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CHAPTER ONE

Rationale and Approach: Need for and Significance of the Study

... the swirling current of change, a current as powerful today that it overturns institutions, erodes our values and shrivels our roots. (Toffler: 1970)

Toffler has visualized this change as accelerating and continuing. He states:

There is an increasing awareness that man now stands on the threshold of a universally urbanized, industrialized, technologically sophisticated world, and nature of his response to those circumstances is and will be dominated by the overwhelming fact of accelerated change unprecedented, explosive as for the foreseeable future of man, continuing. (Tocque, 1967:967)
A major theme underlying arguments for developing community education is that society has recently experienced and continues to experience an unprecedented rate of social change, necessitating new forms of organizational and individual adaptation. (Decker: 1975:12)

The claim is also documented in the literature of sociology, futurology and planning. Erzeginski's "technocratic era", Boulding's "post-civilized society", Bell's "post-industrial society" and Toffler's "super industrial society" are some of the more recent terms which have been used as descriptive of the new environment. (1)

A Toffler has described this change dramatically as:

... the roaring current of change, a current so powerful today that it overturns institutions, shifts our values and shrivels our roots. (Toffler: 1970:4)

C Loeks has viewed this change as accelerating and continuing. He writes:

There is an increasing awareness that man now stands well past the threshold of a universally urbanized, industrialized, technologically sophisticated world. The nature of his response to these circumstances is and will be dominated by the overwhelming fact of accelerated change: unprecedented, explosive, and for the foreseeable future at least, continuing. (Loeks: 1967:347)

The community education viewpoint, that today, man's patterns of behaviour are no longer functional and that knowledge and skills acquired earlier in life have become obsolete is also supported by Toffler, who has coined the term "future shock" to describe the society of the late 20th Century. Explaining his idea of "future shock" Toffler writes:

"Future shock is a time phenomenon, a product of the greatly accelerated rate of change in society. It arises from the superimposition of a new culture on an old one. It is a culture shock in one's own society." (Toffler: 1970:13)

Other social scientists have characterized the changed environment as "turbulent", an environment in which our organizational structures, machinery of government, educational system are no longer viable and require fundamental changes if they are to be adaptive to the environmental conditions of the post industrial era. A major problem however associated with possible future changes envisaged in this sort of environment is the high degree of uncertainty which exists. As E Trist explains:

... turbulence grossly increases the area of relevant uncertainty for individuals and organizations alike. It raises far reaching problems concerning the limits of human adaptation. Forms of adaptation, both personal and organizational, developed to meet a similar type of environment no longer suffice to meet the higher levels of complexity now coming into existence. (Trist: 1970:5)
Advocates of community education have also been concerned to provide some conceptions of the probable shape of society at the turn of this century and of the values and ideals which might underpin it. The idea that has emerged most clearly is that if individuals are to cope with the significant changes occurring in most aspects of their lives, then the most important skill to be acquired is that of "adaptation". (Emery: 1974:40) Emery has argued further that the need for adaptation must also be built into organizations and institutions themselves if they are to survive in a "turbulent environment". (Emery: 1974:52)

In Europe, North America and Australia, there has recently emerged a positive commitment to exploring new organizational models which might be in greater harmony with today's society and which might provide greater control over the shape of future society. Commissions have been established in such areas as Social Welfare, Human Relations, Public Administration, Education and Health. Their broad briefs have enabled them to introduce significant changes in the structures and functions of our basic institutions.

A common element in the reforms advocated by community educationists has been that of positive encouragement for participation by individuals, groups and larger communities in decision making. Some apologists for
community education have claimed that our centralized patterns of policy formation and administration have dehumanised people, failed to respond to diverse needs, fostered feelings of powerlessness, and have been totally incapable of adapting to the rapid social changes confronting society. Recently we have seen the development of community health centres, community schools, legal aid offices, regional councils for social development, community child care projects and the incorporation of communities as legal entities.

Despite these intentions however, major problems have been encountered in endeavouring to implement effectively the new initiatives. Some advocates of community education have claimed that this is because people have not been educated about how to participate. They have argued that there has been almost a tradition in the western world, precluding a wide involvement in decision-making and this has fostered the widespread feeling that the individual is powerless to make any changes or influence decision-making. Those who have believed that they could influence the environment have on the whole lacked an understanding of the process of social change and the necessary skills to achieve it.

Nevertheless, the implications of futures studies and community studies have been far reaching and have begun to be taken seriously in many quarters. Some
educationists today are claiming that the acquisition of specific vocational skills, might be of less relevance to the individual than the skills of problem solving, application of knowledge to new fields of endeavour, and capacity for cooperating effectively in group and team projects.

The western model of education has also come under attack by educational reformers, and like many other organizational forms has been said to be maladaptive to post-industrial society. Critics of education have ranged from those advocating a revolution and "deschooling" society, (as for example I Illich), to those seeking more moderate reforms of the present system, many of whom have become leading spokesmen of the community education and community school movements.

In Australia, there is evidence to suggest that the education system is undergoing significant reform. In some cases, alternative models have been developed in parallel with the traditional system. These include various types of community schools. However, attempts are also being made to introduce substantial reforms

within the existing education system, at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. At the tertiary level, there is significant movement away from highly structured, academic, classroom teaching, towards learning through experience in the field and on the job. (5)

Not only is the structure of the education system changing, but there is also recognition of the need for significant changes in the objectives of education and in the content that is learned. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, through its centre for Educational Research and Innovation has commented on this aspect in its publication on "The Nature of the Curriculum for the Eighties and Onwards":

The contemporary and technical revolution is causing startling changes in the working life of modern men and women. Inventions and techniques are radically altering most branches of industry and commerce: traditional craft skills are being replaced by machines operated by semi-skilled workers; new skills are demanding a background of scientific knowledge; automation and the computer have eliminated the many routine tasks. In this situation it is impossible to anticipate what knowledge or skills will ultimately be most useful to students ... All that is known for certain is that most people will be subject to rapid change within their working environment, and that the workforce of the 1980's and beyond is likely to change jobs several times in a working life. (OECD Report: 1973:12)

The concept of recurrent education is gaining in stature because it represents a strategy to respond to the rapid changes in the work environment. The essence of this concept is that:

... it distributes education over the lifespan of the individual in a recurring way. This means a development away from the present practice of a long uninterrupted pre-work period of full time schooling. It also implies the alternation of education with the individual's other activities in life - principally of course, his work; but his leisure time and even his retirement might be included. Hence the essential potential outcome of recurrent education would be the individuals' liberation from the strict sequence of education - work - leisure - retirement and his freedom to mix and to alternate these phases of life within the limit of what is socially possible and to the satisfaction of his own desires and needs. (OECD: 1973:13)

Spreading educational opportunities thus through a person's life time is an alternative to the increasing initial full time period of education which has hitherto been seen as the way to individual development and to greater equality.

We should break the monopoly of the 16-19 age group on access to higher education - it will always favour the children of the existing social élites; spread the right to education to the adult, and in particular the early adult years; encourage firms, trade unions, and public administration
to accept responsibility for developing individuals through education and training; allow more flexible procedures for acquiring professional qualifications. (OECD: 1975:13)

Recurrent education as an alternative strategy for the education system, however, has not been popular, at least not as popular as its counter part - the more recent movement of community education.

The emerging consensus is that Community Education can be defined as: A process that concerns itself with everything that affects the well-being of the citizens within a given community. This definition extends the role of community education from one of the traditional concepts of teaching children to one of identifying the needs, problems, and wants of the community, and then assisting in the development of facilities, programs, staff, and leadership toward the end of improving the entire community. (Community Education Newsletter: 1976:5)

B C Fitzgerald claims that in 1973, the Karmel Report gave a substantial boost to the idea of increased involvement of the community in educational matters and the expansion of the use of school facilities so that they do not lie idle for much of the year. (Fitzgerald: 1975:3)

The Report recommended:

Educationally and from the point of view of efficient use of resources, it would make good sense to have the school as a nucleus of a community.
centre. Joint planning and control of schools by educational, health, welfare, cultural and sporting agencies could provide additional facilities for the school, allow the community access to its resources and thus generally increase its fruitfulness. In this way a link could be forged between school, family, peer group and the society at large. (Karmel: 1975:14)

Fitzgerald indicates that a variety of moves at Federal and State levels have "accelerated developments (Fitzgerald: 1975:3)." Community education centres have been established in all states with some schemes creating senior positions known as "Coordinator of Community Programs", with the responsibility of developing and maintaining recreational, cultural and educational programming for the community. At the tertiary level courses in community education have been introduced in some institutions. (Fitzgerald: 1975:4)(6)

In the United States, Canada, Great Britain and New Zealand, the present development of the community education movement is vigorous. "At the end of 1974 in the United States alone some 1200 school districts had adopted Community Education philosophy and its school usage policies. (Fitzgerald: 1975:6)" Their educational offerings and administrative structures

had been modified accordingly. (7)

More recently there has been growing concern about the relationship of community education in its more restricted sense, and the broader goals of the movement. (8) Some educationists are claiming that although the general view of community education is an advance on past practice it is lacking in theory and far from appropriate to the needs of our time. "Views based on a wider and more exact knowledge of contemporary research and a clear understanding of the distinctive needs of the present and the immediate future are needed."

It is significant that some of the criticism has come from community educators themselves. The major thrust of the criticism has concerned the absence of any "continuing serious attempt to establish a social or educational theory to support the concept." Fitzgerald claims that while the "popular texts in the area contain elements of theoretical discussion they do not provide substantial theoretical analysis or debate." (Fitzgerald: 1977:5)."

D. Weaver earlier acknowledged the need to develop a theoretical base in community education. (Weaver: 1972:154).

(7) See, Fletcher, S H & Rue, R W "Community Education: Research Report", which contains an analysis of a survey of all two year institutions in the United States and Canada. The survey is an attempt at measuring the extent of community education as it presently exists.

(8) i.e. of its being operationally school based e.g. opening schools to the neighbourhood, some devolution of power to school councils etc.
This idea was also supported by W. Seay in his book entitled *Community Education: A Developing Concept*, (1974) and J D Minzey and C Le Tarte in their book *Community Education From Program to Process*, (1973), and has been the subject of several major articles in the field. However, while recognizing the need for theory development in community education, the bulk of this literature itself has tended to be uncritical and lacking in theoretical content. More recently M Haines in his book *Frontiers in Education and Community*, (1976), has approached the subject as a concern of applied philosophy, developed further in a later work *The Education of Communities*, (1978).

As early as 1972, D Weaver first wrote about the lack of theory development in community education. He said:

> An examination of the literature reveals few attempts at systematic theory development ... Most recent publications in the field have been more descriptive than definitive, more promotional than analytical and more practical than theoretical. (Weaver: 1972:154)

Maurice Seay, a leading American proponent of community education, also warned that in the past:

> Attempts to test the philosophical concepts of John Dewey (1916) failed in part due to lack of theory. Early proponents of Dewey's philosophy
attempted to apply appropriate practice directly from the complex philosophical pronouncements of Dewey without first having developed and tested a systematic framework of assumptions and hypotheses emanating from his philosophy. The results were unsatisfactory since attempts to test practices so derived resulted in a distortion of what Dewey had to say about education and probably contributed to the ultimate demise of progressive education. (Seay: 1974:392)

Seay thus recommended that:

The development of theory from which to develop the assumptions and hypotheses underlying the community education concept is essential to the survival of community education as a viable process. (Seay: 1974:392)

But there are other factors which "contribute to the urgency for theory development in community education ("Weaver: 1972:154)." Not only has the concept been spreading at a "rapid rate" nationally, but "there has been a general social malaise within society which has created a demand for accountability ("Weaver: 1972:154)."

"Writing about the American system he states:

Citizens concerned with the quality of education in this country, deserve some assurance that support of legislation to adopt and fund community education programs will effect improvements not realized through existing educational processes. In its present
state of development, community education theory cannot provide such assurance. I believe it is now possible to develop sound theory. Satisfactory demonstration of community education demands more attention to theory and less attention to practice. (Weaver: 1972:155)

In a more recent article, entitled "Community Education: A Critical Assessment", K H Lawson pursues a similar theme. "Most writers about community education," he says:

... have taken for granted acquiescence in the idea of its worthiness and desirability ... Not only have terms been inadequately defined but many of the enthusiasts have failed to establish or even discuss the basic premises upon which their enthusiasm for community education rests. (Lawson: 1977:6)

He calls for greater consideration of the value judgements involved and of the political implications of diverting scarce resources from the established system to community education.

The absence of formal attempts to develop a disciplined base has resulted in definitions of community education going in many directions with the tendency for different groups to see what they have wanted to see. Community education has become synonymous with adult education, public relations, extended activities for students, or a use of buildings policy. To institutions of higher
education it has come to mean continuing education. In the United States, community education to the segregationists has meant neighbourhood schools and to the militants community control. For those interested in vocational counselling it has meant job training and retraining, while for others it has meant promotion of the Arts. It has meant social welfare work in some districts and poverty and disadvantaged programs to others. For some it has meant cooperative extension, for others it has meant recreation.

Fitzgerald concludes:

To date, the concern has been with the who (the clients, the directors, the teachers), with the what (the programs and proposals) and with the how (the techniques of administration and coordination) with virtually no attention being paid to the why of community development in schools and education. (Fitzgerald: 1977:5)

If community education is to be offered as a desirable alternative to traditional forms of education it is important that it be supported by a satisfactory rationale. "The case that community education is more important because it encourages multi-use of facilities and results in various economic advantages, etc., must rest upon more basic social, political and educational theory (Fitzgerald: 1977:7)."
THE PRESENT STUDY

This study is premised on the proposition that community education theory is less advanced than practice. The study attempts by evaluating some of the central ideas in the literature of community education to narrow the gap between theory and practice.

The following tasks are proposed. (9)

(a) Clarifying the meaning of key terms.
(b) Distinguishing central ideas and underlying values and assumptions and exposing their implications.
(c) Examining the logic of the justifications offered.

Clarifying the Meaning of Key Terms: The Problem of Definition

The primary step in the examination of any subject should be the definition of terms to clarify the guidelines of the enquiry and to assure that those involved are proceeding from a common base.

L E Decker is one of the growing number of apologists for community education who acknowledge the need for the application of conceptual analysis to the field.

(9) See Levit, M (1969).
He writes:

If a community is to embrace the philosophy and implement community education to its fullest potential, conceptual clarification is an essential first step. (Decker: 1975:11)

More recently, N. Haines has stressed the need for constantly looking at the meaning of the terms "community" and "education." (Haines: 1978:7)

Perhaps the most serious consideration of the importance of definition in community education has been given by D. Weaver in his study: "A Case for Theory Development in Community Education" (1972). He claims that:

Failure to (define community education) leaves one open to the charge of including the entire universe within the concept. ("Weaver: 1972:156)

His point, though exaggerated, is nevertheless true. A concept will be meaningless if it is defined in such a way as to be all inclusive in meaning.

The problem however is much bigger than Weaver acknowledges. In my view the problem concerns the broader subject of conceptual analysis.

In his study Weaver proposes that the definition of community education should be "sufficiently comprehensive"
as to encompass all that one means to convey and at the same time precise enough to be understood by those unfamiliar with the concept (Weaver: 1972:155). He offers as an example a definition agreed upon by a group of his doctoral students:

Community education is the process by which the educational needs of the individual and society are met. (Weaver: 1972:155)

But this definition itself is unsatisfactory (Popp: 1969:201). One could ask: What are "educational needs?" What is the intended meaning of the phrase: "the individual" and "the society". An individual can be a child, an adult or an elderly person of either sex. The term "society" could mean "neighbourhood", "community", "state", "nation" or all of these. Given the possible varied meanings of the terms "the individual" and "the society", will the varied goals of satisfying the "educational needs" of individuals (assuming that we are clear on what we mean by "educational needs") necessarily be in harmony? Might there not be a possible antagonistic relationship between the educational needs of individuals, for example in terms of "self-realization" (whatever that might mean) and the wider claims of society?

To my mind the above "Weaver", conventional type definitions are not very helpful and this is not just because they are prescriptive and therefore nearly always
open to challenge, but that they are often so abstract as to be question-begging in the sense that virtually every term invites elaboration.

Concepts like "participation", "involvement", "needs", "development", "self-realization", "autonomy", "self-management", etc, abound in the literature on community education, and though many authors have tried defining them, the debate has tended to become more and more confusing. Indeed the concepts "education" and "community" have themselves defied clear-cut definition, thus making the debate more muddled and perplexing.

This study contends that defining concepts in the previously mentioned "dictionary" sense is unsuitable for community education theory development and that a more rigorous approach to defining concepts is needed. It is proposed that such an approach is to be found in the method of analytical philosophy. (10)

The procedure is grounded in L Wittgenstein's later philosophy and is the method that will be followed here. However the function of analysis in this study will not just be to define and clarify concepts. The task also will be to make questions and statements more precise so that we can know how properly to respond to them. In this sense the Socratic questions "what do you mean?" and

"how do you know?" will be fundamental throughout this study, particularly where value concepts such as "community", "education", "participation" etc., are concerned. In this respect the approach will be philosophical. It is assumed that when philosophers ask what does X mean? given that X is any concept, they are asking what are the rules or criteria for using the concept.

A major aspect of the study will be the search for the rules or criteria for using key concepts which recur in community education debate. This is different from defining concepts in the way D Weaver and other apologists for community education have done.

Distinguishing Ideas/Values, and their Implications, and Examining the Logic of the Justifications Offered.

Community education in its more recent philosophical presentations is still in the process of evaluation. The main ideas of community education are themselves values and need to be integrated into an internally consistent value system.

The proposition put here is that if the concept is to be developed and operationalized it is essential to identify its key ideas and values in precise terms in order that the practical implications for different
stages and aspects of education can be visualized. It has been thought by some critics that the introduction of community education is bound to have consequences for other sub-systems of society. Critics have claimed, for example, that the changes in the present formal system of education in accordance with the aspirations of community education could bring about major changes in the labour market. The age structure, learning needs, and overall composition of the labour force could be drastically changed. Another consequence alluded to results from the fact that community education goes far beyond the arena of the existing formal system of education. It includes the home, which provides a unique situation of learning and serves as a crucible in which a variety of inter-generational interactions occur. These interactions form a very significant part of education not only for children but also for parents. In consequence, the role of the parents and the life style of the family could be greatly influenced. (Terry: 1974: 65-79).

Furthermore it is claimed that there could also be repercussions on different facets of the community, such as work places, trade unions, social and cultural organizations (besides educational institutions, religious institutions, mass-media and so forth). (Ibid:65-79).

Finally, educational institutions themselves might be affected in many respects, and the need for creating new
structures or learning systems of all varieties ranging from highly structured and formal to almost entirely unstructured and informal ones, might be felt. (Duke: 1976:21-27).

It is intended that this study, by distinguishing the major ideas of community education and examining the implications of these ideas, will aid the critical understanding of curriculum planners, teacher educators, practising teachers, administrators, research workers and others concerned with school and out of school education. It is hoped that it will be of some value to other sectors of education and community life as well.

Educational Theory

An important question concerning the approach to be taken, is whether it will be genuinely productive of educational theory. The answer I believe depends on the prior question: what is the nature of educational theory?

There is a considerable volume of literature on this subject, which is clearly beyond the scope of this study. Only the briefest comment will be made here. R S Peters, (1966), P H Hirst, (1966), I Scheffler, (1966), J A Passmore (1965), D J O'Connor (1966) and J Walton and J L Kuethe (1963), have all made rich contributions to an examination of the question. However, while much of the debate in the past has concerned the meaning of educational
theory as including only those questions which were susceptible to scientific investigation, more recently, debate in philosophy of education has reflected the belief on the part of many that there are close interrelationships between the activities of philosophical (conceptual or logical) analysis of educational discourse, formulating definitions of educational terms, and, educational theory construction. This study will proceed on the contention that educational theory embraces more than scientific theory and includes various sorts of philosophical and historical investigations. As R D Archambault writes:

Educational theory is concerned with three major kinds of investigation. The first is the scientific study of factors relevant to an understanding of present problems. These are, chiefly, studies in psychology and sociology. A second kind of study is historical analysis, which attempts to provide perspective on current concerns by looking at analogous situations in the past, or by projecting hypotheses on the genesis of present problems. A third mode of investigation is the philosophical. Its major aim is to make clear those factors which are susceptible to investigation by other disciplines, to explore and explicate the philosophical premises underlying investigations in these other areas, and to attempt to shed light on the issues involved in complex educational problems, especially those which relate to questions of value. (Archambault: 1965:1-2).

Such questions as: "What is education?" "What is teaching?" What ought people learn? How have schools developed in the past, and how ought they to develop in the future? What do we mean by learning? and so on, are philosophical and historical questions which frequently arise in the course of an educator's work. It is my contention that in as much as we endeavour to answer them they form part of the theory of education.
The meaning of the phrase "community education" has several answers to this question will depend on the definition given to the term "community" and "education". There are several questions which are in a sense prior, and need to be answered, before the task of defining community education is attempted. What has to be known, in the practical sense in which the phrase community education is intended to be used. In this sense any one of the following ideas could be at least at one level, plausible answers to the question: what is the meaning of community education.

From one perspective, community education could mean simply teaching the community in the sense of passing on education, for example, teaching language and mathematics. From another perspective, community education could be taken to mean, for "community" in the sense of developing fraternity, for example, brotherly love, neighbourliness, friendship and so on. From still another perspective community education could be taken as meaning education about community, in the sense of giving educational activities (e.g., the school curricula) a societal orientation. Advocates of this view (e.g., Dewey) would claim that the whole environment ("community") should be the classroom or laboratory for learning. Finally, the phrase community education could be understood as meaning the community education in the
The Meaning of the Phrase: "Community Education"

What does the phrase "community education" mean? A satisfactory answer to this question will depend on the meaning given to the terms "community" and "education". There are several questions which are in a sense prior, and need to be answered, before the task of defining community education is attempted. What has to be known, is the practical sense in which the phrase community education is intended to be used. In this sense any one or all of the following ideas could be at least at one level, possible answers to the question: what is the meaning of community education?

From one perspective, community education could mean simply educating the community in the sense of passing on knowledge, for example, teaching language and mathematics. From another perspective, community education could be taken to mean, educating for "community" in the sense of developing fraternity, for example, brotherly love, neighbourliness, friendship and concern. From still another perspective community education could be taken as meaning educating about community, in the sense of giving educational activities (e.g. the school curriculum) a societal orientation. Advocates of this view (e.g. Dewey) would claim that the whole environment ("community") should be the classroom or laboratory for learning. Finally the phrase community education could be understood as meaning the community educating, in the
sense of acknowledging that people outside the educational system are educators, as for example when parents participate in school curriculum activities, and the "whole" community, so to speak, is involved in the decision making process.

I may be accused of "begging the question" here since the terms "community" and "education" have not been defined. However my purpose is simply to show that the phrase, "community education" can be interpreted in different ways (perhaps with the exception of the second view), even if a common definition of the terms "community" and "education" were accepted. The question about the meaning of the concept "community" in terms of who are to be considered as the recipients of the education proposed will be considered in the discussion to follow.

The above statements of some of the possible practical applications of the phrase "community education" raises the necessity of asking several other questions for which answers are necessary if the task of evaluating ideas about community education is to be done satisfactorily.

If the phrase "community education" is intended to be applied in the first way, that is to say, "educating the community" in the service sense, of the passing on of knowledge, then, who are the recipients? The school community - primary and secondary levels only? All
within the educational system - primary, secondary and tertiary? Adults solely - comprising the local community, neighbourhood, or the wider community? Adults plus all those within the established educational system comprising the local community? All people comprising society in the broadest sense? The above questions also apply if the meaning of the phrase "community education" is taken in the second sense mentioned above, that is to say, "community education" in the sense of educating for "community" (fraternity). If the phrase "community education" is intended in the third sense indicated earlier, that is to say "community education" in the sense of educating about community, again it is necessary to be specific. Is the statement intended to be inclusive of all educational activities within the educational system, or only to those educational activities outside it? If it is intended to apply specifically to the educational system, is it meant to be inclusive of all levels - primary, secondary and tertiary, or only some and if so which? Or is the statement intended to include all educational activities inside and outside the educational system?

If the meaning of the phrase "community education" is intended in the last sense mentioned above, again it is necessary to know what exactly is being proposed. Is it that community resource-people be allowed to assist teachers in schools or is it saying that the curriculum should be changed from being "school based" to "community
based", or is it merely that agencies and organizations other than schools - for example, church, YMCA, the mass-media - be acknowledged as educational agencies and encouraged to extend their educational interests?

The above questions comprise only some of the many that need to be asked if a thorough evaluation of the central ideas of community education is to be made.

The problem is made even more complex by the fact that most apologists of community education tend to regard all four of the above statements of possible meanings, as definitive of the phrase "community education".

The following quotations from the literature will illustrate this point.

... the definition must include both the traditional and extended programs of education for both children and adults. It must suggest impact on the entire community and stress community process as well as programs ... (it must also) project the catalytic role played by the school, while recognizing the contributions of other groups and agencies. (Minzey & Le Tarte: 1973: 18)

or

... An attempt to marshall all the educational resources within the community to create a laboratory for the management of human behaviour ... (it is) a theoretical construct, a way of viewing education in the community, a systematic way of looking at people and their problems ... It is based upon the premise that education can be
made relevant to peoples' needs and that the people affected by education should be involved in decisions about the program. It assumes that education should have an impact upon the society it serves. It requires that all who are worthy of the name 'community educator' are involved in all facets of the community at large. (Weaver: 1969:21)

... a process that concerns itself with everything that affects the well being of all citizens within a given community. (Voorhees & Hickey: 1969:36)

Voorhees and Hickey go on to explain that this:

... extends the role of community education from one of the traditional concept of teaching children, to one of identifying the needs, problems and wants of the community and then assisting in the development (or the identification) of facilities, programs, staff and leadership toward the end of improving the entire community. (Voorhees & Hickey: 1969:36)

Maurice Seay views "process" in community education more in terms of developing a sense of belonging towards the ultimate goal of community development:

In community process we are trying to establish a better community feeling based on the premise that there has been a loss of true community identity. We are seeking to help define a true community and move it toward the common good. We are trying to develop a sense of self-good among the members of a community which will lead to a sense of belonging, a common 'esprit de corps', a sense of value of community and its potential for action. Community then becomes a feeling of relationship
between those who have common problems, common interests and common goals. The members aware of these things and then showing them the advantage of working together. When successfully carried out the bond of community becomes strong as does the individual through his identification with others. (Seay: 1974:11)

This community development aspect is extended by L B Miles in his article: "Can Community Development and Community Education be Collaborative?" Miles identifies community development in the context of initiating and developing supportive human relationships. He describes it as a "building process of residents together with planners, program developers, and decision makers - all collectively working to identify local and city wide needs and to develop resource responses which will resolve and reduce these needs (Miles: 1974:76)."

He thus identifies community education as a means for "increasing city wide structures for communication and problem solving within neighbourhoods and between neighbourhoods and government (Ibid: 76)." He claims that:

... neighbourhoods need internal community if communication and citizens' involvement is to be effective. Community education proposes a structure for community organization which can lead to a comprehensive support system for human and community services. (Ibid:76)
Though much of the discussion about community education reflects a variety of meanings, three common themes are discernible. First, that community education is a "process", second, a "method", and third, a "program".

The process is viewed in terms of change from a state where one or two people or a small élite within or without the local community make decisions for the rest of the people, to a state where people themselves make these decisions about matters of common concern; change from a state of minimum to one of maximum cooperation; change from a state where few participate to one where many participate; change from a state where all resources and specialists come from outside to one where local people devise methods for maximal use of their own resources.

The emphasis is on what happens to people psychologically and in their social relationships. As an "education for action process", the people are helped to achieve group goals democratically, the leader becomes an agent for constructing learning experience rather than the proponent of a program for community improvement, and primary importance is attached to the individual. (Totten: 1970: 137). Furthermore, it is problem-oriented at the community level; the means employed in the solution are more important than the solution itself, and it is one of several types of purposive change.
"Process" and "method" are closely related. Indeed in the literature the terms are often used interchangeably. In so far as community education is concerned with purposes or ends - a way of working so that intended outcomes are attained, it is also a method. The method is one which seeks to carry through the stages suggested under "process" in order that the will of those using this method may be carried out.

Even those who stress community education as a process or method soon find themselves involved in programs. Indeed, a major criticism has been that most efforts go into getting programs started, and once under way keeping them going. When one adds to the method which is a set of procedures, some content - such as a list of activities, one immediately moves toward a community education program.

At the commencement of this chapter, I endeavoured to show that at least four major ideas as possible interpretations of the phrase "community education" were distinguishable. The four ideas were:

(i) Community education in the sense of educating the community.

(ii) Community education in the sense of educating for "community".

(iii) Community education in the sense of educating about community.
(iv) Community education in the sense of the community educating.

I also indicated that the above statements presupposed many questions which needed to be answered if a thorough evaluation of some central ideas of community education was to be made. The preceding discussion concerning the meaning of community education from the viewpoint of some representative exponents in the field was intended to illustrate the complexity of the task of evaluation, especially as most apologists regarded all four possible meanings applicable as being definitive of the phrase "community education".

In order to simplify evaluation, the following procedure will be followed. It is proposed that the above four application statements be categorized as the primary ideas of community education. It is submitted that developing a framework in which the ideas designated as primary, form the central themes for the chapters to follow, the secondary ideas developing as they must from the central themes will necessarily make for more systematic consideration and facilitate the task of evaluation. I appreciate that the study may become too narrow. However, it should be noted that in all the strands of community education, one can identify common themes related to values

---

(12) This is not to say that the ideas categorized as primary are more important than those designated as secondary. The approach proposed is being followed for the sake of simplicity.
and beliefs held by their exponents. There is a large volume of literature on the subject of community education embracing a vast range of ideas and practice. Several strands are identifiable bearing characteristics specific to different cultures. e.g. West European (Andragogy), North American and Great Britain (mainly school based), Third World countries (community development oriented and literacy based, as exemplified in the work of P Freire).\(^{13}\) It is beyond the scope of a single study to deal with the topic from a world perspective.

This study will therefore approach the topic from the narrower view of the ideas associated with community education practice in the United States of America, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia.

A necessary precondition for the task ahead is that we be clear about the meaning of the concepts "community" and "education". It is to this task that I now turn.

"Community" and "Education" — An Analytical Perspective

Thomas B Colwell, in his article about the meaning of community, stresses the need to clarify the concept, particularly in terms of philosophical analysis. He writes:

There can be little doubt that the notion of community has enjoyed one of the most influential histories of any word employed in educational thought

\(^{13}\) See P. Friere (1972)
and practice in this century. From Dewey's early way of posing the relationship between school and community, through the progressive era, particularly in the community school movement, to our own involvement with school decentralization and community control, community has been extolled and befriended, lost and rejected, or, more often, used in an uncritical common sense way to connote not much more than "neighbourhood", "city", or "state". But in its various meanings, and from its various authors, talk of community has poured forth over the waves of thought, writing and discussion during the past seventy years or so in a profusion that has surely reached a peak today. The fascinating thing about all of this is that "community" remains one of the most confused, jumbled messes of a word in the English language. We have gone through the better part of a century dominated by the search for a linguistic meaning without having seriously bothered to understand the concept of community. Whatever the reason for this philosophic neglect, I want to argue that now more than ever the issue of community needs the attention of philosophers. (Colwell: 1971:418)

Colwell refers to an article, "The Concept of Community" by John Ladd as being the only article to his knowledge of a genuinely philosophical nature. (Ibid: 1976:2). A more recent example of the application of conceptual analysis to the concept of community is to be found in the work of Raymond Plant in his book titled Community and Ideology. Both Ladd and Plant agree that the desirable approach to defining concepts should not be in terms of what the concepts actually stand for in the sense of denoting some kind of entity which is
definable, but rather in terms of how the concepts are used in ordinary language and how they function logically. (Ladd: 1959: 269:70, Plant: 1974: 10).

Unlike the term "community", "education" has been the subject of discussion in a large number of books and recent articles by philosophers. (14) Of these, R S Peters' analysis is perhaps the clearest and most influential formulation. (15) Peters' analysis has generated widespread debate, some critics arguing that his analysis is incorrect and others maintaining that he has not given sufficient justification.

Peters, Ladd and Plant, all claim that even though it may not be possible to define a concept in terms of encompassing all its usages, it is nevertheless possible to set out criteria which are central to its meaning. (Ladd: 1959: 269, Plant: 1974:9, Peters: 1966:24-25).

As Peters argues, our ability to encompass all usages:

... does not mean that there are no criteria of "education" which are co-extensive with most of its central usages. It only means that terms in a natural language develop a life of their own and send out shoots which take them far away from the central trunk of the concept. But this does not imply the abandonment of the criteria,

---


(15) C.f., e.g. Peters (1972) pp 9-10, Peters (1973) pp 239-41, Hirst (1970) pp 23-25. Since the bulk of the recent work in the analysis of education revolves around the work of Peters it is his thesis that will be considered here.
rather it leads us to distinguish between central and peripheral usages of the term. The important thing is that we should recognize the differences as well as the similarities. The formulation of criteria, which started with Socrates, is an attempt to make explicit, what binds the usages together. It is like a guide to the customs of a people rather than a definitive statement of their law. (Peters: 1966:24)

This approach is similar to that of many contemporary philosophers, especially those who have been influenced by the later Wittgenstein. If we think of definitions on the model of those of geometry, there can be no precise definition of "community" and "education", for they are words which have developed a meaning or more specifically a set of meanings throughout the development of a natural language. And "terms in a natural language develop a life of their own and send out shoots which take them far away from the central trunk of the concept (Ibid:24)". Without the metaphor and leaving aside the possible problem of the conflation of word and concept here, the claim is that there are multifarious and diverse uses of "community" and "education", uses which can all be characterized as legitimate or correct. These uses have developed historically in an unplanned way such that at this point of time, there are many different meanings of education and community. Hence it is impossible to specify only one formula which expresses a single meaning of these terms in all of their
appropriate custom-sanctioned uses. However, these authors reason, even though there is no such formula, there are what may be called central and peripheral uses of the terms. (16) The peripheral uses are parasitic, depending for their meanings upon, and deriving their meanings from, the central uses.

Peters concludes:

As the concept in question is usually one, the possession of which goes with the ability to use words appropriately, what we do is examine the use of words in order to see what principle or principles govern their use. If we can make these explicit, we have uncovered the concept. (Hirst and Peters: 1970:4)

My assumption is that if we follow this procedure we will acquire a theoretical framework which will make clear the main points of agreement and the sources of disagreement among the various views concerning the nature of "community" and "education".

The Meaning of Community

A glance at the English language will show that the concept "community" is used in several different ways. Frequently it is used to indicate some kind of spatial contiguity. For example, botanists speak of the plant community, which designates a group of plants living in close spatial proximity to one another.

Sociologists speak of "rural communities". Villages are usually groups of people living in one area and frequently separated from other people in towns and cities, by some distance. Sociologists also speak of "urban and suburban communities". These may not be separated from each other by much distance, but they are nevertheless separated by boundaries, and thus defined by spatial limits. We also speak of "religious communities". These communities usually live in monasteries, convents, religious houses and comprise a group of people living together in the same place. The phrase "university community" signifies those individuals who are associated with an institution which is also spatially limited and spatially identifiable.

Raymond Plant points out that: "The word community is often used as a synonym for locality (Plant: 1974: 38)" and he sights "community school", "community care", "community church" and "community centre" as cases where the prime reference is to locality. (Plant: 1974:39).

John Ladd also makes a similar claim, stating that:

... prima facie the most obvious criterion of membership in a community is territorial, that is, that the individuals share a common place of residence or of employment. (Ladd: 1959:273).

However, it may be asked, is spatial contiguity a sufficient or necessary characteristic of a "community"?
Ladd answers the question in the negative and claims that:

... if we insist on this criterion as a necessary condition of any aggregation of individuals being a community, we (would) automatically exclude many of the communities on our list. (Ibid: 273)

R Plant, also doubtful about this criterion asks:

Do all communities have to be rooted in a specific locality even though the mere fact of locality does not entail community? (Plant: 1974:40)

Prima facie, it would appear that any arbitrarily delimited spatial area would certainly not necessarily be a community. For example even though an apartment building or a boarding house shares with a religious house the characteristics of being a common place of living, the former two are generally not referred to as communities. Ladd's point is that every "community" is not necessarily spatially delimited. In the English language we find reference being made to such entities as the "business community" of a particular city or a whole nation, and this identifies those individuals within a larger spatial unit who are engaged in a similar type of enterprise, not those who share a certain area. This is also true for example of a "religious community" when this concept is used in a broad sense to refer to the members of a particular religion, as the "Catholic community of Australia".
But Ladd raises a further interesting objection about this:

If we define a community as an aggregation of individuals, say those living within a certain area, the practical function of the concept of membership in a community is nullified. We want to be able to say to someone: 'You live in this area, therefore you are a member of our community, and therefore you ought to do so and so.' If 'membership in community' is defined as 'living within this area' then the force of mentioning that you belong to our community is lost, since it means only that you happen to live here. Hence, a definition of 'community' solely in terms of criteria of membership will necessarily be incomplete because an essential part of the concept of community includes the practical consequences of being a member of the community.

(Ladd: 1959:274)

Similarly, personal acquaintance among all members cannot be a defining characteristic of a "community". For, while all members may know one another in a rural community, a religious community, or even the business community of a small city, it is hard to imagine that everyone could know everyone else in the business community of, for example, a large city like Sydney, the Australian academic community, or even in a particular university community, as for example the Australian National University.

It would appear to be also false that strong feelings of closeness (fraternity, like mindedness) among the members of the group are characteristic of all "communities".
As Ladd states:

... we often feel no hesitation in stating that X is a member of a community 'A' even though he does not have any such feelings. (Ibid:274)

He goes on to point out:

There is no contradiction involved in such a statement as there would be if these feelings were part of the definition. Indeed, there is a definite use for such statements as: 'Even though you don't feel that you belong to our community, you actually do. Therefore ...' Hence such feelings cannot be used as a criterion of membership. (Ibid:274)

Ladd suggests that:

We might try to amend this criterion by specifying that the members of a community ought to have such feelings or more modestly we might say that they are expected to have such feelings. (Ibid:275)

He claims however that:

If we do so, then we are no longer using communal feelings as a criterion of membership, but instead are indicating a practical consequence of membership in some types of community. (Ibid:275)
It is by virtue of membership that the individual has these feelings. If he were not a member, he might not have them. (Ibid: 276). However, the fact that such groups can be characterized by diverse feelings and yet still remain communities (at least in the sense that we designate them as such) does point to one feature that is common to all communities. This is, a mutual acceptance of some sentiment, belief or value which makes an aggregate of individuals into a community, and the character of the community, that is to say its outward features, the relationship which exists among members and so on, is determined by the kind of notion around which the community is formed. (Haines: 1977:48). (17)

The view seems plausible. A "business community" would seem to be a community by virtue of the fact that all of its members operate within the framework of the general principles of economics, market, trade, profit making, and the like. There is generally not a single common goal towards which all members are working, and such a community does not seem to be characterized by strong feelings of attachment among the members. Indeed, since business is often competitive, many business communities would probably be marked by feelings of opposition among many members.

(17) See Nisbet (1973), Coleman (1966), Maciver (1920).
An "ethnic community" would seem to be a community by virtue of the mutual acceptance of the value of the ethnic identity, certain political or social ends for the group, or simply strong feelings of identity with one another. Communities vary greatly in the types of ideas around which they are organized, but some kind of organizing principle is necessary. Furthermore, in addition to this mutual acceptance of some notion, is an agreement, which can be either explicit or implicit among the members, to act according to the organizing principle and not to interfere with the attempts of other members to act according to it. One would hardly be a true member of a particular "religious community", for example, if one adopted another religion and began proselytising among the other members, or likewise, one would not be seen to be a member of a "business community" if rather than work against one's competitors in an economic way, one began blowing up their stores or factories. Again, the nature of the organizing principle determines the extent to which such agreement would affect one's actions. In a "business community", the agreement would only be in terms of observing the rules of a market economy, and this is considerably less extensive than the consequences of the agreement necessary to be a member of a "religious community", that is, to believe certain ideas about the nature of the world and the proper conduct of life, to
abide by the rules of certain authorities, and so on. The agreement in "ethnic communities" could range from simple acceptance of certain sentiments and attitudes about the race to the necessity of living in a certain area and/or participating in certain customs or rituals.

The objection to this view is that it is also open to the criticism raised by Ladd against the previous criterion concerning the notion of feelings of closeness as being characteristic of "community".

The problem as Ladd states it is:

... even if it were possible to discover some particular practical consequence of membership which characterizes every community, on that basis alone a community could not be distinguished from a mere aggregation of individuals; we would still be leaving out something, namely that these consequences of being in a community already pre-suppose that the individual is a member of it. (Ladd: 1959:276)

A major factor overlooked by many exponents of community education in their consideration of the concept of community, is that in addition to having a descriptive meaning it also has what Raymond Plant has referred to as a "value dimension". It is this omission that has resulted in a serious weakness in the discussions of community among community educators for it is from this
Evaluative standpoint (that) some aspects of the descriptive meaning of community (have been) emphasised at the expense of others. (Plant: 1974:13)

Minar, a sociologist, has also commented on the descriptive as well as the value dimension of the concept community.

Community is both empirically descriptive of a social structure and normatively toned. It refers both to the unit of society as it is and to the aspects of that unit that are valued if they exist and desired in their absence. (Minar and Greer: 1969:9)

Bell and Newby have made a similar point referring to most sociologists' discussion:

Most sociologists seem to have weighed in with their own idea of what a community consists of - and in this lies much of the confusion. For sociologists, no more than other individuals, have not always been immune to the emotive overtones that the word community constantly carries with it. Everyone - even sociologists - has wanted to live in a community; feelings have been more equivocal concerning life in collectives, networks and societies. The subjective feelings that the term community conjures up thus lead to a confusion between what is (empirical description) and what the sociologists felt it should be (normative prescription). (Bell & Newby: 1972:21)
This latter point concerning the "naturalistic fallacy" goes back as far as David Hume with the problem of finding common criteria for making moral judgements. What Hume said has particular relevance here since much of the discussion about community education on occasions reflects strong moral overtones, without recognition of the need for justification of the prescriptions given, let alone analysis of the problems concerning the justification involved.

Patrick Suppes expresses the same principle more forcibly as an objection.

The negative answer to this case is that from purely factual considerations or purely empirical evidence, it is not possible to infer a normative philosophy. The claim is that if we limit the grounds of philosophical principles to purely empirical matters, we can make no inference to normative principles. To do so is to commit the naturalistic fallacy. (Suppes: 1968:2)

Hume summarized his thesis as follows:

I cannot forbear adding to these reasons an observation which may be found to be of some importance. In every system of morality which I have hitherto met with I have always remarked that the author proceeds for sometime in the ordinary ways of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs; when of a sudden I am surprised that instead of the usual copulations of the propositions is and is not, I meet with no
proposition which is not connected with an ought or ought not. This change is imperceptible; but is of the last consequence. For as this ought and ought not expresses some new relation and affirmation, it is necessary that it should be observed or explained; and that at the same time, some reason should be given for what seems altogether inconceivable, how this new relation can be a deduction from others which are entirely different. (Hume: 1964:469)

What Hume is saying is that no moral judgement can be deduced from any set of premises which does not in itself contain a moral judgement or principle. This recognition is fundamentally responsible for the present dilemma in ethics; one's choice of the first premise seems to be an arbitrary matter. If we attempt to ground our moral system on what seems to be non-arbitrary assumptions - for example man's basic needs, or desire for happiness, (which in fact are examples to be found in the literature of community education) - we make the false move from saying what "is" natural to man to what "ought" to be done. In Hume's view moral judgements are ultimately dependent on statements of emotional preferences, and are psychologically determined, or mere consequences of our differing makeups.

However one has to guard against the danger of going to the other extreme in defining the concept of community as recommended by R Hillery, and described by Plant as "both a utopian and mistaken view". (Plant: 1974:14)
Hillery writes:

The moral to be drawn is a scientific one: our definitions must be wedded to facts - those things which are perceived through the senses. The error which is often made in the definition of concepts of community is what may be referred to as the sin of pronouncement. Students have pronounced upon the traits they felt should be contained in community and then have proceeded to look at the facts. (Hillery: 1968:4)

At first glance this appears to be similar to the point that John Ladd was making, concerning the inability of practical consequences of membership in a group as being definitive of "community". (Ladd: 1959:276). (Ref this thesis p. 44). Whilst there is a similarity it needs to be recognized that Ladd is making the logical point, that "practical consequences of membership cannot be definitive of community since this would presuppose that the individual is a member of it. (Ladd: 1959:276)."

Hillery is concerned with the question of the absolute separation of values and facts in defining "community". (Hillery: 1968:4). One is inclined to agree with Plant's criticism of him.

(Hillery's) assertion is utopian in that it neglects the ubiquitous and non-detachable nature of the evaluative element in the notion of community and that the evaluative position of those
operating with the notion may well
determine the aspect of the descriptive
meaning of community to be emphasized.
It is mistaken in that it really is
intolerably naïve to think that community
is to be regarded as a 'fact' perceived
through the senses. (Whatever that may
mean.) It is on the contrary, a very
complex and contested interpretation
which we place upon our social exper­

We are thus left with the question - "What is the source
of the evaluative meaning of community?"

Bell and Newby claim that 'The normative character of
community can be related to the history of sociology
itself (Bell and Newby: 1972:21).

Plant recommends that:

In the same way as we look at history
and tradition to see the source of
the evaluative dimensions of "Fascist"
and "Democracy", so we have to look at
the history of social and political
thought and experience to see the
grounds and the nature of the evaluative

Such an inquiry is beyond the scope of this study. How­
ever, some aspects of the question will be taken up in
chapter four.

The Meaning of Education

The common observation in the literature is that the term
education is freely applied in a variety of processes.
The term "education" has been given many interpretations. In different contexts, education has been called an art, a science, a profession, a practice, a process, a product, a social institution, and an academic study. (Smith: 1970:391).

Confusion has also resulted from such similar concepts as "teaching", "training", "instruction" and so on. Can we distinguish between educating and teaching and educating and training? Is instruction education? Are all people who have been 'schooled' educated?

R S Peters' thesis is that the difference between the activity of education and other similar achievement - noting activities, is that educational activity is inseparable from judgements of value. If something learned is to count as "being educated" it must be worthwhile just as the manner of learning must be morally unobjectionable.

"education" is like "reform", both concepts have the criterion built into them that something worthwhile should be achieved. Education does not imply, like "reform", that a man should be brought back from a state of turpitude into which he has lapsed; but it does have normative implications, if along a slightly different dimension. It implies that something worthwhile is being or has been intentionally transmitted in a morally acceptable manner.
It would be a logical contradiction to say that a man had been educated, but that he had in no way changed for the better, or that in educating his son a man was attempting nothing that was worthwhile. (Peters: 1966:25).

Let us consider some examples. If a teacher began training his class in the art of picking pockets, would we say he was educating?

If a teacher gets the infant school children to learn some biblical verses by heart, even though the words are meaningless to them, is she educating?

If a teacher began instructing her pupils in the simple skills of reading and writing, would we then say she was educating?

Peters answers "no" to all the questions. However, given our 'loose' usage of 'education', it is possible that some may want to answer "yes" and others "no" to some or all of the questions.

Teaching children to pick pockets could be considered to be valueless and even harmful, but it could also be considered worthwhile. In Oliver Twist, Mr Fagan valued it, and his pupils learned the art in order to survive.
It is harder to see how getting children to learn meaningless words could be regarded as valuable. Nevertheless some might think that memorizing meaningless symbols was valuable, believing that the memory is improved.

Value seems obvious in the third example. It is difficult to see how anyone could doubt the value of learning to read and write, for as Gribble says:

The skills of reading and writing are necessary preconditions for engaging in a number of valuable activities as science, history, literature and so on. (Gribble: 1972:7)

Learning the skills of reading and writing if not valuable in themselves are at least valuable in so far as that they facilitate the pursuit of other valuable activities.

Given the context of competing values, does this mean that Peters criterion is useless?

Two points of clarification are necessary. The first is that it is not Peters' intention to tell anyone what he takes (values) is worthwhile (desirable). Because of the importance of this point for what follows later his thesis will be quoted at some length. Peters writes:

(18) That is, meaningless to the children.
(The) "connection" between education and what is valuable does not imply any particular commitment to content. It is a further question what the particular standards are in virtue of which activities are thought to be of value and what grounds there might be for claiming that these are the correct ones. All that is implied is a commitment to what is thought valuable. This connection with commendation does not prevent us either of speaking of "poor" education, when we think that a worthwhile job is being botched, or of "bad" education, when we think that much of what people are working at is not worthwhile. There is too a more neutral way of using this term. A sociologist or anthropologist might speak of the education system or moral code of a community without implying that he thought it desirable. But in such cases the implication is that those whose system or code it is, consider that it involves what is desirable. The social scientist would be merely describing what others think worthwhile. But if he went on to say that he did not think that the educational system of a community had any educational value, he would be passing a judgement himself which intimated what he thought worthwhile. (Peters: 1966:25)

Thus it is not that A in claiming that teaching the art of picking pockets is right and B who asserts that it is not educational, is wrong, but that each in order to take a stand must do so on the basis of value judgement. It is in this sense that a universal commitment to value is implied.

The second point is that value in this criterion is not intended in the extrinsic, but intrinsic sense. Thus
according to Peters, teaching the skills of reading and writing could not be educational. This is because these activities are not valuable in themselves (intrinsically valuable), but make possible other activities which are valuable in themselves. If we taught a child to read and write and he never read and wrote anything after he had mastered these skills, would we say that he was educated? (Gribble: 1969:7)

Gribble supports Peters, stating that:

... these skills are necessary for engaging in a number of activities which are valuable such as science history and literature and so on ... (But) since these skills are not valuable in themselves, since they are not intrinsically valuable, the activity of mastering these skills is not properly an educational activity ... It always makes sense to ask what is the aim of learning such skills as reading and writing or the multiplication tables, for to ask for the aim is to ask for the valuable ends which will be achieved by performing activities which are not in themselves valuable. By asking what the aims are, we are asking what extrinsic value will be achieved. (Ibid:7)

Peters' claim is that there is a conceptual connection between "education" and "value" such that anyone who denied the value of an activity would be logically bound to also deny the application of the term education. This argument has made possible the development of an interesting thesis concerning the inappropriateness of stipulating educational aims. (Peters: 1966:27). It is examined
in the next chapter. It also makes possible an important distinction between "educating", and "teaching", "training" and "instruction".

If we accept that "educating" by definition implies value, then it must follow that "teaching", "training", "instruction" and other achievement-noting activities are different, for whereas activities properly called "educational" must be valuable, activities called "teaching", "training", "instruction", need not be so. Concerning my earlier examples, by this analysis, it would be possible for someone to deny that all three activities were valuable and at the same time claim that the teachers were "teaching", "training" and "instructing", but in the case of "educating" it would be a self-contradiction to do so.

However, one can think of many instances where activities are intrinsically valuable, that is to say, pursued for their own sake, but more appropriately called "teaching", "training" or "instruction". Training in swimming, for example, may be pursued for its own sake. The pupils may become better swimmers and even go on to win gold medals. But these extrinsic results could be considered merely a bonus, the teachers and pupils claiming that it was not their purpose that they should be achieved.

If it is true that "teaching", "training" and "instructional" activities, can be intrinsically valuable, then Peters' criterion can be disputed again.
However Peters states:

We do not call a person "educated" who has simply mastered a skill, even though the skill may be very highly prized, such as pottery. For a man to be educated, it is insufficient that he should possess a mere know how or knack. He must also have some body of knowledge and some kind of conceptual scheme to raise this above the level of a collection of disjointed facts. This implies some understanding of principles for the organization of facts. We would not call a man who was merely well informed an educated man. He must also have some understanding of the "reason why" of things. The Spartans, for instance, were militarily and morally trained. They knew how to fight, and they knew what was right and wrong; they were also possessed of a certain stock of folk lore, which enabled them to manage provided that they stayed in Sparta. But we would not say that they had a military or moral education, for they had never been encouraged to probe the principles underlying their code. (Peters: 1966:30).

Elsewhere Peters writes:

A man who is educated is a man who has succeeded in relation-to certain tasks which he and his teacher have been engaged in for a considerable period of time. (Peters: 1967:2)

Peters has a point here. We generally use terms like training, instructing, conditioning, drilling and so on for narrow and specialized activities. We speak about "driving instructors", "trained mechanics", well "drilled platoons" and "conditioning animals". We may also speak of people with special expertise in broader
areas of knowledge, as trained scientists, teachers, historians and so on. But even here our understanding is that they are specialized.

Gribble states:

We don't educate a man to run a machine, to ride a bike or to swim - we speak of training when we teach skills. Thus we speak of training a dog, but it is absurd to speak of educating a dog.

(Gribble: 1969:22)

However, there is a sense in which "teaching" is different from "training", "instructing", "conditioning" and so on. For, in so far as teachers in schools do teach a variety of subjects, spanning many disciplines, and are concerned that their pupils question, analyze, theorize, and criticize, and so on, their activities are broad in cognitive perspective.

However Gribble points out we do not say:

... at the end of a hard day's teaching "I've been educating flat out today". And we could no more look into class rooms as we walk down school corridors and see someone educating than we would ask Mr Jones the science teacher, if he educated 4B in period 6. What we usually see teachers doing when we walk into classrooms is teaching, instructing, training, drilling, and even perhaps indoctrinating or conditioning.

(Ibid:16)
we reserve the term "education" for processes which have a wide cognitive perspective ... If we were to say "My education was in the sciences", or "My education was in the humanities" then the concept fits. (Ibid:22)

This raises the question: how wide must the cognitive perspective be? I am not aware that Peters has dealt with it though Gribble does offer the following general advice:

The wider the range of activities, the less specialized they are, the more appropriate it becomes to speak of "education". The narrower and more circumscribed they are, the more appropriate it becomes to speak of training. (Ibid:23)

Peters final criterion is that those who are engaged in the activity come to care for it, come to think that it is worth doing:

... it must involve the kind of commitment that comes from being on the inside of a form of thought and awareness. A man cannot really understand what it is to think scientifically, unless he not only knows that evidence must be found for assumptions, but knows also what counts as evidence and cares that it should be found. In forms of thought where proof is possible, cogency, simplicity and elegance must be felt to matter ... To be on the inside of them is both to understand and to care. Without such commitment they lose their point. I do not think that we could call a person "educated" whose knowledge was purely external and inert in this way. (Peters: 1966:31)
This seems plausible, as Gribble commenting on this criterion explains:

Let us consider the case where the first two criteria are satisfied. A man has completed a university course in English, history and economics - a wide range of valuable activities - but having finished his examinations he breathes a deep sigh of relief, says "thank God that's over", and spends all his time from then on reading comics and playing cards. He never again shows any sign of interest in literature or in political or economic affairs, and says that he couldn't care less about all that stuff. Could we say then that he was educated? What is there to distinguish him from someone who had never engaged in the activities at all? The letters after his name perhaps, but they don't matter. We might say that he knew a lot, or had been highly trained. But if he does not care at all about what he knows, surely we must deny that he is educated. (Gribble: 1969:11)

Earlier I mentioned that Peters' thesis has generated a great deal of criticism. Inquiry into this field is beyond the scope of this study. My purpose has been to try to elucidate the meaning of "education".

Peters' thesis, though open to criticism, does in my view provide a basis for distinguishing educational activities from other achievement noting activities. The argument has been that, whereas activities to be properly called educational have to satisfy our three criteria, "teaching" "training" and "instructional" activities, though they
may satisfy the criteria, do not have to do so. That is to say the three criteria constitute necessary conditions for the proper use of the term "education"; they do not constitute necessary conditions for the correct usage of these other terms.

Peters' analysis, despite criticism, constitutes a useful contribution and cannot be ignored in any serious discussion about education.
Community Education is the process that achieves a balance and use of all institutional forces in the education of the people — all of the people of the community. (Seay, 1974:11)

Traditionally, education has been viewed as the process which occurs in childhood and youth, its purpose being a preparation for adult life. The idea that education should be available to "all people" — adults and children alike (Seay, 1974:11) is still regarded by many as a new idea. Yet it is as far back as 1918, that Henry Adams wrote that education is not limited to schooling, that it is neither the same as schooling, nor stops when schooling stops. Education, Adams claimed, is the same as growing old as well as growing up, and stops only when life ends. (Adams: 1918:498).

Adams' identification of living with learning and of the entire process of existence as the process of getting an education, at that time was almost revolutionary.

Educating the Community

John Dewey, in his Democracy and Education had already written about the idea of equating education with "the whole of life," and that also schooling must needs be not merely "preparation for life," but living itself, and thus education. (Dewey: 1916:60), that Dewey wrote at that time was innovative and challenging and has now
Community Education is the process that achieves a balance and use of all institutional forces in the education of the people - all of the people of the community. (Seay: 1974:11)

Traditionally, education has been viewed as the process which occurs in childhood and youth, its purpose being a preparation for adult life. The idea that education should be available to "all people" - adults and children alike (Seay: 1974:11) is still regarded by many as a new idea. Yet it is as far back as 1918, that Henry Adams wrote that education is not limited to schooling, that it is neither the same as schooling, nor stops when schooling stops. Education, Adams claimed, is the same as growing old as well as growing up, and stops only when life ends. (Adams: 1918:498).

Adams' identification of living with learning and of the entire process of existence as the process of getting an education, at that time went almost unnoticed.

John Dewey, in his Democracy and Education had already written about the idea of equating education with "the whole of life," and that also schooling must needs be not merely "preparation for life," but living itself, and thus education. (Dewey: 1916:60). What Dewey wrote at that time was innovative and challenging and has now
become a truism in our ideas about education. But it is important to note that he was concerned with the education of childhood and youth. He made no mention of the education of adults.

The idea of the education of "all people" is implicit in the bulk of the literature on community education.

Exhortations that education should:

... provide the same services to the adult population as offered to school age children and youth. (Minzey: 1974: 3)

Serve the entire community by providing for all of the instructional needs of all of the community members. Minzey and Le Tarte: 1973:19.

Involve all ages and address all cradle to grave learning needs and desires. (Decker: 1975:3)

abound in the literature on community education.

The following quotation from Maurice Seay perhaps best reflects the dominant view.

The growing need for life long education becomes more and more obvious. Education for adults becomes an increasingly necessary part of community education. Schooling for children and youth is relegated to a somewhat less dominant position in the hierarchy of educational
forces. Due to increasing rapid obsolescence of skills and knowledge and even of some attitudes and ideas and for increasing leisure for great masses of adults, many forms of community education must grow. The elementary and secondary levels of schooling must become more of a supportive and a preliminary phase of the comprehensive educational process. Continuing education for adults is one of the implications of the phrase in the definition "education of the people - all of the people". (Seay: 1974:14)

We thus have a central idea of community education, the recommendation of "education for all people". But what of the justification? Why educate adults, let alone all adults? Is the doctrine feasible? Given the prospects of increasing constraints, particularly in regard to funding, what should be the priorities and how should they be decided? (Pitman: 1971:82)

Assumptions About Meaning

Is the idea intended to be understood in the "global" sense or in the "local" or "neighbourhood" sense?

If intended in the "global" sense, then prima facie it would seem impossible of attainment. If, on the other hand the "local" or "neighbourhood" sense is intended, that is to say in the sense of an identifiable locality, then it might be feasible, though this would depend on intentions concerning the level, content, quality, quantity and variety of education to be offered.
The term "education" also has several dimensions, and the relationship of these to the idea of education for "all people" would also need to be clarified if the feasibility or otherwise of the idea is to be established.

Is it intended that the idea be understood in the sense of "direct education" as, for example, by institutions as schools serving "all people", or is it intended in the sense of "indirect education" as, for example, through the process of interaction in unplanned learning situations. Or is "self-education" intended as, for example, when a scholar pursuing a program of study in order to write a book or a lecture, reads the newspapers, watches television or travels abroad? Or is it to be understood that all of these are intended?

The extent of the constraints affecting the idea will depend on the particular meanings or dimensions intended, though again the provisions concerning the level, content, quality, quantity and variety of the education intended to be offered would need to be considered.

Maurice Seay's guarded comments on his own definition quoted at the beginning of the chapter perhaps reflects the more reasonable light in which "total education", that is to say education in the "life long" sense, and
for "all people" should be seen. "Community", he says:

can refer to a number of different kinds of communities, but in community education usage the problem is simplified by arbitrarily confining the meaning to local and geographic considerations. (Seay: 1974:12)

Of certain given communities:

... a reasonable tempering of the idealism of 'all institutional forces' and 'all of the people' is necessary in practice of course. A philosophical concept may deal with absolutes - with complete and perfect totals - but educational achievement deals with partial accomplishments. Experience in setting goals and objections and evaluating achievement teaches educators that goals and concepts guide the educational process in the direction of the best possible achievement. (Ibid: 13)

B Fitzgerald has put forward the thesis that there are certain clear benefits to be gained from the education of all adults. He claims that recently:

... there has developed a critical social imbalance between the kinds of human needs that concern people and the ability of the social structure to provide for these needs. (Fitzgerald: 1977:13)

His contention is that several forces in society, "technological", "demographic", "psychological", "political"
and "educational", have "changed the shape and responsibilities of the educational system", and that the education of adults will assist in "redressing this imbalance". (Fitzgerald: 1977:13). He claims for example that advanced technology has produced "new productive processes requiring a new match of human and technical skills". (Ibid:5).

KJ Alexander has pointed out that there are changing patterns in employment resulting in a

... blurring or changing in long established distinctions of status and introduced new hierarchies within occupations, industry and society. (Alexander: 1975:22)

Toffler's statement:

In industry, for example, workers are rated, selected and placed in different jobs, job success is predicted; work environments are studied and manipulated with an eye to changing future productivity levels, job satisfaction or accident rates; man-machine relationships are investigated to increase efficiency or to reduce fatigue; work groups and organizations are studied in order to improve communications or to reduce inter-group tensions; and individuals are studied in order to learn how to increase motivation and morale and reduce boredom and monotony. (Toffler: 1974:95)

provides a sobering reflection of the psychological changes that have occurred.
Referring to political change, R Nisbet writes:

... the waning of the political community in the West is one of the most fateful changes now to be seen ... Trust, confidence and belief in the political state is at an all time low in the United States and other countries as well. Equally serious is the low ebb of interest in or motivation toward politics and political authority.

(Nisbet: 1973:17)

The lessening of trust and confidence in government has resulted in a new interest in "people power" especially in education and the processes of decision making.

G L Johnstone for example claims that:

A prominent feature of many contemporary industrialized societies, has been the rising demand by various occupational associations, from those for unskilled to those for professional workers, for a greater degree of self-determination. One manifestation of this trend has been the pressure by teachers for an enlarged role in the control of the education budget. Teacher organizations in the United States, England and Australia have demonstrated through the late sixties and early seventies, a growing militancy which has been expressed most consistently in connection with demands for increased power in salary determination. (Johnson: 1974:112)

Increased community involvement in education has assisted in the:
Erosion of the assumption that education is a once and for all experience, sufficient to equip people with all the knowledge, techniques and skills needed for a full life. Education can no longer be seen as being principally concerned with the development of the intellect. In schools today, pupils are encouraged to participate in a widening range of activities - cultural, social, practical and recreational, as well as intellectual. (Fitzgerald: 1977:11)

However, assuming the feasibility of community education in the "total education" sense, what of its justification? As Bereiter asks: "Why educate all people?" (Bereiter: 1973:233)

The impression gained from the literature is that community education in the above "education for all" sense needs no justification. It would appear that it is simply assumed that education as "a value" is a-priori justified and does not need to be defended.

The Argument From Value

In the literature on community education, one frequently finds references to the values accruing to "individuals", to the local community, and to "society" as a whole. However, seldom are the values specified. Is "value" intended in the sense of the value inherent in the achievement of the goals of community education? As for
example goals often specified as: "mental health", "self-realization", "personal development", "participatory democracy", "responsible society", "social unity", "social control", and so on? Or is "value" in education intended in the intrinsic sense? - that is to say, as an end in itself. Or is it to be understood that both senses are intended?

**Education as Extrinsically Valuable**

The literature of Philosophy of Education reveals that there are serious objections that can be raised against the policy of stipulating goals or aims of education. (Peters: 1966:27). (19)

In the first place, there are no agreed criteria for defining such goals as "mental health", "self-realization" and so on. Indeed it is unlikely we could ever establish criteria without introducing "highly disputable and personal and social preferences". (Peters: 1973:125)

In the second place there may be considerable disagreement about the "value of what is to be passed on, as well as about the manner of passing it on. (Ibid:125)."

But assuming that these objections were resolvable there would still be some serious questions that would need to be answered. Who is to decide the value of a man's education? Who is the education intended to benefit? The "individual"? The "local neighbourhood"? The wider "community"? Or all of these? Furthermore, how are the conflicting interests to be reconciled?

The answer from the literature on community education to the first question, is that "the community" should decide. (20)

Decker for example claims that:

... an important principle on which community education is based is that those affected by any program or decision making process should have input in the planning or decision making process. (Decker: 1975:7)

He continues:

... although efforts to enhance community participation are frequently time consuming there is a great potential for education to enhance two-way communication and to reduce the distrust and misunderstanding that can exist. Research studies indicate that the psychological well-being of people

(20) The idea of "citizen participation" will be considered as a central idea in Chapter 6. A fuller analysis and evaluation of this idea will be given there.
in a community and their degree of positiveness toward education experience are enhanced when all community members believe that they have meaningful involvement in decisions that affect them. (Decker: 1975:7)

Kerensky, another exponent of community education comments:

In community education, professional educators do not decide by themselves, what shall be learned, when it shall be learned and how it shall be learned. Accountability proponents have become so obsessed with product that the process of decision making and of community involvement have often been completely disregarded or abandoned. (Kerensky: 1972: 159)

J Minzey echoes the same concerns claiming that:

Schools are not the only units of government which have failed to involve community members in the decision making process in a meaningful way. Our entire political operation has abandoned full and personal participation. We assume that we are a democratic society, but democracy presupposes involvement of all concerned in the governance process. Without insidious intent or planned manipulation, we have moved from democracy to oligarchy. The trend seems to have come about through disorganization and apathy. The assumption being made here is that return to more democratic society is what community members desire. (Minzey: 1972:51)
But assuming that we accept the community education emphasis on people participating in planning and decision making, who is to be regarded as the community? (Furter: 1972:314). Earlier I quoted Maurice Seay as representing the general view among community educators concerning the meaning of the concept "community". I quoted him as saying that:

\[(\text{in) community education usage the problem is simplified by arbitrarily confining the meaning to local and geographical considerations. (Seay: 1974:12)}\]

But what should be taken as the local area of the "local community"? How should it be defined? and who should decide? Planners have sometimes used the catchment area of a primary school as a suitable neighbourhood size. But this rests on arbitrary figures for primary school enrolment. How big should it be?

To place a primary school at the heart of a community implies that the needs of young children and their parents should be pre-eminent. Why not the area of a local pub, church, or the district from which workers from a major factory are drawn? Seay in fact acknowledges this problem about boundaries, but his statement that the "extent of the area involved will differ in urban, suburban and rural communities, (Ibid: 12)" does not solve the problem.
In modern urban societies mobility is high, both throughout a citizen's life and in his daily round. Moreover, links with like minded others are often city wide or at least spill over the boundaries of "neighbourhood". If there is no easily identifiable local community, and there is little evidence to suggest that local patriotism is widespread, can we legitimately make claims to community decision making? This brings us to the question: Who is the education intended to benefit?

Assuming that there can be as many motivations as there are people involved in education, how should the problem of conflicting interests affecting goals be solved? (Chai: 1971:91)

In practice, local community participation in decision making, in this discussion educational goal making, means that a small group of representative leaders usually make the decisions. Assuming that it is possible to get a variety of opinions ranging from extreme conservatism to extreme radicalism within a single community, and assuming that consensus were possible: how should the agreed goals of one community be reconciled with the goals of other communities? How should local communities and their education relate to their neighbours and the wider society of which they form a part? Can local communities depend entirely on
their own resources for their education? If they cannot, then the external allocation of resources by central and other governments may reduce local "community education" to tokenism with little or no autonomy. What should be the proper balance between maintaining local ethnic and class cultures and trying to integrate residents into a pluralistic society? Who should decide?

**Education as Intrinsically Valuable**

It is significant to note, that the justification of education in terms of its being intrinsically valuable, contradicts the argument for its justification in terms of its being extrinsically valuable. There is, for example, an argument to be found in the literature of philosophy of education, that to hold the view that education is intrinsically valuable implies that one cannot at the same time ask for, or stipulate, goals or aims of education, for what is meant by education in the intrinsic sense is that something valuable (a-priori) is being done. R S Peters, for example, illustrates this point by using another word, "reform". He points out that it is not the aim of "reform" to make someone better. Part of what is meant by reforming someone is that they are being made better, that is to say the concept of reform implies the very process of making better. (Peters: 1966:27). Similarly, to hold that
education is intrinsically valuable, implies that it cannot be the aim of education to engage in certain activities in order to achieve other extrinsic valuable or worthwhile goals for part of what is meant by education is that worthwhile or valuable activities are being performed. Education as intrinsically valuable implies that by definition the term education means that something valuable is being done in the sense that the concept has built into itself the idea of value in the same way as the concept "reform" has built into itself the idea of making better. It would always make sense to ask how the value derives to particular goals sought or achieved. The answer would always have to be in terms of other goals believed to be valuable and so on. The problem with an instrumental model which is of the sort that views, for example, an educational activity "A", as having a value, leading to something else with a further value "B" and so on, is that it inevitably leads to an infinite regress. (Ibid:29).

The argument claims that the "infinite regress" can be avoided only if the conceptual connection between "education" and "value" is accepted as an analytic one, that is to say, that education by definition is valuable such that if one were to say that an activity "A" is an educational activity and is not valuable one would contradict oneself. The infinite regress is thus
avoided by acknowledging that education is a-priori "valuable" or "worthwhile".

Given such a proposition it would be nonsense to ask what is the value of education for this would be the same as asking what is the value of value, which would be absurd.

If the above argument about the intrinsically valuable nature of education is accepted, then it would appear that apologists for community education do not need to justify their demand for educational opportunities for everyone, since irrespective of the benefits accruing from the possible valuable goals achieved (assuming it is legitimate to stipulate goals), education can be said to be an end in itself and therefore worthy of being pursued for its own sake.

However, there is a serious objection that can be raised. The above argument is based on the premise that the connection between education and engaging in worthwhile activities is an analytic one. But an analytic relationship between terms implies that part of what is meant by one term is to be found in the other, so that to assert one and deny the other would be to contradict oneself. For example, to say that a figure was a triangle but that it did not have three sides would be
self-contradictory. However, this self-contradictory notion does not seem to apply in the relationship between the concepts of education and engaging in valuable activities. (Dray:1967:23 and Woods:1967:19).

It would not appear to be self-contradictory to say that X had been educated but had not changed for the better, or that in getting an education, the children were not receiving something worthwhile, (valuable). Whilst this may be an odd thing to say, it does not seem to be a self-contradiction to say so.

The more reasonable view would be to claim that there is a connection between "education" and doing something worthwhile, but that the connection is weaker than an analytic one.
CHAPTER FOUR

Educating For Community
Earlier, I quoted the kinds of justifications given, or justifications that might be given by advocates of community education for the claim that education should be for "all people". The central questions raised concerned the clients of education. Who should be educated? Who should education be serving? And why? One purpose was to highlight some of the problems connected with the attempt to justify the claim that we should be educating all of the members of the community on the premise that education is a value.

The question as to what the phrase, "educating for community", means, will be dealt with directly: what is of fundamental importance, however, is that it needs to be recognized that on face value at least the phrase is making a statement about the purpose(s) or end(s) of education. I have already mentioned that there are some serious problems associated with general statements of aims or ends in education, and have examined some of the objections that have been given about the legitimacy of speaking about general aims or ends in education. Yet from my reading I have found that statements about general aims or ends abound in the literature of community education, usually without acknowledgement by authors of the difficulties involved, not to mention any attempts on their part to deal with them.
The overall impression gained is that most advocates of community education agree that the fundamental aim of community education is the development of individual human dignity or self realization within community.

In this respect, community education theory is consistent with much of the literature of such progressive educators as Dewey.

It needs to be recognized, however, that such a broadly stated objective can be specified in many ways, emphasising either individual or social association. Notwithstanding this, apologists for community education point out that however one defines "dignity" or "fulfilment" the nature of the society within which it develops is critical. As Kateb states:

... the relationship between social practices and institutions and the self is not simply one of support or encouragement. To put it that way is to imply that there could be selves without society, that society is at most a device for helping the self to do what it could do alone but only laboriously and that eventually the self can outgrow society and be realized in splendid isolation. The plain truth is that within society there are no selves; that as Aristotle said, the community is prior to the individual, and that selves to be realized are given their essential qualities by their societies, and
that the process of self-realization is a process of continuous involvement with society, as society not only shapes but employs everyone's inner riches. The upshot is that thought about possible styles of life or about the nature of man is necessary to give sense to the idea of individuality. Far from being an oppressive encroachment, social theory (utopian or not) is a basic duty. (Kateb: 1965:456).

Kateb's point implies that educational policy needs to be based on deliberation and inquiry into the needs of the individual in community.

But, two important questions immediately need to be asked. What is to be taken as the satisfactory or most acceptable or correct conception of society? And what is to be understood by the idea of the satisfaction of individual human needs in such a society?

Two further ideas also occur in the attempted answers to the above questions to be found in the literature of community education. The first related to an hypothesis about change, and the second, an hypothesis concerning "loss of community". (Fitzgerald: 1977:14).

For example, Fitzgerald referring to general social, political, technological and educational settings claims:

The constant dynamic present in all levels and in all examples is that of change: change in work; change in
leisure; change in personal relationships; change in life style; change in political expectations; change in environmental, moral and social values ... (Fitzgerald: 1977:14)

He goes on to point out that as far back as 1887 Tönnies anticipated the effects of such change on social life and organization.

Social anonymity, the increase in the control of law, occupational specialization, personal and social mobility were all seen as consequences of twentieth century development. (Fitzgerald: 1977:11)

The idea of industrialization, urbanization, specialization, and technology tending to destroy man's sense of relatedness, to disintegrate common bonds, to increase apathy, to depersonalize activities and to reduce identity and meaning in human experience, is central to this community education view which relies heavily on the notion of the value of community.

R Plant was quoted earlier (p. 44) as referring to this view as the "normative character of community, (Plant: 1974:15)". Plant, writing not as an educationist, but for the profession of community work, organization and development, acknowledges the significance of the evaluative meaning of community in his analysis, and the need for studying the literature concerning the
development of its normative character from its earliest beginnings.

He writes:

What is the source of the evaluative meaning of community? Why has it come to have this intrinsic evaluative dimension to its use? We can reasonably well understand why 'Fascist' and 'Democracy' have a very high evaluative content; wars have been fought ostensibly to overcome the one and to strengthen the other, but why is it that community has come to have its prescriptive normative force? In the same way as we have to look at history and tradition to see the source of the evaluative dimensions of 'Fascist' and 'Democracy' so we have to look at the history of social and political thought and experience to see the grounds and the nature of the evaluative side of community.

(Plant: 1974:15)

Quoting a study by Bell and Newby who also make a similar claim that: "The normative character of community can be related to the history of sociology itself (Bell and Newby: 1972:21)." Plant concludes:

An understanding of this history is not therefore something detachable and peripheral, which the community worker may do without; it is rather a central way in which the evaluative meaning of 'community' a word defining its own activity, can be understood.

(Plant: 1974:15)
The point of my argument is that what is being said about the importance of the need for the community worker understanding why the concept of community has such evaluative force, is also relevant for the community educationist. Yet one finds little in the literature of community education which may be regarded as being a serious study of the literature of sociology either in regard to the earlier thinkers: as Tönnies, Herder, Schiller, Hegel, or more recently Nisbet, König, Minar, Greer and Poplin, and others, who have all written extensively on the subject.

While it may be true that the literature of community education fails to consider the relevant sociological studies, there is some material where the subject is briefly pursued. These studies are generally limited to the work of Tönnies and Nisbet, however, and on the whole are limited to providing a rationale for justifying the idea of educating for community rather than being examples of serious systematic research in the field. It is to this rationale for the justification of the idea that we should be educating for 'community' that I will now turn.

(21) Minzey & Le Tarte (1974), Seay (1975), and more recently N Haines, who demonstrates a much more thorough treatment.
There are two major parts to the argument given by community educationists. The first concerns my earlier reference to Fitzgerald's claim about the consequences of change and twentieth century development as tending to destroy that sense of community essential to man's well being and survival in contemporary society. This thesis about change is an important premise linking the second part of the argument which is that 'community' as meaning a sense of belonging, relatedness, feeling of identity and meaning is missing or is tending to be lost, and should be restored through whatever means available; but most importantly, education.

The community educationists point out that Tönnies compared human relationships and groups by referring to a general construct bounded at one end by the concept "community" and at the other by "society". "Community" in this context is understood as signifying a closely knit, generally self sufficient, rural group in which the extended family served not only the function of procreation but also economic production, education, recreation, religion, care of the sick and aged, safety and defence. Trethewey writes about such communities as being characterized by:

A small population, stability of population, employment within the area of residence, employment within
a limited range of occupations known and understood by most people, frequent contact in work and social activities by people within the locality, an extended family pattern, interdependent relationships between people, and convergent values. (Trethewey: 1974:44)

In contrast to this type of group was mass society, characterized by large numbers of people within an urban industrial environment, influenced by many institutions each of which performed the separate functions of education, religion, economic production, defence, medicine, recreation, care of the aged, and legal and political control. People shifted their places of residence, changed their occupations, and followed living styles quite different from those of previous generations. Because of mobility, specialization, and a rapid rate of change, people had less in common with each other and weaker ties to a basic or primary group. Their allegiances and loyalties were diffused among many social units instead of focused on one.

To quote Trethewey again:

... there is a more tenuous, unstable and spatially-extensive network of social interaction producing less sense of place and belonging, less participation and security and even a sense of isolation, anonymity, lack of identity, lack of involvement, even alienation, that is, loss of community. (Trethewey: 1974:45)
Relationships within a community were described as "organic" and "natural", while societal relationships were seen as "mechanical" and "rational". Community was an end in itself, while society was a means to other separate ends. Tönnies' distinction between Gemeinschaft (community), based on shared intimacy and interdependence, and Gesellschaft (society) signifying impersonal, formally contractual relationships, makes the distinction by asserting that in community, human relationships are characterised by acquaintance, sympathy, confidence, and interdependence; whereas in society, relationships reveal strangeness, antipathy, mistrust, and independence. (Tönnies: 1887:37-39).

Fitzgerald claims that it is the kind of "anomie interpretation of contemporary society", linked with the alienation theories preferred by other writers such as Midwinter (1972) and Jackson (1973),

... that has led community educators to deplore the loss of 'community' and by educating for community try to facilitate its re-establishment. (Fitzgerald: 1977:15)

However, while prima facie the "loss of community" thesis seems to be a plausible one, one might well question whether it is realistic. Is it possible to establish in the modern world (of communities), communities similar to the traditional rural model?
Even if it were, would it be advisable to do so? Even if we accepted that such communities did exist and were satisfying to live in, the reality is that forces of change have pushed them aside. Whether it is possible to create new forms of community appropriate for urban and industrial society cannot thus be assumed.

There are also certain other facts which need to be taken into account if contrasts with present day settings are going to be made. Most people today work in small work settings rather than large bureaucracies, performing personal human services rather than manufacturing goods on impersonal assembly lines. Advances in communications and transportation, far from creating divisive fragmentation, have produced unforeseen possibilities for people of widely differing backgrounds to share common experiences. It could be argued that automation has not produced impersonal, mechanistic individuals, but has freed individuals to be more genuinely human than ever before. Many people do have power to determine the destiny of the community through their participation in groups designed specifically for the pursuit of given interests.

Today there are more organizations than ever before: professional associations, credit unions, churches, corporations, labour unions, civil rights groups, clubs, as well as families. It is true, one could argue that
few, if any, of such groups in contemporary society fit the definition of "community" mainly because of their relatively specialized functions. The emergence of many institutions, each with specialized functions, has created discontinuities, such as the major one described by Nisbet:

Our present crisis lies in the fact that whereas the small traditional associations, founded upon kinship, faith, or locality, are still expected to communicate to individuals the principal moral ends and psychological gratifications of society, they have manifestly become detached from positions of functional relevance to the larger economic and political decisions of our society. Family, local community, church, and the whole network of informal interpersonal relationships have ceased to play a determining role in our institutional systems of mutual aid, welfare, education, recreation, and economic production and distribution. Yet despite the loss of these manifest institutional functions, we continue to expect them to perform adequately the implicit psychological or symbolic functions in the life of the individual. (Nisbet: 1962:54)

However, in response it could be said that people do have power to determine the destiny of the community through their participation in groups designed specifically for the pursuit of given interests. Bell, for example, mentions the myriad of groups in contemporary society which people can join - evidence both that man is not alone and that his groups give him power to protect his basic interests. (Bell: 1962:45.)
Nor can it be said that specialization and division of labour are necessarily harmful. On the contrary, they may provide additional alternatives or areas of choice never before open to the individual. A highly differentiated and specialized society offers greater possibilities for meeting specific interests, and idiosyncratic skills and desires. Though change does proceed rapidly, it may have the effect of ensuring flexibility, a safeguard against stagnation into fixed styles of living and thinking.

Automation and technology also have liberating effects, allowing individuals to pursue interpersonal relationships less constrained by the demands of the environment or material needs. While decisions on important matters may be left in the hands of diffuse bureaucracies or distant "experts", these bureaucratic forms and expert fields of knowledge make helpful contributions in the process of decision making and management of human affairs.

At least two reasons can be offered for not questioning current social trends. Firstly, it can be said that much of what is objected to - urbanization, automation, specialization, rapid change and so on, arise as a part of an inevitable stream of social development that has inevitable social costs. Secondly, it can be claimed
that challenging the fundamental premises and organization of the society would result in irrevocable rupture, chaos, and destructive revolution, which would shatter the foundations of modern society rather than improve it. (Keniston: 1965:433).

Finally it could be said that those who embrace the "loss of community" view are really clinging to an out-dated and inappropriate frame of reference (Itzkoff: 1973:29): people living a relatively stable existence, close to nature, with deep rooted personal relationships and a simple social organization whereby individuals exercise power in a way that in fact determines their own destiny. Keniston points out that the concepts of individuality and community take on entirely new meaning in modern society. For example, consent of the governed should not be grounded in the notion that each individual can influence government. Rather, influence must be pursued by joining large pressure groups. Or meaningful work should no longer be judged in terms of obsolete notions of craftsmanship, or pursuing a task from origin to completion; rather, that white collar administrative work within a bureaucracy has important meaning, but in a different sense. Modern society cannot be judged through the lenses of "romantic regression (Keniston: 1965:435)."

The foregoing questions have been raised to show that
to attempt justification of "educating for community" on the grounds that something called community has been lost, fails. However, although I have not found one community educationist who has attempted to answer these questions, it could be said that it is not the intention of the community education position to make historical claims or attempt a return to the past. All that is being claimed is that in contemporary society, community (as defined) is missing. It is of interest to note that Seebohm writing about the same question but in the context of social welfare, states:

> Our emphasis about the importance of the community does not stem from a belief that the small closely-knit rural community of the past could be reproduced in the urban society of today or in the future. Our interest in community is not nostalgic in origin. (Seebohm: 1968:147)

This more moderate position taken by some community educationists is a more plausible one. It points out that while the earlier mentioned—

pattern of change has brought with it the demise of some forms of traditional community groupings, the basic human need for interaction and affection has resulted in the emergence of newer and perhaps more recently apparent forms of community, and education must take account of this. (Fitzgerald: 1977:13)

Nisbet has referred to several forms of this phenomenon.
Speaking of religion, for example, he writes:

The authority of the great organized religions seems to be at a very low point today ... there is the unmis­
takable growth of membership in some of the most fundamentalist of religions. (Nisbet: 1973:17)

He singles out "some of the bizarre and novel hybrid religions formed from Eastern and Western traditions that have attracted many young people (Fitzgerald: 1977:13)".

N Haines points to the importance of recognizing the emergence of the commune as reflective of the need for kinship, and the importance of communication with these newly formed groups in order that we might discover what they are trying to tell us. (Haines: 1978:121-22)

The variety of new types of human associations is char­
acteristic of what Caldwell has referred to as "a new appreciation of cooperation (Caldwell: 1976:4)".

This more moderate view places greater emphasis on the "satisfaction of human needs" than missing community. It is premised on the view that the aim of education should be to provide a full and equal opportunity for all persons to lead self-actualized lives and relies on theory developed by Abraham Maslow. (Seay: 1974:96)
Maslow saw healthy, happy, fully developed, fully functioning human beings as self-actualized, and he claimed that they are people whose essential, hierarchical-ordered needs have found fulfilment. (Maslow: 1968:91)

Defining a need as something human beings require in order to grow or develop to their full stature, Maslow saw man as a being whose experience is organized by needs. When needs are present they motivate their possessors to do those things or to seek those associations which result in their gratification or fulfilment. In these terms, Maslow held that an individual's growth and development - his eventual self-actualization - depends on two things: on being aware of and attuned to his needs, and on conditions in the environment favouring need-fulfilment. (Ibid: 82)

Maslow claimed that there is a kind of hierarchy of human needs, such that when needs at one level are satisfied, new needs on a higher level emerge. Thus when the most basic psychological needs are fulfilled they cease to be the sole organizers of behaviour, making way for the next level. At this second-order level, Maslow identified the needs of safety, survival, and security. When these are met others emerge and press for fulfilment. One would then come to experience the needs which Maslow identified as "belongingness", "affection", "self esteem", and the
"Esteem of others". Highest in the hierarchy was self-actualization which Maslow characterized as:

ongoing actualizing of potential capacities and talents, as fulfilment of mission; as a fuller knowledge of, and acceptance of, the person's own intrinsic nature, an increasing trend toward unity, integration of synergy within the person. (Maslow: 1968:25)

Analyzing the "peak experiences" characteristic of self-actualized persons, Maslow described such experiences as episodes:

in which the powers of the person came together in a particularly efficient and intensely enjoyable way, and in which he is more integrated and less split, more open for experience, more idiosyncratic, more perfectly expressive or spontaneous, or more fully functioning, more creative, more humorous, more ego-transcending, more independent of his lower needs ... more truly himself, more perfectly actualizing his potentialities, closer to the core of his being, more fully human. (Maslow: 1968:97)

Self-actualization is possible, Maslow wrote, when and to the extent that lower level needs are fulfilled. When these lower-level needs are repressed or frustrated - either because the individual is not attuned to his own experiencing or because others are not responsive to his needs - experience is impoverished, and sickness, in one form or another, is the result.
As items which fulfil needs, various kinds of activities and situations are experienced (immediately felt) to be satisfactory; they occasion the quality of experience denoted by the words "contentment", "joy", "pleasure", "relief" and "happiness".

Referring to Maslow's thesis, Fitzgerald claims:

For most people in the Australian society of today the food and safety needs have been met and as a consequence the needs for acceptance and self-fulfilment have become important. But rather than reflecting present day human needs, the characteristics of contemporary Western society are such that the needs are intensified rather than satisfied. (Fitzgerald: 1977:17)

He continues:

If Maslow is to be believed, we need love and affection from others, yet we live in a society characterized by social anonymity, we need to have a sense of esteem, yet we live in a society which is in a state of geographical flux, where people are likely to move before they come to know one another, we have more time to create or express or develop new and satisfying skills, yet, until recently, most community resources were closed or not easily accessible to us. (Fitzgerald: 1977:17)

Fitzgerald's argument is a good one and deserves serious consideration. However, the problem is that it does not go far enough. While it is an attempt at explaining why
we ought to be educating for community it does not tell
us how. Nor have I found other apologists for community
education who have pursued the subject. (22) Perhaps their
reluctance is understandable, for as Fromm has observed,
the task is a difficult one. Fromm writes:

Man's solution to his own needs is exceedingly complex and it depends
on many factors and last but not
least on the way society is organized
and how this organization determines
the relations within it. (Fromm:
1963:19)

Nevertheless the task of providing solutions cannot be
avoided. The questions: "How should education provide
opportunities for all persons to lead self-actualized
lives?" and, "What implications does this have for
educational practice?" are fundamental. (Bestor: 1957:2)
Yet the analysis of the "how" or of method of community
education has been sadly neglected. The proliferation
of school based, program-oriented descriptions has been
inadequate. For, while they might tell us what is or
should be the case, they do-not explain how implementation
of the models prescribed will fulfil the needs given
or why those needs ought to be satisfied.

(22) One notable exception is to be found in the work of
However Haines contends that he is writing as a
social philosopher and not as an apologist for
community education.
CHAPTER FIVE

The idea of the close relationship between education and society is a recurring theme in the literature of community education. Many advocates of community education see the idea as having originated among some writers of the nineteenth century, prominent among these being Emile Durkheim. Durkheim, it is said, saw the basic pedagogical problem as not simply a matter of putting verified ideas into practice, but of finding ideas to guide education. These ideas were to be found in love "... very source of educational life, that is to say, society (Durkheim: 1956:116)".

Contemporary educational literature follows this direction, Paulo Soleri for example:

"The problems of education are surely reflections of the deepest problems of our age. Education which fails to educate humanity in the meaning of that word is meaningless. Our task and the task of all education is to understand the present world, the world in which we live and make our choice..." (Soleri: 1973:16)

If the schools are to promote certain vital understandings on the part of learners, it is essential to examine our present world as it reaches new heights of complexity..." (Soleri: 1973: 16)
The idea of the close relationship between education and society is a recurring theme in the literature of community education. Many advocates of community education see the idea as having originated among some writers of the nineteenth century, prominent among these being Emile Durkheim. Durkheim, it is said, saw the basic pedagogical problem as not simply a matter of putting verified ideas into practice, but of finding ideas to guide education. These ideas were to be found in the: "... very source of educational life, that is to say, society (Durkheim: 1956:114)."

It is society that must be examined, it is society's needs that must be known, since it is society's needs that must be satisfied. (Ibid:114)

Contemporary educational literature follows this direction, Paulo Soleri for example:

The problems of education are merely reflections of the deepest problems of our age ... Education which fails to clarify our central convictions is mere training and indulgence ... Our task and the task of all education is to understand the present world, the world in which we live and make our choices. (Soleri: 1973:14)

If the schools are to promote certain vital understandings on the part of learners, it is essential to examine our present world as it reaches new heights of complexity. (Soleri: 1973:14)
John Holt in How Children Fail, describes the dichotomy between the "real" world and the "school" world. He contends that out-of-school experiences of educational significance either go unexamined or are disregarded in the overwhelming majority of schools. To correct the situation, he says that a balance must be reached between so called "real life experiences" and the more contrived learning environment of the school. (Holt: 1974:111)

The idea that the school can no longer be equated with a formal institution where the subject unit is a clear cut and definable unit of the curriculum is also supported by Bernstein who has observed that in today's schools "... space and time have ceased to have fixed references". Indeed,

School's boundary relations, both within and without are now more open ... The boundary relation between the home and the school has changed, and parents (their beliefs and socializing styles) are incorporated within the school in a way unheard of in older schools. (Bernstein: 1967:351-353)

Proponents of community education further point out that while in previous times the teacher was a major source of knowledge and information in the community, today the teacher is but one of a bewildering range of information sources and resources that confront the student.
For example, Gordon Lee, commenting upon the changing role of the teacher, claims that the teacher has moved "away from the position of being exclusively or predominantly a source of data and a dispenser of information (Lee: 1966:24)."

Lee is one of many who take the view that the teacher can no longer be regarded as the custodian of knowledge. They further argue that at a time when many experiences, much information and many formal and informal learning resources are available outside the school, it is even more essential that schools and teachers be aware of these, and complement, extend and add to them rather than continue to provide only those traditional school experiences and activities which in other times were not available elsewhere. (Mogulof: 1969:234)

The above propositions are also reflected in recent writing on teacher education. McLean, for example, says:

Young teachers need to be taught what is happening in the world and to consider how they are involved in it. (McLean: 1967:38)

Stratemeyer and Lindsey point out that in an early stage of his training:

... the young teacher must be immediately informed on the social structure of his school community. (Stratemeyer & Lindsey: 1966:15)
In the Australian perspective, Richardson, on the future of teacher education in Australia, lists major objectives:

To give appreciation of and insight into the cultural forces that have led to the present structure and practice of education, and the current impact of social changes on education. (Richardson: 1967: 209)

D Edgar, also writing in Australia, recommends that there is a need:

... to conceive of the whole process of teacher training as that of occupational socialization. (Edgar: 1974: 125)

Such occupational socialization would serve to challenge the folk images about education and society that are brought by students into colleges of education (Edgar: 1974: 125).

In Australia the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education has pointed to the agreement which exists between Commonwealth and States that

... the major function of the Colleges is to train students so that they may readily practise their vocations within industry, commerce or community service. (Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education Report: 1969 40)
To accomplish this effectively, the Committee recommended that the staff of Colleges of Advanced Education should at all times be aware and conscious of what the public expects from College graduates.

While this in itself is obvious the means of achieving a close relationship require thought and action, and in some cases a substantial change in attitude. (Ibid:40)

Advocates of community education in Australia point out that the attainment of this awareness and this close relationship will be facilitated by teaching personnel attuned to, involved in, and concerned about the social context of the schools.

During the 1970's in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, there has been a realization that the School-Community relationship needs to be made closer.

In Australia the response has taken various forms - reorganization of school governing councils, relaxed governmental policy concerning use of schools, more frequent consultation with community groups concerning education, and the general extension of powers to local schools and groups, which permit increased local autonomy in some educational matters.
Developments in Australia were given a boost by the 1973 publication of the Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission - the Karmel Report - which pressed for greater community involvement in education.

Education in formal institutions, separated from both the home and the world of work, has proved to be an inadequate means of changing patterns of social stratification or of initiating all young people into society. Unless our conception of education broadens to enable schools to forge close links with other socializing agencies, the possibilities of providing equal life chances for children from all types of social backgrounds is severely limited. (Karmel: 1973:13)

Schools, the Karmel Committee concluded had much to gain from the involvement of the community in educational matters. (Ibid:13)

The Report also placed stress upon the social and educational advantages to be gained from community use of schools. Seeing such developments as a means of forging closer links between schools, family, peer group and the society at large, the Committee said... educationally, and from the point of view of effective use of resources it would make good sense to have the school as the nucleus of a community centre. (Ibid:14)
In Victoria a sequence of developments during the past few years, including the passage of Act 8499, permitting the council of a state school to authorise public use of school property, recently culminated in the publication of a paper, Policy and Guidelines for Community Use of School Facilities, issued jointly by the Director-General of Education and the Acting Minister of Education.

In this paper they stated:

It is the policy of the Education Department and the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation to encourage a community attitude which views schools as more than isolated institutions for day time education. (Dixon and Shears: 1975:1)

Similarly the Second Report of the Schools Commission, specifically mentioned community use of school facilities and recommended the expenditure of both capital and recurrent funds to help schools in such projects. (Schools Commission: 1976: 12-13).

The above criteria of usefulness and relevance would appear to be sound. Recent years have brought profound changes in ways of living. These changes may be attributed to social, political and economic causes. Not the least among these has been education— a leavening agent, which in the short span of six generations has enabled us to develop the tools and techniques to supply the material
basis of the "good life" for all. These very developments, however, have resulted in an unbalanced development of society; we face many problems of social organization and control stemming largely from the ever-increasing gap between great technological advance and the comparatively slight progress in social arrangements.

Traditionally, schools have been given the responsibility for a liberal education on the assumption that, desirable and necessary social changes would inevitably occur when the alumni became adults. With some notable exceptions, schools have been more or less removed from contact with the problems of community life. Too frequently, education has concentrated its attention on the teaching of the skills of literacy and citizenship in an academic atmosphere with little emphasis on the development of programs aimed directly at solving social problems and meeting "social needs". Advocates of community education conceive of education as having a much more dynamic role. The school is viewed as having a positive and immediate force in helping to initiate, implement, and give direction to community efforts to improve living. It is an important tool of the community whereby life in all its aspects is made better for all.

But the argument goes much further. If the school is to solve the problems of the community then it must also help develop a sense of community within the school group.
Advocates of community declare that this will mean the school having to help its local group (neighbourhood community) learn the skills of the community process. If it is to achieve these goals, it will need to be a community itself, and exemplify the community processes in its relation with adults and pupils. More than that, it will have to utilize community activities and problems in its program and take the school group into the community for the mutual benefit of both. It will also need to supplement its own expertise by using people in the community whose expertise is coordinated with that of the teachers.

The above ideas commonly referred to in the literature as the "school based" or "community school" dimension of community education form the base for a large part of community education philosophy, and indeed in much of the literature it is difficult to distinguish between the concept of "community schools" and "community education". (Morgan: 1977:104)

However, most advocates of community education are concerned that there should be no confusion between the two and indeed stress that there are significant differences. As Maurice Seay states:

Authors who write about community education are teaching the public that the word "education" is not
synonymous with "schooling", but refers to a life-time process of which schooling is one part. (Seay: 1974:5)

However, he nevertheless recognizes that in community education philosophy the school is central.

... the role of the school is not diminished except by the need for cooperative action when it recognizes the fact that there are many educational agencies in every community that have legitimate educational aims - and that each agency has a right to serve and be served. Now in a period of resource scarcity and criticism of waste, the possible contributions of all forces in the education of the people are more readily appreciated and accepted. Yes the school is tremendously important, and because of its great resources of human talent and physical facilities, is most often the catalytic agent which takes the leadership role in establishing the organizational and administrative structure necessary for community wide planning and coordination. The school is also the agency which is more likely to offer the educational services needed to provide adjustments (to add or delete) in the "balance" of community wide educational resources. (Ibid:13)

We need not explore this debate further. It is sufficient to note that the community school concept forms a major part of community education philosophy. The rest of this chapter explores the ideas underlying this aspect of community education.
Much of the discussion of community education from the "community schools" perspective is characterized by a vagueness. In the literature one frequently finds proponents of community education speaking of teaching "this way" or "that" without a clear definitional stand, with the result that much of the discussion is mere rhetoric, seeking to persuade and convince, with little or no analysis and description.

No less troublesome is the account of educational objectives. In the bulk of the literature, practitioners seem to emphasise social development, though seldom are their expectations clearly specified. (Katz: 1971:356)

Some major outcomes desired can be listed as follows:

The child will:

(1) take responsibility for his own decisions and actions;
(2) be autonomous, acting and making decisions independently;
(3) have the ability and desire to set his own goals;
(4) be self-directed and learn self-direction as a basis for organizing his life;
(5) have a capacity for long-term involvement at learning tasks of his own choosing;
(6) have a willingness to experiment and demonstrate an ability to seek new solutions and new problems;

(7) feel happy and free; he will be socially and intellectually adaptable; and

(8) feel comfortable with and confident of his own learning processes.

Rarely, however, are any of these advanced as a clearly specified goal. Does the security and happiness, which it is claimed the child gains from a relative freedom of choice, and participation in informal social relationships with children and adults, lead to "better" attitudes, learning and personal relationships?

There is also ambiguity about the intellectual content of community schools. Discussion of the standards established for intellectual rigor is especially vague. From field observation one senses that children are learning to think and to perform important skills but for many observers certain doubts linger. Is this intellectual climate so permissive that "anything goes"? Are consistent standards maintained in ways recognizable to the children? Although multiage grouping may reinforce the common humanity and essential equality of all students, might not this lead to mediocre achievement? Could it be argued, for instance, that in a vertically grouped situation a real levelling occurs, one that invites contentment with one's present position and discourages competitive
striving for excellence?

Some of this characteristic lack of clarity can be explained. The community school movement is young. Many practitioners are perhaps reluctant to put much in writing for fear of being misinterpreted or "copied" too precisely or too superficially. The essence of the community school environment is its flexibility and many of its practices therefore could be said to be difficult to describe. Practice, in this movement, has preceded theory, and, as yet the theories have not "caught up".

A number of questions may also be raised asking whether the practice is appropriate. Issues of appropriateness, although discussed among practitioners, are seldom raised in the literature on community schools and community education. The assumption seems to be that if it is good for one group of children, it must be good for all, and that if it is good for one child at ten, it must be good for him at fourteen or sixteen. Empirical research is lacking. It is permissible, therefore, to speculate about the appropriateness of the community school as a learning environment.

Contending that a child's socio-economic home background in large part determines not only his view of the world, but his ability to cope with its manifold structures, it might be argued that for some "disadvantaged" children at
the lower junior levels the flexibility of the community school organizational features could prove dysfunctional. It may be argued that these children have a special need for clear and consistent - even inflexible - time tables, rules for behaviour, subject matter distinctions, and so on.

To what extent may the community school situation over-emphasize the importance of the experimental, especially the "messing about" aspect of learning? It might be argued that some ideas are better learned through direct observation or vicariously or by abstract reasoning, rather than through direct experience. It can also be argued that there are times (and subjects), when the quickest, and most efficient, and most thorough way to learn something is simply to be told.

Advocates of community schools often appear to assume that all children will make profitable decisions, even when these decisions concern not present desires, but what will be best for them in the long run. By allowing children such a wide range of choice, might not schools be risking the possibility that children will grow "lop sided" becoming specialists prematurely? As R S Peters suggests, any recommendation for "self direction" among school children "must surely be asserted not absolutely but with an 'other things being equal' clause". He asks:

How far are we going to press the value of self-chosen activities if
young people overwhelmingly reject scientific subjects in a highly industrialized society which needs increasingly a vast array of technicians and technologists? (Peters: 1970:10)

His further point that encouraging children "to stand on their own feet and find their own way" means

not only taking them a certain distance in the various options so that they may have experience on the basis of which they may choose, (Ibid:11)

but also

paying special attention to activities such as literature, history and social studies which are an aid to them in this sort of choice, (Ibid:11)

would be supported by many educationists.

Perhaps the most crucial questions concern the nature and quality of children's learning in community schools. What do children really learn in community schools and do they learn it better than in other kinds of schools? What elements within the general community school environment make it more (or less) conducive to which kinds of learning? Assuming that the community school classroom is susceptible to unintended teaching as any other, one needs to inquire into the precise nature of the unintended teaching and unintended learning that occur here. Advocates of community education have
advanced claims for the psychological advantages of the community school. Just what are they, and on what elements of this environment are they most dependent? Is it possible for a good and humane teacher, operating in a traditional setting (with the desks nailed down, fifty minute periods, and a set syllabus) to create a similar psycho-emotional climate? For which sorts of children is this context most important, and for which might it be deleterious?

Many claims have also been made for the effectiveness of organizational flexibility in community schools, claims which remain unsubstantiated in any but the most subjective of terms. Evidence on such questions as these would be useful. For example:

1. Does vertical grouping really teach social responsibility or does it in fact have the opposite effect? Do children in this environment really learn to get along with members of other age groups or do they learn to ignore them? To what extent, then, does functional grouping prove dysfunctional and how much do children voluntarily segregate themselves by sex, interest, or intelligence?

2. What is the combined effect of vertical grouping and spatial fluidity on the community school teacher? Is he in fact freed to become more attentive to the
individual problems of his students or does he become hopelessly overburdened, responsible for too many sub-groups in too many places? How often is his attention monopolized by the lonely or disturbed child? What are the different effects of various teacher pupil ratios in this environment?

3. When a good deal of choice is given to children concerning the curriculum they follow in school, what kinds of children make what kinds of choices and why?

Finally, what is to be made of the notion that the school be regarded as the major agency of education within the community by using the community as its workshop or laboratory?

This idea was perhaps first popularized by Dewey. (Dewey: 1897:77-80) Some years later Harold Rugg put Dewey's idea imaginatively:

If we should trail one of the new school groups for a week or two and record what they did, we should find that the students spent much of their time outside of their assigned classrooms - for example in the library, shops, studies, auditorium and offices of the school itself. The scenes of their activity, however are not only the entire reaches of the new school plant, but also the

whole community and the region round about - the government offices, stores, markets, industries, the water supply, the docks, and the like. Pupils survey the layout of the town, collect pictures, and old records, and interview old residents, city officials, social welfare secretaries, and a host of others. (Rugg: 1936:340-341)

However an important distinction between the early community schools and the later ones is that modern day community schools are much more "community managed". Advocates of community education today unanimously recommend that the education in a particular community should be planned by a broadly based "citizens" or "community education" council, and that adult citizens in their regular jobs should assume educational responsibility for each other and for the youth. Most also see the idea as translatable into organizational as well as financial terms, and propose that a "community education council" present a budget for all educational efforts in their local community with the school budget as only a part of the total. The conclusion to be drawn is that education is not to be the province of specialized experts but is a function of the total community in which adults and youth administer, learn, and teach each other. (Macklin: 1977:59) This is indeed the theme for the next chapter. Community education as the community educating, means just that: adult and youth - all the people of the community participating in administration,

(23) That is to say "administration" not only in the sense of managing but also decision making in educational policy matters etc.
learning and teaching of one another.

However, a major difficulty needs to be recognized here. The problem faced by advocates of community education is the problem of establishing community schools which operate in a genuinely community sense without going beyond the limits of the fundamental ideals and aspirations of the society.

It is easier to understand how a community school can be established when there is no conflict or no serious conflict concerning the ends or purposes to which the society is committed.

However, efforts at establishing community schools in societies where there is disagreement about the moral commitments of the group is much more difficult, mainly because such arrangements necessarily hinge on the location and exercise of authority. It would appear that community educationists want the school to function as a community institution-serving a community function, but do not demonstrate how the school can so operate at the same time in a society which is non-integrated and non-communal.

It is my view that the problem of authority indicated above must be resolved if the community school is to
function. However, one finds little in the literature which would suggest an awareness of the problem, let alone any attempt to deal with it.
CHAPTER SIX

Education learning and teaching are human undertakings. They involve interactions between the individual and his environment, between two or more persons, and even more complex learning situations. In this kind of education we see all as learners, and all potential teachers. (Helby, 1972: 177)

Related to this notion is also the idea of involvement or participation. As John Warden writes:

The literature of community education reflects a strong philosophical commitment to community involvement in the educational process. (Warden, 1976: 77)

The Community Educating

The following quotations from the literature underly an essential commitment by advocates of community education to the idea of citizen participation: 

(1) The process which provides for the use of community resources and needs identification as
The notion that every member of the community is potentially a resource for teaching and learning is central in the literature of community education. The idea has perhaps been best summarized by the leading community educationist, EMelby, who writes:

Education learning and teaching - are human undertakings. They involve interactions between the individual and his environment, between two or more persons. All these make up learning experiences - learning situations. In this kind of education we see all as learners and all as potential teachers. (Melby: 1972:171)

Related to this notion is also the idea of involvement or participation. As John Warden writes:

The literature of community education reflects a strong philosophical commitment to community involvement in the educational process. (Warden: 1974:177).

The following quotations from the literature reflect something of this commitment by advocates of community education to the idea of citizen participation.

Harold Moore, for example, views community involvement as definitive of community education. He defines community education as

(a) process which attempts to bring resources and needs together for
effective problem solving by people on their own behalf. (Moore: 1971:3)

Minzey and Olsen reflect a similar view claiming that:

the ultimate goal of community education is to develop a process by which members of a community identify problems and seek out solutions to these problems. (Minzey & Olsen: 1970:36)

Kerensky has also emphasised the citizen participation view asserting that:

the discovery of the power of lay participation in education may well be the most important educational discovery of many decades. (Kerensky: 1971:157)

But what is to be made of the idea that all community members are potentially educators and learners and that this potential will be realized through participation? What is to be understood by the term participation?

Assuming that the idea were true, would it necessarily be desirable to increase community involvement in education?

Furthermore is the idea intended to relate to all phases of education or is it intended that it should only relate to the schools? Schooling and education are different, though related, concepts. Schooling may be regarded as
the official and institutional provision of teaching and learning. Schooling is one part of education, but education also includes the teaching and learning that goes on through universities, advanced colleges, the family and peer groups, the media and the surrounding culture.

If what is being said is that education generally proceeds via many individuals and institutions - parents, peers, siblings and friends as well as families, churches, libraries, museums, summer camps, it is hard to quarrel with the idea. There is ample research to suggest that parents are educators of their children in this sense, (Gordon: 1972:146); that grandparents are educators of their children and grandchildren and vice versa, (Mead: 1974:241); that children teach their parents and their teachers, (Jones: 1974:71); that siblings educate each other, that parents educate parents, (Leichter: 1974:177); and that citizens generally, educate one another. (Haines: 1973:138).

The problem, however, with this kind of claim is not that it is false, but that it could be misleading: for as A Cremin, discussing parents as teachers writes:

it is often erroneously assumed that what is intended by parents when they teach or nurture is what they actually end up doing and that what they actually end up doing is ultimately effective. (Cremin: 1974:259)
Furthermore it is frequently assumed that:

only one thing at a time is being taught (which may leave observers) egregiously insensitive to cross pressures within the family. (Cremin: 1974:259)

This error, Cremin goes on to say, may be further compounded by the assumption on the part of the observer that the household sets the boundaries of the educational situation, which may leave them equally insensitive to cross-pressures from without.

Cremin concludes:

Like any educational institution, the family originates some educative efforts, mediates others, and actually insulates its members from still others. What is more, as educative efforts within the family involve not only parents teaching children, but children teaching parents, parents teaching one another, and children teaching one another, as with all educational institutions, these efforts within the family are fraught with the uncertainties, contradictions and ironies that inevitably mark any effort to teach anyone anything. (Cremin: 1974:260)

The narrower issue of parent/citizen involvement in schools also raises serious questions. But first, what does the term participation mean? It may be assumed that participation means a share in decision-making. (Mann: 1977:67) It may also be said, that all those
influenced by decisions should have a share in them, on the grounds that decisions should be based on full knowledge of their consequences, and that this is best ensured by bringing into decision-making all those influenced by such consequences.

It may also be said that as a political principle everyone should have a certain amount of control over his life situation. However, as was pointed out earlier in Chapter Two (p. 73) it would appear that the sheer number of those concerned would in many cases make direct participation impossible. (Maddox: 1973:73) At most, one could only achieve a substitute for participation through representatives of interested groups. In the educational system, for example, we would have at least the following groups directly involved: educational policy-makers, administrators, teachers and other employed personnel, and students. In addition there would be other groups more or less concerned with what the educational system produces: parents, employers, professional associations, ideological organizations and politicians.

Thus if we were to take the principle of maximal participation for all concerned seriously, then participation would have to mean most of the population and many in more than one capacity. Such a principle appears
impracticable at present. A representative system is normally used. However it may be argued that as a means of securing the individual a reasonable chance of controlling his own fate, intermittent voting for representatives is a rather meagre offer. In the kind of hierarchical decision-making structure which characterizes most of our social systems, the opportunity of being vaguely represented at some level high up in the hierarchy does not provide individuals with much feeling of control. The inherent rules of the hierarchy itself seem to absorb most effects of such representation as seen from the point of view of the individuals represented.

Advocates of community education in fact argue that participation should have a meaning beyond this. The local sphere of activity in which the individual student, teacher, parent, takes part, is essential to his feeling of personal satisfaction and success, or humiliation and failure. (Oscarson: 1971:80) One must assume that participation would mean some element of control of the immediate circumstances creating such effects. For each person involved in an activity, there must be some rewards, some freedom of choice, some possibilities for learning and personal development and for emotional interaction with others. They thus argue that participation should at least mean some ability to influence conditions that determine opportunities.
This presupposes, however, that decisions concerning such conditions are actually taken in the environment within reach of the individual. Consequently, increased participation cannot only be looked at from the point of view of representation at various levels within an existing decision-making hierarchy. The location of such decisions within the hierarchy must be brought into the discussion. This leads to the conclusion that a precondition for participation in this sense is the existence within organizations of "local" groups with a certain amount of autonomy.

Membership in such groups would not however by itself secure individual participation in the sense indicated above. It is necessary to go more deeply into conditions under which an element of "local" autonomy could be assumed to have a real effect on participation. The theoretical aspects relating to the conditions for participation are obviously beyond the scope of this study. It is important to note, however, that claims for more participation are void without the conditions for achieving it. We need to separate the myth from reality. In discussions about participation we need to distinguish between the "weak" sense and the "strong" sense of the meaning of the term. Many community members have been frustrated by "participating" on local planning bodies of school councils without the power to influence decisions. This is participation in the weak sense. It
is formal participation. It is not actual or operative. Participation in the strong sense, however, would imply that they had such power. This distinction between formal and actual participation is important, for it helps to direct attention to conditions which might otherwise be unrecognized. But even if operationalized, would increased participation in schools be desirable?

Some advocates have been more guarded about community contact with the school. The school doors, they argue, should not be open to all community members, ("the butcher, the baker and candlestick maker") but parents should be encouraged to attend. (Perrone & Strandberg: 1972: 348-49) It is important to clarify some assumptions often ignored in discussions concerning parent participation in schools. Recent research has demonstrated that the family plays a crucial role in a child's later, adult development. Recent studies of schooling effectiveness provide some idea of how important family background is to the child's academic achievement. The Coleman Report has shown that family background, (socio-economic status, parents' expectations, family structure) account for more of the unique variance in achievement test scores than do all of the schooling inputs put together. (Coleman: 1966: 298) (24)

Recent demographic models of status attainment, (how people attain their social-occupational-income positions) provide additional empirical evidence for the importance of family factors. O D Duncan has shown that a child's educational attainment is predictable if we know the father's occupational status, his education, and the number of siblings. The higher the father's occupational status, the more years of his education and the fewer siblings, the more chance of attaining a given high level of education. (Duncan: 1972:10-13) If we add other factors such as race (Porter: 1974:303-316), sex, (Alexander: 1974:668-682), parents' aspirations and expectations for the child (Sewell: 1970:1014-1027), we could predict with greater accuracy the educational level and occupational position a child will achieve.

A second factor often ignored is that "parents" are not a homogeneous body. We talk about "parents", "the community", "the people" or "consumers", but in reality these are composed of various segments. Among the indicators often used to define clienteles operationally are ethnicity, religion, "intact" versus single parent families, educational background and income; correlated with attitudes and child-rearing values.

A third factor frequently overlooked concerns the role that mothers play in family schooling decisions. Mothers
are most often left with the family's primary involvement with schools; the specialisation of labour between mothers and fathers is probably greater in working-class than middle class homes, and middle-class fathers are probably more involved in schooling matters than working class fathers. It is also likely that while most mothers carry the chief responsibility for making day-to-day decisions about school, fathers take part in non-routinized decisions.

The final and perhaps most important point is that it is easier to organize parents, particularly those of the lower social class, to resist threats than it is to organize them to achieve long term positive goals. James Wilson has put the same argument in his examination of the conditions which facilitate citizen participation in community development organizations. He writes:

... lower-income neighbourhoods are more likely to produce collective action in response to threats (real or imagined) than to create opportunities. Because of the private regarding nature of their attachment to the community, they are likely to collaborate when each person can see a danger to him or to his family in some proposed change; collective action is a way not of defining and implementing some broad program for the benefit of all, but of giving force to individual objections by adding them together in a collective protest. (Wilson: 1968:43)
It is not my purpose to examine why parents will band together for resistance where they would not come together for innovation. It is sufficient to have noted the fact.

Parents, families, and community members without children can make contributions to their own and the children's educational achievement. In a general sense it may be claimed that all members of a community have "teaching skills" and there is value in identifying and deepening these existing skills and transmitting others. Participation in decision making may help enhance the abilities of citizens. Participation may also help to avoid certain mistakes. Some believe that with the complexities of our modern world, we cannot rely solely on our representatives to work out solutions to the multitude of problems confronting them. In the words of the United Kingdom Skeffington Report:

It may be that the evaluation of structures of representative government which has concerned western nations for the last century and a half is now entering into a new phase. There is a growing demand for many groups for more opportunity to contribute and for more say in the working out of policies which affect people not merely at election time, but continuously as proposals are being hammered out, and certainly as they are being implemented. Life, so the argument runs, is becoming more and more complex and one cannot leave all the problems to one's representatives. They need some help in reaching the right decisions, and opportunities should be provided for discussions with all those involved. (Ministry of Housing and Local Government: 1969:11)
The central questions, however, are not whether people can or cannot be said to be participating in the sense discussed above, or whether there are or are not mutual benefits accruing to individuals or institutions through participation, but whether "effectiveness is or is not a higher order value than participation (Taylor: 1976:3)".

Though one may not wish to go all the way with community education proponents on the subject of citizen participation in schools, it is a fact that greater involvement by parents in the education of their children is now part of the policy of many governments and education authorities. (Vacchini: 1977:115).

It is important to note that several levels of involvement are distinguishable. (Schools Commission: 1975:113) These levels of involvement might be described as:

- the audience, bystander, observer;
- a level where parent is teacher of the child, (at home);
- one where the parent is a volunteer teacher at school;
- another where the parent is a trained worker; and
- one where the parent is decision maker.

Most attempts at parent involvement have been at level one. However, in recent years there has been a shift to level two where the emphasis has been on making parents aware of their role as teachers of their children,
formally involving them in a process and in creating the learning materials involved. The emphasis here is on informing the parent that he is a teacher of his child, although not in the same sense as a classroom teacher. The assumption is that the parent will adapt to his own environment through information that he might obtain, not only on such things as reading and child-rearing but also on such topics as social services and adult education opportunities.

Level three is taken to mean that parents will become active in the classroom, especially teaching. It is assumed that effective use of parent volunteers will mean that the teacher plans and works with the parent, in advance.

Level four is seen to go beyond volunteer programs, using parents as paid employees, as teacher-aids.

The fifth level of parent involvement is participation in decision making. Since only a few people are able to participate on school councils or boards, it is assumed this will take place in advisory groups and committees, and that these bodies will have powers regarding employment of personnel, revision of all aspects of the school program, and the spending of certain funds as well as participation in planning the budget.
A review of the literature shows that it is the intention that parents should participate at all levels (two through five). Indeed, in our own School Commission Report for the Triennium 1976-1978 we read the following encouraging statement:

... the majority of schools in Australia would be most accurately described in terms of the first and second models. Some administrators, teacher and parent organizations and individuals are strongly pressing for model three. The evidence suggests that they are in advance of the majority opinion of both parents and teachers. Nevertheless the pendulum of interest and action is swinging towards model three, with a few schools pioneering model four. The Commission's funding strategies over the next triennium will seek to increase this momentum. (Schools Commission: 1975:113).

It is important to note, however, that while advocates of community education are generally hopeful of an enthusiastic response from parents, if not from principals and teachers, recent research demonstrates that the evidence about parent-teacher contact in positive terms is not clear and in some instances is contradictory. W Waller for example has claimed that teachers and parents generally distrust one another. He writes:

A marked lack of clear thought and plain speaking exists in the literature touching the relation of parents and teachers. From the ideal point of
view, parents and teachers have much in common, in that both, supposedly, wish things to occur in the best interests of the child; but, in fact, parents and teachers usually live in a condition of mutual distrust and enmity. (Waller: 1961:68)

F Musgrove has reflected a similar view claiming that parents believe the school undermines their values and responsibilities.

The school has often been seen as a threat to the home in at least two senses: in undermining parental influence and family values and substituting the different and perhaps quite alien influence of teachers; and in undermining parents' sense of responsibility, taking on childcare duties which should properly belong to parents. (Musgrove: 1966:16)

W Taylor has gone even further and questioned whether increased communication between teacher and parent will ever in fact change the inherent conflict between home and school. (Taylor: 1970:236).

In other studies (for example Enquiry I of the School Council Report) it was indicated that there was general satisfaction on the part of most parents with the program for meeting teachers. (Enquiry I: 1968:115). However, parents generally wanted: more open days or evenings; special time for meeting staff; easier access to teachers; more time for discussion and more information about pupil progress; and more than half the parents
felt that they were intruding when they visited the school without an invitation, holding that there was not enough communication between the school and themselves. (Enquiry I: 1968:111). All this suggests a fairly high degree of dissatisfaction.

Lack of communication is also claimed by Lynch and Pimlott who found that most parents wanted more information and lacked knowledge about the opportunities for obtaining it. Lynch and Pimlott recommend:

... if parents are to become more involved schools need to develop more strategies ... in order to inform parents of what they provide. (Lynch and Pimlott: 1976: 61)

However it is significant that they also found the majority of parents preferred non-participation in decision making, and non-involvement in curriculum activities, viewing teaching as entirely the domain of the teacher. (Lynch: 1976:61). Their report concludes:

With significant exceptions most parents at all the schools seemed to be relatively satisfied with what the schools were doing for their children and in each case there appears to have been a pool of latent good will towards the school and the teachers. On the other hand there are quite naturally areas where greater cooperation,
information and opportunity would appear to be desirable if the 'educational covenant' between parents, teachers and other lay and professional groups in the community is to be made more flexible and yet more effective. (Lynch and Pimlott 1976:61).

Other studies record disagreement between teachers and principals concerning home/school relations. (Green: 1968: 41). J Mays and W Taylor found the principal's role as central to relations between school and community, the principal generally occupying the position of communicator, mediator and convener. (Mays: 1962: 106 and Taylor: 1970: 236.)

Other studies again have shown that primary and secondary teachers view their roles differently. Musgrove and Taylor's findings concerning the differences between teachers' and parents' conceptions of the teacher's role, (Musgrove and Taylor: 1965: 171) have led to many questions being asked concerning the possible risks of encouraging parent/teacher cooperation and concern about the need for examining the nature and implications of such relationships before cooperation is increased.

Surveys conducted in Australia, though more limited, have had similar results. In Western Australia a survey conducted by L Vlahov concerning parent/teacher relationships, for example, showed that parents initiated most contacts; that most of the communications concerned the
classwork of children and occurred in school hours; that attendance at Parents and Teachers meetings was low and that teachers and parents wanted more contact, but differed over their choice of method for achieving this. (Vlahov: 1971: 111, 117, 119).

A more recent study by C Zinkel in Canberra and Queanbeyan has shown that parents want teachers to consult them as they think they were not being consulted enough; that teachers were too conscious of their own expertise and did not really want to hear the ideas of parents on the grounds that they were untrained persons; and finally, that teachers did not like to meet parents without previous appointments. (Zinkel: 1976: 52)

It is of some significance that in the same survey teachers said that parents were always welcome, that they wanted more contact and were happy always to give assistance and information when required.

A similar study was carried out in New South Wales by King and Watson. Their study has reinforced the findings in the other states, that, on the one hand, most parents prefer closer contact and increased opportunity for participation, but only a small number are involved, and while teachers on the whole believe in greater parent contact they hold serious reservations about parent participation in policy making. (King and Watson: 1976: 25, 44)

This has been supported by a Victorian study conducted by
R Fitzgerald. His work shows that there are significant differences in teacher/parent understandings of the role of the school, and that while students think that parents should participate more in school activities, (particularly in regard to decisions about the curriculum), many parents and most teachers resisted this and only a quarter of teacher respondents supported it. (Fitzgerald: 1974:21).

Another survey conducted in Victoria by Fitzgerald, Musgrove and Pettit, showed that in reality the community has very little influence on what happens in schools. More specifically the survey found that:

... parents mainly saw principals as "gate-keepers" and teachers as specialists (the teachers' view, too). Parent involvement was thought to be mainly at the level of fund raising. Teachers on the whole were unwilling to accept community advice concerning subject content and teaching procedures, while the school initiated the bulk of parent contact with the school. (Fitzgerald, Musgrove & Pettit: 1974:58-61)

In a later more comprehensive study, the same authors found similar results, reinforcing the view that very little influence on school organization and programs can be expected from the school's neighbourhood community given existing bureaucratic structures. (Fitzgerald, Musgrove and Pettit: 1976:179-183).
The Need For An Empirical Approach

Earlier I indicated that disagreements, disputes and confrontations, may be reasonably expected to erupt in public education out of the fundamental differences in conceptions of the basic values to be reflected and enhanced by our educational institutions (p. 73). I identified in the writings of several authors, increasing dissent from the fundamental values in and of public education, and on another level, the youthful manifestations of the counter culture (p. 5 and p. 92). The growing consciousness and sense of identity among various ethnic and racial minorities have also provided a basis for fundamental challenges to the normative foundations of public schooling.

I also acknowledged that constructive dialogue has developed among some proponents of community education regarding the canons of rationality governing justification of value claims, i.e. the verification and validation of such claims (pp. 10-11). The problem is that the value conflicts in question revolve around further justification of the standards and rules used in the process of validation.
The question as to what are appropriate justificatory procedures is beyond the scope of this study. However, it needs to be said that apologists for community education should recognize the importance of providing appropriate directions for inquiry and dialogue when disagreements and disputes in education escalate to the level of fundamental value conflicts, that is to say conflicts arising out of the appeal to differing and incompatible standards and rules of the highest order.

The study has assumed that evaluation includes questions of what? how? and why? and whether something works as it is supposed to, i.e. is it "good"? For example, does a particular program designed to improve education achieve the objectives which it establishes for itself, and do the results in turn lead to other beneficial or detrimental consequences? The approach adopted has been analysis and criticism.* However, "good" ideas and sound logic will not guarantee implementation of policies and goals.

While it may be true that no injunctions as to what ought to be done in education can be derived from

* In the philosophical sense.
purely factual considerations or purely empirical evidence, it is also true that normative injunctions are of little use without the support of those to whom they are directed. This is an important implication of the third of my evaluative criteria: "examination of the logic of the justifications offered". What is demanded is not just demonstration of how goals are to be attained, but, that they are attainable. The view is supported by D. Weaver, who writes:

Practices and programs considered to be essential to implement the community education concept should not be adopted without empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness. (WEAVER: 1972: 155)

The principle demands empirical evidence to show that ideas will be accepted or, on reasonable probability, will be supported. The problem is how does one measure the level of acceptance? It is reasonable to assume that anyone's support for anything is largely determined by how desirable that thing is. For example, in the case of community support for the school one can assume that the closer the outputs of the school are to the wishes and interests of the community, the more likely it is that the community will support the school. Support for the school will be greatest, when the school's outputs coincide with the expressed desires and interests.
of the community. However it should be recognized that there are some aspects of the "real world" which complicate the relation. In the first place, no group of people can articulate its total agenda of interests with complete clarity and accuracy. Secondly, when community interests are expressed they may be contradictory. Thirdly, ideas accepted in one place will not necessarily continue to be accepted there, nor be accepted in another.

For example, it could be assumed that educators and communities have a common interest in increasing material and affective support for schooling. However, while increases in both kinds of support may make the job of the educator an easier one, increases in material support are paid for by communities and may be less acceptable from the community point of view. Thus although administrators might want citizens to believe that it is their duty to be more supportive of the schools, in some instances increased involvement may be accompanied with scepticism.

Another reason given for increased community involvement is that such increases are believed to make educational institutions more responsive to the interests of the people they serve. As the community presence grows in terms of numbers, time and scope of
involvement, it is more likely that the community will present demands and follow up on their resolutions in ways that ensure the responsiveness of the school to the community.

However, while it may be reasonable to assume that community people and administrators may be in agreement about the desirability of this responsiveness, this agreement may dissolve, when the community wishes to effect a change that the school's authorities do not feel is desirable, possible or necessary. At this point, that is to say, at the point of conflict, responsiveness may be found to be no longer unanimously endorsed.

The earlier analysis of empirical research in school-community participation, (pp. 130-135) demonstrates that knowledge and attitudes of citizens and educators represent important areas of inquiry in achieving effective relationships between schools and community.

However, review of the Australian literature shows that only a minimum of information is available concerning school-community partnerships.
Australian researchers in the field have relied almost exclusively on survey/case study approaches. Their studies have tended typically to examine a small unrepresentative sample of school districts and focus on major decisions in these districts.

A study based on a national sample of school districts, systematically selected and with a comprehensive view would be a desirable compliment to the presently small amount of information available.

Of major concern is the almost total lack of data in respect of parent/community participation in Australian primary schools. The following investigation is conducted as part of the present study in order to provide some additional information in this regard.

It is also intended as an example of another kind of survey that could be conducted in order to ascertain peoples' knowledge, attitudes, and needs.
The investigation was conducted in October 1978 as part of the present study in order to provide some objective data concerning parent/community participation in Ballarat primary schools. (26)

The study attempted to gather data on the following:

1. The extent and nature of parent involvement in primary schools in the Ballarat area and parent perceptions of, and attitudes to, community participation in schools.

2. The extent and nature of primary school involvement in the community and Principal and teacher perceptions of, and attitudes to, parent/community participation in schools.

Some biographical data were also obtained. (27)

(25) Ballarat, situated 113 kilometres from Melbourne is the second largest provincial city in Victoria, with a population of 76,955 (Regional figure published by the Ballarat Development Committee in Ballarat Investment Handbook 1976).

(26) The survey has been expanded to include secondary, and technical principals and teachers; pre-school teachers; directors, and teaching staff (lecturers) from post-secondary and tertiary institutions; churches; and employers in industry in Ballarat, with 15 students from the Ballarat College of Advanced Education currently involved in the preparation and distribution of the questionnaires.

(27) For the sake of brevity this information has been included in the appendices. See Appendices 5 and 6.
Questionnaires were sent to principals of all state and independent primary schools in Ballarat and samples of teachers, in Ballarat state and independent schools, (sampled on location, and size of school), and parents, with children enrolled in Ballarat state and independent primary schools, (sampled on location, and size of school).*

Table 1 gives details of the sample and questionnaires returned. (28)

Table 1
Sample/Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Dispatched</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Number Incomplete</th>
<th>Number Analyzed</th>
<th>Proportion Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature and Extent of Involvement

Principals and teachers were asked whether their school was involved in any way with the Ballarat community, and to indicate which one of a list of descriptive statements on the questionnaire best described the nature of their school's involvement. Parents were asked whether they

(28) See Appendix 1, 2, and 3 for the questionnaires used.
* Samples were selected randomly from estimated populations of 512 teachers and 6700 parents. The figures were derived from statistics contained in the Ballarat Regional Directory - All Schools and Services 1978. Published by the Ballarat Regional Education Office, Education Department of Victoria.
were involved in anyway in the primary schools in Ballarat, and similarly, to indicate which one of a list of statements best described the nature of their personal involvement.

The responses showed that a large proportion of principals and teachers saw their school as being involved in the community. It is significant that a much smaller proportion of parents said that they were personally involved in the schools. It is also significant that while 62.6 per cent of parents said they were involved in the school where their child/children attended, only 8.2 per cent said they were involved in other primary schools.

It is worth noting that while nearly half the principals and 65 per cent of teachers saw their school's involvement within the community in terms of parent participation in curriculum activities, only 12.9 per cent of parents indicated that this was the manner of their involvement. It was also interesting to observe that parent responses indicated a fairly high degree of involvement in the traditional "support" roles, (e.g. parent clubs, tuck shop/canteen, fund raising etc), and a fairly low level of involvement in classroom activities, school policy making and curriculum planning. Their responses are detailed in Tables 2 - 6.
Table 2
Principals and Teachers Who Said Their School Was Involved In The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Parents Who Said They Were Involved In The Primary School Where Their Child Attends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Parents Who Said They Were Involved In Other Primary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Principal and Teacher Responses Indicating The Nature Of Their School's Involvement In The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing use of buildings or grounds outside school hours</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing programs after school hours</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement in curriculum activities</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement in curriculum planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Parent Responses Indicating The Nature Of Personal Involvement In The School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in Parents' association/ club/committee</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in school committees</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of excursions and/or sporting activities</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom activities (e.g. teaching reading etc)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of grounds and buildings</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen/tuck shop</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum planning</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy Making</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (29)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(29) Assisting in the school office
Sharing of Resources

All respondents were asked whether they had "considered" the idea of reciprocal sharing of resources between the school and the community. They were also asked to indicate their views, and feelings about community participation in schools by selecting one statement in each of two lists of statements in the questionnaire as the "best" description of their feelings and views.

Additionally, parents were asked:

Have you considered the idea of the local primary school sharing their resources with you (e.g. grounds, buildings, equipment, personnel etc)?

and,

Have you considered the idea of you sharing your resources with the local primary schools (e.g. your home as a meeting place, swimming pool, barbecue, etc)?

The responses showed that a much larger proportion of principals and teachers than parents had given consideration to the idea of reciprocal sharing of resources between the community and the school and that while 56.5 per cent of parents said that they had given consideration to the idea of the school sharing its resources with them personally, only 36.1 per cent had considered the reverse situation of sharing their personal resources with the school.
Nearly twice as many principals (60 per cent) and teachers (56 per cent) as parents (32.7 per cent) viewed community participation as "cooperation" between teachers, parents and the community to improve the learning process of the child. More parents than principals and teachers (15.6 per cent; 4 per cent and 9 per cent respectively), viewed community participation in terms of the first statement given, which was:

> the learning process should be left to the teachers and students and interaction between the local community and school is limited to public occasions (e.g. parent evenings, school fetes etc).

Similarly, more parents than principals and teachers, viewed community participation as involving continuing discussion between teachers and parents concerning educational aims and practices, and the provision of opportunities for parents to participate in decision making and further education.

While the majority of principals, teachers and parents felt that community participation in schools was a "good idea, and worthy of further consideration", the responses showed that a small proportion of principals, teachers, and parents (16 per cent, 13 per cent and 11.6 per cent respectively) were moderately opposed to it. Details of their responses are shown in Tables 7 - 14.
Table 7
Principals and Teachers Who Had Considered
The Idea of the Community Sharing Its
Resources With Their School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Principals and Teachers Who Had Considered
The Idea of Their School Sharing Its
Resources With The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Parents Who Had Considered The Idea Of
Primary Schools Sharing Their Resources
With The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Parents Who Had Considered The Idea Of Primary Schools Sharing Their Resources With Individual Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Parents Who Had Considered The Idea Of The Community Sharing Their Resources With The Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Parents Who Had Considered The Idea Of Sharing Their Personal Resources With The Local Primary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The learning process should be left to the teachers and students, and interaction between the local community and school is limited to public occasions (e.g. parent evenings, school fetes etc).

Teachers, parents and the community should cooperate to improve the learning process of the child (e.g. parent involvement in the classroom, visiting speakers etc).

There should be continuing discussion between teachers, parents and the community to reach agreement concerning educational aims and practices.

Teachers, parents and the community should be provided with opportunities for decision-making in the area of educational aims and practices, and should be given opportunities for furthering their own education (e.g. hobby and certificate/diploma courses etc).

No Response

### Table 13

**Principal, Teacher and Parent Views Concerning Community Participation In Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Principal, Teacher And Parent Feelings Regarding The Idea Of Community Participation

| I feel that community participation in local primary schools is a good idea and worthy of further consideration | Percentage Of Respondents |
|                                                                                                                   | Principals | Teachers | Parents |
| I am moderately opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools                           | 16.0       | 13.0     | 11.6    |
| I strongly favour the idea of community participation in local primary schools                                 | 28.0       | 20.0     | 28.6    |
| I am totally opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools                            | -          | -        | 2.7     |
| No Response                                                                                                     | -          | 6.0      | 5.4     |

Principals and teachers were asked to indicate which community resources, and parents, which school resources, they would be interested in using. Additionally, principals were asked to indicate which of their school's resources they would be prepared to share with the community, and teachers, which resources they considered their school should be prepared to share with the community. Parents were asked to indicate which resources they would personally be prepared to share with the schools.

The responses showed that principals and teachers had a high level of interest in using most community resources.
They also showed that while over 80 per cent of principals and teachers were interested in parents and other members of the community assisting with curriculum activities, less than half the principals and only a quarter of the teachers were interested in parents and other community members assisting in curriculum planning. Parents on the whole appeared to be diffident about using their school's resources, although 50 per cent indicated an interest in using the school grounds and 52 per cent the library. Nor were parents enthusiastic about sharing their own resources. The notable exception, however, was their willingness to share their personal skills. Principals and teachers showed a high level of interest in sharing most of their school's resources with the community. The responses are detailed in Tables 15 - 19.
Table 15
Community Resources That Principals And Teachers Are Interested In Using

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.0 32.0 2.0</td>
<td>19.0 53.0 28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.0 8.0 4.0</td>
<td>78.0 10.0 12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0 28.0 12.0</td>
<td>58.0 19.0 23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.0 20.0 8.0</td>
<td>53.0 22.0 25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.0 16.0 16.0</td>
<td>48.0 25.0 27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.0 12.0 16.0</td>
<td>38.0 34.0 28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.0 4.0 -</td>
<td>75.0 9.0 16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.0 4.0 -</td>
<td>95.0 3.0 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.0 - 4.0</td>
<td>87.0 2.0 11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.0 - 8.0</td>
<td>89.0 6.0 5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.0 - 8.0</td>
<td>86.0 8.0 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.0 44.0 12.0</td>
<td>25.0 56.0 19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.0 4.0 8.0</td>
<td>77.0 11.0 12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catering facilities
Theatrettes, halls, conference rooms, darkrooms, gymnasiums etc.
Office equipment (typewriters, photocopying)
Industrial machinery (e.g. kiln, saw, lathe, sewing machines etc.)
Musical instruments (organ, piano)
Vehicles (back hoe, tractor, bus, industrial mowers etc)
Ovals, basketball courts, tennis courts, swimming pools, etc.
Specialist personnel from industry, retail trades, churches, and post-secondary and tertiary colleges etc.
Venues for educational excursions
Donations of products or purchase at discount rates, including useable industrial waste products
Assistance of parents and other members of the community with curriculum activities outside the classroom (e.g. sports, excursions, outdoor lessons etc)
Assistance of parents and other members of the community with curriculum activities inside the classroom (e.g. reading, handwork, social studies etc)
Assistance of parents and other members of the community with curriculum planning
Audio-visual equipment and facilities
Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' special talents</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio visual equipment</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen facilities</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching aids</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (30)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30) The respondents wrote "sporting equipment"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Personal Resources Which They Are Prepared To Share With Local Primary Schools</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's own home</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden equipment (e.g. lawn mower, tools etc)</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping equipment</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbecue facilities</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic equipment</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby equipment (spinning wheel etc)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational equipment (e.g. canoe, table tennis table etc)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's own special skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(music, orienteering, sports coaching, cooking, needlecraft, gardening, drama, language, interpreting, trade skills, first aid etc)</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (31)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31) The respondent wrote "workshop".
### Table 18
School Resources That Principals Are Prepared To Share With The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounds (e.g. ovals, netball courts etc)</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources and teaching aids</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist personnel</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students assisting with social service activities</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19
School Resources That Teachers Consider The School Should Be Prepared To Share With The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounds</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources and teaching aids</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students assisting with social service activities</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School As Community Centre

The parents' questionnaire asked the respondents to rate their level of interest - "high", "medium" or "low", in each of six educational opportunities which could be provided for the community by the school. They were also invited to list and comment on any additional educational opportunities which could be provided.

Principals and teachers were each similarly asked to rate two separate sets of statements - one set designed to gauge their level of interest in their school providing educational activities for the community; the other set to show their interest in a variety of educational activities which might be provided by the school for school staff.

Principal and teacher responses showed a high level of interest in "education for leisure", in community courses and a low level of interest in "English for migrants". While parent responses indicated moderate interest in a wide range of activities, a fairly large proportion indicated a high level of interest in improving their knowledge of latest "teaching methods and trends", "the school curriculum", and "adult general education". Principal and teacher responses for staff courses indicated a high level of interest in professionally oriented programs. It is worth noting that 40 per cent of principals gave courses designed to inform teachers of the needs of
industry a low interest rating. The responses are detailed in Tables 20 - 22.

**Table 20**
Principal and Teacher Level Of Interest In Types Of Community Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Med Low N.R</td>
<td>High Med Low N.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities designed to improve worker efficiency &amp; safety e.g. first aid</td>
<td>36.0 32.0 16.0 16.0</td>
<td>54.0 33.0 5.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities designed to increase expertise (e.g. public speaking, meeting procedure, basic teaching, care &amp; use of audio-visual equipment)</td>
<td>48.0 36.0 8.0 8.0</td>
<td>33.0 50.0 8.0 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for leisure (e.g. hobby, recreational fitness)</td>
<td>68.0 28.0 - 4.0</td>
<td>52.0 36.0 6.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education to improve knowledge of the school curriculum</td>
<td>48.0 44.0 8.0 -</td>
<td>37.0 48.0 8.0 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for migrants</td>
<td>20.0 20.0 40.0 20.0</td>
<td>31.0 44.0 19.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities designed to improve adult general education</td>
<td>48.0 28.0 8.0 16.0</td>
<td>39.0 42.0 13.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21
Parent Level Of Interest In Types Of Community Courses

| Education to improve knowledge of latest teaching methods and trends | Percentage Of Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Med | Low | N.R |
| Education to improve knowledge of latest teaching methods and trends | 37.4 | 36.7 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Increase expertise (e.g. public speaking, meeting procedure, budget management, care and use of audio-visual equipment) | 27.2 | 38.1 | 19.0 | 15.6 |
| Education for leisure (hobby, recreational, fitness, first aid) | 29.9 | 45.6 | 9.5 | 15.0 |
| Education to improve knowledge of the school curriculum | 36.7 | 36.7 | 11.6 | 15.0 |
| English for migrants | 27.9 | 23.8 | 32.0 | 16.3 |
| Adult general education (adult numeracy and literacy) | 34.7 | 30.6 | 18.4 | 16.3 |
| Other | - | - | - | - |
### Table 22

**Principal And Teacher Level Of Interest In Types Of Staff Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Med Low N.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest teaching methods and trends</td>
<td>60.0 28.0 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses to upgrade teaching qualifications</td>
<td>48.0 36.0 8.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for leisure</td>
<td>44.0 32.0 12.0 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses designed to inform teachers of the needs of industry</td>
<td>16.0 36.0 40.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals and teachers were also asked to indicate whether they thought courses offered for the community by the school should be conducted partly or wholly during school hours or outside school hours.

The large "no response" would indicate a degree of uncertainty in this area. However, principal responses (68 per cent) showed a marked preference for times outside school hours, only 8 per cent indicating courses conducted during "normal working hours", as suitable. Teacher responses also showed preference for times outside school hours, only 17 per cent indicating "normal working hours" as suitable and a quarter "mainly during
school hours" as suitable. Table 23 details the responses.

Table 23
Principal And Teacher Opinions Concerning Suitable Times For Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During normal working hours</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school hours</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly during school hours</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly outside school hours</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Participation In Classroom Activities, Decision-Making And Subject Planning

Parents were asked to indicate whether they thought parents and other members of the community "should help with teaching activities" and "be involved in subject planning" and "decision-making concerning school policy". Additionally they were asked to indicate by rating as "high", "medium" or "low", areas listed in which they would be personally interested in participating, and to comment on any other areas of interest.

Their responses showed that while a high proportion of parents (77.6 per cent) thought that parents and other
community members "should help" with teaching activities "outside the classroom", a much smaller number (59.2 per cent) thought that they should help "inside the classroom". Nearly 60 per cent indicated that parents and other community members should be involved in decision-making concerning school policy and only 37.4 per cent that they should be involved in subject planning.

Less than 40 per cent of parents indicated interest in participating in teaching areas with an academic orientation, the larger proportion 63.3 per cent indicating interest in outdoor and recreational activities. Only 32 per cent said that they would be interested in decision-making concerning school policy, and an even smaller number (27.2 per cent) that they would be interested in "participating with teachers in determining the content of subjects". The responses are detailed in Tables 24 - 28.

Table 24
Parent Opinion Concerning Parent/Community Involvement Outside The Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25
Parent Opinion Concerning Parent/Community Involvement Inside The Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26
Parent Opinion Concerning Parent/Community Involvement In Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27
Parent Opinion Concerning Parent/Community Involvement In Subject Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Areas In Which Parents Would Be Personally Interested In Participating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as nature study, social studies, health, science etc</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as mathematics, reading, spelling, writing etc</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as art, craft, music, drama etc</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating with teachers in outdoor and recreational activities such as camping, excursions, sport etc</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating as a committee member, responsible for school policy making</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating with teachers in determining the content of subjects to be taught</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, as a means of rating their school's level of interest in providing opportunities for parent involvement, parents were asked to consider a list of four statements, (each giving an example of an opportunity that may be provided by the school) and to state whether they judged their school's interest in each to be "high", "medium" or "low".
The responses showed that from the parents' viewpoint, Ballarat schools did not rate highly in providing opportunities for parent involvement. Less than 26 per cent of parents gave a "high" rating in each of the areas listed with 54.4 per cent rating their school's level of interest in providing opportunities for adult further education as "low". Table 29 details their responses.

Table 29
Parent Responses Indicating School Level Of Interest In Providing Opportunities For Parent Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for parent participation in determining content of subjects to be taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for parent participation in decision making concerning school policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for parents to participate in classroom activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for parents to participate in programs designed to further their own education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages And Disadvantages Of Community Participation In Schools

All respondents were asked to indicate which statement in each of two lists of statements, one indicating the
advantages of community participation in schools and the other, the disadvantages, best described their views concerning the advantages and disadvantages of community participation.

While the responses concerning the advantages were fairly evenly distributed a significant proportion of teachers and parents (39 per cent and 38.8 per cent respectively) thought that "better communication between school and community may improve understanding of problems in education and help in solving them".

It is significant that half the principals and teachers and 42.9 per cent of parents viewed community participation in decision making regarding educational aims and practices as a "possible cause of conflict between teachers and the community". It is also worth noting that whereas 16 per cent of principals and 22 per cent of teachers viewed community participation in curriculum activities and curriculum planning as a disadvantage in terms of being disruptive of school programs and eroding the quality of education, only 12.9 per cent of parents took this to be the case. The responses are detailed in Tables 30 and 31.
### Table 30
Advantages Of Community Participation In Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal sharing of resources (man power, equipment etc) may be more economical</td>
<td>Principals Teachers Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0 11.0 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication between school and community may improve understanding of problems in education and help in solving them</td>
<td>28.0 39.0 38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school by working with other educational agencies (e.g. home, community, churches) will provide a more community centred learning experience</td>
<td>12.0 18.0 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the barriers to social progress will be removed and a sense of unity developed when school and community cooperate</td>
<td>28.0 25.0 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12.0 7.0 19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31
Disadvantages Of Community Participation In Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new opportunities for adult education will be costly and burdensome</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in decision-making in respect of educational aims and practices may cause conflict between teachers and community</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in curriculum activities and planning will be disruptive of school programs and erode the quality of education</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased community power in school affairs may make the school more conservative</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication Between The School and the Community

Principals and teachers were asked to indicate whether they would like to see better communication between their school and other organizations in the community, and parents were asked whether they felt there was a need for better communication between individual parents and their school. Respondents were also asked to indicate the method of communication they "most" favoured.
Additionally, teachers and parents were asked to indicate whether they would like to attend a discussion to consider the results of the survey. (32)

The responses showed that over 90 per cent of both principals and teachers said they would like to see improved communication between their school and other organizations within the Ballarat community. Whereas 43.5 per cent of parents felt there was a need for more communication between themselves and their school, 44.9 per cent felt that there was not such a need. The responses showed 36 per cent of principals and 33 per cent of teachers favoured the "newsletter" as a means of improving communication between the school and other organizations in the community, only 6.8 per cent of parents favoured the newsletter as a means of increasing communication between themselves and their school.

Only 7.5 per cent of parents favoured "open days". More than a third of the principals and 26 per cent of teachers favoured "open days" as a means of improving communication between their school and the community. Teacher/parent interviews, although by far the most popular parent choice, only represented a quarter of all parent responses.

(32) This question was omitted in error in the questionnaire to principals.
Teacher and parent responses indicated that 52 per cent of teachers and just over 45 per cent of parents were not interested in attending a discussion to examine the results of the survey. The responses are detailed in Tables 32 - 34.

Table 32

Responses By Principals And Teachers Advocating "Better" Communication Between Their School And Other Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Responses By Parents Advocating "Better" Communication Between Individual Parents And Their School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 34
Method Of Communication Favoured By Principals and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Communication</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter(s)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access of representatives to official meetings</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open days</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (33)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 35
Method Of Communication Favoured By Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Communication</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter(s)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to official meetings</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open days</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/teacher interviews</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (34)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(33) Regular meetings with management from industry; conferences; regular visits of representatives from other organizations to the school, school excursions.

(34) Parents assisting in classrooms.
Table 36
Teacher And Parent Interest In Discussing The Results Of The Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from this survey would suggest that principals, teachers and parents of Ballarat primary schools, see community participation as a "good idea" but a significant proportion in each group see a danger of conflict developing between teachers and the community where community participation involves making decisions about school policy. (35)

The results also indicate that Ballarat principals and teachers see a need for improved communication between their school and other organizations and are willing to reciprocally share school resources with the community. They are also willing to have parents and other community members assist with curriculum activities but are reluctant to accept their help in curriculum planning. (36)

The results further suggest that parents view community participation as implying involvement in decision-making and the provision of adult further-education, and feel that their school does not provide real opportunities for such involvement. It would also appear that parents prefer involvement in activities of a non-academic type and are willing to share their personal skills. However, while parents said that the community should be involved in decision-making concerning school policy, they are reluctant to be personally involved. Only a small number of parents see a need for better communication with their school, and on the whole do not favour teacher/parent interviews as a means of improving communication. (37)

Conclusion

That community involvement in schools may produce conflict between school and community, is not necessarily a bad thing. The literature shows that apologists for community education have been too much concerned with consensus within communities and have undervalued the role of conflict. Creatively dissident individuals may serve to highlight certain structural problems relating to the organization of a given community, and in this sense may be more effective catalysts of change than communities where the democratic consensus is overwhelming but more conservative.

However, there are other objections that need to be considered. Greater community participation may erode standards in education and foster conservatism. Given the invitation to participate, there is the possibility of small pressure groups taking the opportunity to seize power in order to satisfy their vested interests. Given that participatory democracy tends to favour educated and higher income groups, the possibility of creating inequalities in society may also be enhanced.

There are several questions which also need to be considered. Community participation in schools implies the devolution of some power and control to the community. How much control should the community be given? Over finances? Over people? Over curriculum? Or just over the use of facilities. If schools are to be accountable to parents, how will this be done? To whom will they be accountable and for what? What is the place of students in this process - are they community members - what are their rights in relation to those of parents? If schools are to account to the community, will it be only for money expended? Or will schools have to communicate and justify programs? Or outcomes? This may lead to demands for outcomes - for basic skills plus a whole host of other outcomes that it may not be realistic to ask schools to do well? (Vacchini: 1977:128.)
Community participation in schools has advantages as well. As B F Henry writes:

Parents benefit in many ways from genuine partnership with teachers. They gain advanced and recent knowledge about children and education and they also have the opportunity to share experiences and ideas with teachers and other parents. Through this opportunity to establish himself in the eyes of parents as an important contributor to the child's welfare, the teacher may gain additional personal satisfaction, recognition, appreciation and status in the community. The work of both parent and teacher is reinforced and supplemented when there is cooperation of home and school with parents directly involved in education. The openness of a school to parents and the community is a means both of extending its educational influence and of reinforcing pupil motivation. (Henry: 1976:84)

However, a major problem confronting proponents of community participation, is that many parents and members of the community do not wish to participate in the school. J. Lynch and J. Pimlott for example write:

Our research ... indicates that the majority of parents have little desire to interfere with the way schools are at present organized and controlled. There is scant evidence in our research to indicate that "parent power" in the management and government of schools is desired by more than a tiny minority of parents. (Lynch & Pimlott: 1976:73)
R. Fitzgerald in a recent study has also concluded that despite formal and informal attempts (including legislative) to involve parents in the schools, the majority prefer not to participate. 

Irrespective of legislative attempts to increase participation, recent research and our own evidence suggest that there is little desire by the vast bulk of parents to become involved. (Fitzgerald: 1976:111)

Why don't parents want to participate in schools? Is it because they are too busy, lazy or not interested in what is happening in the schools? Is it because they feel insecure and prefer to "leave it to the experts". Are they afraid that their interference may result in reprisals against their child? Or is it that they have developed a cynicism about the motives of governments and about the possibility of any desirable outcomes? (Vacchini: 1976:129.)

P. Grills' observation that in the past Australians have shown

a marked preference for removing decision-making powers from people affected by these decisions by placing them in the hands of experts. (Grills: 1975:14)

and the Australian Schools Commission's own acknowledgement that
... after one hundred years of isolation of the school from its community, a closer relationship may lead to some tension among teachers, parents and students. (Schools Commission: 1975:160)

may partly explain the hesitation of people to participate in the schools. I. Vacchini writes:

The possibility of greater community involvement in the processes of education decision-making at all levels seems quite remote in the present situation in Australia. There are token moves but the reality is not so reassuring. For the community to have an effective voice there will need to be a major change in the thinking of administrators, principals and teachers on the one hand, and parents and other community members on the other. (Vacchini: 1977:127)

It is my contention that a certain amount of prior education in participation is necessary if people are to be expected to avail themselves of such opportunities for participation as exist.

Earlier I indicated the need for establishing the "necessary conditions" for participation. What these conditions are, need to be a matter for extensive research in the future. Recently, Fitzgerald has given some important recommendations:
We believe that approaches which enable schools to become responsive and effective agencies for teaching and learning should not be dependent on formal representation of parents on school councils ... Parents need continuing advice and support if they are to make informed decisions about the education of their children ... We recommend that the Schools Commission, in association with State and Federal education departments; investigate the relationships between the school and the home in different cultural settings for the purpose of clarifying, describing and widely publicising the various strategies which bring about effective interaction. These strategies must, we believe, recognize the right of all parents to make decisions about the educational well-being of their children, to develop legitimate values in a free pluralist society, and to have some liberty of choice about the nature of schooling their children receive. (Fitzgerald: 1976:111)

I believe that it is upon the development of such strategies that proponents of community participation should concentrate.

Community education proponents in the past have been too much concerned with running programs and have not given sufficient consideration to questions concerning whether the programs would in fact produce the outcomes desired. The problem has been, as S. Sarason writes:

that those responsible for introducing change into the school have had no clear conception of the
complexity of the process - no organized set of principles that explicitly takes account of the complexity of the setting in its social psychological and sociological aspects; its usual ways of functioning and changing; and its verbalized and unverbalized traditions and values. (Sarason: 1971:9)

What advocates of community education need, in their efforts to increase participation in schools, are "formulated and testable theories of how the school works, the conditions wherein it changes, and the processes whereby the changes occur", that is to say, they need to provide a theory of the change process itself. (Ibid:9). It is my contention, that until they do, they will continue to cooperate in self-defeating efforts.
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APPENDIX 1

SURVEY: Community Participation in Primary Schools in the Ballarat Area

Questionnaire to Principals of Primary Schools in the Ballarat area.

Please note: Your name and the name of your school is not required. Please tick the appropriate box and comment where required.

1. Is your school involved in any way with the Ballarat Community?

   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2

2. Which ONE of the following statements best describes the nature of your school's involvement with the Ballarat Community?

   - Allowing use of buildings or grounds outside school hours [ ] 1
   - Organizing programs after school hours [ ] 2
   - Parent involvement in curriculum activities (e.g. assistance with reading) [ ] 3
   - Community involvement in curriculum planning [ ] 4
   - Other ____________________________

3. Have you considered the idea of the local Community sharing its resources with your school?

   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2

4. Have you considered the idea of sharing your school's resources with the local Community?

   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2
5. Which ONE of the following statements best describes your views about community participation in schools?

   The learning process should be left to the teachers and students and interaction between the local community and school is limited to public occasions (e.g. parent evenings, school fetes etc) [ ]

   Teachers, parents and the community should cooperate to improve the learning process of the child (e.g. parent involvement in the classroom, visiting speakers, etc) [ ]

   There should be continuing discussion between teachers, parents and the community to reach agreement concerning educational aims and practices [ ]

   Teachers, parents and the community should be provided with opportunities for further education and decision making in respect of educational aims and practices [ ]

Assuming that COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION in Primary Schools is viewed as:

   The provision of opportunities for teachers, parents and the community to participate in further education, (e.g. diploma or hobby courses) and decision making in respect of educational aims and practices

   and/or

   Reciprocal sharing of resources between the school and community (e.g. buildings, grounds, equipment, personnel)

6. Which of the following statements most accurately describes your feelings regarding the above idea of community participation?

   I feel that community participation in local primary schools is a useful idea and worthy of further consideration [ ]

   I am moderately opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools [ ]

   I strongly favour the idea of community participation in local primary schools [ ]

   I am totally opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools [ ]
Assuming that the following resources of the community (churches, industry, other educational institutions etc) were made available for use by your school, which of these resources would you be interested in using?

7. I would be interested in using catering facilities
   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2

8. I would be interested in using theatrettes, halls, conference rooms, darkrooms, gymnasiums, churches etc.
   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2

9. I would be interested in using office equipment (typewriters, photo-copying, duplicating machines, etc)
   YES [ ] 1
   NO [ ] 2

10. I would be interested in using industrial machinery and equipment (kiln, saw, lathe, sewing machines, etc)
    YES [ ] 1
    NO [ ] 2

11. I would be interested in using musical instruments (organ, piano, etc)
    YES [ ] 1
    NO [ ] 2

12. I would be interested in using vehicles (backhoe, tractor, bus, industrial mowers, etc)
    YES [ ] 1
    NO [ ] 2

13. I would be interested in using ovals, basketball courts, tennis courts, swimming pools, etc.
    YES [ ] 1
    NO [ ] 2

14. I would be interested in having the assistance of specialist personnel from industry, retail traders, churches and secondary or tertiary colleges etc.
    YES [ ] 1
    NO [ ] 2
15. I would be interested in groups of our children visiting a wide variety of establishments for educational excursions

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

16. I would be interested in receiving or purchasing products at discount rates (including useable industrial waste products)

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

17. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum activities outside the classroom (e.g. sports, excursions, outdoor lessons etc)

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

18. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum activities inside the classroom (e.g. reading, handwork, social studies etc)

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

19. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum planning

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

20. I would be interested in using audio-visual equipment and facilities available in the community

YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

21. Other

______________________________
If you generally approve of the idea of community participation in local primary schools, GIVEN THAT THE SHARING OF YOUR RESOURCES DID NOT INTERFERE WITH YOUR NORMAL PROGRAM AND THAT ALL CONDITIONS THAT YOU MIGHT SPECIFY WERE MET, which of the following resources of your school, if available, would you be prepared to share?

22. I would be willing to allow the use of the school grounds (e.g. ovals, netball courts, etc) YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

23. I would be willing to allow the use of school buildings (e.g. for conferences, educational courses, social gatherings, accommodation etc) YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

24. I would be willing to allow the use of the library resources and teaching aids YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

25. I would be willing to allow the use of my school's audio-visual equipment YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

26. I would be willing to allow the use of my school's specialist personnel YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

27. I would be willing to allow the students to assist in social service activities in the community YES [ ] 1
NO [ ] 2

28. Other ________________________________
Assuming that you supported the idea of your school conducting a variety of educational activities for members of the community and that your school had the resources to do so, how would you describe your level of interest in each of the following items?

29. Educational opportunities designed to improve worker efficiency and safety (e.g. first aid)

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

30. Educational opportunities designed to increase expertise (e.g. public speaking, meeting procedure, basic teaching, care and use of audio-visual equipment)

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

31. Education for leisure (e.g. hobby, recreational, fitness)

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

32. Education to improve knowledge of school curriculum

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

33. English for migrants...

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

34. Educational opportunities designed to improve adult general education (e.g. adult numeracy and literacy)

   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

35. Other ____________________________
If you supported the idea of conducting all or any of the above courses, which of the following times would you consider to be suitable?

36. During normal school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

37. Outside school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

38. Mainly during school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

39. Mainly outside school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

Assuming that a variety of educational activities were made available to all personnel at your school, on your premises or elsewhere and that you supported the idea provided that All Conditions Specified By Your School Were Met: How would you describe your level of interest on each of the following items?

40. Latest teaching methods and trends
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

41. Courses to up-grade teaching qualifications
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

42. Education for leisure
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

43. Courses designed to inform teachers of the needs of industry
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

44. Others
   ____________________________
45. Would you like to see better communication between your school and other organizations within the Ballarat Community? 

YES [□] 1
NO [□] 2

46. If your answer is yes to the last question which one of the following methods of communication would you MOST favour?

Newsletter(s) [□] 1
Access for representatives to official meetings [□] 2
Open days [□] 3
Social activities [□] 4
Other

Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the ADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

47. Reciprocal sharing of resources (manpower, equipment etc) may be more economical [□] 1

Better communication between school and community may improve understanding of problems in education and help in solving them [□] 2

The school by working with other educational agencies (e.g. home, community, churches) will provide a more community centred learning experience [□] 3

Many of the barriers to social progress will be removed and a sense of unity developed when school and community cooperate [□] 4
Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the DISADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

48. Creating new opportunities for adult education will be costly and burdensome

Community participation in decision making in respect of educational aims and practices may cause conflict between teachers and community

Community participation in curriculum activities and planning will be disruptive of school programs and erode the quality of education

Increased community power in school affairs may make the school more conservative

We would be grateful if you would also complete the following information to assist us with the survey.

49. TYPE OF SCHOOL

State Primary
Independent Primary
Other

50. TOTAL ENROLMENT

less than 20
20 - 50
51 - 100
101 - 200
201 - 300
301 - 500
501 - 700
701 +

51. SEX

Male
Female
APPENDIX 2

SURVEY: Community Participation in Primary Schools in the Ballarat Area

Questionnaire to Primary School Teachers in the Ballarat Area.

Please note: Your name and the name of your school is not required. Please tick the appropriate box and comment where required.

1. Is your school involved in any way with the Ballarat Community?
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

2. Which ONE of the following statements best describes the nature of your school's involvement with the Ballarat Community?
   - Allowing use of buildings or grounds outside school hours [ ]
   - Organizing programs after school hours [ ]
   - Parent involvement in curriculum activities (e.g. assistance with reading) [ ]
   - Community involvement in curriculum planning [ ]
   - Other ____________________________

3. Have you considered the idea of the local Community sharing its resources with your school?
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

4. Have you considered the idea of your school sharing its resources with the local Community?
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]
5. Which ONE of the following statements best describes your views about community participation in schools?

   The learning process should be left to the teachers and students, and interaction between the local community and school is limited to public occasions (e.g. parent evenings, school fetes etc) [□]

   Teachers, parents and the community should cooperate to improve the learning process of the child (e.g. parent involvement in the classroom, visiting speakers, etc) [□]

   There should be continuing discussion between teachers, parents and the community to reach agreement concerning educational aims and practices [□]

   Teachers, parents and the community should be provided with opportunities for further education and decision making in respect of educational aims and practices [□]

Assuming that COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION in Primary Schools is viewed as:

   The provision of opportunities for teachers, parents and the community to participate in further education, (e.g. diploma or hobby courses) and decision making in respect of educational aims and practices

   and/or

   Reciprocal sharing of resources between the school and community (e.g. buildings, grounds, equipment, personnel)

6. Which of the following statements most accurately describes your feelings regarding the above idea of community participation?

   I feel that community participation in local primary schools is a useful idea and worthy of further consideration [□]

   I am moderately opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools [□]

   I strongly favour the idea of community participation in local primary schools [□]

   I am totally opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools [□]
Assuming that the following resources of the community (churches, industry, other educational institutions etc) were made available for use by your school which of these resources would you be interested in using?

7. I would be interested in using catering facilities
   YES [□] 1
   NO [□] 2

8. I would be interested in using theatrettes, halls, conference rooms, darkrooms, gymnasia etc
   YES [□] 1
   NO [□] 2

9. I would be interested in using office equipment (typewriters, photo-copying, duplicating machines, etc)
   YES [□] 1
   NO [□] 2

10. I would be interested in using industrial machinery and equipment (kiln, saw, lathe, sewing machines etc)
    YES [□] 1
    NO [□] 2

11. I would be interested in using musical instruments (organ, piano, etc)
    YES [□] 1
    NO [□] 2

12. I would be interested in using vehicles (back-hoe, tractor, bus, industrial mowers etc)
    YES [□] 1
    NO [□] 2

13. I would be interested in using ovals, basketball courts, tennis courts, swimming pools etc
    YES [□] 1
    NO [□] 2

14. I would be interested in having the assistance of specialist personnel from industry, retail traders, churches and secondary or tertiary colleges etc
    YES [□] 1
    NO [□] 2
15. I would be interested in groups of our children visiting a wide variety of establishments for educational excursions

16. I would be interested in receiving or purchasing products at discount rates (including useable industrial waste products)

17. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum activities outside the classroom (e.g. sports, excursions, outdoor lessons etc)

18. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum activities inside the classroom (e.g. reading, handwork, social studies etc)

19. I would be interested in parents and other members of the community helping with curriculum planning

20. I would be interested in using audio-visual equipment and facilities available in the community

21. I would be interested in attending workshops/seminars etc intended for secondary teachers

22. I would be interested in attending workshops/seminars intended for pre-school teachers

23. Other ________________________________________________
If you generally approve of the idea of Community participation in local primary schools, GIVEN THAT THE SHARING OF YOUR RESOURCES DID NOT INTERFERE WITH YOUR NORMAL PROGRAM, AND THAT ALL CONDITIONS THAT YOUR SCHOOL SPECIFIED WERE MET, which of the following resources, if available, would you consider your school should be prepared to share?

I think the school should be willing to allow the use of the:

24. School grounds (e.g. ovals, netball courts etc)  
   YES [□] 1 
   NO [□] 2

25. School buildings (e.g. for conferences, educational courses, social gatherings, accommodation etc)  
   YES [□] 1 
   NO [□] 2

26. Library resources and teaching aids  
   YES [□] 1 
   NO [□] 2

27. School's audio-visual equipment  
   YES [□] 1 
   NO [□] 2

28. I think the school should be willing to allow students to assist in social service activities in the community  
   YES [□] 1 
   NO [□] 2

29. Other ________________________________
Assuming that you supported the idea of your school conducting a variety of educational activities for members of the community and that your school had the resources to do so, how would you describe your level of interest in each of the following items?

30. Educational opportunities designed to improve efficiency and safety (e.g. first aid)
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

31. Educational opportunities designed to increase expertise (e.g. public speaking, meeting procedure, basic teaching, care and use of audio-visual equipment)
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

32. Education for leisure (e.g. hobby, recreational, fitness)
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

33. Education to improve knowledge of school curriculum
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

34. English for migrants
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

35. Educational opportunities designed to improve adult general education (e.g. adult numeracy and literacy)
   - HIGH [ ]
   - MEDIUM [ ]
   - LOW [ ]

36. Other ____________________________
If you supported the idea of conducting all or any of the above courses, which of the following times would you consider to be suitable?

37. During normal school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

38. Outside school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

39. Mainly during school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

40. Mainly outside school hours
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

Assuming that a variety of educational activities were made available to all personnel at your school, on the school premises or elsewhere, and that you supported the idea, provided that All Conditions Specified By Your School Were Met: How would you describe your level of interest on each of the following items?

41. Latest teaching methods and trends
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

42. Courses to up-grade teaching qualifications
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

43. Education for leisure
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

44. Courses designed to inform teachers of the needs of industry
   HIGH [ ]
   MEDIUM [ ]
   LOW [ ]

45. Others ________________________________
46. Would you like to see better communication between your school and other organizations within the Ballarat Community?

YES [1]
NO [2]

47. If your answer is yes to Item 46, which ONE of the following methods of communication would you MOST favour?

- Newsletter(s) [ ]
- Access for representatives to official meetings [ ]
- Open days [ ]
- Social activities [ ]
- Other [ ]

48. Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the ADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

- Reciprocal sharing of resources (manpower, equipment etc) may be more economical [ ]
- Better communication between school and community may improve understanding of problems in education and help in solving them [ ]
- The school, by working with other educational agencies (e.g. home, community, churches) will provide a more community centered learning experience [ ]
- Many of the barriers to social progress will be removed and a sense of unity developed when school and community cooperate [ ]
49. Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the DISADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

Creating new opportunities for adult education will be costly and burdensome [□][1]

Community participation in decision making in respect of educational aims and practices may cause conflict between teachers and community [□][2]

Community participation in curriculum activities and planning will be disruptive of school programs and erode the quality of education [□][3]

Increased community power in school affairs may make the school more conservative [□][4]

50. Would you be interested in attending a discussion concerning the findings of this survey?

YES [□][1]

NO [□][2]

51. TYPE OF SCHOOL

State Primary [□][1]

Independent Primary [□][2]

Other [□][3]

52. TOTAL ENROLMENT

less than 20 [□][1]

20 - 50 [□][2]

51 - 100 [□][3]

101 - 200 [□][4]

201 - 300 [□][5]

301 - 500 [□][6]

501 - 700 [□][7]

701 + [□][8]

53. SEX OF TEACHER

Male [□][1]

Female [□][2]
APPENDIX 3

SURVEY: Community Participation in Primary Schools
in the Ballarat Area

Questionnaire to Parents of Primary School Children
in the Ballarat Area

Please Note: Your name and the name of your school is
not required. Please tick the appropriate
box and comment where required.

1. As a parent of a primary school child
are you involved in any way with the
primary school where your child/
children attend?
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

2. Are you involved in any way with any
other primary school in Ballarat?
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

Which of the following statements describe the nature
of your involvement?

3. I am involved in the parents
association/club/committee
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

4. I am involved in a school committee
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

5. I am involved in fund raising
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

6. I am involved in supervision of
excursions and/or sporting activities
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

7. I am involved in classroom activities
(e.g. teaching, reading, etc)
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

8. I am involved in grounds and
building maintenance
   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]
9. I am involved in the canteen/tuck shop

10. I am involved in curriculum planning

11. I am involved in school policy making

12. Other (give details)

13. Have you considered the idea of primary schools sharing their resources with the local neighbourhood/community (e.g. buildings, grounds, personnel, equipment)?

14. Have you considered the idea of the local primary schools sharing their resources with you (e.g. grounds, buildings, equipment, personnel etc)?

15. Have you considered the idea of the community sharing its resources with primary schools (e.g. halls, recreational facilities etc)?

16. Have you considered the idea of YOU sharing your resources with the local primary schools (e.g. your home as a meeting place, swimming pool, barbecue area etc)?
17. Which ONE of the following statements BEST describes your views about community participation in schools?

The learning process should be left to the teachers and students and interaction between the local community and school is limited to public occasions (e.g. parent evenings, school fetes, etc) [ ]

Teachers, parents and the community should cooperate to improve the learning process of the child (e.g. parent involvement in the classroom, visiting speakers etc) [ ]

There should be continuing discussion between teachers, parents and the community to reach agreement concerning educational aims and practices [ ]

Teachers, parents and the community should be provided with opportunities for decision making in the area of educational aims and practices, and should be given opportunities for furthering their own education (e.g. hobby and certificate/diploma courses etc) [ ]
Assuming that community participation in primary schools is viewed as:

The provision of opportunities for parents, teachers and the community to participate in further education (e.g. hobby or certificate/diploma courses) and in joint decision making in the area of educational aims and practices

and/or

Reciprocal sharing of resources between the school and community (e.g. buildings, grounds, equipment, personnel):

18. Which ONE of the following statements MOST ACCURATELY describes your feelings regarding the above idea of community participation?

I feel that community participation in local primary schools is a useful idea and worthy of further consideration  

I am moderately opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools  

I strongly favour the idea of community participation in local primary schools  

I am totally opposed to the idea of community participation in local primary schools
Assuming that the following RESOURCES of LOCAL PRIMARY
SCHOOLS were made available to you, which of the
following resources would you be interested in using?

19. I would be interested in using the
    school buildings (e.g. for meetings,
    family gatherings etc)  

20. I would be interested in using the
    school grounds (e.g. for recreational
    purposes)  

21. I would be interested in using the
    library  

22. I would be interested in using
    teachers' special talents (e.g. tutoring,
    consultancy)  

23. I would be interested in using
    the school's audio-visual equip­
    ment (e.g. projectors, screens,
    overhead projector, darkroom etc)  

24. I would be interested in using the
    school canteen facilities  

25. I would be interested in using
    school office equipment (e.g. photo
    copier, duplicator etc)  

26. I would be interested in using
    teaching aids  

27. Other ____________________________
If you generally approve of the idea of community participation in local primary schools, and given that conditions that you might specify were met, which of the following resources, if available, would YOU be prepared to share with local primary schools?

I would be prepared to allow the use of:

28. My home (e.g. for meetings) YES [ ] NO [ ]

29. My garden equipment (e.g. lawn mower, garden tools etc) YES [ ] NO [ ]

30. My camping equipment YES [ ] NO [ ]

31. My trailer YES [ ] NO [ ]

32. My barbecue facilities YES [ ] NO [ ]

33. My swimming pool YES [ ] NO [ ]

34. My photographic equipment YES [ ] NO [ ]

35. My hobby equipment (e.g. spinning wheel etc) YES [ ] NO [ ]

36. My musical instruments YES [ ] NO [ ]

37. My recreational equipment (e.g. canoe, table tennis table etc) YES [ ] NO [ ]

38. My vehicles YES [ ] NO [ ]

39. I would be prepared to share my special skills (e.g. musical, orienteering, sports coaching, cooking, needlecraft, gardening, drama, language interpreting, trade skills, first aid etc) YES [ ] NO [ ]

40. Other ________________________________
41. Do you think that parents and other members of the community should help with teaching activities OUTSIDE the classroom? (e.g. sports, excursions)  

YES [ ] 1  
NO [ ] 2

42. Do you think that parents and other members of the community should help with teaching activities INSIDE the classroom? (e.g. reading, craft, social studies etc)  

YES [ ] 1  
NO [ ] 2

43. Do you think parents and other members of the community should be involved in decision making concerning school policy?  

YES [ ] 1  
NO [ ] 2

44. Do you think parents and other members of the community should be involved in subject planning?  

YES [ ] 1  
NO [ ] 2
In which of the following areas would YOU personally be interested in participating?

I would be interested in:

45. Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as nature study, social studies, health, science etc

46. Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as mathematics, reading, spelling, writing etc

47. Participating with teachers in classroom activities such as art, craft, music, drama etc

48. Participating with teachers in outdoor and recreational activities (e.g. camping, excursions, sport etc)

49. Participating as a committee member, responsible for school policy making

50. Participating with teachers in determining the content of subjects to be taught
Assuming that a variety of educational activities were made available by local primary schools to parents and other members of the community, how would you describe Your Level Of Interest on each of the following items?

51. Educational opportunities to improve knowledge of latest teaching methods and trends

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

52. Educational opportunities designed to increase expertise (e.g. public speaking, meeting procedure, budget management, care and use of audio-visual equipment)

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

53. Education for leisure (e.g. hobby, recreational, fitness and first aid)

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

54. Education to improve knowledge of school curriculum (e.g. Maths, English)

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

55. English for migrants

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

56. Educational opportunities designed to improve adult general education (e.g. adult numeracy and literacy)

- HIGH [ ]
- MEDIUM [ ]
- LOW [ ]

57. Other (comments) __________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________
How would you describe your school's level of interest in each of the following items?

58. Providing opportunities for parents to participate in determining the content of subjects to be taught

59. Providing opportunities for parents to participate in decision making concerning school policy

60. Providing opportunities for parents to participate in classroom activities

61. Providing opportunities for parents to participate in programs designed to further their own education (e.g., public speaking, meeting procedure, care and use of audio-visual equipment, budget management, first aid, knowledge of the school curriculum, adult numeracy and literacy)
Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the ADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

62. Reciprocal sharing of resources (manpower, equipment etc) may be more economical

Better communication between school and community may improve understanding of problems in education and help in solving them

The school, by working with other educational agencies (e.g. home, community, churches) will provide a more community centered learning experience

Many of the barriers to social progress will be removed and a sense of unity developed when school and community cooperate

Which ONE of the following statements in your view BEST describes the DISADVANTAGES of community participation in schools?

63. Creating new opportunities for adult education will be costly and burdensome

Community participation in decision making in respect of educational aims and practices may cause conflict between teachers and community

Community participation in curriculum activities and planning will be disruptive of school programs and erode the quality of education

Increased community power in school affairs may make the school more conservative
64. Do you feel there is a need for better communication between yourself as a parent and your local primary school?  
YES [1]  
NO [2]  

If you answered YES to ITEM 64, which ONE of the following methods of communication would you most favour?

65. Newsletter(s) [1]  
Access to official meetings [2]  
Open Day(s) [3]  
Social activities [4]  
Parent/teacher interviews [5]  
Other  

66. Would you be interested in attending a discussion concerning the findings of this survey?  
YES [1]  
NO [2]
### APPENDIX 4

Teachers Interested In Attending Workshops/Seminars Intended For Secondary and Pre-School Teachers

(Questions 21 and 22 in Questionnaire to teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/seminars for secondary teachers</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/seminars for pre-school teachers</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Biographical Data

(Questionnaire to principals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Primary</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Primary</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage Of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 6

### Biographical Data

(Questionnaire to teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State primary</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent primary</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-700</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701+</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>