad nature of community education, the role expectations of educational institutions and their staff members, the leadership provided by the initiators of community education, and the tendency to perceive a part of the concept as a whole. Nonetheless, the most popular definitions of community education, when analyzed, have commonalities. The common denominators are:

> Community education is a philosophical concept which can be put into operation;

---

[3]Larry E. Decker, "Community Education: The Need for a Conceptual Framework," NASSP Bulletin 59 (November 1975): 6.

[4]Edward G. Olsen and Phillip A. Clark, Life-Centering Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1977), p. 86.

> The concept is not restricted to elementary and secondary schools;
>
> Its purpose is to serve the entire community;
>
> There is community member involvement in educational decision making;
>
> Community members have the opportunity to participate in various types of learning experiences which are based upon their identified wants and needs;
>
> Interagency cooperation and collaboration is important;
>
> Community education emphasizes community problem solving by efficiently utilizing all community resources: human, physical, and financial.[5]

The definition of community education for this study is: community education is a process for identifying and responding to community needs for continuous socialization, lifelong learning, and problem solving. This definition reflects the commonalities found by Olsen and Clark. Proceeding from an established definition it is possible to view the realities, expectations, and implications of community education.

Section 1 of the chapter will demonstrate the realities of community education. The first presentation will be a report on the current status of community education. The current status will then be placed in perspective through a review of the historical development of the community education movement.

Section 2 will examine the foundation and forces of community education. The values and assumptions of community education will be given and the dynamics will be explained.

---

[5]Ibid., p. 89.

Section 3 will consider the implications of community education. The major issues within community education will be identified, and assessment relating to its potential for growth and impact will be given.

Realities

A Current Status Report

> The concept of community education is rapidly expanding throughout the country. Today, 48 state departments of education give instructional recognition to community education and nine states have passed legislation supporting community education. At the local level, more than 1,400 school districts are operating community education programs.[6]

Federal Legislation

The federal government recognized the validity of the concept of community education in 1974, when it passed the Community School Act. Through this legislation the federal government provided financial support to community education at the state and local levels and to institutions of higher education. In 1978, the Community Schools and Comprehensive Education Act was established and "will extend to states and localities the much needed capacity to bring education and related community services into an effective working partnership."[7]

---

[6]Dale Kildee, "The Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978," Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978): 17.

[7]Harrison Williams, "The Community Schools and Comprehensive Education Act of 1978," Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978): 16.

The federal government distinguishes community education programs through a set of minimum elements which must be met by applicants seeking funds for community education. The minimum elements provide that a federally supported community education program must: have direct involvement with a public school; serve an identifiable community coterminus with a school attendance area; offer programs from a public facility; extend the activities and services usually provided in and by the specified public facility; make use of needs assessment instruments and procedures; identify and utilize existing resources; serve clients of all ages and needs; and provide for participation through an advisory group.[8]

Federal Support

The Federal Community Education Clearinghouse was established in 1974, and funded by the Office of Education, Community Education Program. The Clearinghouse serves practitioners in the field by publishing the Community Education Calendar, a newsletter, notices of legislation, and descriptions of local projects. Further, it prepares resource materials, such as The Directory of Community Education Projects and The Catalogue of Resource Materials on Community Education.[9]

---

[8]Federal Register 40 (December 12, 1975): 57936-57937.

[9]"Washington Scene," Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978): 11.

In 1975, the Commissioner of Education set up the Office for Community Education. The Office is charged with assisting in the growth and development of community education; a specific responsibility of this office is the management of federal funds for community education. The Office for Community Education also serves as a communications link with local school districts and state departments of education which have community education projects.[10]

There is a federally appointed Community Education Advisory Council. The Council includes members experienced in the operation of community education programs and the training of such individuals. The Council also includes participants and consumers of community education programs. The duties of the Council include: advising the Commissioner of Education on policies relating to the interests of community schools and community education; advising the National Institute of Education with respect to research and evaluation concerning community education programs; and the Council shall report to the Congress on the operation of federally funded community education projects.[11]

National Network

There is a national network for community education. One of the links in the network is The National Center for

---

[10]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 72.

[11]Federal Register 40 (December 12, 1975): 37937.

Continuing Education. This center, "a consortium of universities and colleges working together to provide specialized training for potential community education leaders,"[12] is located in Flint, Michigan. Primary financial support for the National Center came from the Mott Foundation.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, respective institutions of higher education, and local sources of revenue share in the funding of the one hundred and two Centers for Community Education Development in existence throughout the nation. The Centers provide consultation and training services to public schools, community colleges, universities, and other educational agencies located in communities all across the country.[13] Specifically the Centers assist in providing information on community education, consultant help in developing and implementing community education, ideas for securing financial assistance, aid in securing and training community education personnel, preservice and inservice educational opportunities, evaluation of community education, university credit course work in community education, and information on additional consultant services available.[14]

The National Association for Community Education was formed in 1966. "The Association has contributed significantly to the growth of community education and has played a major

---

[12]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 183.

[13]Ibid., p. 178. [14]Ibid.

role in the passage of federal legislation."[15] At present the organization has a membership of approximately 1,800 and there are thirty-six affiliated state associations.

Major initiatives which will be planned and undertaken in the membership year 1979 include:

1. Continued major involvement in federal legislation in support of community education.
2. Expanded and differentiated membership services.
3. Diversification and multiplication of quality publications.
4. The first National Delegate Assembly in Community Education Development.
5. Aggressive efforts toward building cooperative relations with other related national organizations.
6. Expansion and diversification of the Association's financial base.
7. Implementation of an effective Affirmative Action Plan within the Association.
8. Implementation of an effective marketing and development program within the Association.
9. Implementation of the newly-approved Association By-Laws.
10. Increased dialogue and active involvement with all Association affiliates.[16]

Further, the association will be taking concrete steps for long-range planning. These measures include:

Developing a long-range national plan for community education development.

---

[15] Ibid., p. 176.

[16] John Fallon, "New Directions Toward the Future--1979," NCEA 1978 Annual Report (Washington: National Community Education Association, 1978), p. 17.

Developing a long-range plan for N.C.E.A. Regional Field Operations and Offices.

Developing state association affiliates in states without them.

Developing a long-range plan toward active involvement of the private sector in community education.

Developing creative, broad membership-based positions on such related issues as certification, accreditation, public funding and the roles of various actors and agencies in community education development.

Developing a long-range plan for financial stability.[17]

Completing the network of community education are the publications which disseminate and discuss the realities of the community education movement. The Community Education Journal, the official publication of NCEA, is published monthly and includes a wide variety of professional articles and organizational news. The Pendell Publishing Company of Midland, Michigan, is a well-established and prolific publisher of community education books and pamphlets. National publications which have devoted recent issues to community education are: Phi Delta Kappan; National Elementary Principal's Journal; National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin; Journal of Teacher Education; Leisure Today; and Journal of Alternative Human Services.[18] Minzey and Schmitt note that "other publications have given the concept considerable visibility."[19]

---

[17]Ibid.

[18]Jack Minzey and Donna Schmitt, "Community Education: An Overview," Journal of Alternative Human Services, 4 (Spring 1978): 12.

[19]Ibid.

Review of the Historical Development of Community Education

The Roots

Formal education in America is a unique blend of ideas and practices brought from older western civilizations and new ideas and practices which emerged from the growth of the new country. It is generally conceded that community education is not a new philosophy, but an evolving philosophy with roots in the basic concepts present in Greek, Roman, and European culture.[20]

While no complete history of community education has been written, Olsen and Clark[21] provide one of the most detailed accounts of the origins of the philosophic foundation of community education. These authors draw parallels between community education and the movement known as educational realism. They tie the evolution of community education to the voices for life-centered education. Thus, they link community education to Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Spencer. Specifically they cite Rousseau's commitment to teaching how to live, Pestalozzi's conviction that firsthand experience was the foundation for true learning, and Spencer's concern for the preparation for complete living.[22]

---

[20]Larry E. Decker, Foundations of Community Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972), p. 35.

[21]Edward G. Olsen and Phillip A. Clark, Life-Centering Education, pp. 57-79.

[22]Ibid., p. 59.

Early Beginnings in America

Several authors have pointed out that community education was present during the colonial period. Berridge[23] and Decker[24] both cite the early use of school facilities for community purposes. Berridge states that, "If one simply looks at the public's use of school facilities then community education began in the colonial period in the northeastern United States."[25]

In the nineteenth century, schools began moving to educational purposes beyond the "support of social and religious purposes"[26] and into the realm of social adjustment. In the early nineteenth century, schools in Providence, Rhode Island, Cincinnati, Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, and Chicago, Illinois, initiated adult programs in school facilities.[27] Later in the century, educational opportunities for those in the rural areas became a reality through the work of various agricultural organizations.[28]

In 1890, Francis Parker opened a school that operated on the principle, "What knowledge does this class need for

---

[23]Robert Berridge, "Community Education: Its Involvement," in The Role of the School in Community Education, eds. Howard W. Hickey and Curtis Van Voorhess (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1969), p. 18.

[24]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 36.

[25]Berridge, p. 18.

[26]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 36.

[27]Berridge, p. 18.

[28]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 150.

its present life?" The school was set within a small community of children, parents, teachers, and administrators who lived, studied and played together.[29] Shortly thereafter, John Dewey published School and Society which stressed the school's responsibility to improve the community as well as to educate the child. Dewey pointed out the importance of a child's environment in relation to his total education.[30] Dewey said that:

> From the standpoint of the child, the great waste in the school comes from his inability to utilize the experience he gets outside the school within the school itself; he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning at school. That is the isolation of the school--its isolation from life.[31]

Dewey is credited with being the father of progressive education; Decker contends that progressive education can be viewed as the forerunner of community education.[32]

The Development of Community Education Materials, Curricula, and Schools

In the first third of the twentieth century a number of prominent educators developed and implemented materials and strategies which are felt to be significant underpinnings in the evolution of community educations. Joseph K. Hart, a

---

[29]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 60.

[30]Ibid.

[31]School and Society, quoted in The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective, Edward G. Olsen, ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 264.

[32]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 36.

disciple of Dewey's, authored Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities. This book is considered to be "the first book on community resources."[33]

In 1923, Ellsworth Collings developed a Community Study Curriculum.

> Ellsworth Collings told how he had organized the life of a one-room rural school around the problems of that community and demonstrated in the process that a project curriculum so structured was academically more effective than the traditional subject-centered pattern, even for the so-called fundamentals.[34]

Collings developed projects based on the study of community problems for each of the different grade levels.[35]

Two of the first community schools were established by Elsie Clapp; the first was in Kentucky and the second in West Virginia.[36] In 1939, she wrote a book, Community Schools in Action, which "provides descriptions of the community school that are still widely used and quoted."[37] Clapp defined what the role of the community school was in these terms:

---

[33]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 61.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Bess Goodykoontz, "Selected Studies Relating to Community Schools," The Community School in The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 53.

[36]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 62.

[37]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 43.

> First of all, it meets as best it can, and with everybody's help, the urgent needs of the people, for it holds that everything that affects the welfare of the children and their families is its concern. Where does school end and life outside begin? There is no distinction between them. A community school is a used place, a place used freely and informally for all the needs of living and learning. It is, in effect, a place where living and learning converge.[38]

The Flint, Michigan, Community Schools Program was begun in 1936, "by a wealthy philanthropist, Charles S. Mott, and a citizen with an idea, Frank Manley."[39] Together they started out to broaden the use of existing public facilities. The great recognition which has come to the Flint Program is based on the "actual development and generation of a community education program which is more complete and of greater duration than any other."[40] Further, Flint is unique because it was there that the concept of community education matured and became sophisticated.[41]

The Era of the Community School

From the depression of the 1930's through the post-war years of the Korean conflict, there was the growth and increased importance of the community school. Maurice Seay[42]

---

[38]Elsie R. Clapp, Community Schools in Action, quoted in Larry E. Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 43.

[39]"Community Education," North Carolina Community Education News (Fall 1977): 1.

[40]Jack Minzey and Donna Schmitt, "Community Education: An Overview," p. 9.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Maurice Seay and Associates, Community Education: A Developing Concept (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974), pp. 21-23.

contends that communities turned to the school for leadership, for it was the school which had the buildings, equipment, central location, and staff. Community members felt that the schools, and all they symbolized, could help in solving problems. According to Seay, schools helped to meet the needs of community members for growth and enrichment in that the schools provided practical training, free or inexpensive recreation, and cultural enrichment through music and other performing arts. During and immediately after World War II the schools helped with rationing, library services, and adult education.[43]

Paul R. Hanna and Robert A. Naslund[44] in reviewing the literature of community schools found four prevailing curriculum models. The models were: (1) The Community-centered Curriculum--This model looked upon the community as a resource for the enrichment of the programs of the school; (2) The Vocation-centered Curriculum--In this model the community provided work experience for pupils in a variety of vocational fields; (3) The Community-centered Function--This model made physical facilities of the school open for use by community groups; (4) The Community Service Program--In this

---

[43]Ibid.

[44]Paul R. Hanna and Robert A. Naslund, "The Community School Defined," The Community School in The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 50.

model service to the community for community betterment was emphasized.[45]

According to Hanna and Naslund all the community school models indicated certain assumptions or values to be present in the community. For example, the community school reflected the beliefs that there should be community/school interaction, schools can be a helping agency for community growth and development, education is a total community matter, and a community school's curriculum must be flexible.[46]

From the Community School Concept to the Community Education Concept

During the 1960's and 70's the community education concept emerged as a much more visible and viable entity. The community education concept retained much of the community school concept but it also expanded its philosophy, goals, and process. Seay notes that "as the concept of community education evolved, it incorporated many threads that ran through the community school movement."[47] For example, community education proponents viewed education as a continuous process in which educational activities should be based on the problems, needs and interests of the participants. Further, the community education concept built on the community school concept that "a local community

---

[45] Ibid. [46] Ibid.

[47] Maurice Seay and Associates, Community Education: A Developing Concept, p. 28.

provided a focal point for understanding other, larger communities of people."[48]

Olsen and Clark point out that

> . . . in 1973 the word "SCHOOL" was dropped from the name (National Community School Education Association) to emphasize the total community orientation rather than the much more limited lighted schoolhouse idea earlier associated with the community school concept.[49]

The community school concept gave way to the community education process.

In a summary of the historical development of community education, Minzey and Schmitt note:

> The history of community education has actually evolved from a series of programs appended to the traditional school into a new philosophy of education which describes an expanded new role for public schools. This new role continues to be concerned with the traditional role of education of the typical school-aged child, but in addition accepts some responsibilities which have previously not been perceived as public school responsibilities.[50]

Community education, as previously cited, is being touted as a significant model for change. The pioneers of community education are now prepared "to offer informed speculation on the subject, . . . to point to actual specimens where implementation is taking place."[51]

---

[48]Ibid.

[49]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p.

[50]Minzey and Schmitt, "Community Education: An Overview," p. 10.

[51]Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," p. 3.

The Foundation and Forces of Community Education

Values and Assumptions

The process of community education is built upon values and assumptions. A number of individuals have presented assertions concerning the foundations of community education.

In what has been called the "First Book of Community Schools in Action,"[52] Samuel Everett pointed out the differences between community schools and traditional schools. In so doing, Everett give us a "conception of education . . . built upon a conscious choice between a number of educational and social issues. . . ."[53] In reality, the basic differences between community schools and traditional schools signify a difference in values. The differences and therefore the representative values are:

Community Schools		Traditional Schools
All life is educative	vs	Education is gained only in formal institutions of learning
Education requires participation	vs	Education is adequately gained through studying about life
Adults and children have fundamental common purposes in both work and play	vs	Adults are primarily concerned with work and children with play
Public school systems should be primarily concerned with improvements of the social order	vs	School systems should be primarily concerned with passing on the cultural heritage

[52]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 64.

[53]Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 22.

The curriculum should receive its social orientation from major problems and areas of community living	vs	The curriculum should be oriented in relation to the specialized aims of academic subjects
Public education should be founded upon democratic process and ideals	vs	The belief should be that most children and most adults are incapable of intelligently either running their own lives or participating in common group efforts
Progress in education and community living best comes through the development of common concerns among individuals and social groups	vs	Progress best comes through the development of clear-cut social classes and vested interest groups which struggle for survival and dominance
Public schools should be held responsible for the education of both children and adults	vs	Public schools should only be responsible for the education of children
Teacher-preparatory institutions should prepare youth and adults to carry on a community type of public education	vs	Such institutions should prepare youth and adults to perpetuate academic traditions and practices[54]

Maurice Seay supports the contention that many of the values of community education evolved from the community school movement. He identifies these values as: ". . . education is a continuous process," ". . . educational activities should be based on the problems, needs, and interests for whom they were planned," ". . . services between the school and community should be reciprocal," and ". . . a

---

[54]The Community School, quoted in Decker, Foundations of Community Education, pp. 22-23.

local community is the focal point for understanding other larger communities of people."[55]

As the concept of community education continued to evolve, V. M. Kerensky[56] envisioned community education as an educative community which is based on eight philosophic assumptions. They are:

1. The building of a learning community must be a major goal;
2. All the resources of the community must be mobilized to make learning opportunities for children and adults;
3. Members of a community are resources for education;
4. Alienation can be avoided through meaningful relationships among people in their communities;
5. Education must concern itself with the critical problems of the community;
6. The educative community must be humanistic;
7. The educative community must be synergistic;
8. The educative community must be futuristic.[57]

Other central assumptions concerning the nature of community education are given by Olsen and Clark. These central assumptions are:

> All life educates, not just the school; The goal of community education is to educate people for better living for a better world; The school must often lead the community into cooperative development of educational policies and programs, including that of curriculum; The major concerns of life today and tomorrow, should become the core of the regular school and community college curricula.[58]

---

[55] Seay, Community Education: A Developing Concept, pp. 28-29.

[56] V. M. Kerensky, "The Educative Community," The National Elementary Principal (January-February 1975): 45.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 103.

In relation to public school classrooms, Howard Hickey identifies community education's principles in the following manner:

> The classroom is viewed as a community by teachers and students. . . . The classroom community uses, on a regular basis, resources from its neighborhood communities. . . . The classroom community moves to the neighborhood community whenever it can provide a better learning environment than the school. . . ."[59]

Larry Decker states that

> A basic foundation on which the community education philosophy is built is the mutually interdependent relationship and fundamental linkage between the home, the school, and the community as they interact in phases of human development and community improvement.[60]

He illustrates the linkages between home, school, and community by asserting that neither the home, school nor community cease to exert influence on the individual when an individual physically departs from one sphere and enters another. The influence of each sphere remains a part of an individual at all times. The three spheres are interactive and community education provides a framework for maximizing their interaction.[61]

---

[59]Howard W. Hickey, "Community Education's Implications for Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education 28 (July-August 1977): 19.

[60]Larry E. Decker and Virginia A. Decker, eds., Administrators and Policy Makers' Views of Community Education (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977), p. 6.

[61]Ibid.

Fantini suggests that the foundation of community education is derived from the "notion of socialization."[62] He points out that as society has changed, the basic socialization processes have also changed. He states that "Community education brings the socializing agents--the educators of youth--together and attempts to provide a more coordinated framework for socialization."[63] The idea of community education, according to Fantini, has been around for decades; its roots are in the need to meet needs in an ever-changing society.[64]

The Dynamics of Community Education

Community education has been defined by many, including this investigator, as a process. Even those writers who use other terminology in the definition of community education,[65] speak of the process of community education when they describe its operation. The process or operation of community education involves assisting "community service agencies in cooperation with representatives from the community to develop a sense of mission, a sense of community."[66] The process of

---

[62]Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," p. 3.

[63]Ibid. [64]Ibid.

[65]The reader is reminded of the numerous citations in this study in which community education has been defined in a variety of terms.

[66]Robert J. Shoop, Developing Interagency Cooperation, Community Education How To Series (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1976), p. 12.

community education "can begin to operationalize the often articulated philosophy of service."[67]

The role of community education is to "encourage the development of a comprehensive and coordinated delivery system for providing educational, recreational, social and cultural services for all people in a community."[68] Further, "Community education provides an opportunity for people to work together to achieve community and self-improvement."[69]

Historically, the community school has been the "primary mechanism"[70] for operationalizing the process of community education. According to Minzey and Schmitt, as the community school actualizes the community education process, the result is a system that:

> (1) identifies problems; (2) identifies already existing or potentially-existing resources; and (3) brings the problems and resources together in a facilitative manner.[71]

The public schools of Durham County in North Carolina are an example of community schools facilitating the

---

[67] Ibid.

[68] Larry E. Decker, People Helping People: An Overview of Community Education, Community Education How To Series (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1975), p. 5.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Minzey and Schmitt, "Community Education: An Overview," p. 10.

[71] Ibid.

community education process. Foster[72] describes the Durham model in the following manner:

> . . . (1) citizens voice a need; (2) staff members seek out resources which might bear on the need, going first to agencies already involved in meeting this kind of concern and then to the private sector; (3) citizens are appraised of resource options by staff; (4) a decision is made by citizens and staff as to which option to pursue; (5) a program evaluation instrument is selected; (6) the resource is linked to the need in a manageable way, creating a new program or process for action; (7) the evaluation is made and results reported to the citizens and agencies; (8) a new plan is then developed which is "owned" by the community. . . .[73]

LeTarte and Minzey[74] propose that the ultimate function of community education is to develop a means by which a group of people who share relationships, commonalities, and feelings can develop "a sense of self-good among the members of a community which will lead to a sense of belonging, a community 'esprit de corps,' a sense of values of community and its potential for action."[75] LeTarte and Minzey suggest that communities are capable of becoming self-actualized. They support this contention based on the assumption that

> . . . communities are capable of positive change, social problems have solutions, one of the strongest forces for meaningful change is community power, and community members are desirous of improving their communities and are willing to contribute their energies toward such ends.[76]

---

[72]Barbara Barrett Foster, "The People Connection: A Brokering System for Community Education," The Mid-Atlantic Community Educator (Winter, 1978): 18.

[73]Ibid.

[74]Clyde E. LeTarte and Jack D. Minzey, Community Education from Program to Process (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 31-42.

[75]Ibid., p. 36. [76]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

Implications of Community Education for Public Schools

Community educators and a number of those writing about community education dwell on the impact community education has for the public schools. Decker states that while

> . . . very little research has been done on community education, especially its consequences, the little evidence that is available seems to indicate that the consequence of its adoption is change in the role of the public school and in lay and professional views on the comprehensiveness of education.[77]

Minzey and Schmitt support community education's potential for change. They state that community education, through its primary vehicle, the community school, is a way to create a sense of community, a strategy for returning participatory democracy to the local level, a method of returning to the supportive role which schools once played in society, and a means of meeting a community's demands for specific educational needs.[78]

According to Baas[79] the movement of community school education reflects concern about children and societal structure. Community school education represents a serious and wide-scale attempt to respond to socioeconomic conditions,

---

[77]Decker, "Community Education: The Need for A Conceptual Framework," p. 6.

[78]Munzey and Schmitt, "Community Education: An Overview," pp. 9-10.

[79]Alan M. Baas, Community Schools in Educational Management Series (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management, 1973), p. 1.

racial prejudice, and a multitude of subtle environmental factors through specific programs and activities and through a general reorientation of the community's attitudes toward schools.[80]

Community education is seen by Burdin as a "means of making our schools truly public--responsive and responsible to the people."[81] If schools were committed to community education, Burdin would envision school personnel active in the community developing processes and competencies, training people within organizations and agencies to better facilitate learning activities, and involved in working with adults to assure lifelong learning.[82]

In Education II-Revisited: A Social Imperative, Kerensky and Melby[83] indicate that while caution is needed when one reduces the community school program to a set of components it is also dangerous to be too vague; therefore, they identify "a minimum of twelve ingredients, components, or concerns which are present in an effective community school program."[84] These ingredients are: maximum use of human and physical resources; the establishment and

---

[80]Ibid.

[81]Joel Burdin, "Community Education's Promise," Journal of Teacher Education 28 (July-August 1977): 1.

[82]Ibid.

[83]Kerensky and Melby, Education II-Revisited: A Social Imperative, pp. 177-188.

[84]Ibid., p. 178.

development of cooperative procedures with governmental service agencies, volunteer and civic service organizations, businesses and industries, and other educational institutions; the establishment of procedures for self-generated activities; the initiation and coordination of special community events; the establishment of problem solving procedures through the formation of a citizen advisory council; the employment of a Community School Director who coordinates all of the components; the establishment of a climate for innovation and change; provisions for a heuristic process; and provisions for serendipitous experiences.[85]

To what would a school be committing itself when it accepts the community education process? Minzey and LeTarte list four responsibilities that would have to be assumed. They are:

> . . . providing varied and expanded learning opportunities for school-age children; assuring adult educational opportunities; expanded utilization of school facilities; and leadership in community development and coordination of community services.[86]

Community education's implications for change as noted by Fantini are significant to the basic structure of schooling. He sees community education as leading to a redefinition of who the learner is; a change in the learning

---

[85]Ibid., pp. 177-188.

[86]Jack D. Minzey and Clyde E. LeTarte, "Community Education--Where to Now?" Journal of Teacher Education (July-August 1977): 29-30.

environment " . . . so that there are no learning failures, only program or design failures . . . ;" a replacement of classification or labeling systems with " . . . a more positive personalized philosophy that recognizes the unlimited potential of each person and the fact that every person is indeed talented in something . . . ;" a more personal and decentralized structure; less duplication of services; a more economic system; and a more pluralistic system.[87]

Community education has implications for all educators and specifically for those who train teachers. Sandberg, Weaver, and Kimbrough are among those who call attention to the need to inform and involve educators and teacher educators about community education. Sandberg and Weaver[88] point out the societal factors which necessitate that all educators become community educators. They are:

- General societal malaise
- Dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the schools
- Tendency for institutions to become their own raison d'etre
- Recognized need for coordination of community services

---

[87]Mario D. Fantini, "Community Education: Participants and Participation," Community Education Journal 6 (December 1978): 6.

[88]John Sandberg and Donald Weaver, "Teachers as Community Educators: Training in Teacher Education Colleges," Journal of Teacher Education (July-August 1977): 9-12.

- Inability of the home to provide early childhood environment considered essential as a basis for further education and a productive life

- Recognition of the educative potential of community agencies in addition to the school

- Commitment to the promotion of the community education concept by state legislatures and Congress.[89]

Kimbrough[90] suggests that community education has important implications for teacher preparation. He emphasizes that:

> Central to the developing concept of community education is that all educators must furnish leadership for the education of all the people in concert with the leadership of other institutions of the society. . . . Educators need to become scholarly observers of the culture and the social structure of the communities in which they practice.[91]

According to Kimbrough there must be preparation programs which will help educators transform their perceptions of the school. The new view would recognize that the school is not the center of all learning but rather one among many working to meet the educational needs of society.[92]

In presenting community education's implications for the public schools, most of the attention has focused on broad or multifaceted implications. Olsen and Clark,[93] however, turn to an indepth look at the curriculum of the

---

[89]Ibid., p. 9.

[90]Ralph Kimbrough, "Community Education: Implications for Collegiate Teacher Educators," Journal of Teacher Education (July-August 1977): 25-27.

[91]Ibid., p. 25. [92]Ibid., p. 26.

[93]Olsen and Clark, Life-Centering Education, p. 100.

schools. They state that the K-12 curriculum is neglected or virtually impenetrable by community education, and yet they see it as essential to the success of the community education process. If the K-12 curriculum is left unchanged then community education is a ". . . separate program superimposed upon existing schools. . . or . . . a simple extension of an obsolete education system. . . ."[94]

Olsen and Clark suggest that within the K-12 curriculum "the life processes and concerns of human beings become the common core of systematic learning of youth."[95] The core curriculum would require one-third to two-thirds of the student's time. The remaining time would be given to the election of conventional subjects of an academic or special nature. "Core and non-core activities, alike, however, should stress participatory education, society orientation, illumination of human realities, analysis of values, and constructive community action."[96]

What is suggested by Olsen and Clark is the building of a core curriculum around life concerns. The authors propose a list of basic life concerns which can be used as examples; however, they note that these proposals are not an absolutized or all-inclusive list. Their aim is to illustrate the

---

[94]Ibid., p. 101. [95]Ibid., p. 104.

[96]Ibid.

potential of using the life concerns approach in redesigning the curriculum.[97] To illustrate their proposal Olsen and Clarke present the following life concerns:

Securing food and shelter	Controlling the environment
Protecting life and health	Utilizing leisure time
Communicating ideas and feelings	Enjoying beauty
Adjusting to other people	Appreciating the past
Satisfying sexual desires	Meeting religious needs
Enriching family life	Finding personal identity
Rearing children	Adjusting to change
Securing education	Growing old, facing death[98]
Sharing in citizenship	

The ultimate purpose in redesigning the curriculum along life concerns activities is to educate for better living. According to Olsen and Clark this shibboleth translates into education which is meaningful to today's young people's quest for values in which they can believe and by which they can live. The ultimate concern is the concern for the significance of life.[99] Olsen and Clark view community education and the life concerns curriculum as addressing ". . . present living (to discover needs), past living (for perspective and insight), and future living (to recognize options and plan for improvement."[100] They find the community education approach and the core curriculum to be consistent with the fundamental purposes of school--

> . . . to help transmit to each new generation the best of the human intellectual--aesthetic-ethical heritage;

---

[97] Ibid., p. 107. [98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid., p. 112. [100] Ibid., p. 117.

> to help prepare individuals for personally satisfying, successful and creative living now and in the future; and to help provide society's educative basis for continuing social advance.[101]

Summary of the Data

In this chapter community education materials have been presented as data for the purpose of determining whether the community education process has the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum. The data compiled are a representative collection of the literature by community educators or those well acquainted with the community education process. The material was drawn primarily from government and community education documents, publications by community education center directors, writings by university professors and community education practitioners working on the local level. In addition, a few citations are taken from educators whose primary expertise is in an area other than community education but who have a knowledge and understanding of the community education process.

While there are a significant number of materials written about community education, many of these publications are brief or written to address a particular point about community education. Therefore, this chapter has presented numerous citations within an organized framework for the purpose of establishing an instrument for analysis.

---

[101] Ibid., p. 115.

From the materials presented, this investigator has derived an integration of findings. The five integrated findings are:

Integration #1--Community Education has been translated into a movement for which there is federal, state, and local legislation and support; a national network for dissemination, development, implementation and evaluation; professional commitment and organization; interest and inquiry by other educational organizations and agencies.

Integration #2--Community Education has evolved from a blend of ideas and practices from Western civilization and indigenous ideas and practices. Community Education is linked to educational realism and progressive education; responsive to broad social and economic needs; based on community interaction; concerned with the larger, global community.

Integration #3--Community Education has values and assumptions which provide the process with its focus and guide its actions. The focus is: all life is educative; learning is life-long--education requires participation; education and community living are best when common concerns have been developed among individuals and social groups. The action involves

building a learning community; basing educational activities on the interests, needs and problems of the participants; utilizing all resources of the community; relating to participants humanistically; planning for the future.

Integration #4--Community Education brings about change. Community Education results in a system which identifies problems; identifies resources; brings the problems and resources together; facilitates programs and services; develops a sense of community with the potential for change.

Integration #5--Community Education has implications for the public schools. Community Education is a means of making public schools public; an assumption of greater responsibility on the part of the school; a change from a system of schooling to a system of education; a new role and orientation for the teacher; and a new focus for the curriculum.

CHAPTER IV

MAKING THE MATCH

The purpose of this study is to analyze community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum. It has been demonstrated that there is a need to resolve the difference between what schools are and what schools should be. Contradictions between the stated purposes of education and the actual occurrences in the classroom have been noted, and the curriculum has been identified as the critical unit. The investigator has made six assumptions concerning existing constraints in the school setting; these constraints embody what schools should not be. An integration of the findings from the selected review of literature indicates that three broad areas of change are needed; these changes relate to what schools and curriculum should be. The preceding chapter presents community education materials as descriptive data and from an integration of these data five significant findings emerge. This chapter will examine the five significant findings from the data in their relation to the identified constraints present in the K-12 curriculum; a determination will be made as to whether community education is antithetic to the existing constraints. Second, the data will be examined in their relation to the suggestions for changing the K-12 curriculum as found in the selected review of the literature; a determination will be made as to whether

community education is congruous with the suggested changes, and therefore can be shown to have the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum and resolving differences between what schools are and what they should be.

Matching Community Education Findings Against Curricular Constraints

Life-long Learning vs. Disconnected Learning in the Discrete Curriculum

The language of community education speaks consistently of the value and necessity of life-long learning; the practice within the discrete curriculum of today's schools involves organizing learning into a series of disconnections. Life-long learning assumes learning is a continuous process while the discrete curriculum views learning as beginning in kindergarten and ending with the termination of 12 years of schooling. Further, life-long learning encourages multi-aged learning, whereas the discrete curriculum discourages any disparity in the age of the learners, and in practice frequently limits or closes learning opportunities solely on an age criterion. Life-long learning implies that given the vast quantity of knowledge which exists and the various rates of human development, learning should not be bound by time. The current curricular mode is predicated on the assumption that since learning will cease upon graduation or an otherwise termination of schooling, content must be compacted and presented to learners at an arbitrarily determined

rate. Life-long learning as a continuous process holds the promise of ultimate success in learning. The sequential, graded, and leveled curriculum promotes failure; there are insurmountable failure factors when learners are faced with "You only have one chance to get this material," or "You can't take Spanish because you don't have a B average in English," or "They only study that sort of thing in a more advanced class; here we concentrate on remedial skills."

The concept of life-long learning is antithetic to the concept of disconnected learnings in today's curriculum; the marked contrast in the two concepts indicates that the adoption of the community education process's value on life-long learning has the potential for changing the existing discrete nature of curriculum. The concept of life-long learning makes the process of learning an open system and a whole system; the discrete curriculum dictates that learning will be a closed and fragmented process. The former concept could result in a process of learning which enhances the quality of life for all; unfortunately, the latter concept frequently ends in the creation of a schizoid environment. The adoption of community education's life-long learning value could change or modify the practices of designing the curriculum for the convenience of administrators and teachers; separating one discipline from the others; basing content on the age of the learner; setting up arbitrary standards of mastery

and concluding that not meeting those standards is failure; evaluating on the basis of time needed for mastery; and most importantly, deciding who gets access to what knowledge.

Utilization of All Resources vs. the Isolate "Unto Itself" School

The greatest implication for changing the K-12 curriculum lies in community education's commitment to operationalizing a system which would utilize all existing resources to meet the educational, social, cultural, and recreational needs of all citizens. The community education process is based on the assumption that the school is not the source of all learning, nor can the school afford to establish its learning environment apart from other human and material resources. Implicit in this assumption is the belief that all life is educative, and education takes place best in the context of the world outside of schools and in cooperation, coordination, and collaboration with outside resources.

The schools have frequently taken the position that if not all learning takes place in the schools, then certainly the most important learning takes place there. While the history of education in America documents that there have been proponents of the philosophy that all life is educative, and while many schools' written philosophies support this belief, the actual practice of the schools is quite to the contrary. With the exception of certain alternative schools

and vocational programs, the majority of schools employ strategies which are aimed at keeping students in school, in class, for 180 days, six to seven hours a day. If letting students learn in the world outside school is a tenet of the public schools, every action of the school belies its importance. Further, there are few schools which provide opportunities for the outside world to come into the classroom. The entries which are allowed are usually considered to be public relations gestures, breaks from the regular program, or, at best, a superficial acknowledgement that someone out there has some bit of knowledge or expertise which might provide frosting on the already completed cake.

Schools which have extended their programs into the community or invited the community into the classroom have often done so in a manner which allows them to maintain absolute control and unquestionable professional superiority. Cooperation generally means that the "outside others," or the "theys," do what the schools want done. There are few parent or citizen volunteers who would testify that their input was considered significant. Volunteerism is only gradually beginning to make an impact on the "flowing in" of ideas and services. The critical inhibiting factor within the schools is a combination of pseudo-professionalism, a lack of an ability to put two worlds into a whole, and the belief that the school and the teacher always know best.

In addition to the valuable human resources present in every community, our contemporary society has a wide range of material resources and a vast delivery system for these resources. There are few schools in the present period of inflation that have adequate financial support for personnel, instructional materials and equipment, or ancillary services. Further, schools frequently attempt to duplicate services or materials which other educational agencies are better prepared to offer. The obvious solution is the identification and utilization of existing resources. One example of this process took place recently in a school with which this investigator worked. The school had a need for five sewing machines and was faced with having to eliminate a sewing course or commit financial resources which were badly needed in other areas. A simple remark made about the situation was overheard by the local YMCA director who just happened to have five new machines which were not being used at that time and, in fact, were taking up needed space. The YMCA loaned the sewing machines to the school.

The utilization of all existing resources would be a wise use of monies and it would demonstrate that schools are interested in operating on a sound fiscal basis; a contrary charge is often made by citizens and businesses. Most importantly, the utilization of all existing resources would indicate a reaching out; cooperation, coordination, and

collaboration would testify to the schools being a part of society, not a separate system unto itself.

The implications for the curriculum are significant. Allowing the outside world to come in and the classroom to reach out would create a sound structure for a continuous human socialization process. Students would not merely be told or read about various types of interactions, "how it really is," but they would experience the interactions on a personal, meaningful level. Students would have an opportunity to take content learnings outside a sterile setting and examine or apply them in a dynamic setting. Expanding learning opportunities through a vital curriculum could result in students making connections between what takes place in the life of the school and what is needed for quality life outside the school. Opening the curriculum would very probably result in a change in what is taught, how it is taught, and how the parts of the curriculum are related. Expanding the curriculum or changing the curriculum through more personal and socially relevant experiences and activities would contribute to the improvement of the quality of living in the schools and ultimately in life outside of schools.

Community education's assumption that all existing resources should be brought to bear upon the educational, social, cultural, and recreational needs of all people is

antithetic to the schools' current practice. Utilizing all resources and opening the schools could change the curriculum and therefore the outcomes for learners.

Focusing on the Self-Determined Needs of the Learners vs. the Irrelative Curriculum

The values and assumptions of community education support a process which emanates from a determination of the needs of the learners; self-determination of needs by the participants is considered to be extremely important. The public schools' curricula are also based on needs; however, these needs are almost exclusively determined by someone other than the learners. The content, materials and activities of the public schools' curricula are prescribed by professionals. These prescriptions, while often consistent with certain sound educational theories, seldom consider systematically the learners' perceptions of who they are or what they hope to become. Rather, curricular determinations are often made based on the premise that the schools must either ignore or overcome that which the learners bring with them to school, and that the schools should dictate what the learners should become. When the curriculum is developed without regard to who the learners are and what they hope to become, the curriculum becomes a mechanism for suppression and separation. The learners are not free to be whole, and therefore, they cannot approach learning in a relational manner (see Foshay, p. 26, and Goodlad, pp. 28-29).

The procedure for placing students in vocational programs is an example of the schools' determining a learner's curriculum based on presumptions about who the learner is and what he should become. Students who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are often counseled to enroll in or, in some instances, are placed in vocational programs. The rationale for this action is that if students come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, their needs are best met by providing them with a trade. The fact that these students may have other interests or perceived needs is not weighed heavily, if at all. Although these students may want to study art or a foreign language, they are urged "to be realistic" and take something that will give them salable skills.

Another example of the irrelative nature of the curriculum is the failure of the curriculum to help students deal with their personal predicaments. Much of the contemporary curricular content focuses on the ideal or makes negative judgments about conditions in which the learner finds himself to be. Life concerns are either treated academically or avoided with the result that the student who deals with this concern every day is left feeling untouched or inferior (see Foshay, p. 27).

In contrast to the irrelative curriculum, the community education process values and acts on needs as determined by the participants. Community education programs are not

developed exclusively by professional programmers. Rather, community education begins with a needs assessment of individuals by individuals. Community education utilizes needs assessment instruments and procedures, and also relies on the collective input from the citizens advisory council. The citizens advisory council, which is a representative body from the community, facilitates the determination of community needs, makes suggestions concerning the best way to meet those needs, and then assesses whether or not the identified needs have been met.

The community education process has frequently been criticized as being only a social reform movement. Community educators contend that social change is a vital kind of education and that education must provide the basis for social change. Clearly, community education values and acts on individual needs, as determined by individuals, and community education focuses on life concerns. In these respects, community education is antithetic to the irrelative curriculum.

Broad Participation vs. Select Participation

In this study the differential or discriminatory nature of the curriculum has been identified as a constraint. All schools make determinations about what will be taught, to whom it will be taught, and how it will be taught. Far too many schools approach these determinations in a differential or discriminatory fashion. Certain teachers like to teach

certain courses; those same teachers prefer to teach certain students. Finally, said teachers choose certain materials and instructional techniques which they have developed over a period of time and which make the process of teaching less demanding for them. These teachers discriminate in all areas of curricular development without regard to the deleterious effects on either the included or the excluded students. Does this sound like a valid way to make critical curricular decisions? Sadly, this process can be found in many schools.

There is considerable evidence that teachers perceive that grouping and tracking of students make teaching easier and more pleasant for the teacher. However, these practices, and the more subtle practices emerging in response to federal regulations, deny students the right to self-determination and equal educational opportunities.

Certain critics of curriculum see the differential nature of the curriculum to be no accident; their arguments are forceful. It can be concluded logically that a curriculum which is differential will support the maintenance of the status quo. Community education, which advocates equal access to knowledge, supports change.

A major difference between the existing discriminatory curriculum and the community education model is the issue of participation; the former is exclusive and the latter is inclusive. Community education is founded on the assumption

that education is best when common concerns are developed among individuals and groups. Implicit in this assumption is the belief that all people face the same common life concerns, and therefore, the process for addressing these concerns must be inclusive. Community education is responsive to broad social and economic needs, and as such community education is antithetic to the selective, differential curriculum.

A Sense of Community vs. the Impersonal Curriculum

People helping people is a dominant theme in community education. People being reduced to labels, numbers, and manipulative objects is a practice in many schools. The focus of community education is in marked contrast to the focus of schools and the curriculum.

Community education with its emphasis on the human potential, seeks to realize individual and collective potential through the creation of a learning community. In the public schools one can readily identify the teams of players, the casts of characters, the councils of government, and the classifications of students. In addition, school records reveal the numbers of TMR's, EMR's, EH's, LD's, and GT's. What one can rarely find in the public schools is a feeling of common purpose and mutual interdependence. Indeed, it is difficult to achieve a sense of community when everything around one reinforces singularity through classification.

Within the impersonal curriculum, learning experiences are often too abstract and too far removed from personal meanings. Frequently, course content is either presented at a level which precludes students becoming involved personally, or the content is reduced to a level where personal meaning is impossible. For example, trade materials which are presented for adoption as standard texts are generally observed to be too difficult and technical, or they are stripped to a readable level, devoid of any consequential substance. Since many of the students within a particular school read at or below the arbitrarily determined grade level, the materials chosen tend to be the non-substantive kind. Further, when these materials are used by students, to no real success except that they can read them, there is little if anything done by the teacher to put content back into them. The outcomes of this common practice confirm for the school that it was professionally sound to have labeled these students in the first place, and this practice reduces the potential for students to become informed, creative, and participating citizens.

Along with the determinations of what will be taught, to whom it will be taught, and how it will be taught, there are more subtle determinations which result in a separation of teachers as participants. Teachers are labeled also. The teacher who works with handicapped and disadvantaged students

becomes the "handicapped teacher"; the teacher who instructs superior students is perceived as the "superior teacher", and the teacher who has a quiet room is heralded as the "good teacher". These labels falsely separate teachers from feelings of common purpose and mutual interdependence. Moreover, these labels and their subsequent disposition foster feelings of a disparity of worth. A final consequence is the creation of a system which negates the existence of a learning community based on common life concerns with participation by all; instead, a system is erected which denies the importance of personal meaning and separates participants from one another.

An exceptionally strong thread running through the community education process is the assumption that education requires participation and that participants should be related to, humanistically. Participation within the community education context requires that the participants themselves be given a high degree of self-determination concerning their wants and needs, when they shall have access to various kinds of learning, the methods by which they will learn, and the evaluation of how well the learning experiences met their personal needs. Participation based on these criteria would drastically change the curricular practices of the public schools.

A Global View vs. the Provincial Curriculum

While one might assume that community education's thrust is limited and localized, the opposite is true. The community education process is predicated on the assumption that education and reform at the local level must be in relationship to the larger community setting. Moreover, the life concerns emphasis in the community education process reflects concerns which are present throughout the world. The value placed on the mutual interdependence of the home, the school, and the community is an initial step in building a framework which can create an even larger, global sense of community. A process which values all human potential and facilitates interaction and problem solving has significant implications for the immediate community and the larger community. The community education process is responsive to broad social and economic needs; responding to these needs includes utilizing all existing resources in the most beneficial way. Obviously, the community education process encourages planning for the future; this planning includes both the projected needs of the local community and the projected needs of the larger community.

Within the school setting, there is very little done to create the feeling that learners are an integral part of a global community. Many students not only lack the ability to relate to other cultures, they seldom have even a cursory

knowledge of anything that transpires outside their own country. This appalling lack of knowledge and understanding about the world around them was overwhelmingly demonstrated during the Viet Nam War when many students could not even find Viet Nam on a map. Moreover, those students who knew where Viet Nam was located had little conception of the political, social and economic conditions there. Finally, there were few students, or adults for that matter, who could fathom the drastic international impact or the far-reaching national strife which the Viet Nam War produced.

For the most part, the curricula in public schools fail to provide students with meaningful experiences which can foster the concept of interdependence. While the social studies sequence in public schools is often developed to incorporate content about other cultures, there are a limited number of teachers who can translate this content into appropriate learning activities for students. Since many teachers feel insecure teaching about other cultures, the learning environment is extremely tentative and the learning activities may be too simplified, too contrived, or even predicated upon misconceptions and errors. In addition, it has been observed that the content used for teaching about other cultures generally focuses on the unique features of the other cultures without an attempt to point out or build on the commonalities which exist among cultures.

A global view vs. a provincial view is one of the noticeable differences between the community education process and many curricular practices. The community education process seeks to build on mutual interdependence while the content and learning activities in the schools frequently widen the gap between peoples or flagrantly ignore the common life concerns and interrelatedness of all people everywhere. Again, the community education process is antithetic to a curricular constraint, provincialism.

Results of the Match

An analysis of the integrated findings relating to the community education process matched against the six identified curricular constraints indicates that the community education process is antithetic to the curricular constraints. The findings show that there are marked contrasts between the values, assumptions, and practices of community education and the actual practices within the K-12 curriculum. It is, therefore, demonstrated that the community education process has the potential for changing the discrete, isolate, orrelative, differential, impersonal, and provincial nature of the K-12 curriculum.

Looking for Congruence

To resolve the difference between what schools are and what they should be, according to this investigator, requires identifying constraints and seeking for ways to remove these

constraints. It has been demonstrated that community education has the potential for changing the six identified curricular constraints. A further step in the analysis of community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum involves looking for congruence between the integrated findings of the community education process and the suggestions for changing the K-12 curriculum as found in the selected review of the literature. These suggestions for change include the need for a redefinition of the meaning of schools and education which includes recognition that learning is life-long, learning should take place within the context of the world outside of schools, and learning should be personalized and liberating; the need to involve all agencies in the educational process realizing that schools are not the only source of learning, and recognizing the benefits possible through the utilization of all existing resources; and the need to provide for personal and community participation in determining educational needs and in planning, implementing and evaluating the curriculum.

In the first step of this analysis the integrated findings from community education data were matched <u>against</u> the assumptions made concerning curricular constraints. It can now be logically demonstrated that the integrated findings from community education data match <u>with</u> the suggestions for changing these constraints.

Redefinition of Schools

Community education is a redefinition of schools and education, and the redefinition is consistent with the call for life-long learning, learning within the setting outside of schools, and learning which has personal meanings.

The history of the community education movement reveals that the early emphasis in the movement was on the school as community. The schools had the buildings and the human and material resources; therefore, the schools were called upon and encouraged to let the community come in. As the schools began to open up their doors, citizens began to feel a sense of ownership, responsibility, and personal gratification; these feelings led ultimately to citizens believing that they indeed had the right to have certain expectations of schools and that their input could be of consequence. Citizen advisory councils were formed and a mechanism for a broad base of community input was established. Gradually through the efforts of the visionaries, both professionals and lay-citizens alike, the emphasis of community education has turned to the assmmption that the school must also reach out. Today, the purpose of the school, according to community education, must be to provide education and to provide it within the framework of a continuous process and in the context of the world outside of schools.

Utilization of All Existing Resources

Community education's assumption that the utilization of all existing resources will maximize learning opportunities matches another recommendation from the review of curricular change literature. The community education process not only assumes that all existing resources should be brought to bear on the educational needs of all people, but that assumption is operationalized through a system which identifies needs, identifies resources, and then brings these needs and resources together. Through the auspices of community education a large number of inter-agency councils have been organized. These councils, which are representative of the various services which exist within a community, provide a forum for cooperative, coordinative, and collaborative planning. Further, through the councils, the agencies have a legitimate avenue for dealing with the issues of duplicative services and unmet needs. Bringing the many diverse service delivery systems together in a council of communication, where each agency has the privilege of expression both as an entity and as an integral part of a whole, creates a synergistic system. Agencies feel good about their worth, better about other agencies, and more fervently committed to meeting all the needs of all the community. Inter-agency councils are visible proof of the intent and practice of the community education process.

Provisions for Personal and Collective Participation

The need to provide for personal and collective participation in determining educational needs and in planning, implementing and evaluating the curriculum is a central value and basic assumption of the community education process. In addition to the use of collective forms of community input, through the citizens advisory councils and inter-agency councils, the community education process facilitates individual or personal participation. On an operational level, community education makes use of a communication network to ascertain individual or personal wants and needs. The communication network channels information in through the use of needs assessment instruments and procedures; the network gets information out through news releases, media coverage, and community and neighborhood meetings. This network utilizes all formal means of communication and all informal avenues of communication. For example, announcements at church, school, and local gathering places personalize information and reach all people, especially those people who do not readily identify or respond to formal communications procedures. Somewhat less tangible, but ultimately more important than the establishment of a network for personal and collective input concerning wants and needs is the creation of a sense of community based on mutual interdependence and worth. An environment which acknowledges the importance

of persons and groups of persons is an environment for renewal rather than an environment of perpetuation. The mission of the community education process is to facilitate such an environment.

Results of the Match

An analysis of the integrated findings relating to the community education process matched with three suggestions for changing the K-12 curriculum as found in the selected review of literature shows that there is congruence between the two. It is found that the values, assumptions, and practices of community education are congruous with the recommendations for changing the K-12 curriculum. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that community education has the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum and resolving differences between what schools are and what schools should be.

Conclusions

A principal with whom this investigator once worked was asked in a tense faculty meeting, "Just exactly how do you define good discipline?" The basis for this question was the frustration a number of teachers were experiencing in regard to their classroom control. These teachers were seeking solutions to problems through definition. The principal did not give a definitive answer; rather, he responded

with two descriptive statements: "Good discipline is an attitude," and "Good discipline is a place where learning occurs."

A parallel between this vignette and the community education process is that a greater personal meaning can often be derived from revealing practical possibilities built on the recognition of human potential than from stating precisely what something is. All too frequently the actual occurrences in the classroom are based on decisions which are related to definition; thus, many activities in the K-12 curriculum are predicated on restricting practical possibilities based on the recognition of human potential. Community Education is a process which enhances practical possibilities built on the recognition of human potential.

The Community Education materials which have been presented as data in this study are in essence descriptions of community education. These descriptive data do reveal practically possibilities built on the recognition of human potential. Community Education has been demonstrated to be antithetic to the six constraints in the K-12 curriculum as identified in this study and community education has been demonstrated to be congruous with the three suggestions found in the selected review of the literature for changing the K-12 curriculum.

A second parallel between the vignette and the community education process can be found in what happens after

practical possibilities based on the recognition of human potential are revealed. A number of teachers left the faculty meeting that day with emerging mental pictures of good discipline, rather than a pronouncement imprinted on mimeograph paper. From then on these teachers, both individually and collectively, explored ideas and feelings about good discipline. Ultimately these ideas and feelings were translated into an environment where learning could take place and where attitudes could be positive. The principal facilitated this liberation through his valuing of the teachers' human potential. Further, the principal then helped to create a support system which served to sustain and renew these teachers.

The community education process also values human potential. The emphases on self-determination for educational wants and needs and collective problem-solving are evidence of the valuing of the human potential. To support this valuing of the human potential, community education has developed a national network. The national network operationalizes the community education process by providing information, assistance in development and implementation, training, financial resources, and evaluative services. The national network for community education has a large number of professionals and lay-citizens who are committed to common goals; there is very little evidence of divisiveness. Further, the national network for community education is accessible both

physically and functionally for millions of people in every part of the conntry. The existence of this national network has significant implications for the growth and development of community education.

The parallels drawn between the vignette and the community education process illustrate that description can be powerful and far-reaching in consequence. In certain academic disciplines and technological operations, it may be absolutely essential to be able to define. In a process which deals with human potential and the quality of life for all, it seems appropriate to use description. Community education results in a schematic which holds promise for education which is personally meaningful and socially relevant. It is therefore concluded that community education has the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum and for improving the quality of life in schools.

CHAPTER V

REALIZING PRACTICAL POSSIBILITIES

Summary of the Study

The schools have frequently been a target for criticism; in response to that criticism there have been many attempts at reform in the schools. Today, the criticisms are sharper; nonetheless, the schools are still essentially unchanged. There are new educational theories, new curricular designs, new instructional techniques, and new materials; however, the actual occurrences in the classrooms are seldom significantly affected. In light of the extensive criticism, the unsuccessful attempts at reform, and the actual practices in the classrooms, there is a need to enhance or otherwise improve the quality of living in schools. The curriculum, with its fundamental questions of what shall be taught, to whom it shall be taught and how it shall be taught, is the critical unit.

Changing the K-12 curriculum necessitates resolving the difference between what schools are and what schools should be. An initial step toward resolution requires identification of the existing constraints. For the purpose of this study, the investigator identified six curricular constraints. These constraints are that the K-12 curriculum is discrete, isolate, irrelative, differential, impersonal, and provincial.

There is a significant volume of literature relating to curricular change. A selected review of literature pertaining to curricular change was presented in Chapter II. From this literature, there was found to be consensus on the need for a redefinition of schools and education, the need for a greater utilization of all existing resources, and the need to strengthen personal and community participation in determining educational needs and curricular concerns.

To this end, the determination of whether there was an existing framework or process which had potential for changing the K-12 curriculum became the focus for inquiry in the present study. A decision was made to analyze community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum. This decision was based on the widespread support being evidenced for community education.

The methodology of this study involved using community education materials as descriptive data. An analysis of the data was combined in two steps. First, the integrated findings from the community education data were matched against the six identified curricular constraints. Secondly, the integrated findings from the community education data were matched with the suggestions for changing the K-12 curriculum as found in the selected review of the literature.

The results of the analysis of the data show the community education process to be antithetic to the six curricular

constraints and congruous with the suggestions for changing the K-12 curriculum. It was concluded that the community education process has the potential for changing the K-12 curriculum. Further, it was concluded that the community education process has significance for education which is personally meaningful and socially relevant. Finally, it was concluded that the community education process has potential for enhancing or otherwise improving the quality of living in schools.

Recommendations to Schools for Changing the K-12 Curriculum

Changing the K-12 curriculum begins with the identification of the existing curricular constraints. Once these constraints are identified, ways must be sought to remove them. Based on the findings and conclusions from the present study on community education's potential for changing the K-12 curriculum, schools should seriously consider the following recommendations:

1. Adopting a philosophy and practice which recognizes that learning is a continuous, life-long process. A practical possibility for realizing this recommendation could include the use of a non-graded organization which provides for multi-aged and intergenerational learning opportunities within the curriculum.

2. Utilizing all existing resources in the planning, implementation and evaluation of curriculum. A practical possibility for realizing this recommendation could involve the schools working in concert with citizens advisory councils and inter-agency councils to identify needs, to identify resources, and to bring these needs and resources together.
3. Allowing a greater degree of self-determination on the part of all learners. A practical possibility for realizing this recommendation could depend on the development of individual needs assessment instruments and procedures and the initiation of a continuous evaluation process which has provisions for feedback from the learners themselves.
4. Basing participation on an inclusive model rather than an exclusive model. A practical possibility for realizing this recommendation could rest in the abolition of all grouping and tracking procedures which bar students from access to programs.
5. Viewing and treating all students in a humane manner. A practical possibility for realizing this recommendation could be found in the discontinuation of all practices which label students.
6. Approaching learning in the context of its larger community setting; a practical possibility for

realizing this recommendation could be through the focusing of course content on common life concerns and the mutual interdependence of all people.

If the schools of today are to meet the needs of the present and prepare for the challenges of tomorrow, schools will have to be significantly different. The schools have the potential for educating all and the power to reform society. Education and social reform must have as their aim the improvement of the quality of living for all. Community education through its process and subsequent programs is doing much to make learning personally meaningful and socially relevant. However, the community education process, with its values, assumptions, and practices is ultimately doomed unless there is a change in that which goes on in the daily life of the school. The K-12 curriculum is not only the critical unit in the school; it is a critical unit for all life.

Recommendations for Further Study

A number of topics for further study have been generated during this investigation. These topics relate both to curricular change and to the potential of community education for changing the K-12 curriculum. The topics are as follows:

1. Are there other curricular constraints which need to be identified in order to change the K-12 curriculum?

2. Is the community education movement significantly different from other educational and social reform movements?
3. Will the national network for community education bureaucratize the community education process?
4. What kind of response would there be from the public if the K-12 curriculum were to adopt community education's values, assumptions and practices?
5. What kind of response would there be from administrators and teachers if the values, assumptions and practices of community education were applied to the K-12 curriculum?
6. What kind of effect would there be on traditional discipline concerns if the public schools accommodated inter-generational learning?
7. Would there be a difference in learners' attitudes, participation and attendance in schools which were changed in accordance with community education values, assumptions and practices?
8. Would a K-12 curriculum which adhered to community education's values, assumptions and practices produce students who were less academically prepared?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, Michael W., and King, Nancy R. "What Do Schools Teach?" Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977):354.

Baas, Alan, M. Community Schools. Educational Management Series, Eugene, Ore.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management, 1973.

Bailey, Stephen. The Purposes of Education. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.

Bane, Mary Jo, and Jencks, Christopher. "The Schools and Equal Opportunity." In Christopher Jencks in Perspective. Edited by William J. Ellena. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

Bell, Daniel. "Schools in a Communal Society." In The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling. In Research for Better Schools, Inc. Edited by Louis Robin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Berridge, Robert. "Community Education: Its Involvement." In The Role of the School in Community Education. Edited by Howard W. Hickey and Curtis Van Voorhees. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1969.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "New Views of the Learner: Implications for Instruction and Curriculum." Educational Leadership 35 (April 1978):572-573.

Brown, George Isaac, ed. The Live Class Room: Innovation Through Confluent Education and Gestalt. New York: The Viking Press, 1975.

Burdin, Joel. "Community Education's Promise." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (July-August 1977):1.

Chisholm, Shirley. "Rescue the Children." In Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools. Edited by Louis Rubin. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1978.

Coleman, James. "The Transition from Youth to Adult." New York University Education Quarterly 3 (Spring 1974):3.

Commager, Henry Steele. "The School as Surrogate Conscience." Saturday Review, January 11, 1975, p. 57.

"Community Education." North Carolina Community Education News, Fall 1977, p. 1.

The Community School. Quoted in Larry E. Decker, Foundations of Community Education, pp. 22-23. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

Community Schools in Action. Quoted in Larry E. Decker, Foundations of Community Education, p. 43. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

Conant, James Bryant. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959.

Course and Curriculum Improvement Projects. Quoted in Daniel Tanner, Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Crouse, James H., and McFarlane, Paul T. "Monopoly, Myth and 'Convivial Access' to the Tools of Learning." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (May 1975):591-595.

Dale, Edgar. "Instructional Resources." The Changing American School, John I. Goodlad, ed. in The Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education,11966.

Decker, Larry E. "Community Education: The Need for a Conceptual Framework." NASSP Bulletin 59 (November 1975):6-7.

Decker, Larry E. Foundations of Community Education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

Decker, Larry E. People Helping People: An Overview of Community Education. Community Education How To Series. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1975.

Decker, Larry E., and Decker, Virginia A., eds. Administrators and Policy Makers' Views of Community Education. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977.

Fallon, John. "New Directions Toward the Future--1979." NCEA 1978 Annual Report. Washington: National Community Education Association, 1978.

Fantini, Mario D. "Community Education: Participants and Participation." Community Education Journal 6 (December 1978):2.

Federal Register 40 (December 12, 1975):57936-57937.

Foshay, Arthur W. Curriculum for the 70's: An Agenda for Invention. Schools for the 70's Preliminary Series. Washington: National Education Association Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970.

Foster, Barbara Barrett. "The People Connection: A Brokering System for Community Education." The Mid-Atlantic Community Educator, Winter, 1978, p. 18.

Frost, Joe L., and Rowland, G. Thomas. Curricula for the Seventies: Early Childhood Through Early Adolescence. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.

Glaser, Robert. "The School of the Future: Adaptive Environments for Learning." The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling. In Research for Better Schools, Inc. Edited by Louis Rubin. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Glines, Don E. "Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Individual Schools." In Designing Education for the Future: Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Education. Edited by Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Goodlad, John I. "The Curriculum." The Changing American School in The Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1966.

Goodlad, John et al. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Goodykoontz, Ness. "Selected Studies Relating to Community Schools." The Community School in The Fifty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Hanna, Paul L., and Roslund, Robert A. "The Community School Defined." The Community School in The Fifty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Herrick, Virgil E. Strategies of Curriculum Development. Comp. Andersen, Don W.; Macdonald, James B.; and May, Frank B. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

Hickey, Howard W. "Community Education's Implications for Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (July-August 1977):19.

Huebner, Dwayne. "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake and Our Work." Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1976):165.

Itzkoff, Seymour W. A New Public Education. Educational Policy, Planning & Theory Series. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1976.

Jackson, Philip W. "Beyond Good and Evil: Observations on the Recent Criticism of Schooling." Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977):314.

Katz, Michael B., ed. School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Kerensky, V. M. "The Educative Community." The National Elementary Principal, January-February 1975, p. 45.

Kerensky, V. M., and Melhy, Ernest O. Education II--The Social Imperative. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.

Kildee, Dale. "The Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978." Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978):17.

Kimbrough, Ralph. "Community Education: Implications for Collegiate Teacher Educators." Journal of Teacher Education, July-August 1977, pp. 25-27.

Klein, M. Frances. "Tyler and Goodlad Speak on American Education: A Critique." Educational Leadership 33 (May 1976):565-570.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory." Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling in 1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Vernon F. Haubrick, ed. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Curriculum Theory: Give Me a 'For Instance'." Curriculum Inquiry 6 (1977):262.

LeTarte, Clyde E., and Menzey, Jack D. Community Education from Program to Process. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

Macdonald, James B. "Curriculum Development in Relation to Social and Intellectual Systems." The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, in The Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1971.

Macdonald, James B., and Zaret, Esther, eds. Schools in Search of Meaning. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Miller, Richard I. Education in a Changing Society. Project on Instruction Reports. Washington: National Education Association, 1963.

Minzey, Jack D., and LeTarte, Clyde E. "Community Education--Where to Now?" Journal of Teacher Education, July-August 1977, pp. 29-30.

Minzey, Jack, and Schmitt, Donna. "Community Education: An Overview." Journal of Alternative Human Services 4 (Spring 1978): 12.

Murphy, William J., and Pilder, William F. "Alternative Organizational Forms, Cultural Revolution and Education." In Planned Educational Change: Some Issues, Some Directions. Vol. 43, No. 3: Viewpoints: Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University. Bloomington: Indiana Univ., 1972.

Olsen, Edward G., and Clark, Phillip A. Life-Centering Education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1977.

Pharis, William L.; Robinson, Lloyd E.; and Walden, John C. Decision Making and Schools for the 70's. Schools for the 70's Preliminary Series. Washington: National Education Association Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970.

Purpel, David E., and Belanger, Maurice, eds. Curriculum and the Cultural Revolution. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1972.

Reid, William A., and Walker, Decker F., eds. Case Studies in Curriculum: Great Britain and the United States. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Roberts, Arthur, D., ed. Educational Innovation: Alternatives in Curriculum and Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Rubin, Louis, ed. Curriculum Handbook: The Disciplines, Current Movements, and Instructional Methodology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Rubin, Louis, ed. Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1978.

Rubin, Louis, ed. The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Sandberg, John, and Weaver, John. "Teachers as Community Educators: Training in Teacher Education Colleges." Journal of Teacher Education, July-August 1977, pp. 9-12.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

School and Society. Quoted in The School and Community Reader: Education in Perspective, p. 264, Edward G. Olsen, ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Seay, Maurice et al. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.

Shane, Harold G. "America's Educational Futures: 1976-2001." Futurist 10 (October 1976):252-257.

Shoop, Robert J. Developing Interagency Cooperation. Community Education How To Series. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1976.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Sprinthall, Norman A., and Tudeman, David V. "Guidance and the Pupil." The Changing American School. John I. Goodlad, ed. In The Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1966.

Stephens, J. M. The Process of Schooling: A Psychological Examination. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Tanner, Daniel. Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Tomorrow's Education." American Education 11 (September 1975):23.

Walberg, Herbert J., and Rasher, Sue Pinzer. "Public School Effectiveness and Equality: New Evidence and Its Implication." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (September 1974): 3-9.

"Washington Scene." Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978):11.

Williams, Harrison. "The Community Schools and Comprehensive Education Act of 1978." Community Education Journal 6 (July 1978):16.

Zais, Robert S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1976.