

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN  
COMMUNITY EDUCATION:  
A THEORETICAL STUDY**

by

**SHARILYN CALLIOU**  
(Michel Band, Alberta)

B.Ed., The University of Calgary, 1979  
Dip.Ed., Foundations (Philosophy), The University of Alberta, 1991

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF**

**THE REQUIREMENTS**

**FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS**

in

**THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

(Department of Social and Educational Studies)

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

July 1992

© Sharilyn Calliou, 1992

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

(Signature)

Department of *Social and Educational Studies*

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, Canada

Date *December 21, 1992*

## **ABSTRACT**

This study was primarily designed to develop principles and evaluation criteria of curriculum in community education. Before these could be developed, it was necessary to reassess commonly well-known and accepted works of community education theorists in order to deduce generic features and, thusly, identify the means and ends envisioned by community educators. Community education can be defined as a hypothesis which attempts to explain a relationship where participants interact in certain ways and use particular methods in a location over time to achieve self-determined transformative change and social justice. Therefore, curriculum development in community education ought to mirror facets of this definition. In this study, curricular experiences would be designed to have these features: (1) community-based study which has an extra-community awareness; (2) lifelong teaching and learning; (3) proactive problem-solving; (4) educational activism; (5) participatory democracy; (6) intergenerational grouping; and, (7) egalitarianism.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT .....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ix
PREFACE .....	x
DEDICATION .....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
The Need for Additional Development of Curriculum Theory in Community Education .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	2
Previous Curriculum Development in Community Education .....	3
Elsie Ripley Clapp .....	3
Edward G. Olsen .....	5
Irwin and Russell .....	8
Minzey and LeTarte .....	9
Olsen and Clark .....	10
Relevant Articles .....	11
Summary .....	14
The Objectives and Organization of This Theoretical Study .....	14
Rationale for This Study .....	15
To Add to the Theoretical Discussion .....	15
To Provide Reflective Discussion Materials for Practitioners ..	16
To Provide a Conceptualization of Authentic Practice .....	17
To Produce Criteria for Evaluation .....	17
Research Questions .....	18
The Decision to Make a Theoretical Study .....	19
The Type of Theoretical Curriculum Study .....	19
Limitations of This Study .....	20
Definition of Terms .....	20
Summary .....	22

CHAPTER 2: DESIGN METHODOLOGY .....	23
The Need to Formulate Additional Theories of Curriculum in	
Community Education .....	23
Statement of the Problem .....	23
Procedures .....	24
Formulation of the Inductive Argument to Hypothesis Framed for	
Community Education and Curriculum in Community	
Education .....	25
The Inductive Argument to Hypothesis .....	26
Data Collection .....	27
Sources of the Propositions .....	28
Identification of the Generic Features and Propositions	
From the Literature Review .....	30
"Strength" or "Weakness" of the Propositions .....	32
Strongly Supported Propositions .....	32
Weakly Supported Propositions .....	32
Formulation of a Parallel Inductive Argument to Hypothesis for	
Curriculum in Community Education .....	33
Formulation of Principles and Evaluation Criteria .....	35
Consideration of an Appropriate Definition .....	36
Summary .....	37
CHAPTER 3: REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF SELECTED WRITINGS .....	38
Introduction .....	38
The Overall Argument of Community Education .....	39
Part I: Discussion of the Conclusion .....	40
The Deduction of the Conclusion .....	40
Social Justice .....	42
Transformative Change .....	45
Self-determined Change .....	48
Summary of Part I .....	51
Part II: Discussion of the Seven Premises .....	51
Discussion of Premise #1: Location .....	51
Considerations Related to this Premise .....	52
The Seeming Ambiguity of the Concept of	
Community .....	52
Defining the Boundaries .....	54
The Difficulty of Establishing Unified Community	
Action .....	54
Community Involvement and Extra-community	
Awareness .....	55
Summary of Premise #1 .....	56
Discussion of Premise #2: Time Interval .....	56
Summary of Premise #2 .....	58
Discussion of Premises #3, #4 and #5: Methods .....	58
Discussion of Premise #3: Problem Solving .....	58
Self-Determination .....	60

Ethical Nature .....	60
Holistic Approach .....	62
Rationality .....	62
Common Unity .....	63
Discussion of Premise #4: Educational Activism .....	64
Qualities of the Solutions to be Obtained for Self-determined Problem Solving .....	65
Summary of Premise #4 .....	67
Discussion of Premise #5: Participatory Democracy .....	67
The Role of the State .....	68
The Difficulties of Achieving Empowerment .....	70
Summary of Premise #5 .....	71
Introduction to Premises #6 and #7: Intergenerational Connectedness and Egalitarianism .....	72
Discussion of Premise #6: Intergenerational Connectedness .....	72
Discussion of Premise #7: Egalitarianism .....	73
Summary .....	74
 CHAPTER 4: REPORT OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS .....	76
The Introduction of Seven Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education .....	76
Organization of the Findings .....	76
Discussion of the Principles .....	76
How These Principles Can Provide Guidance .....	76
Curriculum and the Extent of Reform .....	79
Discussion of Principle #1: Location .....	81
Community-Based Studies and Action and Community Educating .....	85
Summary .....	88
Discussion of Principle #2: Time Interval .....	88
Lifelong Teaching and Learning .....	89
Discussion of Principle #3: Problem-Solving Pedagogy .....	91
Collaboration .....	92
Community-based Problem Solving .....	92
The Role of Knowledge .....	93
The Advantages of Problem Solving Curricular Experiences ..	95
Discussion of Principle #4: Educational Activism .....	96
Educational Activism as Curricular Experiences .....	97
Discussion of Principle #5: Participatory Democracy .....	99
Participatory Democracy and Curricular Experiences .....	100
Discussion of Principles #6 and #7: Intergenerational Connectedness and Egalitarian Participation .....	103
Principle #6: Intergenerational Connectedness .....	104
Egalitarian Participation .....	106
Summary of Chapter 4 .....	107

CHAPTER 5: A HYPOTHETICAL CASE STUDY .....	110
Application of the Research Findings to a Case Study .....	110
A Description of the Hypothetical Case Study .....	110
Criteria for Evaluating in Community Education Based Upon	
This Concept .....	110
Evaluation Criteria Developed From This Theoretical	
Study .....	111
The Opening Stem of Each Evaluation Statement ...	111
Part I: The Hypothetical Case Study .....	114
A Profile of the Fictitious Community .....	114
Incidents Which Have Caused Concern in the Community ..	115
Emergent Problems in This Fictitious Community .....	116
Objective: To Use a Community Education Approach .....	117
Part II: A Description of Some of the Observations Which Might Be	
Expected In "Radon-ville" From Application of the Principles .....	118
Discussion of Community-based Study and Community-based	
Actions .....	118
Community-Based Study .....	118
Content Development .....	118
Informational Content of Community Dialogue .....	118
Multi-age Involvement in Content Development .....	119
Community-based Actions .....	119
Extra-Community Interaction .....	120
Multi-Age Research and Action Teams .....	120
Community-based Problem Solving .....	121
Lifelong Teaching and Learning .....	121
Opportunities to Learn How to Teach and Learn .....	121
Quality of Discussion About Learning and Teaching .....	122
Discussion of Proactive Problem Solving .....	122
Data Collection .....	123
Workshops Available to Facilitate Problem-Solving Skills ..	123
Knowledgeable Problem Solving .....	124
Discussion of Educational Activism .....	124
Compassionate and Ethical Solutions .....	124
Long-term Solutions .....	125
Discussion of Participatory Democracy .....	125
Community-based Content and Action .....	126
Self-government by Consent and Problem Solving .....	126
Open Sharing of Information .....	126
Discussion of Intergenerational Connectedness .....	127
Discussion of Egalitarian Partnerships .....	127
Evaluation Strategies in Curriculum in Community Education ....	128
Summary .....	128

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	129
Part I: Conclusions From This Theoretical Study .....	129
Research Question #1 .....	129
Research Question #2 .....	129
Research Questions #3 .....	131
Research Question #4 .....	132
Research Question #5 .....	133
Research Question #6 .....	134
Research Question #7 .....	134
The Multiplicity of Existing Terms .....	134
Introduction of a Theoretical Definition .....	134
Part II: Recommendations for Additional Curriculum Development in Community Education .....	136
The Need for a More Conscious Ecological Stance .....	137
The Ethical Foundations of Community Education .....	138
Summary .....	139
 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	 143
 APPENDIX I .....	 153
 APPENDIX II .....	 155
 APPENDIX III .....	 159

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1      Guiding Questions, Expressed Relationship and Types of Propositions of an Inductive Argument Framed to Explain Community Education .....	31
Table 2      Premises and Conclusion of an Inductive Argument to Hypothesis Framed to Explain the Relationship of Characteristics and Events in Community Education. ....	41
Table 3      Parallel Inductive Arguments Framed to Hypothesize For Community Education and Curriculum in Community Education and Proposed Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education .....	77
Table 4      Principles and Evaluation Criteria of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education in a Community Committed to Self-Determined Transformative Change and Social Justice .....	112
Table 5      Evaluation Criteria Developed for Application to a Hypothetical Case Study for This Theoretical Study. ....	135
Table 6a      The Identification of the Need to Change .....	166
Table 6b      Identification of Specific Outcomes .....	167
Table 7      Identification of the Location .....	168
Table 8      Identification of Time Duration .....	169
Table 9      Identification of the Method of Problem-Solving .....	170
Table 10      Identification of Educational Processes as a Means to Attain Desired Outcomes .....	171
Table 11      Identification of Participation and Democratic Methods .....	172
Table 12      Identification of the Characteristics of the Interactions .....	173
Table 13      Miscellaneous Items .....	174

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis writing project involves more than the library, the data, the research, the analysis, and the composition. Words are committed to paper, but they would remain lifeless if the researcher is not nurtured. This researcher flourished because of the gentle and strong loving support given by so many. Your love and help have taught me much about generosity — thank you C.I.W. for catching me every time I was falling and so many basic amenities. Thank you B.S. for your believing in me and this project. Thank you M.M. for the empathy and the sanctuary. Thank you Y.L. for sharing your humor and knowledge and love of language. Thank you E.G.O. for extending such a firm hand to a ‘new kid on the block’ and so freely giving of your knowledge and encouragement. Thank you S.M. for fulfilling all the WP requests and your sympathetic ears. Thank you my R.B.F.L. for the empathy, love, intellectual sparring and such constant belief in me; especially when I needed it most.

I acknowledge the Financial Assistance of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (Edmonton Regional Office, Alberta), and the firm encouragement from Post-Secondary Education Counsellors: Francis Roach and Janet Third.

## PREFACE

Excerpted portions of Chapter 3: Research and Analysis of the Writings has been previously published in 1992 under the title "Community Education: A Theory for Living in Community" in The Journal of the Canadian Association for Community Education, 3(May), 25-42.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to

Elsie Ripley Clapp

and

Edward Gustave Olsen

whose texts taught me much about

thinking about curriculum in community education;

to

Charlotte Stone, Gloria Toole, Judy Gunderson

and Brian Staples,

and to those teachers of

Langevin Community School (Calgary Board of Education, Alberta, Canada)

whose cheerful risk-taking taught me much about my work

as a

Community School Curriculum Coordinator.

## **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

No community can progress in its development  
while the individual who is a member of it  
remains behind; the individual who is a member  
of the whole, cannot progress in his [or her]  
development while the community remains  
behind (Froebel, 1834).

### **The Need for Additional Development of Curriculum Theory in Community Education**

Theories of curriculum in community education are few and theorizing has been limited. Warden (1972) stated that community educators had failed to facilitate meaningful curricular innovation because they had not examined the relationships between community education processes and curriculum. However, this lack of curriculum theorizing is not unique to this field. Kliebard (1982) observed that "One of the surest ways to kill a conversation on the subject of curriculum theory is to ask someone to name one" (p. 11). This thesis was an attempt to add to the conversation about curriculum education.

The lack of curriculum development in community education can be a liability. Clark (1987), a community educator, regarded curriculum as the heart of education, and he believed that if the purpose, content and methodology of curriculum were left undefined, then "chaos rather than community" would result (p. 60). Clark argued that a common curricular rationale was needed in community education in order to unify practice and purpose. The development of a common curricular rationale could assist community educators to achieve the desired outcomes of this educational

philosophy (Clark, 1987, p.60). However, the connection between a philosophy of community education and a community education curriculum has been identified, but foundational work remains underdeveloped.

This theoretical study was an analysis of 30 selections by 24 American theorists in the field of community education. From this analysis data was collected which was used to formulate parallel inductive arguments to hypothesis (a type of argument discussed in Chapter 2). These arguments were generated for community education and curriculum in community education. This theoretical study endeavoured to generate principles, evaluation criteria and a definition of curriculum in community education.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Theoretical curriculum development in community education is hampered by three problems.

- (1) Although a body of literature existed for community education, which provided recommendations for curricular content and practice, the linkages between the theory of community education and the theory of curriculum in community education are not fully developed or clearly explicated.
- (2) Recommendations made for particular content or methodologies originate in sources within and without the field known as community education; for example, components of progressive education theory are evident in works by Clapp (1933, 1939); and Olsen (1945); or elements of community school theory (Hanna & Naslund, 1953), yet the reasons for these recommendations are not well explored.

- (3) Community educators have few curriculum designs which can be subjected to empirical research.

### Previous Curriculum Development in Community Education

Three major trends were evident in a review of the literature on curriculum theory in community education. Firstly, the theorists stated that the nature of curriculum content appeared to be academic, with curricular experiences not related to the immediate problems of the community (Clapp, 1939; Olsen, 1945; Clark & Olsen, 1977). Secondly, experiential learning techniques were emphasized as a means to better relate academic content to community-based studies and to help learners to perceive and understand the nature of the conditions of their community (Olsen, 1945; Clark & Olsen, 1977). Thirdly, the recommendations for curricular innovation are often school-based (Clapp, 1939; Olsen, 1945, 1954; Irwin & Russel, 1971; Clark & Olsen, 1977) with better reference to other aspects of the community.

The following section highlights the major works located as related to curriculum developments in community education.

#### Elsie Ripley Clapp

Clapp's (1939) text, Community Schools in Action, consisted primarily of anecdotal reportage from herself and teachers involved with two experimental community schools in West Virginia and Kentucky during the 1930s. Her 429 page text documents the use of progressive education methods, community education endeavours and changes in reflective awareness made by teachers and community members about the use of the school as a community education center. She wrote this text to clarify the concept of community school, to illustrate what a "socially

functioning school" does and to be of some service to future generations of community educators (Clapp, 1939, p. 391).

Dewey (1939), writing in the forward to Clapp's (1939) text, described the work of these pioneer community educators as an example which illustrated what can be done to demonstrate the "social function of schools" beyond mere theorizing (p. vii). Dewey was referring to his recommendation that the social function of schools is more significant than schooling as a more than academic pursuit. Dewey (1939) believed that rural settings were "[f]rom the viewpoint of genuine community education" one of the greatest opportunities for demonstrating the close connection between schooling and community improvement (p. ix) and he applauded Clapp's efforts to actualize a community school rather than add to theoretical discussions.

However, a unified curricular rationale was not presented in her text. Examples of curriculum and instruction illustrated the creativity, flexibility and innovative thinking of these teachers. Dewey (1939) remarked on the "tax on time and energy" these teachers must have expended in their creative development of community-based studies (p. ix). Teachers reconceptualized the delivery of Social Studies, Home Economics, Science, Mathematics and other subjects to increase relevance for learners by considering, for example, the direct application of concepts and skills to community needs and problem solving. Their experimental curriculum work led to reconsideration of the nature and purpose of subjects in that subjects came to be viewed as sources for praxis and not static academic discipline to be subjected to rote memorization (Clapp, 1939, pp. 48-52). The theoretical framework and assumptions are not always evident, although the emphasis is on curricular activities which are community-based and in the service of community enhancement.

This text was republished in 1952 under a different title with little, new information added.

Edward G. Olsen

In 1945, Olsen's School and Community was first published, with a second edition following in 1954. His text provided a thorough description of curriculum and instruction, introduced a new term and meaning for curriculum in community education and provided ten principles for curriculum development in community education based on both progressive education and community education theories. Dr. Olsen has been a mentor in the field of curriculum in community education and produced numerous articles, bibliographies, pamphlets and three texts (one co-authored with Clark in 1977). Olsen (1954) stated that school-based curriculum can develop from three primary motivations which he described as book-centered, child-centered or life-centered (p. 475).

Olsen's work has focused on developing a life-centered curriculum approach, although he did not believe that a community-minded school must choose one of his three designated emphases. He stated that each of the three primary curriculum patterns can be modified to emphasize events and conditions of the community. For example, he stated that if a curriculum stressed a book-centered approach with mastery of subject matter, then resources for the community (that is, people, sites, artifacts, etc.) could be used to enrich it (Olsen, 1954, p. 476). He further stated that if curriculum was developed to serve the interests of the learner (child-centered), then community resources could be used "as stimulants to aesthetic, intellectual, and socializing pupil experiences and interests" (Olsen, 1954, P. 476). However, he added that if book- or child-centered approaches were not suitable, then a core curriculum

could be developed to study the fundamental questions and persistent problems of living in communities. He recommended that this core curriculum would occupy students one third to two thirds of a school day. Olsen appeared to be the only theorist to present a unified theory of curriculum in community education and is often cited by others writing about curriculum in community education.

Olsen (1945) used the term "life-centering" the curriculum (p. 18) to refer to curriculum based on "enduring life concerns and problems of living" (p. 409). He used this term to describe curricular experiences which addressed the basic concerns any individual has as a learner while growing up in his/her society (p. 409); although he commented that "schooling is by no means 'life-centered' yet - the struggle goes on" (Personal communication, April 15, 1992). Olsen (1945) followed in Deweyian tradition in which schooling is conceptualized not so much as an individualistic pursuit but a communal endeavour to maintain democracy (Dewey, 1899). Dewey wrote in The School and Society, originally published in 1899, that "What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children" (1971, p. 7).

Olsen (1945) introduced ten principles to guide community educators in the development of curriculum to create and sustain this connection between schooling and community in the interests of maintaining and strengthening democracy (Olsen, 1945). The text was republished in 1954, with the principles reworded (Olsen, 1954, pp. 477-480). Both sets of principles are reprinted, with the permission of the author, in Appendix I.

These principles are one of too few examples of foundational work in curriculum in community education. The intent of both sets of principles remained

the same. Only the first principle was completely reworded to highlight the functional nature of life-centered curriculum to nurture community involvement.

My following commentary examined the original set of principles presented by Olsen in 1945. Olsen, like Clapp (1939), stressed community-based studies. The second, third, fourth, sixth and seventh principles elaborated ways to conceptualize and study a locality in terms of its history, location, resources and culture. He described experiential learning techniques (field studies, resource speaker visits, documentary production) to provide community-based curricular experiences to intensively analyze the local community which could be argued strengthen understanding and appreciation of other communities (Olsen, 1950, p. 412).

Olsen (1945) stated that a major function of curricular endeavors is to assist learners to develop understandings about the changes occurring in the unique, cultural milieu of their community (pp. 409-410). He further stressed that it would be these future citizens who would bring change to their communities and that they needed curricular opportunities to understand how to make "democratic social improvements" which would be based on a respect for, loyalty to, and use of the finest traditions of American ethics and social values (pp. 410-412). A major assumption of life-centered curriculum would be a reliance on a "fundamentally democratic frame of reference" which would increase the need to teach citizenship skills to foster citizen participation and leadership (Olsen, 1950, p. 409).

The remaining principles described the need for a planned learning sequence, experiential learning opportunities and multi-age interaction (Principles #V, #VIII and #IX). Olsen believed that education which, he stated, "cannot be truly realistic, vital and defensible" unless child, curriculum and community are

purposively connected (Olsen, 1950, pp. 412-413). In 1992, Olsen commented that curriculum in community education could be viewed as a form of needs-based education, and, that when such a view is formulated it becomes "clear that traditional preoccupation with academic subject matter is not adequate for our times" (Personal communication, Feb. 1, 1992).

Although this examination has been brief, Olsen's influence has been significant in the field of community education.

### Irwin and Russell

Irwin and Russell (1971) wrote The Community Is The Classroom to explain an interdisciplinary and integrated approach to curriculum and instruction designed to help children to find answers to basic questions which the child-as-learner would find embedded in his or her direct encounters with the community (p. 15). They used the term - integrated - to refer to curriculum and instruction which closely blended the activities of classroom as they believed that traditional schooling was distant and removed from the daily concerns of living. The two teachers and curriculum theorists stated that school subjects viewed as "skills and knowledge are often seen as ends in themselves" with too much of a focus on "organizational patterns and the establishment of academic standards" (Irwin & Russell, 1971, p. 15). Instead, they expressed the belief that curricular experiences should draw upon the events, resources and conditions of the community as a primary source for curriculum development. They argued for the implementation of what they called a community-centered curriculum.

Irwin and Russell's (1971) definition of a community-centered curriculum was similar in nature and intent to that developed by Olsen (1945, 1954) who had used the

term life-centered curriculum. They described a community-centered curriculum as one where the community is conceptualized as a learning lab and that curricular activities should extend outwards from the classroom into the community itself (Ibid., p. 15). By their definition, a community-centered curriculum would be one where the child's school-based teaching and learning experiences matched those of out-of-school experiences, provided content which focussed on life in the community, and used a multidisciplinary approach which utilized the events and conditions of the immediate community. Their observations are similar to those of Dewey, who argued in 1899, in The School and Society, that the child-as-learner is unnecessarily isolated from his/her world of experiences. Consequently, the child cannot "utilize the experiences he[she] gets outside the school in any complete and free way" and that the student's knowledge is reduced to secondary and, sometimes, meaningless symbolization of the actual reality (1971, pp. 75-80, 112, 126).

Their approach to curriculum could be described as a utilitarian approach where community-based studies are paramount. However, the reader (teacher or curriculumist) would not easily understand any causal relationship between their intentions and the development of ends envisioned by community educators. Although these two American community educators did visit community schools, primarily in Britain, a discussion of major thinkers in the field is absent.

#### Minzey and LeTarte

Minzey and LeTarte's (Orig. 1972, Rev. 1979) textbook Community Education: From Program to Process to Practice (1979) provided a discussion of the theory and practice of community education and is considered by community educators to be one of the standard texts used at college or university levels (Ledford, 1988). Chapter VII

(pp. 99-106) has some discussion about the development of student enrichment activities (such as after-school child-centered projects where students could pursue their interests or community service) to promote lifelong learning. However, these suggested enrichment activities were presented as an antidote to what Minzey and LeTarte perceived to be the overly-intellectual climate of traditional schooling which seemed to neglect the social, cultural or vocational aspects of the individual's personal and community life (p. 100). This criticism is a familiar one which was evident in the previous works discussed above.

However, the chapter does not provide any theoretical development for the community-based enrichment activities recommended and there are no guidelines for developing authentic curriculum in community education. Their discussions about the basic assumptions, principles and goals of community education are not directly linked with their chapter's description of curriculum. Also, their discussion did not include a description of curricular activities which would integrate with the regular school day.

Although the chapter does not provide any theoretical development for their suggested curricular experiences, this text was included for discussion here to indicate the limited amount of text and thought which has been devoted to curriculum in community education.

### Olsen and Clark

In 1977, Olsen and Clark's publication Life-Centering the Curriculum appeared. The co-authors suggested that the school-based curriculum must be reshaped and patterned around the primary issues and problems of personal and community living. The sections in the text related to curriculum followed closely

from Olsen's earlier works (1945, 1954) and the text was not strictly devoted to curriculum development. Instead, chapters are committed to explaining historical aspects of schooling and education, debunking myths about community education and explaining some of the key characteristics of community education.

### Relevant Articles

A literature search of educational journals located only a few articles related to curriculum development in community education. For the most part, these articles were published in the primary journal in the field which is known as Community Education Journal. Two issues of this journal were about curriculum (Nov.-Dec., 1975; Oct., 1982). This article will discuss three of the major articles.

Warden (1975) cautioned that curriculum in community education needed to encompass a broad view of what comprised educational content and instruction to prevent curriculum in community education from becoming "a limited concept with a limited boxed curriculum" (p. 28). He stated that curriculum should not simply be a fixed, narrow program of specialized offerings confined to academic study of the disciplines, but that curriculum in community education should also include community-based teaching and learning (p. 28). Similar views were expressed by the theorists discussed above (Clapp, 1939, Olsen, 1945, 1954, Irwin & Russell, 1971, etc.).

Warden (1975) expressed the hope that community-based study and action could provide active opportunities to develop solutions to local problems and also to assist the learner to grapple with the "deeper meaning to life" (p. 28). Warden did not stipulate what the attributes of deeper meaning might be in terms of curricular experiences.

Warden (1975) theorized that there were connections which needed to be made between curriculum development in community education and the processes of community educating (pp. 30-31). Community educators have argued that the significant outcomes of community education are those of emerging process and not those of products (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979). Warden stated that the linking of community education with curriculum development would have several implications. These included: (1) the design of curricular experiences which were also process-oriented, (2) the provision of active, direct curricular activities related to local needs and problems, (3) the opportunity for learner-directed dialogue about community-based needs and problems, (4) the need for direct involvement of the learner with the community, and (5) the reconceptualization of teacher education programs in community education (Ibid., pp. 30-31). He further stated that curriculum developers in community education would need to examine alternative models and conceptualizations of curriculum in order to determine principles and pedagogy which more closely resembled community education's intentions as traditional models would not be entirely applicable (Ibid., p. 31).

In the same issue of this journal which carried Warden's article, Olsen (1975) provided a succinct summary of his theory of life-centering curriculum (pp. 35-41). The summary of his theory continues to resonate with the request that risks are needed in order to directly incorporate the fundamental concerns of living into curricular content (poverty, family life, suitable employment) which truly reflected the events and conditions of the community of the learner (p. 36). Olsen (1975) did not believe that this should imply the complete elimination of all traditional school subjects, but, rather, a reconceptualization of the utility of subject designations and

subject matter in order to better link out-of-school experience with the knowledge contained in the discipline (p. 36).

Olsen (1975) suggested that enduring life concerns and problems are the chief, generic "activity areas to which people give most of their time, energy, effort and worry throughout their lives" (p. 36). The article is a useful, brief introduction to novice community educators although it may be difficult to discern the direct connections with community education theory. Olsen's theory of life-centered curriculum is a blend of progressive education theory and community education theory.

In 1982, Cook stated that the interaction between curriculum and community education would suggest a reconceptualization of the traditional thought about curriculum content and delivery (p. 18). His observation was not new, but it was a timely statement to those who were unacquainted with the works of pioneers like Clapp (1939) and Olsen (1945) in that the author recommended that curriculum in community education would provide a radical approach due to some of its differences from traditional school. Cook's article restated the hope of early writers in that curriculum would not be just the academic pursuit of knowledge. Again Cook's (1982) feelings reiterate that

education would not pass through and out of the phase of considering subject matter interests as different aspects or elements or emphases of man's living, to a study of life, including nature and society" (Clapp, 1939, p. 52).

Unfortunately, he offered no new directives or methodologies to community educators. His two-page article drew on Olsen and Clark's (1977) concept of the life-

concerns core curriculum and he recommended that instruction would be best provided through experiential or action learning approaches (Cook, 1982, p. 19). However, if experiential learning refers primarily to hands-on activities, then print-style learners might be at a disadvantage in community school settings.

This summary illustrated the limited material related to curriculum in community education; especially in terms of curriculum theory development. Curriculum has been characterized as community-based, experientially-based, and pragmatically-aware of the utilitarian function of knowledge. There is a further implication that curricular experiences would not be merely an "added-on program" (Williams, 1981) in that curriculum inside and outside of the classroom would have community life infused in an across-the-curriculum approach.

### Summary

The above discussion was provided to briefly describe some of the previous theorizing in curriculum in community education to illuminate the limited amount of theorizing in this field. Although the actual development of alternative models of curriculum development and delivery are limited, these community educators did express the belief that curriculum in community education would be, somehow, different from that experienced by learners in what is known as traditional schooling.

### The Objectives and Organization of This Theoretical Study

The major intent of this study was to extend the discussion about curriculum in community education. The six objectives of this study are listed below. (Chapter(s) directly related to each objective are identified in parentheses.)

- (1) the identification of the propositions (statements) of an inductive argument to explain the theory of community education (Chapters 2 and 3);

- (2) the production of a congruent inductive argument to hypothesis to explain curriculum in community education based on propositions identified in (1) (Chapter 4);
- (3) the translation of the propositions of the inductive argument framed for curriculum in community education into principles for development of curricular experiences (Chapter 4)
- (4) the restatement of the principles as evaluation criteria with application to a hypothetical case study to illustrate curriculum in community education (Chapter 5);
- (5) the introduction of a definition for curriculum in community education (Chapter 6); and,
- (6) the recommendation of areas for further theorizing about curriculum in community education (Chapter 6).

#### Rationale for This Study

This study was conducted for the following reasons.

#### To Add to the Theoretical Discussion

As theories of curriculum in community education are few, this study was conducted to add to the body of literature which has not had a major infusions since Olsen and Clark (1977). The previous discussion of curriculum in community education demonstrated that theorizing has been limited mainly to one key individual - Dr. Edward Olsen. Thus, it would seem there is a need for further curriculum development.

### To Provide Reflective Discussion Materials for Practitioners

Simpson and Jackson (1984) argued that the role of the teacher is more than possession of knowledge about classroom management, developmental stages of learning, and subject-matter mastery. They considered that the teacher is also involved in curricular activities and responsibilities which require making philosophical judgements (p. 5). Although Simpson and Jackson are not community educators, the observation does apply to community education because community educators will be involved directly with community issues as community-based curriculum will draw on the local problematique for content and experience. The likelihood of making philosophical (that is, ethical, logical and rationally compassionate) judgements will be increased as teaching and learning become more directly immersed in issues (poverty, unemployment, racism, sexism) which require knowledge and action on the part of community educators. As teaching and learning become more directly linked with community life, as techniques and content are modified to reflect that community life, and as evaluation is made of the effectiveness of curricular experiences to change community life, then teachers and learners will be more deeply plunged into the philosophical nature of their shared worlds.

Curriculists and practitioners will need to examine their approach to localized curricular phenomena. According to Beauchamp (1982), curriculum theories can explain curricular phenomena through "definition, description and prediction" (p. 26). Community educators need a variety of alternative curriculum models in order to reflect and understand the life of the local community.

### To Provide a Conceptualization of Authentic Practice

Some teachers in community schools believed that it was definitely important to use community resources. This belief was documented and was found to be more strongly held by teachers in community schools (Williams, 1981, p. 78). Yet, it has been further documented that teachers in community schools seldom changed their practice or were unable to articulate what exact changes were required to produce a curricular approach congruent with community education theory (Olsen, 1947; Williams, 1981; Clark, 1982; Cook, 1982; Wear, 1982; Jones & Falkenberg, 1989).

If teachers do believe that their role in community schools is one which should be based on "different curricular expectations" (Williams, 1981, p. 88), the curriculum and instruction should somehow reflect these differences. Theorizing could help to articulate these subtle, or not so subtle, differences.

### To Produce Criteria for Evaluation

Several Ministries of Education and district school boards in Canada sanction a community-based curriculum approach in funded community school programs: (Alberta Community School Programme, 1981; Saskatchewan Community Schools Program, 1980; Greater Victoria School District #61 District-Wide Community Education Project, 1988; Winnipeg Community Education Development Association, 1979; York [Ontario] Board of Education Community School Program, 1989; and the Newfoundland Experimental Pilot Project Community School Program, 1991). Extensive freedom of choice is indicated in statements from these provincially funded programs with recommendations made for curricular activities such as those found in Alberta's Interdepartmental Community School Committee document about community school operation. This document contained suggestions for field trips,

local studies, resource speakers, study of issues (racism, ageism), use of community resources, adult basic literacy classes, across-age tutoring, and parental/guardian involvement (1983, p. 18).

Principles and evaluation criteria, developed through this study, could help practitioners to assess the nature of the differences sought in curriculum and instruction. For example, in 1953, Krug stated that "casual observation of a community-based field trip" may not clearly highlight the relative nature of the community orientation in content and objectives which the teacher may be striving to create (p. 92). Thus, an understanding of the nature of curriculum in community education is crucial because, according to Krug (1953),

when field trips are conducted and resource speakers used merely to activate study or interest or to provide variety in learning activities, these may be considered 'good' features of any instructional program rather than identifying characteristics of a community school (p. 92).

Thus, evaluation criteria could assist practitioners to identify aspects of the 'good' features of community-based learning as implemented in a community education setting.

### **Research Questions**

The seven research questions which guided this theoretical study are stated below.

- (1) What are the essential features of community education?
- (2) What are the propositions (statements) of an inductive argument to hypothesis to explain community education theory?

- (3) What are the propositions of a parallel inductive argument to hypothesis which could explain a theory of curriculum in community education?
- (4) What principles for a theory of curriculum in community education are suggested from the propositions of the developed parallel inductive argument?
- (5) How could the application of these principles to curriculum design assist community educators to achieve the objectives of a community education program?
- (6) What evaluation criteria for curriculum in community education are suggested from the developed principles?
- (7) What definition (terms and meaning) is suggested from this theory of curriculum in community education?

#### The Decision to Make a Theoretical Study

The study was based on the analysis of the writings of important theorists. This decision to work downwards from theory was made to accommodate the perceived incomplete knowledge of community education theory at the practitioner level (MacGregor, Personal Communication, Feb., 1992). This analysis worked "downwards" from community education theory rather than from the "grassroots" of practice because studies have documented that knowledge of community theory was incomplete at the practitioner level (Williams, 1981; Clark, 1982; Wear, 1983). Thus, interviews with practitioners or observations of practice were not part of the study.

#### The Type of Theoretical Curriculum Study

Walker (1982) suggested that there are four types of curriculum theories: program rationalization, rationalization of procedures, conceptualization of curricular phenomena, and explanation of curricular phenomena (p. 63). Walker described

program rationalization to consist of "contents, aims, and approaches to education" (p. 63). The second theory provided a justified explanation of procedures to construct curriculum. Walker (1982) used Bobbit's (1918) use of management techniques to illustrate this theory of curriculum development. His third theory of conceptualization, which contained no specific prescriptions for curriculum or instruction, was intended to provide "helpful ways of thinking about curriculum" (p. 63). The fourth theory of explanation made scholarly attempts to analyze and explain changes which occurred in curriculum and instruction; for example, the appearance of "new" math or the dropping of the teaching rhetoric.

This theoretical study about curriculum in community education most closely resembled the third type of theory described by Walker (1982) because it intended to assist practitioners to conceptualize, that is, to provide a vision of curriculum and instruction as related to the field of community education.

### **Limitations of This Study**

This research was not designed to:

- (1) evaluate current levels of practice in curriculum in community education;
- (2) examine theoretical curricular frameworks outside of the field of community education;
- (3) identify implications for teacher education;
- (4) offer a critique of community education theory; or,
- (5) provide "how-to" instructions for practice.

### **Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

1. Community Education: Community education is defined as a series of activities through which community members interacting together identify

individual needs, common problems and concerns, and available resources. The community members make use of those resources to generate alternative methods for meeting needs, solving problems and resolving concerns. The purpose of this interaction is to gain a greater sense of influencing what goes on about them as well as gain greater control of themselves. It is the sense of community which creates a learning atmosphere where all those who participate can benefit from the utilization of the available resources. In such an atmosphere, the sense of common purpose, the awareness of commonalities, encourages the discovery of needs and resources, which greatly enhance the acquisition of information and knowledge. It also provides encouragement of conceptual skills such as problem solving, conflict management, etc. (Piotrowski, 1975, p. 14).

2. Community: A group of people who share awareness of their commonalities and participate in the process of meeting mutual needs (Piotrowski, 1975, p. 14).
3. Curriculum: Curriculum refers to the purpose, content, practices and evaluation of curriculum in community education. The purpose is a statement of educational aims which have a basis in an ideological framework. The content refers to the information, knowledge, values, history, etc., to be studied. Practice refers to methods of instruction and learning. Evaluation refers to the strategies used to assess growth, shortcomings or stagnation.

Although debate about the semantics of curriculum definition can bewilder some participants, the curriculumist Doll (1989) noted that there is a generally accepted definition for curriculum. He defined curriculum as "the formal and informal content and processes by which learners gain knowledge and understanding, develop skills, and alter attitudes, and appreciations, and values under the auspices of that school" (p. 8). However, in community education curriculum is not limited to just the authority of the school. Consequently, such a definition overlooks the community-wide nature of curriculum in community education. Thus, the standard definition of curriculum was not used for this study.

4. Curriculum Theory: A set of related statements, or propositions, that gives meaning to the phenomena related to the concept of curriculum (Beauchamp, 1982, p. 24).

5. Educative Community: A community characterized as one where collaborative efforts of "all of the formal and informal organizations, agencies, and individuals" are evidently in use to produce community betterment and an "acceptable quality of life for all citizens" (Winecoff & Lyday, 1991, p. 8).

### **Summary**

In this chapter the need for additional curriculum theorizing in community education was argued. The brief summary of previous curriculum development work in the field of community education confirms Wear's (1982) observation. Wear (1982) stated that community educators are more often doers and organizers, but seldom theorizers; in fact, "Swimming or even wading in philosophy of education or curriculum theory is rare" (p. 6). Thus, this theoretical study was developed to extend the field of curriculum theorizing in community education as indicated by the problems identified in this field. These included the lack of theoretical exploration, the lack of congruent theory between community education and a companion curriculum, and the need to develop new models of curriculum theory in community education. For curriculum and community to be more closely related requires the resources of theory to explain and interpret perceptions and actions in curriculum and instruction.

## **CHAPTER 2: DESIGN METHODOLOGY**

### **The Need to Formulate Additional Theories of Curriculum in Community Education**

The Canadian curriculumist McCutcheon (1982) observed that educators are in need of curriculum theories. Curriculum theories can guide educators to envision an organizational framework which can facilitate new perceptions by creating new "alternative courses of action" (p. 20). Her statement can be applied to community education as well. What might a curriculum in community education look like? The purpose of this study was to create a theory of curriculum in community education from the collective writings of prominent American community educators.

#### **Statement of the Problem**

At present, there are numerous practical suggestions for curriculum; however, congruency, origin of or sources and lack of testable models are absent in curriculum development in community education. This problem was identified by two methods. The personal experience of the researcher, while a teacher consultant for eight years with the Alberta Community School Program (1981 - 1989), indicated that there were limited theoretical resources about curriculum in community education to use with teachers for the purposes of personal or group in-servicing. The lack of theoretical research in curriculum in community education was further identified through a review of the literature to discover previous curriculum work in this field. This first literature review - a synthesized critique of the status of knowledge of a research problem - documented the limited curriculum theorizing evident to date in curriculum in community education. The results of this literature review were discussed in Chapter 1.

These research questions were used to guide this theoretical analysis and were first introduced in Chapter 1.

- (1) What are the essential (generic) features of community education?
- (2) What are the propositions of an inductive argument to hypothesis to explain a theory of community education?
- (3) What are the propositions of a parallel inductive argument to hypothesis which can explain a theory of curriculum in community education?
- (4) What principles for a theory of curriculum in community education are suggested from the propositions of this parallel inductive argument?
- (5) How will application of these principles to curriculum design assist community educators to achieve desired outcomes.
- (6) What evaluation criteria for curriculum in community education are suggested from the principles?
- (7) Is a definition (term and meaning) suggested from this theory?

The following discussion described the sequence of steps used to answer these research questions.

### **Procedures**

A research design refers to the thoughtful plan and structure of the investigation to be conducted (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 30). The research design used in this study consisted of several steps. Firstly, a problem was sensed in curriculum in community education and then developed through discussion with other practitioners and a literature review. Secondly, generic features of community education theory were identified through a literature review. This phase can be identified as data collection. Then, parallel inductive arguments to hypothesis were

developed for community education and curriculum in community education. Fourthly, principles, evaluation criteria and a definition were generated for curriculum in community education. The following discussion provides a more detailed description of the research design.

### Formulation of the Inductive Argument to Hypothesis

#### Framed for Community Education and Curriculum in Community Education

The methodology used to develop the two inductive arguments can be summarized as follows. In Step #1, the generic features of the theory of community education were identified through a literature review of 30 selections by 23 Euro-American male and 1 female theorists. A series of codes were devised to identify the essential characteristics which community educator Maurice Seay described as threads which "appear again and again in a great variety of programs in widely separated geographical regions" (1972, p. 16). As suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (1989), these codes were developed as the selections were read for themes, patterns or repeated ideas without forcing the data into some predetermined *apiori* framework (p. 417). Thus, theoretical constructs were deduced from theories in the field.

In the second step, propositions (that is, statements) were formulated from the features identified in Step 1. A proposition is a statement which is either true or false and is used to develop arguments wherein a statement; which, it can be claimed, "logically follows from the others" (Barry & Soccio, 1988, p. 292). For the purposes of this study, all statements were accepted as "true" based on the strength of support received in the analysis of the literature in the sense that they were essential or frequently occurring features identified by the theorists.

In the third step, these propositions were organized as premises and a conclusion for an inductive argument to hypothesis for community education. A series of questions were devised to guide the formulation of the propositions. This step will be discussed in further detail in a following section.

In the four step, these propositions were used to formulate a parallel argument to hypothesis for curriculum in community education. Fifthly, these propositions were restated as principles and evaluation criteria for a theory of curriculum in community education.

### The Inductive Argument to Hypothesis

Copti discussed the two types of arguments. These are deductive and inductive arguments. Both arguments consist of two parts: premises and conclusion. Premises are propositions (statements) which provide evidence for a conclusion. The conclusion is the propositional statement which identifies the outcome (Copti, 1982, pp. 5 - 7). The deductive argument is one which asserts that its premises will provide "conclusive grounds" for a claim made (Copti, 1982, p. 54). A variation of the classical example of the deductive argument is

All humans are mortal.

Maurice Seay is a human.

Therefore, Maurice Seay is mortal.

Thus, a particular conclusion about Seay is inferred (validly) from the premises given.

The second type of argument is known as the inductive argument. In the inductive argument "a general or universal conclusion is inferred from premises all of which are particular propositions" (Copti, 1982, p. 52). This is a variation of a classical example of the inductive argument.

Elsie Clapp is human and mortal.

Edward Olsen is human and mortal.

Jack Minzey is human and mortal.

Therefore, probably all humans are mortal.

In this style of argumentation the conclusion is only claimed to follow from stated propositions with some degree of likelihood (Copti, 1982, p. 54). Community education can be viewed as an inductive argument in that a conclusion (that is, outcome) is said to follow from certain inputs (which are, propositions).

One form of the inductive argument is the inductive argument to hypothesis. The inductive argument is an inductive form of argument where a tentative conclusion is reached which relates and explains a group of statements (Barry & Soccio, 1988, p. 227). The phrase, *inductive argument to hypothesis*, appears clumsy to some readers, but that is the term used. Community education can be viewed as an inductive argument to hypothesis in that it attempts to explain a likely outcome if particular events and conditions were available to create planned, educative and educated changes in the quality of life for community members at the community level. No one can predict with complete certainty what would occur, but community educators have attempted to posit the likelihood of particular outcomes, encapsulated in the conclusion of the inductive argument to hypothesis, of what might occur if certain events or conditions were to be actualized.

### Data Collection

Data refers to the results which are gathered through research processes from which conclusions and interpretations can be made (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p.534). In this case, the data collected are those features which occurred with a high

frequency in the literature review. The features are the source of the propositions in the parallel inductive arguments.

### Sources of the Propositions

An examination and synthesis were made of five decades (1939 - 1989) of readings in the American tradition of the field of community education. A chronological listing of sources is located in Appendix 1, which is a selection of reasonably well-known authors in the field. The readings were searched to locate definitional work related to the concept of community education. Readings were located, keeping in mind a warning from Fletcher and Thompson (1980) who are two British community education theorists. They stated that

[d]espite some fifty years of activity . . . there are remarkably few readily accessible writings. This is in part because it is a minority commitment, partly because its practitioners have devoted most, if not all, of their energies to the tasks in hand and partly because as a movement most of what has been written has had a limited circulation (Fletcher & Thompson, 1980, p. 1).

With this caution in mind, the literature was selected to locate what are known as theoretical definitions.

A theoretical definition is one where attempts are made to adequately characterize or scientifically describe a phenomenon (Copti, 1982, pp. 152-153). Thus, texts (books and articles) were examined to locate theoretical definitions.

The search for theoretical definitions began with the location of bibliographies or surveys of the literature. The results of a study by Wood and Neat (1988) indicated that the most cited texts were as follows:

1. Minzey & LeTarte's 1972/1979 CE: From Program to Process to Practice (10/22)
2. CE Journal (8/22)
3. Mott foundation films (5/22)
4. Kerensky & Melby's Education II, The Social Imperative (4/22)
5. Berridge, Stark & West, 1977, Training the CE (3/22)
6. Clark & Olsen, 1977, Life-Centering Education (3/22)

These results were obtained from 22 of 35 questionnaires circulated to universities and colleges with community education programs. These texts were available for study from libraries and the personal collections of the researcher and colleagues.

Another community education researcher, Ledford, conducted a study in 1988 which indicated that no new textbooks have been published since 1979. Kerensky's 1989, The Sovereign, New Perspectives on People, Power, and Public Education, was published just after Ledford's study was completed. Ledford (1988) noted that Seay's 1974 text, Community Education: A Developing Concept, seemed to have the most comprehensive information about community education. He further identified the Minzey and LeTarte text as the second most comprehensive text for community educators (Ledford, 1988). They were located in libraries and read as starting points.

Ledford's analysis of texts in the field of community education spanned 1969 to 1983. He concluded that there appeared to be no specific changes or notable trends over time in the content of text (Ledford, 1988). He stated that the study results related to the lack of evident change could indicate that community education was a stagnant or stable field or that the time interval chosen for the study was too brief (Ledford, 1988, p. 28).

It would be unfortunate if only one analysis, that is, Ledford's (1988), set the standard to describe the field. However, Martin (1987) commented that "it is now possible to locate various distinctive patterns in this historical development of CE" (p. 11). A reading list was developed and confirmed by Dr. Inge Williams to begin the search for these generic features or distinctive trends in the literature. The selection of readings was also confirmed through correspondence with Dr. Edward Olsen who stated that he "was impressed by [the] comprehensive survey of the literature and [the] critical evaluation of its major emphases" made by this researcher in this theoretical study (Personal communication, June 5, 1992).

#### Identification of the Generic Features and Propositions From the Literature Review

Five questions were used to identify, organize and order data - elements of the expressed relationship between inputs (premises) and outcome (conclusion) - collected through the literature review. McMillan and Schumacher (1989) described the organization of data as an intuitive process based on divergent thought and logical analysis (p. 417). The questions used to guide the organization of the data are shown in Column I of Table 1 and the expressed relationship is shown in Column II of the same table. Column III listed the type of premise, that is evidence or conclusion, developed. Thus data was collected, sorted and ordered into logical categories to formulate a sequence for community education's process-orientation.

The questions used were based on reasonableness, and on discussion with community education practitioners, as no models appeared to be evident with which to develop questions. Thus, an expressed relationship was developed to identify location, time interval or duration, methods, and characteristics to produce a likely outcome(s) for community educating. That is, propositions were stated as premises to focus this

**Table 1      Guiding Questions, Expressed Relationship and Types of Propositions of an Inductive Argument Framed to Explain Community Education**

<b>I</b> <b><u>Guiding Questions</u></b>	<b>II</b> <b><u>The Expressed Relationship of This Inductive Argument</u></b>	<b>III</b> <b><u>Premises and Conclusion Identification</u></b>
1. Where can community education occur?	IF Actions to create defined outcomes occur in a defined setting	Location Premise (Evidence)
2. When can community education occur?	IF Actions occur at particular time intervals	Time Intervals/Duration Premise (Evidence)
3. How can the purpose(s) of community education be achieved?	IF Particular method(s) are used to achieve the defined outcomes	Method(s) Required Premise(s) (Evidence)
4. What is/are characteristic(s) of effective community educating?	IF Particular characteristic(s) are evident among participants	Characteristic(s) Premise(s) (Evidence)
5. What is/are the purpose(s) of community education?	THEN Potential outcomes of Community Education are likely to occur	THEN, CONCLUSION Desired Outcomes

interpretation of an argument to illustrate the hypothesis that if community educating occurred in a designated location during a particular time interval using particular methods under certain conditions, then there is a likelihood that the potential outcomes of community education will occur.

### "Strength" or "Weakness" of the Propositions

The identification of generic features was needed to formulate propositions. Highly similar features were grouped in categories which were distinct, neither too broad nor too limited, and related to the guiding questions. A summary of this data collection is provided in Appendix III. An inductive argument is developed in terms of its strength or weakness. Not all items located in the data collection were included.

Strongly Supported Propositions. If 16 or more of the 30 selections (50 - 100 percent) provided statements which supported a feature, it was adopted and used to develop a proposition for the argument.

Weakly Supported Propositions. Features were considered not supported if no theorists provided statements of evidence of a particular event or characteristic. Weakly supported features were those where 1 to 15 of the 30 selections had statements related to a feature. For example, although environmental issues are now generally deemed crucial, only a few of the selected theorists noted the need for natural resource conservation or protection (Olsen, 1945; Seay, 1953; Totten, 1970). Thus, the feature of environmental caretaking could not be included in the development of this argument, although it could be strongly argued that this aspect of community educating would need to be included based on the current status of environmental vulnerability.

Formulation of a Parallel Inductive Argument  
to Hypothesis for Curriculum in Community Education

Once the inductive argument to hypothesis had been used to develop a theory of community education, a parallel argument to hypothesis was developed for curriculum in community education. This was done through examination of the premises of the inductive argument to hypothesis to determine their relationship to curriculum in community education. These premises had identified the location, time interval, methods and characteristics for community education. The same four elements were related to curriculum in community education.

The inductive argument to hypothesis began with an analysis to discover whether or not location was also relevant to curriculum theorizing. Did curriculum and instruction require a particular location in curriculum in community education? As a specific location might be necessary for community educating, then one might be relevant to curriculum theorizing. For example, if the literature search revealed that a rural location would be needed, then the parallel inductive argument to hypothesis for curriculum in community education would also include a rural location.

The second element of time interval was also considered for relevance and sensibility. Did curriculum and instruction require implementation at a specific time interval or intervals? As a specific time might be necessary for community educating, the specification of a time interval or duration might be needed in theorizing in curriculum in community education. For example, if the literature search revealed that community educating was a lifelong activity, then this element was also included in the argument for curriculum in community education.

The third element was related to methods suggested for effective community educating. These would also be examined to see if identification of particular methods also related to the development of curriculum in community education. Did curriculum and instruction require the use of any or all pedagogical practices? Or would community education narrow the field of curriculum in community education? If particular events are necessary to actualize community education, then it could be argued that these particular events must also be present in curriculum instruction. For example, if the literature search revealed that dialogue and experiential learning were necessary for community educating, then these were included in the argument for curriculum in community education.

Finally, any characteristics identified for community education were analyzed for their relevance to curriculum in community education. Did curriculum and instruction require that certain characteristics were needed to enhance community educating? These identified characteristics were examined to determine their relevance in the development of an inductive argument to hypothesis for curriculum in community education. For example, if the literature search revealed that compassion was an essential feature of effective community educating, then the development of the parallel argument would ensure that this element was included in curriculum in community education.

Thus, the two inductive arguments were developed as mirror or twin arguments without addition to or omission from the parent argument for the theory of community education. In this way, the origin of this theory of curriculum in community education could be clearly identified and understood. This methodology

was chosen to address the problems of congruency and origin identified in the statement of the problem.

### Formulation of Principles and Evaluation Criteria

The propositions of the inductive argument were used to construct principles and evaluation criteria. The concept of a *principle* was not meant to be used prescriptively, but rather as a guideline (Olsen, 1950). Each principle was worded and reworded several times for clarity and to ensure that essential information was not lost in the translation. These were presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

The concept of *evaluation criteria* was used to designate standards which would be evident if this particular theory of curriculum in community education was in operation. The questions or statements could be developed as closed or open form items (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 258). In a closed form type of question or statement the participant must choose among predetermined items, where in the open form of question or statement the participant may write or give oral answers in any response they want (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 258).

The evaluation criteria were developed as open-ended questions to avoid the influence of predetermined responses on closure. The question format used for the evaluation criteria are fairly broad and can be identified as semi-structured questions which would follow specified categories. These follow the direction of the principles developed for curriculum in community education (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, pp. 266-267). The semi-structured question is one which is open-ended "but is fairly specific in its intent" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 267). This format was chosen so as to be specific in intent but to still allow opportunity for data not yet considered to surface.

The principles were not applied to evaluate an actual test case study as no community school has yet adopted these principles. Thus, the evaluation criteria were applied to a hypothetical case study developed for this thesis study. These were examined, presented and discussed in Chapter 5. The researcher made the decision to invent and discuss a hypothetical case study to provide the reader with a sense of what this theory of curriculum in community education might be like in practice.

### Consideration of an Appropriate Definition

A final intention of this study was the development of a definition for curriculum in community education. Barry and Soccio (1988) identified five guidelines, "not commandments", for creating a term and meaning for a phenomenon (p. 50). According to their guideline, an acceptable definition is one which provides essential features, is not too broad or limited, not circular, not obscure or vague and not expressed in the negative (Barry & Soccio, 1988, pp. 50-51). Keeping these guidelines in focus, analysis was made of the propositions of the argument for curriculum in community education, the resultant principles and evaluation criteria.

According to Copti (1982) a definition has two parts. The first part is called the *definiendum* which refers to the term used (Copti, 1982, p. 148). For example, community education is a term which refers to a philosophy of education. The *definiens* is the meaning assigned to the term (Ibid., p. 148).

An assessment was first made to decide whether or not the field of curriculum in community education required another *definiendum* - without creating more jargon - and *definiens* for community educating activity related to curricular opportunities. Secondly, previous definitions were re-examined to assess their accuracy. On the basis of findings discovered through this examination, a final decision was made as to

the need for a new definition and term. It was understood that it would be necessary to create the definition from discoveries made in this study to create further congruency. Thus, the definiens would be based on the generic features contained within the propositions of the inductive argument framed for curriculum in community education.

### **Summary**

This chapter has provided an overview of common terminology to be used throughout the thesis - for example, premise, proposition, inductive argument, definiens - and the overall research design of this theoretical study. The procedures used to create solutions for the research problems were outlined and described and follow established guidelines for research which includes problem formation, data collection, development of a hypothesis, application of research findings (albeit to a hypothetical case study) and presentation of the findings (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). These procedures included: a purposeful literature review to identify the extent of the research problem, data collection to identify generic features of community education, development of the inductive arguments to hypothesis, creation of principles and evaluation criteria and the generation of a definition for curriculum in community education.

The methodology was developed to answer the question: What might curriculum in community education look like? The answer was presented as a theory, which was defined by Delese Wear and Dale Cook (1982), community educators, as "a possibility, an invitation to consider existing or future phenomena; it is a framework on which to begin thought" (p. 5). As yet, no community education theorist has chosen this approach to develop a theory of curriculum in community education.

## CHAPTER 3: REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF SELECTED WRITINGS

### Introduction

The purpose of this review and analysis of the writings was to locate definitions of community education in order to locate the constructs of this theory of education. American community education theorists were aware of internal struggles to define the concept. According to Seay (1974) the concept seemed mirage-like because of "its all inclusive nature and breach of old habits" (p. 10). By "all inclusive", Seay referred to the interdisciplinary nature of the field which, at times, merged and borrowed from fields like community development, community planning, education, political science and other areas not traditionally considered within the realm of education. Decker (1972) observed that in its infancy community education "begged, borrowed, or stole from other disciplines to suit its needs" (p. 209). Minzey and LeTarte (1979) agreed that borrowing had occurred, but that this did not make particular disciplines synonymous with community education. For example, they argued that community education and community development are not be considered equal (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 20). The discussion within the field appeared to have been an attempt to establish the uniqueness of community education as a philosophy, a movement and an educational process and not merely a set of add-on school programs (Ibid., p. 31).

The British community education philosopher and theorists, Allen (1987) observed that community education appeared to be a concept which was "problematic and contested despite its widespread currency" (p. 22). Although there appears to be difficulties with definition (not unique to this field) and acceptance, there are

currently 85 members countries of the International Community Education Association who have adopted this philosophy of education.

Eric Batten (1981), British community education theorist, stated that community education appeared to be vaguely shaped with "no general organizing theory within a country" (p. 27). Yet, he considered the efforts of community educators worldwide to be significant enough to "redirect educational policy and practice in ways which bring education into a closer and more equal relationship" with the issues and needs of their own area (p. 2). Thus, this study attempted to identify, firstly, the generic features of this theory.

Despite the "nebulous nature" and seeming imprecision of definition (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 38), this study was able to locate the recurrent themes alluded to by American theorists like Maurice Seay (1972) and Ledford (1988). The locations of these themes was necessary to proceed to the next step of this research design, that is, to formulate propositions for the parallel inductive arguments to hypothesis.

This chapter has provided a discussion of the research findings based on this analysis of the writings of major American contributors to the field of community education during the period 1939-1989. The findings are presented in two parts. Part I has presented the conclusion, that is, the intended outcomes or end envisioned by community education theorists. Part II has presented the premises (that is, propositions of support) identified through this analysis which described the events or conditions (means) which would enable achievement of the outcomes.

### The Overall Argument of Community Education

Community education can be reconstructed as an inductive argument which attempts to explain a relationship where participants interact in certain ways and use

methods to achieve desired outcomes in a specified location over time. Simplified this can be stated: **if** particular elements are in place, **then** particular outcomes are expected. Of course, charting such theoretical terrain can be risky since human psychology and motivation are difficult to predetermine. Community education theorists are well aware of the voluntary and unpredictable depths of human nature, but have continued to offer this argument to discuss a pedagogy of possibility to create transformative change and social justice.

This chapter has presented a discussion of this five part relationship described above. Included in this discussion are the following elements: location, time interval, methods, characteristics and outcomes. The outcomes have been encapsulated in the conclusion statement of the argument and are located at item #8 on Table 2. The propositions, which serve as premises, have been presented in Items #1 to #7 on Table 2. Table 2 was prepared to offer the reader an overview of this argumentation developed from analysis of the 30 selected readings.

This chapter will, firstly, offer the reader a description of the conclusion and, secondly, provide a review of the seven propositions in the numerical order listed on Table 2.

## **Part I: Discussion of the Conclusion**

### **The Deduction of the Conclusion**

The conclusion reads:

*Then community members are likely to create self-determined transformative change and social justice.*

The conclusion was formulated from data collected to answer the question: What is/are the purpose(s) of community education? In this case, purpose referred to

**Table 2 Premises and Conclusion of an Inductive Argument to Hypothesis Framed to Explain the Relationship of Characteristics and Events in Community Education.**

<b>I</b> <b><u>Element of The Theoretical</u></b> <b><u>Relationship</u></b>	<b>II</b> <b><u>Premises and Conclusion</u></b>
1. LOCATION (Characteristic)	<b>IF</b> Community members study their needs, problems and concerns and create actions which have an extra community awareness of influences and consequences.
2. TIME DURATION (Characteristic)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members recognize and accept themselves and each other as lifelong teachers and learners (community educators).
3. PREFERRED METHOD #1 (Event)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members use problem-solving methods to meet needs and resolve problems.
4. PREFERRED METHOD #2 (Event)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members use collaborative teaching and learning (that is, educational activism) to create educated, educative and enduring solutions.
5. PREFERRED METHOD #3 (Event)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members respect the ideals of and use the methods of participatory democracy for cooperative problem-solving.
6. PREFERRED QUALITY OF INTERACTION #1 (Characteristic)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members respectfully involve all ages in dialogue, study, planning, problem-solving, evaluation, shared decision making and other aspects of community education.
7. PREFERRED QUALITY OF INTERACTION #2 (Characteristic)	<b>AND, IF</b> Community members recognize and accept each other as equal (egalitarian) partners.
8. CONCLUSION Desired Outcome(s)	<b>THEN</b> Community members are likely to create self-determined transformative change and social justice.

the general good of community education. The following discussion addressed the three features of the conclusion. These three features were: social justice, transformative change and self-determination. These features will be discussed in this order.

### Social Justice

A variety of phrases and statements were located which included the concept of social justice (that is, just and right relations and actions among community members to provide a basic quality of life). Totten (1970) offered a summary of aims which encapsulated those mentioned by the other theorists. He described the outcomes of change as those which would counteract the perceived alienation produced by urbanization, which would create common concerns and actions to resolve the dehumanizing effects generated by social problems (like bigotry and poverty), which would afford opportunity to genuine community involve to reduce indifference of apathy and which would, hopefully, assist in the foundation of a peaceful and less violent world civilization (p. 12). He further stated that community members must also strive not only for material gain but also "strive for the things worth *being*" [His italics] (Totten, 1970, p. 148).

Several of the community education theorists took issue with what they perceived to be the alienating and dehumanizing effects of urbanization. Misner (1938) identified a hope that community education could be a means to counteract the "effects of the machine age" and to "transform the potential evils of machine technology into human assets" (p. 54). Minzey and LeTarte (1979) also stressed their belief that urbanization created ill effects on individuals and communities of a psychological, physical and emotional nature and that the recreation of nurturing

social groupings could reduce the sense of anomie and alienation experienced by some individuals (pp. 27-29).

All of the theorists expressed an optimistic hope that community improvement is possible through the use of educational, collaborative and democratic means to ameliorate social injustice and an inequitable quality of life. Olsen (1954) provided this rationale for community-wide improvement: "The good community is concerned with the well-being of *all* its people" [His italics] (p. 69). Thus, the phrase, *and social justice*, was included in this statement of the conclusion to qualify the nature of the humanitarian change-making sought.

In the discussion of social justice by community educators, social justice referred to the resolution of situations of inequity and debilitated quality of life (lack of affordable housing or nutritious food or access to decision making) based on "humane values and humanitarian issues" (Seay, 1974, p. 27). The hope for meeting basic needs was most thoroughly described by Seay in 1953. He specified the needs and problems which community-wide educational processes would address (Ibid., p. 11). He identified problem areas in terms of nourishment, clothing, shelter, recreation, physical and mental health, citizenship, morality, religion and work (Ibid., p. 11). Seay's humanitarianism is evident, although he did not use the term social justice and he did not specify with exactitude the minimum standards to be achieved in these areas.

The term social justice was used to describe the nature of justice sought by community educators wishing to use educational process to solve these self-identified problems. Olsen (1951) stated that education needed to serve a changing civilization and would need to be, therefore, dynamic and reorganized around a new "moral-civic-

social" purpose (p. 176). Although he did not use the term social justice, the hyphenated phrase - moral-civic-social - could be interpreted as a basis for improved quality of life in his further qualification that schools must attend to the "enduring life needs of the whole person of the whole community" (Ibid., p. 176).

Totten (1970) enlarged the concept of social justice by stating that community educators may find there is need to "find better ways to distribute and use good and services to meet the basic needs" (p. 160). In a similar vein, Olsen (1953) discussed the need for the reconstruction of domestic economics to meet basic needs (p. 28). Thus, community educators were concerned with the poverty of some individuals which they had witnessed in their local, national and global communities. Together, these writings have formed a tradition of questioning why basic needs had not been provided for all individuals in American capitalist society. In 1938, Everett first observed that there is struggle for dominance and that this struggle does have roots in "clear-cut social classes and vested interests" (p. 45).

Community educators appeared to believe that social justice would not occur without a struggle and there is discussion about the socio-economic and other barriers which inhibit positive social interactions (for examples, Olsen, 1945, 1951, 1954; Melby, 1955; Totten, 1970; Minzey & LeTarte, 1979). Community educators expressed concern about factors like class or caste structures evident in American society (Olsen, 1945, pp. 18, 102-107). For example, Olsen (1954) stated that social class is an undeniable reality of American society despite the idealization of equality in American democracy; and, that teachers must actively promote opportunities to study and understand the effects of these community conditions (p. 106).

Minzey and LeTarte (1979) provided a different perception of affluence. They stated that community educators must not make judgements about the ability of the individual or community to solve problems to meet needs on the basis of wealth or degree of education (p. 131). Totten (1970) identified additional barriers like racism, wealth and class as these could create conflictive situations which could hamper positive relations and marginalize some individuals in terms of the quality of life enjoyed (p. 12). Thus, the barriers to achievement of social justice (a fair and equitable quality of life) were recognized by community educators as inhibiting factors which would daunt their expressed goals to attain social justice.

As these barriers might remain invisible to some, other community educators, like Melby (1955), Olsen (1954) and Fasheh (1990), have drawn on the goal of education as the search for truth to accent the need to locate the reasons for social injustice. The component of social justice is of major significance in the discussion of the outcomes envisioned by community educators.

### Transformative Change

Community education is about change. Statements were located in all of the 30 selections which supported a need for change for a variety of reasons and outcomes. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) summarized three, basic assumptions about change-making. These included: (1) communities possess the ability to create positive change, (2) communities have social problems which have solutions, (3) individuals are motivated to change (Ibid. p. 45). Community education theorists talked about events or characteristics which would theoretically create change, or identified events or characteristics which had created positive change. These descriptions included the use of phrases which referred to the creation of progress and improvement in community

living (Kirkpatrick, 1938, p. 19); social reconstruction (Clapp. 1939; Olsen, 1945, p. 3); improvement of all aspects of group living (Hanna & Naslund, 1953, p. 52); and, problem solutions obtained through unified social action (Totten, 1970, p. 11).

Perhaps, community education could have been called *change education* or *community change education*. In 1972, Hiemstra provided a statement which expressed the awareness of the pervasiveness of the need for change felt by community educators. He stated

That we now live in an age of rapid change has been said in many ways by many people. Change has become the only inevitability in history, therefore, we must learn to educate for change (Hiemstra, 1972, p. 18).

It is this social change which has also brought some social problems. These included, in addition to unmet basic needs, poverty, deteriorating morality, racial unrest, racism, increased crime, population growth, unemployment, health problems and environmental degradation (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 29).

These 24 theorists have not focused on education for a particular group of clients identified with terms like early childhood or adult education, nor did they focus on a particular ideology like Montessori Education or experiential learning. Instead, they have focused on establishing connections between education and community betterment through education-based change. The type of changes identified are for the purposes of community improvement, betterment or reconstruction. These essential goals are not immediately evident in the descriptor *community*.

The term community is used to identify the primary geographical and/or social (that is, interest or other type of collective association) groups a member inhabits and

claims ownership to; that is, his/her point of reference in terms of place and participation. The community is envisioned as a place where methods used at the community level could create desired, planned, social change (Seay, 1974). However, to identify the change sought as merely *social change* would be inadequate. Social change is not only an inadequate term, but also a ubiquitous term. Chirot (1989) stated that any event which organized people would normally enact while living collectively would constitute a social change if the actions were repeated rather than episodic (pp. 760-761). Thus, a more specific term was sought to describe this aspect of the end envisioned by community educators.

Boles and Seay (1974) distinguished social changes in social institutions from those which could be classified as general change as those which would be planned, researched and purposeful (p. 55). They defined a social institution as the ideas, customs or beliefs (ideology) which society valued enough to continue (p. 53). They cited schooling as an example of an institution. Thus, institutions which were valued would endure; however, community living is rife with examples of institutions (like poverty or sexism) which also endure and it is these institutions which community educators needed to dismantled, modified or eliminated.

Instead of social change, community educators were seeking transformation. Webster's (1970) defined *transform* thusly, "to change the condition, nature of function of" (Guralnik, Ed., 1970, p. 1510). This meaning is applicable to the nature of the change advocated by community educators. Theorists supported the "power of education" to transform their communities in terms of the quality of life and measure of social justice (for examples, Everett, 1938; Clapp, 1939; Seay, 1945, 1953; Olsen,

1945; Totten, 1970). Therefore, the term transformative change was chosen for inclusion in the conclusion to identify the quality of social change.

### Self-determined Change

Another strongly supported feature of community education is the belief in the right of the individual to self-determine personal and community events and conditions. Twenty-three of the 30 selections contained statements which emphasized self-determination. Everett (1938), one of the earliest community education pioneers and philosophers in the field, wrote that genuine "understanding, mutual respect and significant accomplishment" to reconstruct community conditions could only result from "self-determined change by community members" (p. 442). Community-based identification of problems and community-based action were continuing threads throughout the literature. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that community control is self-determination wherein "responsibility and the decision making authority" returns to the grassroots of the local citizenry (p. 17).

All of the theorists identified that the change agent is the individual who must cooperate, in some fashion, with other members of his/her social group. In 1990, Decker stressed that community members develop as change agents when they have been assumed "some responsibility" and have had opportunity for "active engagement" in communal problem solving (p. 4). Minzey and LeTarte (1979) observed that during the 1970s and the 1980s that there was an increasing valuing of self-determination and attempts were being made to return "authority to the citizen" (p. 29). This return to local, community-based control was viewed as an empowering force and a basic tenet of American democracy, which could enable individuals to increase control over the issues affecting their lives (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 29).

These two theorists asserted that the most meaningful and genuine change-making would more likely occur if it was created by the community itself (Ibid., p. 35), although they did not qualify this assumption with examples to demonstrate their premise. Will community-based, local change always be the most meaningful and effective?

Theorists stressed the necessity of self-determination in a variety of ways. Clapp (1939) provided one of the earliest statements about the need for community-based will and community-based action in terms of community education. She stated that change cannot meaningfully occur by imposed authority from without or above the community level

Community education is, from the point of view of the people working in it, primarily education of themselves in facing new problems, in working with others on these, and, in guiding work upon them. It is here that learning is not only shared, but mutual (Clapp, 1939, p. 169).

Clapp (1939) continued that the teacher, who is becoming a community educator, must abandon authority based on role status and expectations, and become a respected authority by virtue of his/her knowledge of the community which is confirmed in the creation of positive actions to improve the quality of life (p. 169). Furthermore, she stated that community education be actualized by planning, design or legislation which does not have direct input from those the plans, designs or legislation will affect.

Community education is not brought into being by the putting over of a plan, or by the imposing of ideas. It requires that full recognition be given to people's desires and needs, feelings and opinions, ways of doing

and thinking; and that the relation of any particular enterprise to other enterprises and to the whole be currently understood (Clapp, 1939, p. 169).

Thus, Clapp observed, based on her reflective theorizing about the operation of two experimental community schools in the southern U.S., that change must result from self-determined actions and not from the will of experts alone. This observation also illustrated that intended change must be holistic and consider the relationships among conditions and events.

Larry Horyna (1990) continued this view in the contemporary literature and stated that "local people are in the best position to identify community needs and wants" (p. 7). Self-determination has an aspect of inclusiveness wherein all community members are to be directly involved in planning and designing change-making. As early as 1938 Hullfish cautioned that community educators must resist any tendency to identify the community with the "partial interests of self-centered individuals and groups" (p. 49). Consequently, self-determination has become an ingrained tenet in community education theory. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that a continuing assumption of community education is that people should be "*done with* and not *to*" in relation to creating transformative change [Their italics](p. 113). In some ways this aspect of self-determination is both means and an end. However, the researcher felt that this aspect should receive a more prominent placement in the conclusion because the methods for change-making, recommended by the theorists, always included the element of self-determination.

### Summary of Part I

This first section of Chapter 3 introduced three features of the outcomes envisioned in the literature of community education. This end can be described as one which would result from self-determined efforts to create transformative change and social justice.

### **Part II: Discussion of the Seven Premises**

In this second section, each premise was presented as an italicized statement at the beginning of each discussion.

#### Discussion of Premise #1: Location

*Community members study their needs, problems and concerns and create actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.*

The first premise addressed the question: Where can community education occur? Statements were located in 28 of the 30 writings which indicated that community-based study and resolution of social problems to meet basic needs should occur at the community level. Communities are the source of client, content, motivation and action. In 1938, Everett stressed that the community is the primary setting for educational problem solving (p. 442). In 1939, Clapp also stated that if community education is to be effective, localized change making, then individuals must begin with examination and resolution of local issues first (p. 256). However, change is not limited to a physical locale.

Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that community must be understood as more than a location, but rather as a feeling and as a reference to local conditions (p. 21). The potential for the interests of selfish localism to dominate choices made to solve

problems was discouraged by these two theorists. Thirteen of the 24 theorists in 17 of the 30 selections stated that the community is not just one of geographic territory. Instead, community is to be interpreted in "all of the broad meaning of that concept in the local, state, regional, national or international community" (Hanna & Naslund, 1953, p. 52). Awareness of the interplay of global influences, effects and consequences is evident. However, there is little explanation given of techniques needed to minimize the potentially detrimental effects of solutions obtained in one locale, or recommended methods for regional planning.

According to Seay (1953), community-based problem solving could enable individuals to use skills, values, concepts, experience and knowledge to bear on local and global problems. Thus, it became necessary to add a caveat to this premise which indicated that community educators are cognizant of the holistic interrelationship between local and global communities. Therefore, the phrase, *extra-community awareness*, was added to indicate this extended sense of community-based action.

#### Considerations Related to this Premise

The following discussion has addressed considerations the researcher has with this first premise. Four considerations, that is, points for further reflection, have been described. These include the ambiguity of the concept of community, the difficulty of locating community boundaries, the complications of attempting to establish unified collective action and the need for extra-community awareness.

The Seeming Ambiguity of the Concept of Community. Although community has become an imprecise and contested term (Decker, 1972, Martin, 1987), all of these theorists used the term to designate a geographical area and/or to characterize a sense of collective identity. All of the theorists also extended the intent of the Socratic

maxim, "Know Thyself" to "Know Thyself in The Community" in terms of what Everett (1938) had identified as a "shared world setting" (p. 443).

Several major trends work against the concept of community. Two of these are population mobility and the anonymity of urban settlement. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that a community does not have a static population because the constituents are constantly changing due to "inward and outward migration" (p. 131). In light of factors such as these, the implementation of community education would be twofold. Firstly, individuals would need to experience and understand their self-recognition and identification with a particular 'community'. Secondly, these community members would need to experience and comprehend their responsibility to and ownership of events and conditions of the problems in their area. However, it is difficult to imagine that individuals, especially those in urban settings, could be brought to focus their attention on this setting as a primary source of identity and action, in light of mobility (for reasons of career, education or other) and barriers engendered in differences like class and other forms of segregation.

However, the term continues to be firmly coupled to the term education in the this field. Community educators appear to use the term to signify the importance of grassroots will and action. It would seem necessary, then, to foster positive ways to promote identification with and commitment to improvement of conditions within an area rather than (or, in combination with) commitment solely concerned with individualistic or collective pursuits of self-interest. As many community members now live in a more associational manner (clubs, occupation, interests, social causes, religious affiliations), individuals appear to be less bound by loyalty to a neighbourhood. A first task of community educators would be that of rebuilding a

consciousness about immediate community. This has been an emphasis throughout the literature and has often been discussed as creation of *a sense of community*, that is, conscious and intentional group solidarity.

Defining the Boundaries. In 1945, Olsen (pp. 43-71) provided one of the most extensive explanations for the identification of the geographical, material, institutional and psychological dimensions of a community's location, resources and culture. Half of the theorists felt it necessary to discuss methods of conducting a community inventory. Fletcher (1990) observed that community education might be better labelled *locality education* (p. 177). Twenty-one of the 24 theorists attempted to locate these boundaries using the service area of the school; for an example, see Olsen (1945, p. 45). It would seem necessary that community educators would need to decide if the selected area would have fixed or fluid boundaries and whether decisions made by community members to accept or reject communities as defined by local, rural, municipal, educational or other authorities were required.

The feature of extra-community awareness could assist community educators to ensure that local control of an area through self-determined actions would not conflict negatively with the understandings and expectations of the members of other communities who may consider an area their territory.

The Difficulty of Establishing Unified Community Action. As a community membership has diverse interests (social, spiritual, economic, political), these interests and other factors (racism, classism, sexism, etc.) may alienate community groups and create irresolvable conflicts. These same interests and factors may also limit access to, let alone control of, needed resources and power. O'Hagen (1987) stated that some community educators have overlooked the fact that the community is a contrast of

contradictory impulses (p. 74). He further argued that these difficulties were not the result of simple misunderstandings, but resulted from inequitable distribution and control of power and resources (O'Hagen, 1987, p. 74).

All of the theorists supported the development of common concerns. However, the levelling of political, economic, power, and class differentiations is much easier stated than accomplished. Community educators (theorists and practitioners) need to explore further discussions about methods to create unified action through consensus building or coalition building. A distinction between co-optation -assimilation to another point of view without respect for a similar perspective or need - and collective unity which respects and incorporates diversity needs to be made and put into practice. These are difficult issues of human relationships to resolve and require further research.

Community Involvement and Extra-community Awareness. The writings emphasized extra-community awareness; however there is scant evidence to show that a local emphasis will automatically lead to global awareness; or even to, as suggested by Decker (1992), education's helping individuals to "understand and discharge their global responsibilities" (p. 5). In this regard, it is likely that community educators will need to more openly emphasize the connection between studied consideration of local and extra-community influences on the local and other communities in terms of situation, conditions, resources and power.

With regard to this sense of global awareness, members of the local community may also be hampered in creating community-based actions due to lack of access to information from other communities about events in their communities which are impairing the quality of health of the local community. Therefore, it would be

reasonable to assume that community educators will need to more rationally consider the nature and quality of interaction with other locales and peoples.

### Summary of Premise #1

This first premise identified the community as the primary site of community-based study and action. However, the community is not only located to a particular physical territory but also included in the community a sense of communal identification and purpose. The question of location was specifically addressed; however, there were still some ambiguities which require further clarification and study. These included the nebulousness of the concept of community, the difficulty of defining a locale, barriers (socio-economic, racial, class, etc.) which inhibit unified, collective action and the need for further exploration of the links between local and global social problems and solutions. These four areas identified a range of problems which could influence community-based study and action.

### Discussion of Premise #2: Time Interval

*If community members recognize and accept themselves and each other as lifelong teachers and learners*

The second premise was developed to answer the question: When could community education occur? Statements were located in 26 of the 30 selections which indicated that lifelong learning is a basic feature of community education. Seay (1972) identified lifelong learning as one of the six most recurrent themes in community education. He stated that an individual's education is more than schooling and is a "composite of all his experiences" (p. 17). Hiemstra (1972) summarized community education as "lifelong, continuous, and encompassing both in and out of school activities" (p. 61). Decker (1992) stated that the current narrow

conception of education as grade- and age-based should be viewed as a sequence of steps and "not as a continuum, grouping students by age and by academic ability as measured on standardized tests" (p. 5). However, the focus in community education has not been limited to lifelong learning.

There has also been a sense of lifelong teaching. In 1953, Olsen posited that all community members "are teachers or potential teachers, as well as learners" in that every individual has knowledge or experience to contribute to educational problem solving to meet community needs (p. 90). Community members are considered lay and valuable teachers in community education. According to Muntyan (1953), community education extended the educational authority throughout the community to all members, which further suggested to him that what is traditionally considered teaching skills and authority would need "to be reconstructed in terms of group processes and methods" (p. 42).

This perception of individuals is one where they are viewed as alternatively, or simultaneously, as teachers and learners. Twenty of the 30 selections contained statements which identified individuals as teachers involved in the process of community educating. For example, Totten (1970) stated that in community educating all individuals are to be considered "participants and producers in all areas of our culture as well as acquirers of knowledge" and respected in terms of their potential as teachers (pp. 13, 148). The community member is ascribed the active role of teacher not just the involved citizen. The citizenship role has an added dimension of teacher. Kerensky and Melby (1975) suggested that the mobilization of a community as skilled teachers and learners would be a challenge (p. 195).

Thus, community educators would need to re-examine their conceptualizations of who is the teacher and who is the learner. Teaching is considered a specialized profession. Strategies would be required to informally train individuals to more effectively teach (that is, research, prepare, share, instruct and evaluate curricular experiences). This is not to suggest the complete elimination of the profession of teaching, but to create the understanding that the availability of informal teachers had increased.

### Summary of Premise #2

The second premise identified the time interval as lifelong and lifelong in terms of teaching and learning processes which would be considered necessary to promote continuous community-based study and action. Also, community members would need to learn how to value their potential as teachers.

### **Discussion of Premises #3, #4 and #5: Methods**

In this section of Part II, the three most often cited methods preferred by community educators have been discussed. The three methods were: problem solving, educational activism, and participatory democracy. This discussion will also proceed in this order. The formulation of these premises answered the question: How can the goals of community education be achieved? The goals referred to are those of self-determined transformative change and social justice.

### Discussion of Premise #3: Problem Solving

*Community members use problem solving to meet needs and resolve problems.*

Twenty-nine of the 30 selections contained statements which indicated that community members should use problem solving as one method to achieve outcomes. Twenty-three of the 30 selections contained statements which indicated the formal or

informal methods of problem solving needed. The methods indicated a variety of methods which have been summarized in Table 5.0 of Appendix III.

The community is often identified as a learning laboratory for community educating (for example, Clapp, 1939; Misner, 1953; Seay, 1953; Irwin & Russell, 1971). Problem solving was described as a means to couple knowledge with action through processes of problem solving. A sense of pragmatism was evident in the theoretical writings, with knowledge viewed as a resource for praxis. The term pragmatic referred to a sense that knowledge would have not earthly use unless it directly related to discovering the reasons for community need and the methods to meet these needs (Everett, 1938, p. 443). Community educators believed that finding out also implied applying the new knowledge to problems which seem persistent.

Seay (1972) summarized the problem solving educative processes as a seven stage sequence (p. 18). This sequence included: (1) collection of facts to formulate a problem, (2) design of experiments and demonstrations to attempt problem solution, (3) participation in study circles to discuss features of the problem, (4) direct observation of the problem to consider available solutions, (5) development of projects related to the problem, and (6) usage of diverse instructional materials (p. 18). The approach may be interpreted as quite linear because Seay (1972) does not directly discuss the interconnectedness of problems or solutions. This sequence does not recommend the holistic approach suggested by Clapp (1939) who stated that problem solving needed to be cognizant of relationships among events and conditions in the community.

There are some additional considerations related to the problem solving process which include: (1) self-determination, (2) ethics, (3) holism, (4) rationality and (5) common unity.

### Self-Determination

The first quality is directly related to initiation of the problem solving process where community education theorists again emphasized local control. Twenty of the 30 selections contained statements which indicated that community members were to be directly involved in the self-determination and self-solution of problems. Clapp's (1939) pronouncement summarized the intent of this sense of self-determination

Above all, it seems to me, the record should make clear that it  
community education one is never dealing with a fixed plan, a formula,  
or a ready-made organization, but with needs as they are revealed --  
needs and aspirations of the people (pp. 255-256).

Community educators expressed a belief that problems are most effectively solved through local involvement. Olsen (1954) stated that "paternalism" or a "dependence on 'Mr. Big' to solve problems" could lead to a malfunctioning in problem solving: especially those related to the economic welfare of the community (p. 70). He further observed that when problem solving is concentrated in the hands of an individual or corporation, then there is potential to misuse power and, even, to possibly bring harm to the individual or the community (p. 70). Olsen believed that individuals should never be exploited for their labor and that economic activity ought to be an open and shared endeavor of the community (Ibid., p. 70). Thus, self-determination is an important aspect of the problem solving process for many aspects of communal life.

### Ethical Nature

Although the discussion of the ethical nature of problem solving was limited, that is, only five of the 30 selections made direct reference to such, the need for an ethical basis was strongly implied within the discussions related to social justice.

Olsen (1954) stated that youth need to be respectful of other community members and that they needed to "grow in their insight into ethical values and principles" (p. 508). However, most of the writings did not place an emphasis here. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that methods chosen to achieve social justice would be actions which would be socially just and ethical. However, the literature has provided little direction to develop or judge the ethical nature of actions.

Not all measures taken to ensure social justice might provide such. For example, a problem related to community unemployment might be resolved with a collectively supported decision to open a toxic-waste facility. However, ethical questions could be raised about short- and long-term environmental and social (for example, health) consequences of this action and the quality of the economic gain to be acquired. In 1945, Olsen stated that "knowledge without ethics is at best indifferent" to community standards and could destroy them and individuals (p. 35). Thus, it would be logical to assume that problem solving would have a framework of ethics which would guide discussion and selection of appropriate solutions.

Additionally, the enormity and entrenchment of some barriers to economic, political or social equality are unethical hindrances to self-determination. Collective problem solving will raise issues related to the lack of empowerment for all community members. There is, however, a pacifist tone to the writings of these community education theorists which could hopefully assist in the dissolution of these barriers.

The ethical nature of problem solving, and of the problems themselves, will require community educators who understand the basis and operation of ethics to guide positive community living.

### Holistic Approach

Schuell (1990) observed that problems are often seen as independent of one another and that problem solvers tend to work on one problem at a time (p. 103). However, problems are not isolated, singular puzzles. Schuell (1990) further observed that when the problem solver begins to work with one problem, s/he will often find another problem and that these problems have sub-problems (p. 103). In community educating, the problem solving process could begin to reveal further difficulties which would need to be integrated in a holistic pattern which illustrated the complexities of community life.

### Rationality

Few of the theorists observed that problem solving could be interpreted as an overly rationalistic approach. Reasoning was stressed as an aspect of problem solving in all of the selections but the emotional nature of problem solving was not often addressed. Kerensky and Melby (1975) are two of the theorists who did raise this dimension. They argued that community educators cannot be expected to appreciate the affective considerations of community educating if only the cognitive concerns were stressed (Kerensky & Melby, 1975, p. 148). Their discussion included feelings which could, if negatively expressed, create conflict and injure the positive intentions problem solvers (for example, Everett, 1938; Clapp, 1939; Olsen, 1945). Conflict has emotional content. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) observed that emotions can even inhibit personal motivation to attempt problem solving because timidity, frustration, suspicion and antagonism would only interfere with design and implementation of solutions (p. 45).

Therefore, it would seem necessary to have individuals develop a sensitive awareness that as problems are identified, studied and discussed in their immediate community, then intelligent observation, thoughtful ideation and, perhaps, a mixed bag of emotions will be expressed. Perhaps, community members will need to include a sense of compassion and respect in their interactions with others in order to lessen the potential destructive of conflictive interactions.

If left unchecked, negative expressions of feelings could also diminish the self-esteem and confidence levels of participants (Kirkpatrick, 1938). Kirkpatrick observed that in community education "the foundation of morality and proper society" must be respected because individuals must appreciate and respect the rights and feelings of everyone (p. 5). Kirkpatrick (1938) continued by stating that community educating cannot occur unless "self-regarding" and "other regarding feelings and acts are balanced interaction" (p. 5). Therefore, problem solving ought not to be viewed as merely a process of the development of correct reasoning and justification, but one which also included the dimensions of feelings. Techniques for diffusing negative expressions and nurturing positive expressions will need to be studied and learned by community members to maintain collaborative problem solving.

### Common Unity

The theorists also viewed problem solving as a method to create common concerns and, as a result, a sense of community which would be both positive and nurturing. Through communal engagement and successful solution of problems, community educators expressed the hope that this would bring people into more intimate and constructive associations which would not harm the community. It is

not evident, from the literature, if working together as a group would necessarily develop a sense of community team spirit.

#### Discussion of Premise #4: Educational Activism

*Community members use collaborative teaching and learning (that is, educational activism) to create educated, educative and enduring solutions for community problems.*

A second method of community educating was identified as educational activism. Twenty-three of the theorists supported the use of educational processes to achieve the desired outcomes. Olsen's (1958) statement can be viewed as a summary of the intent of many of these theorists. He believed that community members, of all ages, must "learn to utilize educational processes as dynamic means for improving the individual's own life" in local and global settings (Olsen, 1958, no pg. nos.). The term educational activism was not used by the theorists; however, the term was introduced to this study to represent the importance given to "education as a means of change" (Hanna & Naslund, 1953, p. 62). Totten (1970) was often quoted by other theorists to describe the needed network of community-wide teaching and learning where all of the "learning forces and factors" will be brought into complementary interaction to produce community betterment (p. 11).

However, it is difficult to assert that all life is educational: sometimes life is just living and not intentionally instructional. Foshay (1985) argued that communities themselves cannot engage in the deliberate actions of teaching and learning and that it is necessary to have teachers who know how to create curricular experiences which assist learners to encode and decode information (p. 12). He further stated that the community can only stimulate and that sometimes elements of the

community provide harmful stimulation (for examples, gangs, prostitution, addictions) (p. 12). Thus, it would be reasonable to suggest that community educators would again require a firmly justified, understood and communicated knowledge of the ethical nature of problems and solutions in order to identify which events or conditions of community were educative or mis-educative.

A number of assumptions are implied in this premise. For example, within the concept of educational activism there is the assumption that continuous opportunities (in informal or formal settings) for the study of issues through mutual teaching and learning would be available. There is also the implication that community educators would have to access to accessible and affordable materials based on a variety of variables like reading level, researched information and the like in order share teachings about the problem and solution. There is a further implication that restrictions which inhibited community-based teaching and learning (for examples, economic or attitudinal) would need to be identified and removed.

#### Qualities of the Solutions to be Obtained for Self-determined Problem Solving

The analysis of the writings suggested that particular kinds of solutions were sought. These solutions would be those which could be characterized as enduring, educated and educative.

Firstly, self-created transformative change and social justice were to be long-term and not simply reactions or quick-fix repairs. In 1953, Seay observed that there were other procedures which could produce change. These included methods like high pressure sales tactics or subsidization projects. However, the resultant change would more likely be permanent if community members learned new behaviors rather than resorting to "old practices" which were harmful to the individual and the community

(p. 3). He further stated that educational objectives are often stated in terms of changed behaviour (1972, p. 18). Seay described this type of change as one which would permeate "the whole fiber of the individual" and mature as part of the individual's "understanding as well as his [her] way of doing things" (p. 18). Thus, community educators would strive for change-making which is enduring.

Secondly, transformative change was to be educated change. Melby (1955) introduced the concept of the *educative community* as where educational activism would be a community-wide means to create change (p. 282). In the educative community individuals would become a unified network of teachers, learners, researchers and resource sharers to create planned change (Ibid., p. 282). Hence, transformative change would be related to problem solving processes which promoted comprehension of the origin of the problem(s), its/their effects and influences, and its/their relationships to other events and conditions of the community. Community educators were seeking change-making which engendered the sense that life itself is potentially an educational experience. This sense of the potential of experience to be educational has a heritage in Dewey's philosophy of education where education has been described as a process of social experience. Dewey (1964) stated, in an essay outlining his pedagogic creed, that "Education is a process of living and not a preparation for future living" (p. 430). Thus, if problem solving is to be an educational experience, then the solutions to be problems studied would be, hopefully, educational conclusions.

In the same manner, educated solutions would in turn create educative effects; that is, the solutions would illustrate the creation of new knowledge and experiences which community members could learn from or use as teaching material.

#### Summary of Premise #4

This fourth premise introduced the term educational activism to describe community members' engagement in collaborative teaching and learning to produce solutions to problems. The solutions produced through lifelong processes of educational collaboration would be those characterized as enduring, educated and educative.

#### **Discussion of Premise #5: Participatory Democracy**

*Community members respect the ideals and use methods of participatory democracy for cooperative problem solving.*

In community education, participatory democracy was characterized as:

- (1) inclusive participation from everyone (28 of the 30 selections);
- (2) collaborative or cooperative processes (30 of the 30 selections);
- (3) faith in the individual's ability to effect change (17 of the of the 30 solutions);
- (4) respect for the individual (26 of the 30 selections);
- (5) shared powers in the decision making processes (25 of the 30 selections);
- (6) democratic processes (20 of the 30 selections); and,
- (7) cooperative planning processes (25 of the 30 selections).

Minzey and LeTarte (1979) used the term, participatory democracy (p. 128), to describe the nature of the community involvement imagined by community educators. Denton (1983) used the term *direct democracy* to describe community-wide involvement and the localization of community-based actions to create self-determined futures. Decentralization, as suggested by Denton (1983), would extend devolution of decision making from centralized control to local control. Denton (1983) suggested that this would create immediate responsiveness, less bureaucracy and a reduction in

external decisions which are divorced from or irrelevant to people's lives (p. 20).

Although Olsen (1954) did not use the term participatory democracy, he described democratic living as interactive and cooperative participation by community members in the self-government of their daily living. He stated that democracy, which he believed to be essential to freedom, to be more than a political system was "above all a dynamic social faith in the ability of enlightened people to manage their own affairs with justice and intelligence" (Olsen, 1954, p. 494). Therefore, the term participatory democracy was selected because the phrase most closely identified the nature of social and political interaction pictured by community educators.

The writings introduced some of the difficulties related to local control. These have included: the role of the state and the extent of local control and barriers to shared decision making. These two issues will be discussed in this order in the following section.

### The Role of the State

The term is in contrast to representative democracy where individuals are selected, appointed or elected to manage affairs. Although community educators described a participatory form of democracy, they did not discuss what the relationship between the state and the community would be. According to Minzey (1972) community control was always available "as long as communities exercise their political will" (p. 152). He stated that civic involvement had declined because the size of a community and complex institutional structures could frustrate individual will and attempts to act (Minzey, 1972, p. 27). Minzey and LeTarte (1979) further developed their understanding of the lack of civic participation in 1979 by observing, again, that local control was always available, but that some elected individuals only

gave "lip service" to democracy's potential and that these elected representatives appeared to be more "oriented to a belief in 'elitist' government and governmental oligarchy rather than in participatory democracy" (p. 128). Although Minzey and LeTarte (1979) were clearly disenchanted with some representatives of democracy, they did not suggest abolishment of the state. Instead, they argued that community power is available and underutilized and advocated that community members must reaccept their responsibility in governing their lives (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, pp. 129-130).

There was an ambiguous or unstated relationship between local control and centralized control. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) described the state as a function of three components: legally elected boards, professionals, and the community itself (p. 129). They stated that each had a unique role in an interdependent role of checks and balances which had ceased to function and that the role of the community has become greatly diminished (p. 129). They argued that community education must consciously "reconstruct the system as it was intended to operate" without favor given to any one of the three (elected board, professionals, community) elements (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, pp. 129-130). Thus, the state is defined here as a function of elements where the effectiveness of the local element has been reduced.

Denton (1983) offered this view about the extent of decentralization. He stated that a more inclusive form of participation be initiated at the neighborhood level (Denton, 1983, p. 24). Denton (1983) argued that localized decision-making could eliminate bureaucracy and nurture cooperative partnerships to achieve collective goals (p. 21). He further stated that this local self-control need not be restricted to just the area of education (Denton, 1983, p. 21).

Just how far would American community educators be willing to extend local control? Kerensky (1972) observed that community education theorists have discussed both local control and community involvement (p. 160); however, the balance between centralization and decentralization has not been fully explored by these theorists.

### The Difficulties of Achieving Empowerment

A sense of the concept of empowerment, that is, full participation in terms of equality of power in decision-making and local control, was referred to in community education as self-help, self-education and self-determination. In 1970, Totten stated that community educators cannot presume to give each other ready-made solutions but that community members must be willing to cooperatively create solutions (p. 25). The sense of empowerment is considered necessary and available to all individuals by these theorists. Kerensky (1972) observed that change is more readily accepted if individuals are directly involved in the change making (p. 160). He argued that local control of the decision making process needed to be moved "closer and closer to the clients" to ensure that choices and actions reflected communal viewpoints and addressed direct and urgent needs (Kerensky, 1972, p. 160).

However, some community problems have their origins at the macro-level in institutions and situations controlled by individuals with inordinate amounts of wealth and power (Everett, 1939; Olsen, 1945, 1951, 1954; Minzey & LeTarte, 1979; Cowburn, 1986). Blackhurst, President of the International Community Education Association, has observed that community educators will need to examine the feasibility of the hope that educational activism can indeed "dismantle the apparatuses and structures that hinder progress and development" (p. 1). It may be

naive to assume that all community members will suddenly share power to achieve collective goals or truly respect each other as collaborative partners.

The inequitable dispersion and concentration of power throughout communities — local and global — requires some techniques for levelling the inequity. In 1970, Totten stated that the development of counter-power structures might be needed to rebalance the inequitable influence of power, but he did not describe processes to create these egalitarian structures (p. 151). Later, in 1972, Heimstra suggested that community educators would need to decide whether or not they would befriend and involve influential community leaders (pp. 85-86). However, this friendship building might lead to little more than co-optation, even if those approached would be willing to develop such open inclusiveness. In 1979, Minzey and LeTarte suggested that the system needed to be restructured as a genuine participatory democracy which did not create new, or oppressive, power blocs (which might anyone's power) (pp. 129-130). Clearly, the call for participatory democracy introduced difficult questions about power, individual and community empowerment and methods needed to achieve a participatory and inclusive system of local democracy.

#### Summary of Premise #5

In this section, the concept of participatory democracy was discussed. This was the third of the three methods of community educating identified by the analysis of the 30 selections. Participatory democracy has been defined in community education as a system of open and local self-government. However, the difficult complexities of issues related to achieving empowerment (that is, equitable power sharing) for all community members of the community and the role of the state have not been fully explored.

## **Introduction to Premises #6 and #7:**

### **Intergenerational Connectedness and Egalitarianism**

This discussion focuses on the final two premises which describe characteristics, which community educators believed, could enhance interactions among community members. These were intergenerational connectedness and egalitarianism. These two characteristics were located as answers to the question: What is/are characteristics of effective community educating?

#### Discussion of Premise #6: Intergenerational Connectedness

*Community members respectfully involve all ages in dialogue, study, planning, problem solving, evaluation, shared decision making and other aspects of community educating.*

According to Allan (1983), community education involves processes to re-engage individuals in meaningful human relationships to effect local change (p. 3). Twenty-two of the 24 theorists (29 of the 30 selections) offered a recommendation that individuals of all ages be brought together as active participants in community educating. For example, in 1938, Everett stated that as adults and youth have essential and common purposes in both work and play, then opportunities should be provided for their interaction (p. 440). Clapp described this multi-age interaction as one which would involve everyone — babies to grandmothers. In community education, collaborative teaching and learning opportunities were to be designed to reintegrate "age grouping that have been segregated for learning and social purposes" (Denton, 1983, p. 21). Study groups, tutoring clubs, and research teams would have a multi-age population which could strengthen community-wide dialogue and community-based action.

Eleven of the 24 theorists directly recommended that time and opportunity must be made available for community members to share dialogic encounters. For example, Olsen (1954) recommended that community members need settings of informal association where people can "move, talk, argue and reach agreements" in relaxed, inclusive and intimate interactions (p. 98). Multi-age groupings were valued by theorists because they believed that an authentic community is inclusive and that multi-age interactions can strengthen the sense of community needed to develop common concerns and unified community action. (For examples: Everett, 1938; Clapp, 1939; Seay, 1945; Olsen, 1945, 1954; etc.)

#### Discussion of Premise #7: Egalitarianism

*Community members recognize and accept each other as equal (egalitarian) partners.*

Twenty-one of the theorists stated that was a need for inclusive participation by all community members. Olsen and Clark (1977) believed that change-making would require the participation of "old and young, rich and poor, white, black, yellow, brown or red, of whatever religious, societal and political conviction regardless of their school attainment level" (p. 90). Community educators believe that all community members should be viewed respectfully without prejudice as those who have the right to participate in the implementation of measures to meet needs through educational, democratic and, hopefully, compassionate means.

Decker (1972) stated that an inclusive, community-based problem solving process would restore community control to its rightful place (p. 6). In 1970, Totten described community educating as multi-age involvement in all aspects of community life — work, study, play — without separations based on socioeconomic backgrounds

(p. 157). These recommendations for egalitarian participation would seem to suggest that strategies are required to develop and strengthen shared and conjoint engagement in community-based actions. However, it could be argued that to assert that community members should and must be involved in changing-making, will be difficult (Decker, 1972, p. 65).

Yet, community educators are realists and have expressed a critical awareness about the differences which can separate community members. For example, Van Voorhees (1969) observes that this "multitude of differences" could inhibit unified community action (p. 69). The term community has important connotations for community education. In 1987, Martin, a Scots educator, stated that the term community is an essential feature of the term. For Martin (1987) community represented the egalitarian processes of individuals producing planned, collective action (p. 12). He viewed the collective actions of community educating as those which could be "progressive, emancipatory and dynamic" rather than processes which are hierarchical and excluded some individuals (p. 12). It would be reasonable to assume that this characteristic of egalitarianism would be an essential characteristics, albeit problematic to attain, for creating social justice through self-determined transformative change.

### **Summary**

In Chapter 3 data collected from 30 selections authored by 24 American community education theorists was analyzed in order to identify generic features of community education. Eight propositions which were presented there as one conclusion and seven premises for an inductive argument to hypothesis. This research analysis revealed that community education did not have adequate statements to

construct basic elements of a theory as related to specification location, time, events (that is, methods) and characteristics. The research revealed that community educators recommended that the community is the primary site of transformative change with the caveat that an extra-community awareness of influences and effects is required. The research also revealed that community educators believed that community-based study and action is a lifelong process of teaching and learning. Community educators identified numerous methods for community-based action which were summarized in three major categories for the purposes of this study. These were problem solving, educational activism and participatory democracy. Finally, the research revealed that community educators believed that particular qualities were required to enhance the effectiveness of community educating. These included intergenerational connectedness and egalitarianism.

Overall, these elements can be combined to develop an inductive argument which illustrated the theoretical components needed to effect self-determined transformative change for social justice through community-based study and action as envisioned by community educators.

## **CHAPTER 4: REPORT OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS**

### **The Introduction of Seven Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education**

This chapter presents the research findings. The propositions and principles have been summarized in Table 3. Column I has listed the theory of community education which was explained in Chapter 3. Column II has listed the parallel inductive argument developed to explain curriculum in community education. Column III has listed the seven principles for curriculum in community education which arose from this study.

#### Organization of the Findings

Each principle has been discussed in the sequence shown in Column III of Table 3. The term *principle*

was used in this study, with the caution suggested by Olsen (1945), to mean a reasonable guideline for curriculum development in community education and not a rigid dictum considered to be a "universally valid truth" (p. 409). Thus, these seven principles are offered only as guidance for curriculumists who wish to develop curricular experiences consistent with community education theory.

#### **Discussion of the Principles**

##### How These Principles Can Provide Guidance

Community educators could use curricula designed with these seven principles as a basis for what Warden (1983) described as a needed "core of beliefs" for community educators (p. 7). Warden (1983) insisted that a common foundation was required to prevent fragmentation of the community education movement (p. 7).

**Table 3      Parallel Inductive Arguments Framed to Hypothesize For Community Education and Curriculum in Community Education and Proposed Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education**

<p>I</p> <p><u>Community Education Hypothesis</u></p>	<p>II</p> <p><u>Curriculum in Community Education Hypothesis</u></p>	<p>III</p> <p><u>Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education</u></p>
<p>1. IF Community members study their needs, problems and concerns and create actions which have an extra community awareness of influences and consequences.</p>	<p>IF Curriculum is designed to study community-based issues (concerns, needs, problems) and create community-based actions which demonstrate an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• study community-based needs and problems and create community-based actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences</li> </ul>
<p>2. AND, IF Community members recognize and accept themselves as lifelong teachers and learners (community educators).</p>	<p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners</li> </ul>
<p>3. AND, IF Community members use problem-solving methods to meet needs and resolve problems.</p>	<p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to facilitate rational problem-solving to meet community-identified needs.</p> <p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to demonstrate that educational activism can create educated, educative and enduring solutions for community problems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to facilitate problem-solving to meet self-perceived needs.</li> <li>• to provide opportunities for educational activism to create educated, educative and enduring solutions to unique problems.</li> </ul>

Table 3 (continued):

<p>I</p> <p><u>Community Education Hypothesis</u></p>	<p>II</p> <p><u>Curriculum in Community Education Hypothesis</u></p>	<p>III</p> <p><u>Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education</u></p>
<p>5. AND, IF Community members respect the ideals of and use the methods of participatory democracy for cooperative problem-solving.</p>	<p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to model and demonstrate effective use of the ideals and methods of participatory democracy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to provide opportunities for educational activism to create educated, educative and enduring solutions to unique problems.</li> </ul>
<p>6. AND, IF Community members respectfully involve all ages in dialogue, study, planning, problem-solving evaluation, shared decision making, and other aspects of community educating.</p>	<p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to develop intergenerational connectedness and respect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to develop intergenerational connectedness and respect.</li> </ul>
<p>7. AND, IF Community members (individuals, groups, agencies, etc.) recognize and accept each other as equal (egalitarian) partners.</p>	<p>AND, IF Curriculum is designed to develop egalitarian partnerships.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to develop egalitarian partnerships.</li> </ul>
<p>CONCLUSION: THEN Community members are likely to create self-determined transformative change and social justice</p>	<p>CONCLUSION: THEN Curriculum activities are likely to assist community educators to achieve self-determined transformative change and social justice in an educative community.</p>	<p>CONCLUSION RESTATED AS AN INTRODUCTORY STEM Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed ...</p>

In this section, each principle has been introduced in italicized, double-spaced text which appears at the beginning of each sub-section. The principle was briefly described and discussed. The unity of this inductive argument suggested that curriculum design should use all of the principles rather than one or two. The use of one or two principles may be starting points for communities new to this concept; however, community education is a holistic approach to transformative change. Thus, the holism of this approach presents an expectation that the principles are considered seriously as a totality. For example, the development of programs to pair seniors with community youth or pre-schoolers, which could be one interpretation of the principle of intergenerational connectedness, is not likely enough to produce community-wide transformative change and social justice. A multi-age grouping may, in fact, be a conflictual grouping if the individuals do not possess the skills and attitudes to generate respectful cooperation.

#### Curriculum and the Extent of Reform

The extent of the ideas about localized, community-based change has varied both in the literature and the international practice of community education. In 1983 Denton identified the possibility of "institutional reform" of the educational system through mechanisms like community schools (p. 19). He also examined the possibility of the total reconstruction of community life (Denton, 1983, p. 19).

In his discussion, he described institutional reform as a "transmissive mode of education" which aimed to improve schooling and assist community members with "cultural demands and expectations" while the "reconstructive mode" would be one where the current "cultural malaise" could be repaired to produce "healthy, supportive community life" (Denton, 1983, p. 19). The principles of a theory of

curriculum in community education, developed in this study, addressed the latter viewpoint because they were developed to focus curricular development as a holistic construction which would encompass and emphasize community-wide transformative change and social justice.

This set of principles was intended to assist efforts to bring change to community injustice without suggesting that all institutions be eliminated. Boles and Seay (1974) defined an institution as the "ideas, practices and beliefs" of a community (p. 53). It may not be practical to abolish all existing institutions and hope to begin anew. Instead, community educators may need to explore the compromise which was suggested by Denton (1983). He advised that community educators would need to

critically assess and perpetuate only the best features of the emerging culture while actively exploring potential dysfunctions and alternatives for cultural renewal (Ibid., p. 17).

Denton (1983) did not describe the criteria needed to define the nature of these "best" features; however, within the context of community education these must be understood as actions which create community-wide social justice. In order for these principles to apply, community educators will need to assess the conditions, events, institutions and trends in the community and determine which of those they are empowered to change, in order to make collective decisions to continue those which are valued or based on ethical standards, discard those not aligned with ethical standards and develop new, and not harmful, alternatives.

These principles were developed as a foundational exploration of what community-wide curriculum might look like in the educative community where curriculum would be designed by numerous individuals. In the educative community

these principles could be used by a variety of agencies or institutions. For example, a hospital could use these principles to create a preventative health program which attempted to dovetail with the efforts of community agencies, individuals or institutions to produce change which improved the quality of life. In such a hospital program, the principles of intergenerational contact and participatory democracy could be used to develop educational experiences which promoted multi-age discussion about health concerns and the empowerment of individuals as community and personal health caretakers to develop and act on mutually understood solutions.

The concept of the educative community implies that all agencies create curriculum "specifically attuned to community needs" (Hanna & Naslund, 1953, p. 130). The concept also implies that all community educators have potential as curriculum-makers because each community member is considered a change agent, teacher and learner (for example, Totten, 1970). Thus, in the educative community, the individual can be viewed as an educational activist. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to assume that these educational activists would need to know how to select and prepare curricular content and methodologies to promote personal and community betterment.

#### Discussion of Principle #1: Location

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to study community-based needs and problems and create community-based actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.*

Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that curriculum is frequently developed on a basis of habit and tradition (p. 221). A curriculum rationale which is based on habit

and tradition may perpetuate less than optimum community conditions. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that traditional curriculum has been "patched, twisted, added to and subtracted from", but not basically altered (p. 100). However, curriculum in community education would be altered in that the greater emphasis placed on the needs and problems of a locality would reduce the stress placed on standardized curriculum and uniform textbook presentations. As curriculum in community education underscored the need for community members to identify and effect social change, then curriculum development would also be altered in that one community may give greater emphasis to curricular experiences related to problems which another community may be having less difficulty with at the same time.

This thrust of community education would reshape curricular experiences. Minzey and LeTarte (1979) stated that community education must accentuate the organization and encouragement of community groups until they have achieved community identification, have been motivated, have mastered the techniques of a community approach to problem solving, and have experienced success or failure with these techniques to the degree that they see the potential of their joint efforts (pp. 45-46).

Thus, curricular formation would concentrate on the local environment.

Olsen (1945) devised a community-based curriculum which he called *life-centered curriculum* and organized this curriculum around 13 fundamental areas of personal and communal living. These included: (1) food and shelter, (2) protection of life and health, (3) communication, (4) interpersonal relations, (5) citizenship, (6) environmental control, (7) education, (8) supportive and nurturing family life, (9) historical knowledge and appreciation, (10) religion, (11) recreation and leisure,

(12) aesthetic appreciation, and (13) self-identity. These thirteen areas could be viewed as the 'subject areas' of community-based curriculum in community education keeping in mind that these curricular areas would be first studied in terms of the problems inhibiting social justice and requiring researched community-action.

In a contemporary context, the emphasis on environmental control to more rigorously consider acts of stewardship rather than acts of control would be necessary. When questioned about the lack of environmental emphasis in his development of life-centered concerns, Dr. Olsen responded that the element of control needed to be de-emphasized. He stated that

'Caretake the environment' is better than 'control'. This reflects the changing concept which in recent years has been gaining acceptance among educators including myself (E. Olsen, Personal Communication, March 11, 1992).

In community education this first principle has three components: (1) study of community-based needs and problems, (2) creation of community-based actions, and (3) cognizance of extra-community influences and consequences. Needs and problems would be those conditions or situations of want or harm which diminished the quality of life for some community members. Actions would refer to those events which community members conjointly generated.

The first component, community-based needs and problems, referred to collaborative research, teaching and learning about pressing problems and processes of community living. Olsen (1945) described these as the first, essential curriculum (p. 70). Thus, curricular activities would need to be designed to develop research - that is, study, interview, evaluation, observation - of an issue. Curricular experiences

would then be opportunities for individuals to assess relevant information (for example, from such sources as texts, sites, policy papers, documentary photographs, interviews) in order to facilitate researched identification of the problem to be solved. Community members could become proactive scholars of their community through this form of studied analysis of information and opinions and direct observation of events and conditions of community-based situations.

The second part referred to actions taken to create self-determined, transformative change and social justice. For example, it would not be enough to study poverty; community-based actions would also need to be incorporated into curricular experiences to address issues at personal and community levels. Curricular experiences could include the development of home visits to establish collective kitchens (a practice of group sharing of food costs and preparation). Or, study circles could be organized to investigate an issue in order to lobby governments (municipal, provincial or federal) to improve the minimum, annual income of those encased in poverty.

Study and action would be interpreted through a variety of "vicarious and first-hand experiences" (Olsen, 1945, p. 70). This means that curriculum in community education is not limited to field studies but would extend beyond examination of print materials. The communal study group would need to determine the appropriate self-directed learning which might include field trips to view a site or library visits to read documents. A community-based curriculum program does not imply over-emphasis on one style of learning. However, the focus of curricular experiences would be those which could actively develop empathy and involvement.

Thirdly, the reference to extra-community awareness suggests that the significance of local problems and needs do not eclipse the needs of other communities. The community is not an isolated entity.

#### Community-Based Studies and Action and Community Educating

Curriculum designed with this principle as a starting point could assist community educators in five ways. Firstly, individual and community self-identity and self-concept would be identified in terms of strengths, weaknesses and resources. Community-based studies could assist community members to know the context of their personal and communal living and the inter-relatedness of the personal to the communal life of a locality. According to Misner (1938), community-based observation could help community members to "develop a sense of values and relatedness about themselves and the world in which they live" (p. 72). Transformative change requires that individuals know their strengths, flaws and needs before considered actions are taken. It is therefore suggested that standards of social justice can be set and examined through what is available and what is lacking at individual and communal levels. Community-based study could create a forum for the identification and sharing of knowledge and experience.

Secondly, self-determination could be strengthened as individuals come to recognize their personal and communal resources. Self-created change, as posited by community educators continuously (for example, Evertt, 1938; Clapp, 1939; Seay, 1945, 1953; Melby, 1955), appears to be one of the more effective means for producing confidence and pride rather than helplessness, dependency, resentment or apathy. Thus, individuals who collectively repair or improve a local situation may begin to experience greater confidence and, thus, feel more assured as self-determining agents.

Thirdly, community-based studies can provide first-hand appreciation of local conditions and events. This comprehension may provoke critical questioning of the reasons for and outcomes of local problems (Irwin & Russell, 1971, p. 26). Such comprehensions would engender critical awareness and not cynical negativity. Misner (1938) stated that community-based study ought to exceed "a blind and uncritical acceptance of the *status quo* [His italics](p. 69). Fourteen of the selections reviewed in this analysis contained statements which indicated that the status quo, that is, the existing state of affairs, needed examined change.

Mathier (1990) observed that community education theory was one which encouraged individuals to cultivate a critical scrutiny of the world and one's position and influence on events (p. 27). Participatory democracy requires individuals who are capable of questioning because democratic society does not function automatically (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 151). It would seem reasonable that the ability to discern discrepancies can be more immediately developed through first-hand observation and participation rather than filtered perceptions of information gathered from secondary sources like edited textbooks. First-hand observation, as practiced in community education, is a necessary sequence of the curricular experience to provide the learner with concrete information about a problem. It may not always be possible to provide direct experience for reasons of safety or health (for example, tour of a toxic waste site or field trip to a combat zone). Here, secondary sources, scrutinized for accuracy and editorial point-of-view become necessary.

Fourthly, community-based action depends on the ability of the individual and the group to envision change. Winecoff and Lyday (1991) described visioning as a "proactive tool for building educative communities" (p. 9). They described these

educative communities as ones which would be capable of survival, long-term, able to solve current problems, interdependent and "continually reinvented" (Winecoff & Lyday, 1991, p.9). By 'continually reinvented', they referred to community-based change which was ever responsive to newly emergent conditions or events which threatened communal living. Thus, communities are not considered to be static.

Fifthly, some community educators have highlighted a need for global awareness. Hanna and Naslund (1953) stated that a community-based curriculum need not be provincial, but that its first emphasis would be on territorial needs (p. 54). Increasing global difficulties demand that community educators develop what Mitchell (1972) has termed *world-mindedness* (p. 26). He cautioned that if community-based study and action focused inward, without recognition of the global picture, then insularity may result in species and planetary destruction (p. 26).

Community educators could use curriculum designed with a community-based focus to emphasize the creation of solutions which incorporated a realization of inter- and extra-community influences. Mathews (in Decker, 1990) stated that community educators must determine the "inter-relations of many interests and the long-term consequences of each possible action before implementation" (p.5). Thus, solutions, which have been created with a world-mindedness, must also facilitate global caretaking. Community-based study and action ought to be designed to reduce local and global distress. This requires a much more holistic approach to problem identification and generation of solutions so that difficulties are not treated as isolated fragments of global inter-relations.

### Summary

Therefore, this principle related to community-based study and action can assist community education curriculumists to develop curricular experiences which strengthen community identity and self-concept, support a collective approach to change-making, provide first-hand experiences of events and conditions and change-making, develop local vision and extend this vision from the local to the global.

### Discussion of Principle #2: Time Interval

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners.*

This principle addressed the need to identify when community educating occurs. Curricular experiences would be designed to involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners. Collaborative teaching and learning would extend through the lifetime of the individual and the community. Collaborative teaching and learning would not be viewed as static processes which began and ended within the constructs of a school day or term. Instead, as the life of a community is continuous; so is education. Accordingly, community educating cannot be confined to the regular conceptualization of the school day (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 33).

Denton (1991) characterized community education as a social movement which has emerged historically as a philosophy of both reform and restructuring (p. 19). Throughout this evolution the relevance of lifelong teaching and learning has not diminished. In the literature surveyed, 26 of the 30 selections featured lifelong learning and 20 of the selections stated that every community member is, potentially, both teacher and learner. Community-wide educational activism will require greater

voluntary and skilled involvement of all community members as individuals who can facilitate lifelong community-based study and action.

### Lifelong Teaching and Learning

If educational activism requires individuals who are capable of and willing to both teach and learn to generate solutions to local problems, then curricular experiences will need to provide opportunities to learn and practice effective teaching and learning methods. Schooling is often thought of as processes of learning - whether active or passive - but seldom is the individual also considered a teacher. The focus of interaction in schooling situations might need to extend the roles of teacher and learner so that future citizens understand how to communicate information in a manner which is beyond merely telling.

As all community members are considered teachers and learners in the educative community, then individuals may need to be given opportunities to leave the workplace when they are called upon to provide paid or unpaid community service. These individuals could, perhaps, be granted this freedom to leave the workplace to sit as voluntary members of community study circles or community-based action collectives.

Additionally, problem solving directed towards a critical stance of conditions would imply that community members would be acknowledged as having a right to contribute their talent, experience or ability in problem solving processes (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 45). Curricular experiences would need to capitalize on the lifelong experiences and knowledge individuals have acquired in order to add depth to the critique of a local situation.

Thirdly, this principle of lifelong teaching and learning combined with the first principle, which emphasized community-based study and action with an extra-community awareness, has some implications for the educative community. For example, the significance of community-based study and action would be a lifetime endeavour. Consequently, the 'school' day could be envisioned as a year-by-year progress through localized problems rather than subjects. For example, younger community members might begin a pond study in preschool. Older students may be revisiting this pond to further scrutinize pond life and problems related to, for example, species extinction, pollution, and recreational usage. Adults and seniors may also study the pond and assist younger members to develop researched actions which respect pond life and maintain the pond for future generations. Thus, the pond and its problems are lifelong curricular experiences for community-based study and action, and not merely components of a subject-based program wherein the pond may have a brief starring role as a component of a science curriculum.

Finally, as a critical stance of events and conditions is required on the part of community members, then individuals would need to be relentless in their observations of social justice in their area. Social justice cannot be maintained if events and conditions are only studied at particular times by selected individuals for a particular subject - or examination. Hence, curricular experiences would need to include a sense of social justice across-the-curriculum wherein all lessons and topics of study had a common theme to eliminate social injustice.

In conclusion, this second principle of curricular development in community education identified the time interval for community educating as lifelong; and,

lifelong in terms of both teaching and learning through processes of community-based study and action.

### Discussion of Principle #3: Problem-Solving Pedagogy

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to facilitate problem solving to meet self-perceived needs.*

Schuell (1990), an educational psychologist, defined teaching and learning as goal-directed activity and problem solving (p. 102). He stated that these processes can be conceptualized in this manner because an outcome is expected and there is a situation which requires resolution (Ibid., p. 102). In community educating the emphasis is clearly on production of positive outcomes to local difficulties. In 23 of the 30 selections reviewed, these theorists stressed the need for self-identification of a problem; and, in 29 of the 30 selections the theorists also underscored the need to problem solve collaboratively. For example, Clark and Olsen (1977) stated that all community members would need to "first learn the art and science of problem solving" (p. 99).

This emphasis on problem solving has three implications, among others, for curriculum development in this field. Firstly, community members would need to understand collaborative rather than individualized approaches to problem solving. Secondly, individuals would need to have opportunities for direct experience with applying experimental approaches to problem solving. Thirdly, community members would need to re-evaluate the role of knowledge in teaching and learning wherein knowledge is viewed more as an active means than an end; knowledge is more than a product to be consumed.

### Collaboration

The emphasis on collaborative problem solving necessitates the occasions to develop cooperative strategies which can produce communal responses which attempt to include a variety of viewpoints and needs in the solutions generated. Therefore, curricular activities would need to be ones which highlighted, for purposes of observation and discussion, events which promoted cooperation rather than conflict. One example of this type of collaboration is as follows. If the community met to discuss deforestation, then individuals would need to recognize each other as collaborative partners on an equal footing with each other as fellow community members with potential to teach, learn, change, share and problem solve. This would indicate that experts would not necessarily be delegated as the individuals responsible for the problem solution. Instead, experts could contribute their knowledge and experience as related to a problem. In this case, knowledge would also not be enough. Community-based study of deforestation could not be confined to textbook or media study but would also include the experience of observing deforestation locally and consideration of global influences and consequences (for example, the relationship between tree cutting and economic priorities). The group would need to be willing to listen to differing points of view about deforestation before collaboratively undertaking researched problem solving. Research would need to include the perceptions of all community members and not just the facts about deforestation.

### Community-based Problem Solving

The first principle introduced in this chapter illustrated the need for community-based study and action. This principle must be considered when developing a problem-solving sequence because the individual is directly involved with

the formulation of solutions. Thus, in the example related above about deforestation, community members would use their knowledge, expertise and experiences to address the applicable conditions and events of their locale before studying about deforestation a continent or two away from their area. Therefore, a pedagogy for problem solving, in community education, would provide curricular opportunities to actually engage at the local level in experimentation with community change-making.

### The Role of Knowledge

A pedagogy for problem solving would also stress the need for reasoned solutions (that is, rational, thoughtful resolutions) rather than impulsive reactions or poorly considered plans. The role of knowledge would be altered in community education from a product to be acquired to that of direct application. Knowledge would play a supportive role and would not be viewed as an end of teaching and learning where study is directed towards examination performance. In 1938, Everett advised that community educators should not "clutter up the minds" of learners with "a mass of intellectual furniture" and that knowledge must have a functional relationship to community needs and problems (p. 443). Consequently, curricular activities would have a pragmatic emphasis in that knowledge would be acquired because of a need and for a purpose. Olsen (1945) regarded the "organized knowledge" of school subjects as a significant source for "both personal development and social improvement" (p. 8).

In the educative community, school subjects would have to be reviewed for their potential as a resource for problem solving. In 1939, Clapp concluded, after her work with two experimental community schools, that subjects are resources, "ways of finding out, methods to use, places to look for further information" and not merely

areas to study (p. 49). She further reported that her staff found it necessary to re-examine the nature of school subjects to discover the practical applications inherent in subject matter knowledge to the actual needs of the community (Clapp, 1939, p. 48). Community educators, like Clapp (1939), have argued that "education should really function in people's lives" (p. 48).

When the community member is viewed as a lifelong teacher, learner, problem solver and change agent, then the teacher can no longer be only a vehicle for information transfer. Olsen (1945) has caricatured some teachers as "frequently weary manipulators of dreary subject matter" (p. 177). If community educators are to be collaborative problem solvers, then curricular activities will require the development of a sensitivity towards knowledge as more of an active resource for application than a product.

Knowledge, then, becomes an active component of communal living where "information access, information sharing, and shared decision-making form the heart of the educative community" (Winecoff & Lyday, 1991, p. 9). Therefore, if curricular experiences are to extend the role of the student from that of knowledge consumer to that of knowledge applier, then opportunities are required for the learner to witness the relationship between knowledge and the strengths and deficiencies of the solutions generated.

As problem solving is a favoured method of attaining outcomes, then curricular activities would also need to be designed to facilitate opportunities for problem solving in areas like these: (1) rehearsal and direct experimentation with collaborative problem solving skills and methods, (2) direct solution of problems, and (3) use of

knowledge (subject matter, personal, traditional) as a resource and not only as a course of study.

### The Advantages of Problem Solving Curricular Experiences

A problem solving pedagogy can provide several benefits in the development of the educative community. If it is agreed that community educating requires reasoned solutions to local problems, then curricular experiences would need to be those which stressed rational and reasoned justifications of the identification of steps in the sequence of problem solving. The enhancement of reasoning skills can be developed as learners become more experienced with successful or failed problem solving in terms of the identification of the problem (and sub-problems), the understanding of the relationships among problems, data collection, interpretation of findings and evaluation of solutions.

Secondly, as an intention of the problem solving emphasis, then planned change, that is praxis, requires a basis in knowledge derived from a variety of sources rather than an accumulation of information. Community educators may begin to understand the value of reasoned solutions based on specific data collection rather than solutions based on incomplete information which could create haphazard change-making. Again, the importance of a holistic approach is apparent in that resultant change-making would not be based on incomplete knowledge.

Thirdly, curricular experiences could help to develop a communal sense of identity as interdependent relationships are developed through collaborative efforts. Successful or failed solutions could also generate intimacy as individuals encourage supportive relationships although group cohesiveness and positive self-esteem may be more readily evident in the case of favorable outcomes. Additionally, practice with

firsthand problem solving could also assist individuals to become more decisive and confident decision makers as direct experience with difficult situations increases.

Fourthly, community members could also assist individuals to observe, study and develop means to lessen the negative effects of conflict which can hinder or derail problem-solving strategies. It is likely that as community educators experience conflict openly, that the disadvantages of conflict may become more obvious and individuals will more quickly develop ways to negotiate and elicit acceptable compromises which do not undermine the actions needed to implement a solution.

Finally, the lifelong exercise of reasoning skills could add to the development of critical awareness of and vigilance about a community's unique events and conditions which contradict standards of social justice. However, although the ethical nature of problem solving was not emphasized in the literature, problem solving which relied primarily on rationality, without consideration of ethics or compassion, may make communal problem solving a mechanical process of identifying and implementing expedient solutions which deny or negate further humanization of communities.

#### Discussion of Principle #4: Educational Activism

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to provide opportunities for educational activism to create educated, educative and enduring solutions to unique problems.*

Thus far, these principles recommend that curriculum development would proceed using these three features: (1) community-based study and action which demonstrates extra-community awareness of influences and consequences, (2) lifelong

teaching and learning, and (3) proactive problem solving. In this section, a fourth component described as educational activism will be discussed.

Problems, and the nature of problems, can overwhelm some individuals or product situations which leave other individuals feeling helpless or apathetic (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979, p. 45). Curricular experiences designed to create educated, educative and enduring solutions could emphasize the depth of human resourcefulness and optimism and, in so doing, reduce the feelings of frustration and inertia experienced by some. The search for solutions, could enhance self-determination if individuals were encouraged to use their own confidence and creativity. Improved self-esteem (personal and collective) could result as individuals come to observe and value their contributions, and those of community partners, through the problem solving.

Educational activism can be described as a process of community education which, if well considered, "empowers individuals as workers, and as citizens [of all ages], enables them to develop their potential and impels them with a sense of responsibility for others' (Fantini, 1983, p. 26). Any solution created through educational means is more likely to be based on thoughtful, creative action rather than developed from selfish motivations because education implies more than a self-interest.

#### Educational Activism as Curricular Experiences

Curricular experiences designed using this principle could assist with the development of the educative community in several ways.

Firstly, as processes of local control and personal involvement are vital to the creation of educative communities, then methods of conjoint teaching, learning and

proactive problem solving are also vital (Kerensky & Melby, 1975, p. 75). Individuals who are engaged and directly educated about the local problematique are more likely to be interested in discovering the truth of a situation and the accurate collection of data necessary to generate reasoned solutions (which are also compassionate and ethical and not merely convenient).

Curricular activities designed to create skilled teachers and learners may be a mechanism to revitalize the idea of responsible interdependency because teaching and learning would be an interactive exchange to address local needs rather than a one-way transmittal of outcomes from expert to client. In 1972, Minzey observed that community-wide involvement at a grassroots level seemed absent in the United States (p. 151). However, the dialogic nature of teaching and learning could spark involvement as community-based problems must not be, as Mathews (in Decker, 1990) has stated, only talked about but talked through in local context. Consequently, curricular experiences, which are designed to be educational encounters, may increase the dialogic nature of the educative community and, as problem solving skills are increased, the accuracy, cogency and depth of the dialogue may be improved as well.

Secondly, collaborative teaching and learning could provide opportunities to improve problem solving skills. For example, community educators would not just become adept mechanics looking to fix problems, but individuals with an increased appreciation of the resources and concerns of their environment. Educational activists might also be individuals who seek to more actively perceive the educational potential of conditions, sites and events of a locale which would be a more active engagement with one's community.

Finally, the attainment of standards of social justice (that is, standards of equity and inclusiveness which enhance each individual's life journey) seems to require some changes to structures and ideology which impede justice. There is a need for an educated awareness, that is, a realization of the human condition which is comprehensively understood and not just studied. Boles and Seay (1974) commented that "proposed change is a threat to persons whose interactions would be affected, and the change may be resisted" (p. 55). However, as educational activism is perceived as an interdependent process of teaching and learning, the resistance could be decreased as individual's gain a deeper knowledge about the area's needs and problems.

Community-wide and community-based educational activism may help to teach justified and compassionate reasons for transformative change because education is, by its nature, considered to be more than schooling, but, ultimately, a search for both truth and justice. Accordingly, individuals engaged in processes of educational activism may come to realize that problem solving is not merely a skill but rather that truth and justice are important elements of creating educated, educative and enduring solutions.

#### Discussion of Principle #5: Participatory Democracy

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to model and demonstrate the ideals and methods of participatory democracy.*

Participatory democracy was a third method stressed by community education theorists. This method was viewed as a means to revitalize the right and ability of community members to enact community-based study and action, problem solving and educational activism. The key aspects of participatory democracy, as identified in the

30 selections examined, were as follows: (1) participation by all (28 of the 30 selections), (2) collaboration or cooperation (30 of the 30 selections), (3) faith in the individual (17 of the 30 selections), (4) respect for the individual (26 of the 30 selections), (5) shared power and shared decision making (25 of the 30 selections), (6) democratic processes (20 of the 30 selections), and (7) planning community improvements together (25 of the 30 selections).

This method of local self-government emphasized the need for open sharing of information, knowledge, experience and feelings, shared decision making based on researched examination of a need or problem and cooperative implementation of a planned solution. Participatory structures rather than representative structures of democratic interaction are strongly implied from the theorists. Participatory structures may more readily capture the diverse needs, interests, feelings and perceptions of individuals because consensual decisions would not be edited representations of some viewpoints which would be contradictory to mainstream or traditionally accepted perceptions. Thus, participatory structures would need to be evident throughout curricular experiences from the design of learning circles to the evaluation of outcomes. This has several implications for curriculum development in community education.

#### Participatory Democracy and Curricular Experiences

Curriculum designed to model and demonstrate the advantages of participatory democracy could help to develop the educative community in several ways.

Firstly, such curricular activities could assist educational activists to learn how to consciously, respectfully and conscientiously interact so that all residents are included in community-based study and action. Decisions would not be made by

'experts' or specialists or certain professionals (political or knowledgeable) but would be a constellation of community voices. Hence, curricular experiences would need to model respectful inclusiveness which indicated a determined faith in the individual's ability to change and create worthwhile change.

Curricular experiences conjointly developed could also amplify feelings of mutual trust as some individuals come to understand the strengths of unified, participatory actions based upon the openness and directness implied in participatory democracy.

Secondly, these curricular experiences could help individuals to resolve conflicts more openly as participatory democracy is just that: participatory. Opportunities - like forums or study groups - would be available to express opinions, tell stories, communicate feelings and grievances and exchange ideas frankly. In this way, individuals could reduce feelings of separation which can fragment a common unity of purpose. Therefore, curricular experiences must be based on devising situations where community members understand that they need to respectfully encounter each other directly in order to lessen feelings like exclusion, helplessness or resentment.

Curricular activities, which model direct and honest sharing of opinions, knowledge, experience and feelings, could increase the understanding that conflict is a normal part of problem solving as there will always be differing needs and dissenting interests and ideas. However, participatory structures, which allow these differences to be expressed freely, could allow the statement of differences to be viewed as natural in the diversity of pluralistic communities. The isolation, as experienced by some individuals in pluralistic societies, could be reduced if curricular experiences demonstrate that despite differences of opinion all individuals are to be respectfully

considered as those worthy of trusted faith in their ability to positively contribute to proactive problem solving.

Curricular experiences, which emphasize participatory democracy, would also develop opportunity for shared talk and mutual, dialogic exploration of issues. These dialogic encounters could be enhanced through an application of Bridges' (1979) six norms which he called *moral dispositions*. Bridges (1979) stated that these norms could improve the quality of dialogue in problem solving. The norms he specified included the willingness to be: (1) reasonable, (2) open to information supplied by others, (3) peaceable, (4) accepting of the knowledge of others as equally relevant, (5) truthful, and (6) respectful (pp. 21-26). These six traits could also be further developed as features to be nurtured in the creation of educative communities.

Thirdly, the relationship between problem solving and participatory democracy could be stressed to demonstrate that consensual and collaborative actions are possible. The process of problem solving is more than the design and implementation of a plan. Throughout the process of problem solving, individuals will need to understand and use methods to confer with each other before acting. Principles of participatory democracy, as described in the selected writings, could provide a foundation for lifelong respectful interaction.

Finally, curricular experiences, based on participatory democracy, could help to develop the educative community because some of the skills and attitudes needed to foster direct and open contact could help to augment an understanding of the nature of local control. In theory, participatory democracy engenders a responsiveness and responsibility which aids in the more intimate association of members in their community's development. Community educators, as collaborative teachers and

learners, will more readily understand and use direct consultation on a community-wide basis if structures, like forums and study circles, are readily available.

Thus, curricular experiences, which are developed using processes and principles of participatory democracy, could assist with the development of an educative community which is collaborative, dialogic, inclusive and open to direct consultation. This principle complements the three previous principles in that it provides a functional form for the proactive problem-solving processes to be undertaken in lifelong community-based study and action.

#### Discussion of Principles #6 and #7: Intergenerational

##### Connectedness and Egalitarian Participation

Thus far, Chapter 4 has discussed the development of curricular experiences which would be situated in a particular locale although these would not be limited to an area, which would promote lifelong educational activism through collaborative problem solving and which would be based on principles of participatory democracy. The inductive argument developed for community education also implied two characteristics related to suggested modes of human interaction. The following two principles state the nature of these characteristics.

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change is designed to develop intergenerational connectedness and respect.*

*Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change is designed to develop egalitarian partnerships.*

Both of these characteristics could assist in the creation of the educative community in that a unique discourse (that is, unified point-of-view embracing

understandings, feelings, knowledge and experience), could unfold. These two characteristics will be discussed in the following sections in the above order.

Principle #6: Intergenerational Connectedness

In 1939, Clapp stated that in community education all individuals were to be concerned with the development of individuals of all ages, from babies to grandparents, with their groupings in families and social relationships as friends and neighbours, in work and play, in clubs, in social gatherings, and in the give-and-take of daily existence (p. 333).

Curricular experiences designed, using this principle as a guidepost, would have several characteristics.

One of these is that curricular content would require an age-inclusive portrait of shared opinions, narratives, insights, ideas and feelings. The informational, instructional and entertainment values of this content could assist community educators to better appreciate the stages of human change and maturation experienced differently and similarly by the generations. Intergenerational talk could encourage this sharing of information and discourage ignorance of local issues and the effects these have on some members of different age groups. Multi-age discussions could also reduce age-based stereotyping.

Secondly, curricular experiences would need to be designed to actively reunite the ages in community-based study and action because the need for collaboration implies this form of inclusiveness. Individuals live in what could be called age ghettos in that communities have come to separate groups of individuals on the basis of age. To reduce this separation, youth, parents and grandparents could participate in a variety of collaborative teaching and learning situations. For example, they

could study the disease now known as AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) and its effects in their community. Multigenerational study teams could develop a number of projects like the compilation of biographies of these community members. The product could be published and sold as a fund-raiser or presented as a memorial gift to the local medical library. Finally, the team could assess how their study has added to the identification of a problem and created a degree of positive change in the interests of social justice in their community.

Methods would need to be tried to lessen the stultifying effects of forced or strained encounters between members of different generations. Additionally, multi-age educational activism could help to extend the research of a local problem because older community members could contribute historical knowledge and opinions to re-educate others about misconceptions of a problem or provide missing information. These individuals could also use their narratives to help pinpoint problem origination and evolution. Krug (1953) observed that cooperative teams of adults, youth and children could provide opportunities for dialogic exchange and that all ages would benefit from the insights shared (p. 93).

Finally, intergenerational connectedness is a consideration which meets the expressed need for an inclusive proactive citizenship required to assist in fully inclusive forms of participatory democracy.

Thus, curricular experiences which do add this quality will enhance the inclusiveness of community-based study and action. The contact between the generations can also provide motivation for lifelong learning as the wisdom of elders is freely shared with those younger and the curiosity of those younger prompts the curiosity of those older to re-examine their community. The range of available

knowledge will intensify the problem-solving process. The nurturance of this characteristic of community interaction could contribute much to the creation of healthy educative communities.

### Egalitarian Participation

Egalitarianism is the belief that each community member ought to have equal social, political and economic rights. In community education, egalitarianism has been described by Totten (1970) as the hope that all individuals of all "socio-economic backgrounds" can "work, study, and play together on an equal basis" (p. 157). The ideal that participation will be on an equal footing appears to still be a hope in capitalist societies where class, based on economic attainment, does create some barriers to participation and achievement. However, community educators have stressed that hierarchies of individuals should be levelled.

Many other factors, besides class, can artificially deter an individual's participation. These include: intelligence, ability, race, neighbourhood, sexuality, body image, schooling, disabilities, ideological persuasions, religious beliefs, ethnicity, organizational affiliations. In community education, these factors need to be considered barriers to full membership in and engagement with proactive problem solving, educational activism and participatory democracy.

Thus, curricular activities need to be designed to demonstrate that the equality of the individual, without the reduction of the unique differences which can contribute to community diversity, is not a threat but an advantage to meeting needs. If all individuals were viewed as equal partners, then it may be more reasonable to expect that community members will come to, at least, acknowledge the strengths and gifts of others, and possibly, to care about the unmet needs of others. It would seem likely

that curricular experiences would not emphasize sexist, ageist, classist, racist or other negative attitudes which negate equality. The abolition of these 'isms' is important to the development of intimate, cohesive and collaborative communities.

One example of a curricular activity designed with the use of this principle would be the formation of intergenerational study teams which would also include individuals with a variety of viewpoints and lifestyles. An intergenerational study team, organized to address a community-based problem like recycling of organic wastes, could be comprised of a Jewish rock star, Mohawk poet, Buddhist parolee, and so on. If participatory democracy is to be more than an ideal, then egalitarian acceptance of others will be extremely vital.

This seventh principle is the final of this set of guidelines developed to define the boundaries of the discourse of curriculum in community education as based on the analysis of relevant theorists.

#### **Summary of Chapter 4**

This chapter has reported the findings of this theoretical study as seven principles which highlight the unique features of curriculum development in community education. These principles included the following features of the design of curricular experiences in this field: (1) community-based study and action which possess an extra-community awareness, (2) lifelong teaching and learning, (3) proactive problem solving, (4) educational activism to create solutions which are educated, educative and enduring, (5) participatory democracy, (6) intergenerational associations, and (7) egalitarian partnerships.

These principles, it could be argued, cannot be used in isolation, although it may be necessary to begin with the use of one or two principles to guide curricular

development and implementation as readiness and resources dictate. However, if the outcomes (stated as transformative change and social justice) are to be fully realized, then the seven features of this theory must be maintained and strengthened through a companion curriculum. The development of the educative community is a holistic process which requires minimal attention to these seven features.

For example, the development of intergenerational encounters may strengthen the intimate associations of the generations without necessarily fortifying proactive problem solving. The discussion and demonstration of egalitarian partnerships at the community level may reduce racist, sexist, classist or other harmful barriers without addressing the resolutions of environmental (for example, pollution, deforestation) or social (for example, poverty) problems of injustice. Curricular emphasis on problem solving alone may create solutions which are insensitive to the knowledge and needs of generations not included in the development of solutions. The seven principles have been created directly from an argument developed to explain the paradigm of community education wherein a relationship is expressed to explain how participants should interact in particular ways and use specific methods to achieve desired outcomes in a specified location over time. Therefore, curriculumists in community education should attend to the holistic nature of this paradigm and design curricular experiences which complement and enhance development of an educative community as envisioned by community education theorists.

Finally, these principles are offered without empirical verification of their ability to assist community educators to obtain the outcomes envisioned. However, the intent of this study was to develop a theoretical analysis of the nature of community education in order to further develop a congruent theory of curriculum in

community education. This analytic development appeared to be an overlooked area of theorizing in community education. Field practitioners would need to understand that application of these principles come, as yet, untested, although they are firmly embedded in the foundational nature of community education. Thus, the potential connections between the two theories in this field have become more fully explicated. As well, this set of principles presents a starting point for community education researchers to develop research designs which can be experimentally tested.

Chapter 4 can be viewed as a response to Warden's (1974) charge that community educators had thus far failed to examine and facilitate meaningful curricular innovation (p. 28). It is hoped that this presentation will further the conversation about and practice of curriculum in community education.

## CHAPTER 5: A HYPOTHETICAL CASE STUDY

### Application of the Research Findings to a Case Study

This chapter has presented an example of the application of the seven principles of a theory of curriculum in community education to a hypothetical case study.

#### A Description of the Hypothetical Case Study

This case study is fictitious and the information was not meant to resemble any group of persons. A hypothetical case study was chosen for two reasons. Firstly, the premises and conclusion of this study can be rendered less abstract through demonstration. Secondly, a fictitious case study cannot be misconstrued as evaluation of any actual community education project.

The following example is presented in two parts. The first section describes the evaluation criteria from the principles of a theory of curriculum in community education (as presented in Chapter 4). The second section presents the case study.

#### Criteria for Evaluating in Community Education Based Upon This Concept

This discussion responds to the sixth research question of this theoretical study: "What evaluation criteria for curriculum in community education are suggested from the principle?"

The term *evaluation* was used to refer to the "broad and continuous effort to inquire into the effects of utilizing educational content and process to meet clearly defined goals" (Doll, 1989, p. 237). Doll (1989) suggested that evaluation is an important aspect of curriculum development. In this case study, evaluation was made of the hypothetical application of the seven principles. Criteria were suggested which

might indicate events, activities and effects which might result from the design of curricular experiences using this theory of curriculum in community education.

These criteria comprised minimal standards which, if met, would demonstrate that curriculum activities (including purpose, content, methodology, evaluation) were based on the seven principles of curriculum in community education. These evaluation criteria would be meant for self-evaluation purposes to respect the overall aspect of self-determination in community education theory.

#### Evaluation Criteria Developed From This Theoretical Study

Table 4 displayed the seven principles of a theory of curriculum in community education in Column I and the evaluation criteria in Column II. These criteria have been presented as questions because open-ended questions can prompt responses which can confirm or disprove intentions.

The Opening Stem of Each Evaluation Statement. Each question began with this wording:

Do the curriculum activities designed to assist community educators to  
create self-determined transformative change and social justice provide  
informal and formal opportunities for community members . . . ?

This introductory stem stressed the recognition of the evolving network of educational opportunities to be formally and informally available in the educative community. Secondly, the stated outcomes of community education processes were included in the phrase "to create transformative change and social justice" to indicate the intended outcomes.

**Table 4 Principles and Evaluation Criteria of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education in a Community Committed to Self-Determined Transformative Change and Social Justice**

<p style="text-align: center;">I <u>Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">II <u>Evaluation Criteria of A Curriculum in Community Education</u></p>
<p><u>Opening Stem:</u> The curriculum of a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice is designed to:</p>	<p><u>Opening Stem:</u> Do the curriculum activities to create transformative change and social justice provide informal and formal opportunities to:*</p>
<p>1. study community-based needs and issues and create community-based actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.</p>	<p>1. (a) research, develop and study accurate content related to community-based needs and issues? (b) experimentally develop community-based actions? (c) research and discuss extra-community influences on issues and solutions? (d) discuss and assess extra-community effects of community-based actions?</p>
<p>2. involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners.</p>	<p>2. (a) share their knowledge, skills and experience as lifelong teachers? (b) pursue community-based study of needs and issues as lifelong learners?</p>
<p>3. facilitate (compassionate, ethical) and rational problem-solving to meet self-perceived needs.</p>	<p>3. (a) self-determine needs and issues of a community-wide nature? (b) identify problems and sub-problems and relationships with other problems and solutions? (c) brainstorm alternatives for their community? (d) select alternatives to try as community-based action? (e) apply the alternatives? (f) assess the effects (i) within the community? (ii) without the community?</p>

---

\*The introductory stem was stated once to avoid repetition.

Table 4 (Continued):

I <u>Principles of a Theory of Curriculum in Community Education</u>	II <u>Evaluation Criteria of A Curriculum in Community Education</u>
4. demonstrate ways that educational activism can create educated, educative and enduring solutions for community problems.	4. (a) collaboratively teach and learn with (i) other community members? (ii) with other communities? (b) evaluate solutions to identify their potential to educate and produce solutions which are long-term and understood?
5. model and demonstrate the ideals and methods of participatory democracy.	5. (a) participate as valued community educators? (b) share in all decision-making processes? (c) openly share information? (d) equally share power?
6. develop intergenerational connectedness and respect to strengthen creation of an inclusive community discourse.	6. (a) appreciate and respect viewpoints of all generations? (b) provide intergenerational connectedness? (c) strengthen creation of an inclusive intergenerational discourse?
7. develop egalitarian partnerships to strengthen creation of an inclusive community discourse.	7. (a) provide respect for and have faith in the individual to contribute an action of value? (b) strengthen creation of an inclusive community-wide discourse?

## **Part I: The Hypothetical Case Study**

In this section of the chapter a profile of the fictitious community with a description of some of the incidents and a statement of some of the issues has been presented.

### **A Profile of the Fictitious Community**

The fictitious community is located in a parkland area on the northwest shore of a lake. The population is approximately 6,000, with Metis, First Nations and Euro-Canadians about equally represented.

The community's economic base relies on small owner-operated farms, recreational hunting and trapping, service-related careers and employment at a local plant refinery.

There are two schools, a dental clinic, a hospital, plant refinery, seniors' home, co-operative grocery and hardware store, a fourteen store shopping mall, a library/museum/theatre facility, three movie theatres, union office and recreation center in the area. Most professions and occupations are well represented in the area as well as a mix of socio-economic levels including unemployed and retired. The average grade level achieved is 7.0.

Twelve different religious groups are represented although some groups share facilities. One group rents a local school on weekends.

Housing indicates the variety of lifestyles and commitments to home maintenance.

Transportation is provided by thrice-weekly rail service because a major highway does not come into the community and because of the plant. There is one private airport.

Communication is provided by a daily newspaper printed in French, English and Cree. There is no local television station. There are two radio stations.

Law enforcement is provided by provincial police services. Court cases are heard weekly in the local theatre.

### Incidents Which Have Caused Concern in the Community

The following lists incidents which have created concern in the community.

1. One Friday morning in December the local K-9 school is closed abruptly. Parents/guardians are told there is a fault in the ventilation system. However, a Press Release issued after one week of school closure explained that unacceptable levels of radon gas have been measured in the school. It is suspected that the gas has come from radioactive fill used in the school's construction.

The Press Release stated that:

radon is one of the toxic wastes produced as radioactive wastes decay and has been considered carcinogenic (causing cancer).

The Press Release further stated that all students will be bussed to a school outside of the community until further notice.

As the New Year progresses eight further incidents were identified. These included:

2. One family reported that their garden at the bottom of the new school parking lot had sickened, until even the oldest 100 year old trees had died.
3. School absentee rates are higher than average.
4. Several students have refused to be bussed to the temporary school because they believe racism was directed at them because they have been called names which denigrate their ethnic heritage.

5. Several children had been diagnosed with a mystery ailment which weakens muscle tissue. Infant mortality is twice the regional average and is attributed to unusual incidence of SIDS (Sudden Infant Death Syndrome).
6. The residents of the 30 homes adjacent to the plant had been quietly bought out 5 years earlier.
7. Two ponies had died.
8. Cows, owned by an area farmer, were skinny, their fur loose and had an extraordinary number of aborted calves.
9. Home owners who had made home renovations with plant rubble have had abnormally "high" readings of levels of radon found in their homes.
10. A local group had released reports which blamed the plant for all of the problems in the community. Members of the group are convinced that the odorless and tasteless gas comes from waste materials of the local plant which has been disposing waste materials in a landfill north of town for 25 years with the permission of the town council.

#### Emergent Problems in This Fictitious Community

The following description listed several of the problems which have emerged in this community.

1. The plant management is "fed up" with the adverse publicity. The plant management has slowed operations and laid off 480 workers. Plant owners have threatened total plant closure.
2. Fear of unemployment has created stress-related increased in incidence of anti-social behaviors including alcoholism, family violence and lavish spending on

credit. Unemployed individuals have been involved in similar incidents and some criminal acts of game poaching.

3. Tourism has decreased and other community papers have used headlines which have labelled the town "Radon-ville - The Birthplace of Superman?"
4. Students are generally uncooperative with bussing procedures and state that they have experienced increasing race-related harassment. Absenteeism is above average. Teachers at the neighbouring school continue to request parent/guardian interviews but these are poorly attended.
5. Some students believe they are being socially ostracized because some students at the neighbouring school fear radon contamination.
6. A local dairy farmer faces bankruptcy because customers now refuse to purchase his products.
7. The local food stores have begun to import produce causing higher prices for community residents and reduced income for two local market gardeners.
8. Agencies in the communities (churches, hospital, social services) continue to report severe increases in client requests for mental, emotional and physical health needs. Individuals complain that delivery of social services is too slow.
9. A food and clothing bank has recently opened. Some people are resentful of its presence and it has been vandalized twice.

Objective: To Use a Community Education Approach

The community has adopted a community education approach as a basis to resolve problems and meet needs as most community members did not want to relocate.

A community committee had been organized to design curricular activities consistent with the implementation of a community education approach to improve living conditions. Each community member now wears a button stating "Talk TO ME! I'm A Community Educator".

**Part II: A Description of Some of the Observations Which Might Be Expected In "Radon-ville" From Application of the Principles**

After one year of implementing a community-wide curriculum based on community education, one might expect to observe the following:

Discussion of Community-based Study and Community-based Actions

In this section, some comments related to community-based study and community-based action are presented.

Community-Based Study

Content Development. Curricular activities might exhibit content based on a researched study of community issues like radon, unemployment and racism. Community-wide distribution of easily understood materials might be available at all potentially educative sites in formats which make materials accessible to all as the average education level is Grade 7.0. For example, newly produced community video shorts might be used to introduce feature films at a local movie theatre.

Informational Content of Community Dialogue. Dialogic encounters in a participatory democracy could become stalled if community members endlessly discussed opinions and feelings without accurate information. Examination of the documentation of community issues in sources like community minutes might exhibit a knowledgeable handling of information directly related to issues. Where dialogue

could be recorded, there might be exhibited a sophisticated level of articulation about cows, toxic waste and alcoholism.

Multi-age Involvement in Content Development. Content could exhibit research which had been created by multi-age research teams. There might be examples to discuss which reflected the extent of opportunities available for intergenerational meetings which provided time to exchange viewpoints and create intergenerational collegiality. Multi-age collegiality could be measured to assess the development of strengthened feelings of solidarity and trust, examples of more open sharing of information, and development of close working relationships in joint problem-solving ventures.

As all community members are potentially lifelong teachers and learners, multi-age and multi-level teaching teams could be observed presenting information in various sites which may have been modified for such. For example, a public library and study room might be available at the plant, or gender-balanced teams of plant managers, retired plant workers and plant union members could provide street theatre performances about the effects of unemployment or the changes in knowledge about the effects of radon.

#### Community-based Actions

Curricular experiences which used this design would not limit teaching and learning to research and study. If only evidence of community-based research and study were available, then the desired outcome of transformative change would not have been pursued using a community education approach. Examples of collaborative teaching and learning could be evaluated to identify whether or not all community

educators had been engaged in solving community-based problems in some capacity as teacher, learner or researcher.

#### Extra-Community Interaction

Self-evaluation could provide observations which indicated attempts made to educate in neighbouring communities. For example, community members could have taken measures to schedule meetings with school personnel in the neighbouring school to provide information about SIDS, racism and toxic waste creation and disposal.

The multi-age self-evaluation teams could discuss opportunities like forums, video pen-pals and community tours and whether or not these curriculum experiences had opened discussion about problems and solutions. For example, a multi-age and gender-balanced community tour team might have explained to members of other communities how the need for a particular product created toxic waste in their community. Efforts would be evident which indicated that educational dialogue with diverse audiences and not just the converted had occurred.

#### Multi-Age Research and Action Teams

Self-evaluation teams might locate multi-age research and action teams. Teams could be observed to understand their involvement with and effect on resolution of community problems and meeting local needs. For example, community educators may have surveyed and identified the reasons for origination of the food bank and some attendant resentment. Data gathered might have provided some basis for devising alternative measures to meet nutritional needs or to improve the public relations efforts of the food bank organization.

### Community-based Problem Solving

The self-evaluation team might question multi-age problem-solving teams to discern whether or not problems had been self-identified and discuss whether or not this self-determined process had assisted in the development of individual or collective self-determination and confidence.

### Lifelong Teaching and Learning

Educational activism would require individuals who understood, valued and respected their roles as lifelong teachers and learners. If the identified community-based curriculum experiences could demonstrate community-wide involvement of all individuals in curriculum experiences, then these could assist residents to decode and encode experiences and create knowledge and action. For example, the dairy farmer could be interviewed to discover how often s/he has been asked to "teach" others about the safety measures undertaken at the farm and other issues related to this issue. There might be a measurable increase in the number of times community members had actively served as teachers and facilitators.

### Opportunities to Learn How to Teach and Learn

As teaching and learning are problem-solving processes, curriculum experiences might show that informal or formal courses had been designed to teach individuals how to prepare and present information, answer questions, interact with a diverse audience, evaluate outcomes and actively facilitate learning rather than being just information transmitters at community lectures. The self-evaluation team could interview randomly selected community members and discuss their willingness and the opportunities available to actively participate in the role of community educator as teacher.

The self-evaluation team could also examine community-wide instructional sessions at a variety of sites, which had been made available to help all community residents, and provided opportunities to rehearse and practice skills (reasoning, memory, evaluation, synthesis, reading) to assist with problem-solving procedures. Attendance figures for and feedback about these sessions might indicate whether or not community residents had taken steps to become community educators.

Guided reflective discussion to self-evaluate their roles might identify the effects of lifelong teaching and learning in the achievement of the intended outcomes of transformative change and social justice.

#### Quality of Discussion About Learning and Teaching

In the educative community, the self-evaluation team might find examples where residents could knowledgeably discuss effective teaching and learning techniques and differences in teaching and learning styles amongst community members. They might also be able to distinguish between positive and detrimental aspects of learning; for example, learning how to be an abusive spouse versus learning how to be a loving, supportive spouse.

#### Discussion of Proactive Problem Solving

The self-evaluation team could identify curricular experiences which illustrated how community educators had been involved in community-wide problem-solving. In the educative community, the individual is considered both the client and problem solver and not just a consumer and recipient of information and solutions.

The self-evaluation team could interview individuals and have them narrate their involvement with and the difficulties of participating in collective problem solving processes. Individuals could comment on the strengths and weaknesses of

group research processes, collective experimentation and shared evaluation. This feedback could be used to improve or change problem-solving procedures and assessment.

### Data Collection

Individuals could describe how they had been involved with data collection methods. For example, hospital employees could have actively involved other community members as data gatherers about the muscle ailment or the effects, incidence or evidence of alcoholism. The community members would need to be involved as more than interviewees. The community self-evaluation team could document and record examples of community-wide involvement in data gathering rather than data collection made and analyzed solely by experts or selected groups. Experts could provide analyses of data.

### Workshops Available to Facilitate Problem-Solving Skills

Curricular experiences - like workshops or lectures - could be identified which illustrated efforts taken to help community residents practice community educating. The self-evaluation team could discuss and demonstrate the knowledge and skills related to problem solving gained from these workshops or demonstrations. For example, individuals might be able to demonstrate how they had self-initiated the identification of a problem. Residents might be able to explain solutions in light of their ability to save jobs, reduce household food budgets and restore community autonomy.

Community members might be able to assess and discuss their personal strengths and weaknesses related to proactive problem solving and describe their

skills in terms of data collection, research methodology, solution development and evaluation of outcomes.

### Knowledgeable Problem Solving

Community educators might be more able than members of a non-community educating group to explain an issue related to a problem and the attendant sub-problems and the inter-relationships among problems. For example, a community resident might be able to explain if the existence of the two dead ponies was related to unacceptable readings of radon; or, if the issues of racism was only an out-of-community experience for identified individuals in the community.

### Discussion of Educational Activism

Collaborative teaching and learning suggested that individuals could not rely solely on technological or financial solutions. Instead, individuals are to be encouraged to participate at all suitable hours of the day. Potential solutions could be assessed and discussed to identify the understanding of the discovered learning and newly (if any) created knowledge which resulted from their self-initiated educational activism.

They could explain how they did not automatically apply solutions, but could explain the use of problem-solving techniques. The effects of solutions could be studied. Evaluation team members could ascertain whether the documentation of solutions had been re-articulated as community-based content in videos or in the daily newspaper.

### Compassionate and Ethical Solutions

Curricular experiences designed using this approach might be assessed to identify the emphasis on rationalism or the strict employment of the scientific

method. Self-evaluation teams could interview individuals to discuss their compassionate understandings of the human dimensions and feelings of others involved with a problem.

Community self-evaluation team members could observe if the discussions of solutions and means used to solve a problem reflected a set of ethical values or standards which govern the conduct of individuals or groups. For example, the community members might be able to explain the reasons for involvement of the local refinery management and owners in generating solutions rather than launching lawsuits. Or, community members could explain how solutions or means were developed not to harm or hinder others.

#### Long-term Solutions

Community educators could determine whether solutions had been planned for short- or long-term purposes. For example, a short-term solution to the experiences of racism may have been simply moving the students to a new school or building a new facility.

The issue of racism would require opportunities to sensitize individuals to the basis and detrimental effects of racism both within and without the community. It would be evident that community members were working towards long-term elimination of barriers with solutions not developed as short-term reactions or short-cuts.

#### Discussion of Participatory Democracy

Curricular activities designed using this approach might have examples which demonstrated that community educators had levels of knowledge and skills related to

ideals and processes. Community educators could be asked to explain this style and methodology of democratic decision-making as it happens in their community.

#### Community-based Content and Action

The development of community-based content might demonstrate an inclusive process where emphasis was not given to information or components deemed more essential or significant by certain individuals or groups. Curriculum experiences would demonstrate that development had not been guided or influenced by the desires and wishes of certain individuals and groups. A balanced community-wide viewpoint and involvement would be more evident in discussion and assessment of community-wide curriculum experiences.

#### Self-government by Consent and Problem Solving

The self-evaluation team could record instances where curriculum experiences demonstrated collective ownership of problems and solutions and the development of alternatives like open forums and public debates to achieve openly discussed and accepted solutions. Decisions to accept or reject alternative choices to resolve a problem would have clearly resulted from self-determined actions accepted by negotiation and consent rather than imposed from outside the community or by a select group in the community.

This is not to suggest that "Radon-ville" would be without conflicts. However, evaluation might reveal how face-to-face dialogue had improved or worsened or not affected potentially conflictual encounters during the problem-solving process.

#### Open Sharing of Information

Community-based and community-developed content might be evaluated to see how available information is and where it is located. For example, the mean

educational level for this community suggests that print materials must be modified when technical information is being presented. Evaluation members could be asked to identify videos or pamphlets which provided easily accessible information about family abuse or local alternative means for economic development.

#### Discussion of Intergenerational Connectedness

It could be documented that multi-age interaction, cooperation and collegiality were evident in this design and implementation to create change, solve problems to meet needs and evaluate the quality of social justice community-wide. Individuals could be asked to articulate a community-wide point-of-view (discourse) about unique community conditions (unemployment, infant mortality), events (plant lay-offs, attempts to re-renovate homes) and actions (programs to educate others about the damaging effects of racism).

#### Discussion of Egalitarian Partnerships

It would be evident that barriers to equal participation were lessened and that community educators could express their reasons for valuing each other as needed partners in problem-solving attempts. Individuals would be able to describe the destructive effects of "-isms" to community development, self-identity and self-esteem and in problem-solving activities which used a participatory democracy mode. Community educators could be asked to articulate the reasons for and benefits of creating an inclusive community discourse whereby community-wide engagement displayed a profile of a collective voice, and not competing voices eager to protect interests and horde power.

### Evaluation Strategies in Curriculum in Community Education

Community improvement, betterment or reconstruction in community-based study and action would suggest that self-evaluation would be based on an assessment to determine the knowledge and skill levels of community educators in areas such as these:

- (1) development of community-based curriculum;
- (2) presentation of community-based content as teachers;
- (3) active learning and learning styles;
- (4) critical awareness;
- (5) problem-solving processes;
- (6) educational activism;
- (7) educational/instructional processes which do not indoctrinate;
- (8) planning models and long-term solutions;
- (9) participatory democracy;
- (10) intergenerational connectedness;
- (11) egalitarianism; and,
- (12) transformative change and social justice.

### **Summary**

Chapter 5 has described some of the observations which a self-evaluation team might find evident in an educative community which had chosen to design curricular activities using this theory of curriculum in community education.

These observations were developed through creation of a hypothetical case study of a community.

## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter has been organized in two sections: (1) presentation of the conclusions from this study; and (2) two recommendations for further curriculum theorizing.

### **Part I: Conclusions From This Theoretical Study**

Findings are summarized and presented in the order of the research questions.

#### **Research Question #1**

The first research question stated: What are the essential features of community education theory?

Data collected, through an analysis of 30 American-authored selections in the field, revealed ten generic features of the theory of community education. These features were as follows: (1) community-based study; (2) community-based action; (3) extra-community awareness of influences and consequences; (4) lifelong teaching and learning; (5) proactive problem-solving; (6) educational activism (collaborative teaching and learning to create educated, educative and enduring solutions); (7) participatory democracy; (8) egalitarian partnerships; (9) intergenerational grouping; (10) transformative change; (11) social justice; and (12) self-determination.

#### **Research Question #2**

The second research question stated: What are the propositions of an inductive argument to hypothesis to explain community education theory?

In Chapter 3 the seven premises and conclusion of an inductive argument to hypothesis to explain this formulated theory of community education were described. These were formulated from the literature review described in the Chapter 3 and are stated below:

Premise #1:

IF

Community members study their needs, problems and concerns and create actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.

Premise #2:

IF

Community members recognize and accept themselves as lifelong teachers and learners.

Premise #3:

IF

Community members use problem-solving methods to meet self-perceived needs.

Premise #4

IF

Community members develop opportunities for educational activism to create educated, educative and enduring solutions for community problems.

Premise #5

IF

Community members respect the ideals of and use the methods of participatory democracy for cooperative problem-solving.

Premise #6:

IF

Community members respectfully involve all ages in dialogue, study, planning, problem-solving, evaluation, shared decision-making and other aspects of community educating.

Premise #7:

IF

Community members recognize and accept each other as equal (egalitarian) partners.

Conclusion:

THEN

Community members are likely to create self-determined transformative change and social justice.

Considerations related to each proposition were discussed briefly (see Chapter 3) as this study was not intended to be a thorough critique of community education theory. However, this analysis has revealed some areas which might warrant serious consideration. For example, community education theorists have stated that participatory democracy is desirable but the relationship between the community and the levels of government was not fully developed. Also, the complex interrelationships of current conditions and events may warrant the studied examination of environmental factors which may make environmental caretaking the primary principle. Therefore, this analysis illustrated a need for further thought.

Research Questions #3

The third research question stated: What are the propositions of a parallel inductive argument to hypothesis which can explain a theory of curriculum in community education?

These propositions were identified as premises and conclusion and were discussed in Chapter 4. The inductive argument was framed as follows:

Premise #1:

IF

Curriculum is designed to study community-based issues, concerns, needs and problems and create community-based actions which demonstrate an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.

Premise #2:

IF

Curriculum is designed to involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners.

Premise #3:

IF

Curriculum is designed to facilitate problem-solving to meet community-identified needs.

Premise #4:

IF

Curriculum is designed to demonstrate that educational activism can create educated, educative and enduring solutions for community problems.

Premise #5:

IF

Curriculum is designed to model and demonstrate effective use of the ideals and methods of participatory democracy.

Premise #6:

IF

Curriculum is designed to develop intergenerational connectedness.

Premise #7:

IF

Curriculum is designed to develop egalitarian partnerships.

Conclusion:

THEN

Curricular experiences (purpose, content, methodology, evaluation) are likely to assist community educators to achieve self-determined transformative change and social justice.

Research Question #4

The fourth research question stated: What principles for a theory of curriculum in community education are suggested from the propositions of the

parallel inductive argument? The construction of these principles were the major work of this study.

The propositions were restated as seven principles of a theory of curriculum in community education as follows: Curriculum in a community committed to self-determined transformative change and social justice would be designed to:

1. study community-based needs and issues and create community-based actions which have an extra-community awareness of influences and consequences.
2. involve all community members as lifelong teachers and learners.
3. facilitate problem solving to meet self-perceived needs.
4. provide opportunities for educational activism to create educated, educative and enduring solutions to unique problems.
5. model and demonstrate the ideals and methods of participatory democracy.
6. develop intergenerational connectedness and respect.
7. develop egalitarian partnerships.

#### Research Question #5

The fifth research question stated: How will application of these principles to curriculum design assist community educators to achieve desired outcomes?

Discussion of this curriculum design was provided in Chapter 4 and illustrated the potential of these principles to assist community educators in the process of creating the educative community.

### Research Question #6

The sixth research question stated: What evaluation criteria for curriculum in community education are suggested from the developed principles?

The evaluation criteria developed from the principles are shown in Table 5. These formed the basis of a hypothetical case study in Chapter 5.

### Research Question #7

The seventh research question stated: Is a definition (term and meaning) suggested from this theory of curriculum in community education? In this section a theoretical *definiens* was introduced without a new term.

### The Multiplicity of Existing Terms

A variety of terms have been used to identify curriculum in community education which include: (1) community school-related curriculum (Interdepartmental Community School Committee, Alberta, 1983); (2) community-related curriculum (colloquial expression used by some community educators with the Alberta Community School Programme); (3) community-based curriculum (Saskatchewan Community Schools Program, 1980); (4) community-oriented and community-focused curriculum (Greater Victoria School District #61, 1988); (5) life-centered curriculum (Olsen, 1945); and, (6) community-centered curriculum (Irwin & Russell, 1971).

The identification and introduction of a new term seemed only to add additional jargon without providing concrete benefit; thus, the term *curriculum in community education* was kept.

### Introduction of a Theoretical Definition

A theoretical definition (described in Chapter 2) for this version of curriculum in community education would need to include the primary features identified in the

**Table 5      Evaluation Criteria Developed for Application to a Hypothetical Case Study for This Theoretical Study.**

**OPENING STEM**

Do the curriculum activities created for the purposes of self-determined transformative change and social justice provide informal and formal opportunities to:

1. (a) research, develop and study accurate content related to community-based needs and issues?  
     (b) experimentally develop community-based actions?  
     (c) research and discuss extra-community influences on issues and solutions?  
     (d) discuss and assess extra-community effects of community-based actions?
2. (a) share their knowledge, skills and experience as lifelong teachers?  
     (b) pursue community-based study of needs and issues as lifelong learners?
3. (a) self-determine needs and issues of a community-wide nature?  
     (b) identify problems and sub-problems and relationships with other problems and solutions?  
     (c) brainstorm alternatives for their community?  
     (d) select alternatives to try as community-based action?  
     (e) apply the alternatives?  
     (f) assess the effects (i) within the community? (ii) without the community?
4. (a) collaboratively teach and learn with (i) other community members? (ii) with other communities?  
     (b) evaluate solutions to identify their potential to educate and produce solutions which are long-term and understood?
5. (a) participate as valued community members?  
     (b) share in all decision-making processes?  
     (c) openly share information?  
     (d) equally share power?
6. (a) appreciate and respect viewpoints of all generations?  
     (b) provide intergenerational connectedness?  
     (c) strengthen creation of an inclusive intergenerational discourse?
7. (a) provide respect for and demonstrate faith in the individual to contribute an action of value?  
     (b) strengthen creation of an inclusive community-wide discourse?

propositions and principles of this theory of curriculum in community education. In this theoretical study *curriculum in community education* would be defined as follows:

Curricular experiences which are designed using these principles of curriculum design in community education would have the following features: (1) community-based study; (2) community-based actions which demonstrate extra-community awareness of influences and consequences; (3) lifelong teaching and learning; (4) proactive problem solving; (5) educational activism; (6) production of educated, educative and enduring solutions to community-based problems; (7) exemplary practice of the ideals and methods of participatory democracy; (8) intergenerational connectedness; and (9) egalitarian partnerships.

It has been demonstrated that these features of curriculum in community education will more likely be compatible with the aims of community education (that is, self-determined transformative change and social justice) because the curriculum theory is based on community education theory. However, these principles for curriculum in community education have been presented from a theoretical foundation and would require field testing. Experimental designs to identify the linkages would need to be devised and outcomes assessed to deduce their ability to enhance the development of the educative community.

## **Part II: Recommendations for Additional Curriculum Development in Community Education**

In this section, two recommendations are made for areas where curriculum theorists in community education may need to extend analysis. These include: (1) consideration of the ecological caretaking of any community; and (2) further exploration of the foundational ethics of community educating.

### The Need for a More Conscious Ecological Stance

The environmental problems of this planet seem well-documented. The American theorists did not rigorously pursue the development of an ecological consciousness. Clapp (1939) reported that efforts had been made at Ballard Memorial Community School (Kentucky) to further understand "the educational import of the environment" with a study course called "Economic Geography" (p. 57). The students also studied their farms, "pastures, cultivated fields and woodlands", and gardens to examine practices - such as crop rotation, co-operative marketing and textile crafts produced - (p. 57), but no mention was made of environmental education activities or the need to plan for balanced economic activity which did not create deterioration of the environment.

Olsen (1945) recommended that study should be made of the biophysical setting of the community. The biophysical setting is described as the "climate, topography, and natural resources" (p. 47), with the natural resources described as the "natural inheritance of a particular locality" (p. 47). He stated that urban sprawl was creating difficulties and land use conflicts and that these topics should be "studied in connection with the problem of past and present land use" (p. 47). He further stated that "poor utilization" of natural resources and "the environment brings social problems" (p. 48). For example, "failure to put land to its best use" may "prevent functioning of other social processes" such as work and health (p. 51). Olsen concluded that the "failure to plan for wise use, conservation, and possible restoration of natural resources may menace both the present and future well-being of the community" (p. 51). His prediction can be validated with contemporary examples;

however, he did not include this insight in either of his two sets of principles to guide curriculum development.

Overall, references to environmental awareness or community-based actions to maintain environmental balance were scarce. The sense of a land-sacredness, which is evident in the thought and cosmology of some other cultures, is absent.

In light of the current environmental problems, it is valid to suggest that an additional proposition be formulated for the inductive arguments for community education and then curriculum in community education. Or, the concern for the environment could be included as an additional phrase in the conclusion. For example,

Community members are likely to create self-determined transformative change and social justice which do not damage the biophysical environment or help to repair current damage.

Community educators may view deteriorating environmental conditions as part of a larger social problematique and decide that community-based problem-solving attempts will address the issue of environmental education within the framework of transformative change and/or social justice. If the educative community is "[t]hat community which is a learning laboratory in its totality" (Hiemstra, 1972, p. 31), then responsible caretaking of the land needs to be considered. Further analysis of the relationships between human activity and effects on the immediate biophysical environment would suggest that this is an important aspect to be considered.

#### The Ethical Foundations of Community Education

The literature related to ethical foundations in community education is quite brief. Melby (1955) stated that community educators "must see clearly the need for moral"

strength and action (p. 27). He speculated that some of the evident failures which were observable after World War II could be attributed to education where educators generally had "failed to stress the moral and spiritual values which were basic" to the United States (p. 28). Olsen (1945) stated that the creation of knowledge without ethics can be detrimental to community maturation and achievement of measures to create betterment or reconstruction (p. 53). The formulation of a proposition to highlight the ethical nature of community education could not be supported at this point as too few theorists included it in their discussions.

The ethical nature of community educating remains an issue because the creation of planned change and social justice suggested that improvement of living conditions cannot be made through actions which would further oppress individuals, create further inequity or produce damage to members of the community or other communities.

### **Summary**

In this chapter, a brief summary of the results of this study have been presented. These findings included the deduction of the generic features of community education theory based on 30 selections from reasonably well-known and accepted Euro-American writers. This researcher did make serious effort to locate writings by female theorists; however, this search revealed that this field of education consists of, to the present, male-dominated discourse. Of the 24 theorists studied, only one theorist was female. However, the seminal work of Elsie Ripley Clapp should not be overlooked because her works revealed a rare combination of theory and practice. As the writings are dominated by male authorship, community education theorists may want to re-examine the direction of their theorizing and decide whether the more

feminine components (like nurturing or intuitive knowledge) have been overlooked and/or a feminine point of view marginalized.

The identification of the generic features was necessary in order to define the expressed relationship (means and ends) of community education. Analysis revealed that the most logical combination of features would produce a relationship which stated that: where participants interact in certain ways (as intergeneration and egalitarian partners) and use particular methods (proactive problem solving, ideals and methods of participatory democracy and educational activism) in a location (community-based with an extra-community awareness) at a specific time (as lifelong teachers and learners), then particular outcomes are likely to occur (self-determined transformative change and social justice). Therefore, once this relationship had been produced, it was possible to consider and develop the means and ends of a theory of curriculum development in community education.

This relational definition of community education is unique in that this researcher did not locate such a succinct statement in previous theoretical writings. Perhaps, this definitional work will provide guidance to community educators who may wish to design experimental community education paradigms, or already have such in operation. There are seven variables here to include in test designs and this may make research into the development of intentional communities unwieldy. However, a foundation based on previous works has been established. Additionally, these variables would need to be observed (separately and in combination) to assess the strength or weakness of their potential contribution to the development of self-determined transformative change and social justice.

Once the generic features and expressed relationship had been identified, then a researched foundation was available to begin the construction of a theory of curriculum in community education which would clearly originate from within the field. As stated in Chapter 1, the review of the literature revealed that there has been an almost non-existent body of curricular theory in this field. The notable exception is the scholarship of Dr. Edward Olsen who established the need for community educators to consider principles and practices of life-centered curriculum.

From this study, seven principles for the development of curricular experiences emerged. The ideal curricular experience would be one characterized as respectfully egalitarian, intergenerational, in a process of lifelong and collaborative teaching and learning which emphasized community-based study and solving of local problems. The nature of solutions developed ought to be those which are educative, educated (based on well-reasoned justifications) and enduring. However, the solutions ought to also be those which are also compassionate, ethical and environmentally sound and not merely expedient. These three latter characteristics have not yet been extensively developed in the literature and provide topics for further exploratory debate.

Additionally, community-based study would not be an insular, and narrow-minded, study of local issues. Instead, curricular experiences would need to include an extra-community awareness. Community educators would need to have a holistic understanding of events and conditions, and the relationship therein, in order to provide a balanced view of local and global influences and effects. In a world which is inundated hourly with new information, the demands on individuals to thoroughly

research the problem under study in terms of global connections might make problem solving time-consuming and complex to manage.

Finally, these curricular experiences would need to provide direct experience of the ideals and methods of participatory democracy. In this case, lifelong teachers and learners would need to acquaint themselves with processes, (like open dialogue, consensual decision-making and removal of discriminatory uses or abuses of power), in order to develop skills and attitudes conducive to local control and shared decision-making and to reduce the potential marginalization of anyone's point of view, knowledge or experience.

These principles were redeveloped as possible evaluation criteria which could be used as guidelines to determine the authenticity of curricular experiences in community education. The evaluation criteria, stated as open-ended questions, were applied to a hypothetical case study (in Chapter 5) to give the reader some sense of an educative community which had implemented these principles.

In conclusion, this study has added a new theory of curriculum in community education which can provide thoughtful reading for the reflective practitioner or guidelines for community educators who are seeking to develop curricular experiences for creation of the educative community.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, D. (1973). Schools: A case for community education. Provincial Community School Team, Working Paper Number 3. Vancouver, B.C.: British Columbia School Trustees Association. August.
- Allan, D. (1973). Relevance of community education in contemporary society. Provincial Community School Team. Working Paper Number 2. Vancouver, B.C.: British Columbia School Trustees. July.
- Allen, G., Bastiani, J., Martin, I. & Richards, J.K. (1987). Community education, an agenda for educational reform. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Archambault, R. (1964). John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: Random House.
- Ariyaratne, A. (1991). Community education for a learning society. The Journal of Community Education, 9(2), 3-4.
- American Psychological Association. (1984). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: author.
- Association for Community Education in British Columbia. (1988). What are community schools all about? Basic concepts. no page nos.
- Barry, V. & Soccio, D. (1988). Practical logic (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Batten, E. (1980). Community education and ideology: A case for radicalism. In C. Fletcher (Ed.), Issues in community education (pp. 27-38). London: Falmer Press.
- Beauchamp, G.A. (1982). Curriculum theory: Meaning, development and use. Theory Into Practice, XXI(1), 23-37.
- Becker, W. (1972). Review of Community education: From program to process by J. Minzey & C. LeTarte. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 209.
- Berridge, R.I. (1973). The community education handbook. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Berridge, R.I. & Stark, S.L. (1977). Training the community educator, a case study approach. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Blackhurst, A. (1987). Introduction to International Issue: The challenge of development. The Journal of Community Education, 5(4), 1.
- Blackhurst, A. (1988). Introduction to International Issue: Social change through community education. The Journal of Community Education, 6(3), 1-2.

- Board of Education for the City of York. (1988). Learning to ride the third wave, Annual report of the community services office for 1988. York, Ontario: author.
- Bobbit, F. (1918). How to make a curriculum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press.
- Bogner, C. (1983). Project Director. Evaluation of the community schools program. Submitted to Community Education Branch, Policy Planning and Special Projects, Saskatchewan Education. Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia.
- Boles, H.W. & Seay, M. (1974). Community education leadership: A theory. In M. Seay (Ed.), Community education: An emerging concept (pp. 86-116). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Bridges, D. (1979). Education, democracy and discussion. National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Calliou, S. (1991). Some principles for consideration in community-related curriculum design. Edmonton. Unpublished. 25 pp. June, 1991.
- Canadian Association for Community Education. (1990). Constitution, Canadian Association for Community Education. (Amended May, 1990).
- Chirot, D. (1985). Social change. In A. Kuper & J. Kuper (Eds.), The social science encyclopedia (pp. 760-763). New York: Routledge.
- Clapp, E.R. (1933). A rural community school in Kentucky. Progressive Education, X(3), 123-128.
- Clapp, E.R. (1939). Community schools in action. New York: The Viking Press.
- Clapp, E.R. (1952). The use of resources in education. New York: Harper.
- Clark, D. (1973). The concept of community: A re-examination. Sociological Review, 21(23), 397-416.
- Clark, D. (1989). The training of community educators. The Journal of Community Education, 7(3), 6-8.
- Clark, P.A. (1982). The centrality of the teacher. Community Education Journal, X(1), 13-15.
- Commager, H.S. (1984). The schools can't do it all. Community Education Journal, XII(3), 8-10.
- Cook, D.L. (1982). The curriculum and the community. Community Education Journal, X(1), 18-20.

- Cook, L.A. & Olsen, E.G. (1950). Chapter 12: Toward life-centered schooling. In Lloyd Allen Cook & Elaine Forsyth Cook (Eds.), A sociological approach to education, a revision of community backgrounds of education (pp. 272-287). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Copti, I.M. (1982). Introduction to logic (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Cowburn, W. (1986). Class, ideology and community education. London: Cromm Helm.
- Curtis, S.J. & M.E.A. Boulton. (1966). A Short history of educational ideas (4th ed). London: University Tutorial Press Limited.
- Decker, L. (1972). Foundations of community education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Decker, L. (Ed.). (1990). Community education: Building learning communities. Alexandria, VA: National Community Education Association.
- Decker, L. (1992). Building learning communities: The realities of educational restructuring. Community Education Journal, XIX(3), 5-7.
- Denton, W.H. (1983). Reconstructionism - A philosophy for community education. Community Education Journal, X(2), 17-21.
- Dewey, J. (Orig. 1938; 1963). Experience and education. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (Orig. 1902; 1971). The child and the curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (Orig. 1900; 1971). The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Doll, R. (1989). Curriculum improvement, decision making and process. (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Everett, S. (1938). Chapter XI: An analysis of the programs. In Samuel Everett (Ed.), The community school (pp. 435-462). National Society for Curriculum Study, Committee on the Community School. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- Everett, S. (Ed.). (1938). The community school. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- Fantini, M. (1982). Changing concepts of community education. Community Education Journal, X(1), 6-11.

- Fasheh, M. (1990). Community education: To reclaim and transform what has been made invisible. Harvard Educational Review, 60(1), 19-35.
- Fletcher, C. & Thompson, N. (1980). Issues in community education. Lewes, Sussex: The Falmer Press.
- Fletcher, C. (1987). The concept of community education. In G. Allen et al. (Eds.) Community education, an agenda for education reform (Chap. 3, pp. 33-49). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Foshay, A.W. (1985). The city as teacher. Community Education Journal, XII(3), 12-15.
- Greater Victoria School District (#61). (1988). Report of the task force on community education. Victoria, British Columbia: author.
- Guralnik, D. (Ed.). (1970). Webster's new world dictionary (2nd ed.). New York: The World Publishing Company.
- Hager-Schoeny, D. (Ed.). (1982). Community education and K-12: Making the connection. [Special Issue]. Community Education Journal, X(1), 4-6.
- Hanna, P.R. & Naslund, R.A. (1953). Chapter IV: The community school defined. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part II, the community school (pp. 49-63). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Harvey Research Ltd. (May, 1986). Evaluation of community schools. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.
- Heimstra, R. (1972). The educative community, linking the community, school and family. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc.
- Hessong, R.F. & Weeks, T.H. (1987). Chapter 7: Educational philosophies. Introduction to education (pp. 173-194). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hickey, H.W. & Van Voorhees, C. (Eds.). (1969). The role of the school in community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Hopkins, K.W. (1975). Planned community education: A systems approach. Community Education Journal, V(3), 22-26.
- Horyna, L. (1990). Principles of community education. In L. Decker (Ed.), Community education: Building learning communities (p. 7). Alexandria, VA: National Community School Association.

- Hullfish, G. (1938). Developing common concerns: The road to democracy. In S. Everett (Ed.), The community school. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- Hunnicut, C.W. (1953). The community school as a social instrument. In N.B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook for the national society for the study of education, part II, the community school (pp. 179-194). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Inter-departmental Community School Committee. (1983). Document 35RII. Alberta Education. 1983-04-15.
- Irwin, M. & Russell, W. (1971). The community is the classroom. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Jarolimek, J. (1981). The schools in contemporary society, an analysis of social currents, issues and forces. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Jones, L. & Falkenberg, E. (1991). Impact of a community school on citizen attitudes. Community Education Research Digest, 5(2), 19-38.
- Kerensky, V.M. & Melby, E.O. (1975). Education II - revisited: a social imperative (Rev. Ed.). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Kerensky, V.M. (1972). Correcting some misconceptions about community education. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 158-160.
- Kerensky, V.M. (1989). The sovereign, new perspectives on people, power, and public education (2nd ed.). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Kilpatrick, W.F. (1938). Chapter I: Introduction: principles of community learning. In Samuel Everett (Ed.), The Community School (pp. 1-22). New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- Kliebard, H. (1982). Curriculum theory as metaphor. Theory Into Practice, XXI(1), 11-17.
- Krug, E. (1953). Chapter VI: The program of the community school. In, Nelson B. Henry, Ed. The fifty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part II, the community school (pp. 83-99). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Kussrow, P. (1990). Core curriculum for K-12. Community Education Journal, XVII(3), pp. 22-23.
- Kussrow, P. (1990). Citizen participation in community education. Community Education Journal, XVII(2), 21-23.

- Lazaruk, W. (1982). A comparative analysis of selected designated community schools and non-designated schools in Alberta. Alberta: Inter-Departmental Community School Committee.
- Lazerfeld, P. & Barton, A. (Eds.). (1972). Qualitative analysis, historical and critical essays (Orig. 1951). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lippitt, G. (1973). Visualizing change: Model building and the change process. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, Inc.
- Martin, I. (1987). Community education: Towards a theoretical analysis. In G. Allen et al. (Eds.), Community education: An agenda for educational reform. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Mathieu, D.J. (1990). Community education as radical pedagogy. Community Education Journal, XVII(4), 26-29.
- McClure, L., Cook, S.C. & Thompson, V. (1977). Experience-based learning, how to make the community your classroom. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- McClusky, H.Y. (1959). Some propositions in support of the community school — A summary. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 33(4), 179-183.
- McCutcheon, G. (1982). What in the world is curriculum theory? Theory Into Practice, XXI(1), 18-22.
- McCutcheon, G. (Ed.) (1982). Curriculum theory [Special Issue]. Theory Into Practice, XXI(1).
- Melby, E.O. (1955). Administering community education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Melby, E.O. (1959). Keynote to the theme. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 23(4), 170-178.
- Mezirow, J. (Ed.). (1990). Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Minogue, K. (1985). State. In A. Kupper & J. Kupper (Eds.), The social science encyclopedia (pp. 818-820). New York: Routledge.
- Minzey, J.D. & Olsen, C.R. (1969). Chapter III. Community education: An overview. In Howard W. Hickey & Curtis Van Voorhees (Eds.), The role of the school in community education, (pp. 29-40). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.

- Minzey, J. (1972). Community education: An amalgam of many views. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 150-153.
- Minzey, J. (1981). Community education in the United States. In D. Davies (Ed.), Communities and Schools (pp. 269-295). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Minzey, J.D. (1985). Beyond economics: Redefining a core curriculum. Community Education Journal. XII(4), 23-25.
- Minzey, J.D. & LeTarte, C.E. (1979). Community education: From program to process to practice, the schools' role in a new educational society (2nd ed.). Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Misner, P. (1938). A community educational center. In S. Everett (Ed.), The community school (pp. 51-82). New York: D. Appleton-Century Publishing Company.
- Mitchell, M. (1972). Can community education build world mindedness? Community Education Journal, II(1), 23-26.
- Muntyan, M. (1953). Chapter III: Community-school concepts: A critical analysis. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part II, the community school (pp. 31-48). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Naslund, R. (1951). The origin and development of the community school concept. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Leland Stanford Junior University.
- O'Hagen, B. (1987). Community education in Britain: Some myths and their consequences. In G. Allen et al. (Eds.), Community education: An agenda for educational reform (pp. 70-80). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Olsen, E.G. (1950). School and community, the philosophy, procedures and problems of community study and service through schools and colleges. (Orig. 1945). New York: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Olsen, E.G. (1951). The community school. The North Central Association Quarterly, XXVI(2), 176-180.
- Olsen, E.G. (1954). School and community, the philosophy, procedures, and problems of community study and service through schools and colleges (2nd ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Olsen, E.G. (1958). Is the community school anti-intellectual? School Executive. (Reprint obtained from the Author. No page nos.)
- Olsen, E.G. (1972). Enlivening the community school curriculum. Phi Delta Kappa, LIV(3), 176-178.

- Olsen, E.G. (1975). A life-centered curriculum. Community Education Journal, V(3), 35-41.
- Olsen, E.G. (1975). Community education: Perspective and potential. In Effie Fairchild & Larry Neal (Eds.), Common-unity in the community: a forward-looking program of recreation and leisure services for the handicapped (pp. 15-22). Oregon: Center of Leisure Studies, University of Oregon.
- Olsen, E.G. & Clark, P. (Eds.). (1975). The community education curriculum [special issue]. Community Education Journal, V(6).
- Olsen, E.G. & Clark, P. (1977). Life-centering education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Co.
- Ozmone, H.A. & Craver, S.M. (Eds.). (1981). Chapter 4: Reconstructionism and education. Philosophical foundations of education (pp. 120-152). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, a Bell & Howell Company (2nd edition).
- Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Perrin, P. (Ed.) (1965). In K. Dykema & W. Ebbitt (Eds.), Writer's guide and index to English (rev. ed.). Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Piotrowski, L.J. (1975). The third century educational process. Community Education Journal, V(3), 13-17.
- Poster, C. & Kruger, A. (1990). Community education in the western world. London: Routledge.
- Prince Albert Public Schools. (1989). Community school program, discussion paper, revised for staff handbook. Saskatchewan Education: author.
- Rennie, J. (1985). British community primary school, four case studies. London: The Falmer Press.
- Schuell, T.J. (1990). Teaching and learning as problem solving. Theory into Practice, XXIX(2), pp. 102-108.
- Seay, M. (1945). Chapter X: The community-school emphases in postwar education. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The forty-fourth yearbook of the national society for the study of education, american education in the postwar period, part I, curriculum reconstruction (pp. 209-225). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Seay, M. (1953). Chapter I: The community School: New meaning for an old term. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part II, the community school (pp. 1-14). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

- Seay, M. (1972). Threads running through the community school movement. Community Education Journal, II(1), 16-19.
- Seay, M. Ed. (1974). Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Simpson, D. & Jackson, M. (1984). The teacher as philosopher. Toronto: Methuen Publications.
- Soltis, J. (1978). An introduction to the analysis of educational concepts. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Totten, W.F. (1970). The power of community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Totten, W.F. (Ed.). (1972). Community education [Special Issue]. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3).
- Totten, W.F. (1972). Community education: The feasible reform. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 148-149.
- Van Voorhees, C. (1969). Community education: A developmental process. In H.W. Hickey & C. Van Voorhees (Eds.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
- Walker, D.F. (1982). Curriculum theory is many things to many people. Theory Into Practice, XXI(1), 62-65.
- Warden, J. (1975). The curriculum of community education. Community Education Journal, V(3), 28-31.
- Warden, J. (1983). Community education as a movement. Community Education Journal, XI(1), 4-8.
- Watson, F. (Ed.). (1922). The encyclopedia and dictionary of education, (Volume III). Toronto: Sir Issac Pitman & Sons.
- Wear, D.W. (1982). What teachers think of community education. Community Education Journal, X(1), 16-18.
- Wear, D. (1987). Curriculum theory; some starting points for inquiry. Community Education Journal, XIV(2), 6-7.
- Wear, D. & Cook, D. (1987). The need for critical reflection. Community Education Journal, XIV(2), 5.
- Whetten, C.L. (1981). Getting involved with K-12. Community Education Journal, VII(3), 22-24.

- Winecoff, L. & Lyday, W.J. (1991). Community educators, visions, and educative communities. Community Education Journal, XVIII(2), 8-12.
- Williams, I (1981). A comparative analysis of attitudes of community school teachers and regular school teachers toward children and toward the use of community resources. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Oregon: University of Oregon, Teached Education and Graduate School.
- Wood, G. & Neat, S. (1988). A search for core readings in community education. Community Education Journal, XV(4), 25-26.

**APPENDIX I\*****Ten Principles Developed by Dr. Edward Olsen  
to Life-Center Curriculum (Orig. 1945; 1950 : pp. 409-412)**

- I Distinguish three omnibus aims in the area of school-community relationships: (a) social comprehension; (b) social motivation; and, (c) social skills.
- II Define the community as the service area of the school; but relate it directly and constantly with the larger areas of state, region, nation and the world.
- III Recognize three major levels of culture to be studied in every community, immediate or remote, contemporary or historical.
- IV Emphasize physical setting, social processes, social structure, and social problems; and stress the close inter-relationship among these factors.
- V Plan a sequential development of student experiences through each year of the entire school program.
- VI Begin this sequence with consideration of material culture in the local community, in particular reference to its geographic and demographic aspects.
- VII Expand this initial study in three related dimensions: (a) space, (b) time, and, (c) scope.
- VIII Utilize all appropriate techniques for effectively relating the school with the community: (a) firsthand experiences with reality; (b) representations of reality; and, (c) symbols of reality.
- IX Focus attention upon the status, problems, and social contributions of youth who have participated in the basic processes of the various communities and societal areas studied.
- X Direct primary personal loyalties to a people's finest traditions, ethical ideals and social values, rather than to their geographic territory, political structure, or any other segment of their material or institutional culture."

---

\*Reprinted with the permission of Dr. Olsen.

**Ten Principles Restated (Orig. 1954; Second Ed, pp. 477-480)**

1. Analyze the improvement-of-living aim into its functional elements.
2. Define the community as the service area of the school, but relate it directly and constantly with the larger areas of region, nation, world.
3. Recognize three levels of culture to be studied in every community.
4. Stress the interrelationships between such factors as community setting, social statuses, social processes, and social problems.
5. Plan for sequential development of community experiences throughout each year of the school program.
6. Begin this sequence with consideration of material culture in the local community.
7. Expand this initial study into other related dimensions.
8. Use all appropriate techniques for relating the school with the community.
9. Focus attention upon the needs, problems, and social contributions of young people.
10. Direct personal loyalties toward our finest traditions, ethical ideals, and moral and spiritual values.

## APPENDIX II

### Data Collection: A Listing of the Thirty Selections Used for This Theoretical Study

This is a chronological listing of the American-authored works selected for this theoretical study. These writings were examined to identify generic features which were used as a basis to formulate propositions of an inductive argument to hypothesis for a theory of community education.

I        II

Year    Author and Title Information

1.     1933    Clapp, E.R. (1933). A rural community school in Kentucky. Progressive Education, X(3), 123-128.
2.     1938    Everett, S. (1938). An analysis of the programs. In S. Everett (Ed.), The Community School, (pp. 435-462). New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
3.     1938    Kilpatrick, W.H. (1938). Introduction, principles of community learning. In S. Everett (Ed.), The Community School, (pp. 1-22). New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
4.     1939    Clapp, E.R. (1939). Community schools in action. New York: The Viking Press.
5.     1945    Olsen, E. (1950, Orig. 1945). School and community, the philosophy, procedures and problems of community study and service through schools and colleges. (1st ed). New York: Prentice-Hall Inc.
6.     1945    Seay, M. (1945). The community school emphases in postwar education. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed), The forty-fourth yearbook of the national

- society for the study of education (Part I), (pp. 209-225). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
7. 1953 Seay, Maurice. (1953). The community school: New meaning for an old term. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education (Part II), (pp. 1-14). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
  8. 1953 Muntyan, M. (1953). Community-school concepts: A critical analysis. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook for the national society for the study of education (Part II), (pp. 31-48). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
  9. 1953 Hanna, P.R. & Naslund, R. (1953). The community school defined. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook for the national society for the study of education (Part II), (pp. 49-63). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
  10. 1953 Hunnicutt, C.W. (1953). The community school as a social instrument. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The fifty-second yearbook for the national society for the study of education (Part II), (pp. 179-194). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
  11. 1955 Melby, E. Administering community education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
  12. 1959 McClusky, Howard Y. (1959). Some propositions in support of the community school — a summary. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 33(4), 179-183.
  13. 1969 Minzey, J. & Olsen, C.R. (1969). Community education: An overview. In H.W. Hickey, C. Van Voorhees (Eds.), The role of the school in

- community education, (pp. 29-40). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
14. 1969 Van Voorhees, C. (1969). Community education: A developmental process. In Howard W. Hickey & Curtis Van Voorhees (Eds.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
  15. 1970 Totten, F.W. (1970). The power of community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
  16. 1972 Minzey, J. (1972). Community education: An amalgam of many views. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 150-153.
  17. 1972 Kerensky, V.M. (1972). Correcting some misconceptions about community education. Phi Delta Kappan, LIV(3), 158-160.
  18. 1972 Hiemstra, R. (1972). The educative community, linking the community, school, and family. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc.
  19. 1972 Decker, L. (1972). The foundations of community education. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
  20. 1973 Berridge, R.I. (1973). The community education handbook. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
  21. 1974 Seay, Maurice. (1974). The community education concept — A definition & How the concept grew. In M.F. & Associates. Community education: An emerging concept, (pp. 1-16 & 17-46). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
  22. 1975 Piotrowski, L.J. (1975). The third century educational process. Community Education Journal, V(3), 13-17.

23. 1977 Olsen E. & Clark, P. Community education: Past and present. In Olsen E. & Clark, P. Life-centering education (Chapter 3). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
24. 1975 Kerensky, V. & Melby, E. (1975). Education II — Revisited: A social imperative (2nd Ed.). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
25. 1979 Minzey, J. & LeTarte, C. (1979). Community education: From program to process to practice, the school's role in a new educational society, (2nd Ed.). Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.
26. 1981 Minzey, J. (1981). Community education in the United States. In Don Davies (Ed.), Communities and their schools, (pp. 269-295). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
27. 1982 Fantini, M. (1982). Changing concepts of community education. Community Education Journal, X(1), 6-11.
28. 1988 Horyna, L. (1990). Principles of community education. In Decker, L. & Associates. Community education: building learning communities (p. 7). Alexandria, VA: National Community Education Association.
29. 1989 Kerensky, V. (1989). The sovereign, new perspectives on people, power and public education. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
30. 1990 Decker, L (Ed.). (1990). Community education: Building learning communities. Alexandria, VA: National Community Education Association.

### APPENDIX III

#### **Data Collection: Tabulation of Information to Formulate the Propositions of Parallel Inductive Arguments for Community Education and Curriculum in Community Education**

The following tables were compiled to show the data collection made through a literature review of 30 selections written by 24 American community education theorists. Each table is titled to identify the area of data collection. A chronological listing of the selections positioned vertically along the left side of each table. The features which were identified are listed in a vertical column at the top of each table. The symbol '✓' represents the presence of this feature. A blank space represents the absence of this feature or no statement located.

#### A Hypothesis for a Theory of Community Education

Community education can be expressed as a hypothesis which attempts to explain the relationship where participants interact in certain ways and use methods to achieve desired outcomes in a location over time.

Data was collected to identify the type of interactions, the preferred methods, the location and time duration in order to formulate the propositions (premises and conclusion) of an inductive argument to hypothesis for a theory of community education.

#### Tables 6a. and 6b.: Identification of the Desired Outcomes

Table 6a, titled The Need to Change, was constructed after a preliminary reading of all the works. Data collected was used to construct part of the conclusion statement of the inductive argument.

#### Table 6a: The Need to Change.

The following codes were used to identify the expressed need to change:

1. NPC = Need to Change

2. NPC = Need to Change at Personal level
3. NS/CC = Need to change social/community conditions
4. NCS = Need to change schools
5. NGC = Need to change global (worldwide) conditions
6. NNC = No need to change
7. NS = No statement located

There were no cases located for statement #5, (NNC). Change was most often indicated in direct statements, examples or in phrases like 'meet needs' or 'solve problems'.

From the data collected in Table 1.O.a. the first part of the statement which identified a desired outcome in the conclusion was formulated. This category was labelled 'change'. The discussion of the selection of a term to describe the type of change sought was described in Chapter 3.

An analysis of the data in Table 1.O.b. confirmed the feature of 'need to change' which is stated in phrases like 'community improvement', 'community betterment' and 'social reconstruction'. Analysis also indicated that community educators discussed a broad spectrum of changes which were just not related to reform of schools. These were identified in Table 6b.

Table 6b.: The Variety of Change Outcomes Identified in the Literature.

Table 6b lists the types of specific changes identified in the 30 selections by the 24 theorists. The listing of each of these features in the conclusion would be cumbersome. A term was sought to categorize the quality of these statements. The term *social justice* was chosen. The discussion of the selection of this term was discussed in the sub-section titled, The Additional Desired Outcome of Social Justice (Chapter 3).

**Table 7: Data Collected to Identify the Location of Social Change**

Data was collected to answer the question: Where can community education occur? Twenty-two of the 24 theorists in the 30 selections identified the community as the primary arena where processes would be enacted to create transformative change and social justice.

Four codes were used:

1. C = Community
2. OL = Other Location
3. CBA = Community-based Actions
4. ECA = Extra-community Awareness

There were no cases of item #2.

**Extra-Community Awareness.**

While reading to identify statements related to identify the location of change processes, the characteristic of 'extra-community awareness' emerged. This awareness referred to a cognizance of influences and conditions beyond borders of the community on the part of the participants. Additionally, there were statements which indicated that change could have extra-community consequences.

Thus, the code 'ECA' was added to indicate the consideration of the effects on change processes on or beyond the community.

This awareness was included in the first proposition statement to qualify suggested community-based study and actions as those which would not be restricted to a local area.

**Table 8: Identification of the Time Interval**

Table 8 is a compilation of the data to answer the question: When can community education occur? Statements were located in twenty-six of the 30 selections. Twenty of the selections contained statements which described that a community members would be

teachers at some point in their lifetimes while engaged in cooperative procedures to identify and solve community-based problems and/or evaluate the results of applied solutions.

The second premise was formulated to capture the features of 'lifelong', 'lifelong learning' and 'everyone a teacher and a learner'.

Table 9: Identification of Problem-Solving as a Method of Change

Twenty-three of the 24 theorists in 29 of the 30 selections identified problem-solving as a cooperative procedure to achieve the desired outcomes. This is consistent with the finding in Table 6b where 30 of the selections contained statements which indicated that community members were engaged in activities to solve the problems of the area to meet a variety of needs.

Table 10: Identification of Educational Processes to Attain Desired Outcomes

This table summarized data which suggested the fourth proposition of a theory of community education. Although twenty-three of the selections contained statements which indicated the need to change the schools, this was not the extent of educational reform advocated.

In addition, a majority of the theorists stated that individuals were to be actively engaged in processes of learning together. While solving local problems. Twenty-eight of the selections contained statements which indicated that living was to have or has an educational basis. The presence of this educational basis in living was perceived as a necessary means to create change in conjunction with collective problem-solving and participatory democracy.

Table 11: Identification of Participatory and Democratic Methods

This table summarized data related to the development of the fifth proposition of a theory of community education. Twenty-eight of the 30 selections contained statements

which indicated that all individuals would be directly involved in processes of community-based problem-solving as a method of meeting self-identified needs.

Twenty of the selections contained statements which indicated that democratic ideals and methods would be used in self-governing actions at the local level. Twenty-six of the selections contained statements which indicated shared decision making. The recommendation for shared decision making seemed to suggest shared power as it would be difficult to develop collective decisions in the openly respectful manner suggested by community education theorists if some individuals continued to maintain greater power over the decision making. If this were to occur, then consensual decisions would not likely happen, or decisions would evolve which did not respect the sense of shared and active participation recommended by the theorists.

The decision was made to use the term *participatory democracy* because it combined the features of 'participation by all' with 'democratic processes' and 'shared decision making'.

**Table 12: Identification of the Characteristics of the Interactions among Participants**

Data was collected to discover whether or not theorists stated that particular interactions among participants would be needed. Three codes were devised while reading. These were:

1. PWAA = Participation With all Ages
2. EQ = Equal Right to Involvement
3. EEQ = Everyone to be Considered an Equal

Statements were located in 29 of the 30 selections which indicated that children, youth and adults are to be involved. The activities mentioned included: dialogue, problem-solving, shared teaching and learning, planning, community action and study.

The term intergenerational connectedness was used to describe this feature of multi-age interaction.

Items #2 and #3 data were used to formulate the seventh proposition of the inductive argument to hypothesis for a theory of community education. Items #2 and #3 indicated that some community education theorists recommended that community educators would need to recognize each other as equal partners in community based actions to solve problems in order to meet needs.

The term egalitarian partnerships was chosen to describe features of 'equal right to involvement' and 'everyone to be considered an equal'. The term referred to equality of individuals community-based actions but not to an economic equality.

This data was used to formulate the seventh principle of the inductive argument to hypothesis for a theory of community education.

#### Table 13: Miscellaneous Item

Table 13 presented a tabulation of some of the miscellaneous categories. As discussed in Chapter 6, ethics and environmental awareness were not thematic features developed by community education theorists.

Five of the selections contained statements which indicated resource conservation. Six of the selections contained statements related to the ethical nature of community education.

#### Self-Determination.

Overlooked in an initial analysis were statements in 21 of the 30 selections which referred to the feature of self-determination. A majority of the theorists stated a version of what Horyna (1990) described as self-determination:

Local people are in the best position to identify community needs and wants (p. 7).

This feature did not appear to be another proposition. Instead, the data was used as a descriptor to modify transformative change to indicate that change will be self-initiated to assist individuals "to gain a greater sense of influencing what goes on about them as well as gain created control over themselves" (Piotrowski, 1975, p. 14).

Table 6a The Identification of the Need to Change

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Clapp (1933)	✓		✓	✓			
2. Everett (1938)	✓		✓	✓			
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
6. Seay (1945)	✓		✓	✓	✓		
7. Seay (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓		✓	✓			
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓		✓				
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓				
12. McClusky (1959)	✓		✓	✓			
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓		✓				
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓		✓	✓			
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
16. Minzey (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓		✓	✓			
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
19. Decker (1972)	✓		✓	✓	✓		
20. Berridge (1973)	✓		✓				
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
26. Minzey (1981)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
27. Fantini (1982)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
28. Horyna (1988)	✓		✓				
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓	✓	✓				
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓	✓				
<b>TOTALS</b>	30	18	30	23	9	0	0

## Key:

1. NC = Need to change
2. NPC = Need to change personal level
3. NS/CC = Need to change social/community conditions
4. NCS = Need to change schools
5. NCG = Need to change global
6. NNC = No need to change
7. NSL = No statement located

Table 6b Identification of Specific Outcomes

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Clapp (1933)	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓		✓
2. Everett (1938)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	
7. Seay (1953)	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓	✓					✓	✓		
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. McClusky (1959)	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓		✓
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓						✓	✓		✓
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓		✓
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓		✓
20. Berridge (1973)	✓						✓	✓	✓	
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓			✓			✓	✓		✓
27. Fantini (1982)	✓						✓	✓		✓
28. Horyna (1988)	✓						✓	✓		✓
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓						✓	✓		✓
30. Decker (1990)	✓			✓			✓	✓		✓
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>27</b>

Key:

- |                                                        |                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. IC = Improve Conditions of the community            | 6. BC = Rebalance or balance culture                       |
| 2. ISO = Improve social order or social reconstruction | 7. MN = Meet needs                                         |
| 3. PP = Peaceful progress                              | 8. SP = Solve Problems                                     |
| 4. UCE = Urbanization, counteract effects              | 9. UJ = Universal Justice/Human Brotherhood/Global Justice |
| 5. ≠ SQ = Not maintain status quo                      | 10. ISL = Improve standard of living                       |

**Table 7 Identification of the Location**

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features			
	1	2	3	4
1. Clapp (1933)	✓		✓	
2. Everett (1938)	✓		✓	✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓		✓	✓
4. Clapp (1939)	✓		✓	
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓		✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓		✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓		✓	✓
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓		✓	✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓		✓	✓
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓		✓	✓
11. Melby (1955)	✓			✓
12. McClusky (1959)			✓	
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓		✓	✓
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓		✓	
15. Totten (1970)	✓		✓	
16. Minzey (1972)	✓		✓	✓
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓		✓	
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓		✓	✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓		✓	✓
20. Berridge (1973)	✓		✓	
21. Seay (1974)	✓		✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓		✓	
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓		✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓		✓	
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓		✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓		✓	
27. Fantini (1982)				✓
28. Horyna (1988)	✓			
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓		✓	
30. Decker (1990)	✓			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>

Key: 1. C = Community  
2. OL = Other location  
3. CBA = Community-Based Action  
4. ECA = Extra-community awareness

**Table 8 Identification of Time Duration**

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features	
	1. LLL = Lifelong Learning	2. ETL = Everyone a Teacher or Learner
1. Clapp (1933)	✓	
2. Everett (1938)	✓	
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓	
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓	
8. Muntyan (1953)		✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)		✓
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓	✓
11. Melby (1955)	✓	
12. McClusky (1959)		
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓	✓
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓	✓
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓	
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓	✓
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓	✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓	
20. Berridge (1973)		✓
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓	
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓	✓
27. Fantini (1982)	✓	✓
28. Horyna (1988)	✓	
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓	✓
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓
<b>TOTALS</b>	26	20

**Table 9 Identification of the Method of Problem-Solving**

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Clapp (1933)	✓		✓	✓	✓
2. Everett (1938)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)			✓	✓	
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)			✓	✓	
10. Hunnicutt (1953)			✓	✓	✓
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. McClusky (1959)			✓		
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
15. Totten (1970)		✓	✓	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓		✓	✓	
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓		✓	✓	✓
20. Berridge (1973)	✓		✓	✓	
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓		✓	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓		✓	✓	
27. Fantini (1982)				✓	
28. Horyna (1988)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
29. Kerensky (1989)		✓	✓	✓	
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>

Key: 1. SIP = Self identification of problems  
2. SP = Study problem  
3. SP = Solve Problem  
4. C = Collaboration, cooperation  
5. PST = Planning & applying solutions together

**Table 10 Identification of Educational Processes as a Means to Attain Desired Outcomes**

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Clapp (1933)	✓		✓	✓	✓		
2. Everett (1938)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓					✓	✓
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓	✓		✓		✓	
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
11. Melby (1955)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. McClusky (1959)	✓		✓	✓			
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓	✓		✓	✓		
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓			✓		✓	✓
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓	✓		✓			
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓			
19. Decker (1972)	✓			✓			
20. Berridge (1973)	✓	✓		✓	✓		
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓		✓		✓	
26. Minzey (1981)	✓	✓		✓	✓		
27. Fantini (1982)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
28. Horyna (1988)	✓			✓	✓		
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓	✓			✓		
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>

Key:

1. LT = Learning together
2. ET/L = Everyone a teacher/learner
3. ALE = All life educative
4. EBL = Education basis for based living

5. SE/SH = Self-education and self help in problem solving/Meeting needs
6. LBD = Learning by doing
7. LBTA = Learning by testing in action

**Table 11 Identification of Participation and Democratic Methods**

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Clapp (1933)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Everett (1938)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)		✓				✓	✓
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓	✓			✓		
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. McClusky (1959)			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓	✓			✓		✓
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓	✓			✓		✓
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓	✓		✓			✓
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
20. Berridge (1973)	✓	✓					✓
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓					✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
27. Fantini (1982)		✓	✓	✓			
28. Horyna (1988)	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓	✓			✓	✓	
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
<b>TOTALS</b>	28	30	17	26	25	20	25

**Key:**

1. PBA = Participation by all
2. C = Collaboration cooperation
3. FI = Faith in the individual
4. RI = Respect for the individual

5. SD = Shared (power) decision making
6. DP = Democratic processes
7. PT = Planning together

Table 12 Identification of the Characteristics of the Interactions

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features		
	1	2	3
1. Clapp (1933)	✓		✓
2. Everett (1938)	✓	✓	✓
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓	✓	
4. Clapp (1939)	✓	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓	✓
7. Seay (1953)	✓		
8. Muntyan (1953)	✓	✓	✓
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓	✓	✓
10. Hunnicutt (1953)	✓	✓	✓
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓
12. McClusky (1959)	✓		✓
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓	✓	
14. Von Voorhees (1969)	✓		
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓	✓	✓
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓	✓	
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓		✓
19. Decker (1972)	✓	✓	✓
20. Berridge (1973)	✓	✓	✓
21. Seay (1974)	✓	✓	✓
22. Piotrowski (1975)		✓	✓
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)	✓	✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓	✓	✓
26. Minzey (1981)	✓		
27. Fantini (1982)	✓		
28. Horyna (1988)	✓	✓	✓
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓	✓	✓
30. Decker (1990)	✓	✓	✓
<b>TOTALS</b>	29	23	23

Key: 1. PWAA = Participation with all ages  
2. EQ = Equal right to involvement  
3. EEQ = Everyone to be considered as an equal

Table 13      Miscellaneous Items

Chronological List of Selections	Coded Features					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Clapp (1933)	✓			✓		
2. Everett (1938)	✓		✓	✓	✓	
3. Kilpatrick (1938)	✓		✓	✓		✓
4. Clapp (1939)	✓			✓	✓	✓
5. Olsen, E. (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
6. Seay (1945)	✓	✓	✓	✓		
7. Seay (1953)	✓					
8. Muntyan (1953)					✓	
9. Hanna & Naslund (1953)	✓					
10. Hunnicutt (1953)						
11. Melby (1955)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12. McClusky (1959)						
13. Minzey & Olsen, C. (1969)	✓			✓		
14. Von Voorhees (1969)						
15. Totten (1970)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
16. Minzey (1972)	✓					
17. Kerensky (1972)	✓				✓	
18. Hiemstra (1972)	✓				✓	
19. Decker (1972)						
20. Berridge (1973)				✓		
21. Seay (1974)	✓			✓	✓	
22. Piotrowski (1975)	✓					
23. Kerensky & Melby (1975)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
24. Olsen, E. & Clark (1977)					✓	✓
25. Minzey & LeTarte (1979)	✓					
26. Minzey (1981)						
27. Fantini (1982)						
28. Horyna (1988)	✓					
29. Kerensky (1989)	✓					
30. Decker (1990)	✓			✓		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>

- Key:
1. SD/LC = Self-determination or Local control in C.E.
  2. RC = Resource (natural) conservation
  3. M/E = Moral/ethical means
  4. TT = Talking together
  5. E > A = Education which is more social than academic
  6. DSSL = Develop socially significant learning